

tory means that the future of the race for which the partners of a marriage are jointly responsible, is now found in the eschatological figure of the New Adam: marriage finds its meaning as a figure of the union of Christ and the Church, and the offspring of marriage need to be introduced into the new solidarity by baptism.⁴

But the process of saving history is the enactment of a *moral* mystery, the making manifest of sin and love: it is through personal response in human beings that the cosmic process is given its redemptive sense. Sexual morality is informed by the redemptive mystery, by way of judgment or fulfilment: it exhibits God's love or his wrath in every succeeding historical moment. Catholic sexual morality can never cease to be a testimony to the world of the Passion and Resurrection, and indeed for many Catholics, in the West at least, it is the only true martyrdom which they may expect to face and endure. It is certain that they will fail in this test if they have not acquired a sense of the place of sex in the ontogenesis of the human person, the revelation of the sons of God for which all creation groans. 'This mystery is great; but I speak with reference to Christ and the Church'.

Authority and Radicalism

JOHN COULSON

This is not a statement of a political kind: a manifesto for yet another Catholic Guild; nor is it what Field Marshal Montgomery would call an excuse for belly-aching. It is rather an agenda for further study—a plea for a new attitude of mind. I say attitude of mind, because my own experience of Catholics has been that in this country they still tend to look at social questions differently from their fellow Christians—as aliens, not as members by birth of a society which 'belongs' to the members of the other denominations, in their capacity as citizens. This attitude is expressed in terms of keeping oneself to oneself, or the half-resentful assumption of a superiority which is not felt: 'They have the

⁴The place of virginity in the Christian economy was discussed in a separate lecture, to be published later in *The Life of the Spirit*.

society, but *we* have authority'.

But as far as social questions go, what does this authority amount to? A few half-remembered phrases from St Thomas, a couple of encyclicals? If so, this is not authority, but mere slogan-thinking.

I have also met Catholics who say that social problems do not really exist as such. The only problems are theological. It is all a question of applying the answers already available in the deposit (that is, I think the term) of the faith. Thus an exact study of social questions is unnecessary, especially as the Welfare State has eliminated poverty, starvation, bad housing, and all the normal objects of Christian charity. It would, of course, be heretical to deny that Catholics, by virtue of their faith are in possession of the Church's answer to questions of moral principle. But in the ordinary and highly complicated business of living, how far does that get you? Does the possession of principles, *ipso facto*, make you a successful social scientist? The gap between a particular social problem and a particular moral principle, between the lonely men and women condemned to an isolated existence, not in cities, but in megalopolitan conurbations, and the commandment to love one's neighbour as oneself—this gap is as wide as that between a notional and a real religion.

How is that gap to be bridged? How are we to treat the man who says, 'I am so lonely, I shall kill myself; but I cannot keep my friends?' These are the problems of the Welfare State: loneliness, the accidie of a mis-used leisure, and above all the erosion of the demand for those very principles which the Church professes.

This where the need for a *science* of the application of our moral principles becomes imperative. Not to provide one will have serious consequences for the following reasons:

A pre-occupation with social questions is more than a matter of tactics and of stealing the opponents' thunder. It leads to a deeper and more real understanding of the nature, operation and structure of that very authority which we so rightly claim to possess; because what distinguishes a community from a mob, a police-state, or a problem area is that one has learned how to live with authority and the others have not.

Secondly, it is my contention that Catholics are unlikely to make any distinctive impact upon this country and its culture until they realise how deep-seated are certain pre-suppositions about the nature and exercise of authority. I think it is true to say that if you scratch an Englishman, you will find a radical; and that it is for this reason that conservatism as a political principle has ceased to exist in this country. We are all radicals; but some of us are more to the Left than others; and the

peculiar dilemma of the Labour party is that the divisions within itself correspond to the divisions within the nation.

Radicalism may seem a vague term, but it stands for a definable attitude of mind which is common to non-marxist socialists, left wingers, pinkoes, Butskillites, those who vote Liberal and a significant proportion of those who vote for Mr Macmillan. Such radical attitudes, because they are deeply rooted in the national character, possess great psychological strength. They evolved out of certain theological conclusions; and their strength seems to me to reside in their being not a series of slogans or pronouncements (a word too highly prized by the timid), but a system of embodied values, arrived at by minds living and working in community with each other.

Thus the *authority* of radical attitudes is a growth, rather than a synthesis of odds and ends: hence its dynamic quality. It is a concept of authority which comes closest to the etymology of the term itself: AUCTOR—to make something *grow*.

My last claim is that radicalism in this country, like socialism, is not Marxist in origin but Methodist—or certainly Puritan; and that it springs from a determined, but highly extraverted (and theologically one-sided) interpretation of the doctrine of the mystical body.

As Père Congar has pointed out in his *Lay People in the Church*, the effect of the Reformation upon the Catholic Church was to bring under suspicion any requests for lay initiative or for a fuller development of the doctrine of the mystical body. Even at the Vatican Council several bishops wanted to avoid the idea of the mystical body, as savouring to them of Jansenism. This left the field free, as it were, to the Protestants, and particularly to the Puritans. Their doctrine that the relationship of God and man did not require the mediation of the Church removed the Church as the balancing factor between the individual and his ruler; and this led, in practice, either to the creation of theocracies—as at Geneva—or to the Erastian subordination of the new churches to the State.

What all reformers had in common, however, was that they looked upon society as the arena in which personal sanctification was to be achieved; and thus in order to sanctify himself, the Protestant had the duty to bring about a sanctified society, a veritable kingdom of Christ on earth, in which the individual duties are performed by men, conscious that they are 'ever in the great Task-master's eye', and the whole fabric is preserved from corruption by a stringent and all-embracing discipline.

Thus Calvin turned the whole of Geneva into a monastery, in which the traitors to the Kingdom might be identified by pointed shoes or golden ear-rings as well as by grosser failings such as drinking, dancing, and failing to attend church. A child was even beheaded for striking its parents, and in the four years 1542-6, fifty-eight persons were executed and seventy-six banished from the city. Geneva had become a spiritual glass-house.

An asceticism quite as severe as that of most monastic orders had as its sphere of operation the counting house, the workshop, the family; and to the Puritans salvation was achieved not merely *in vocatione*, but *per vocationem*. They spurned what they called 'the begging friars and such monks as live only to themselves and to their formal devotion, but do employ themselves in no one thing to further their own subsistence or the good of mankind . . . yet have the confidence to boast of this their course as a state of perfection; which in very deed, as to the worthiness of it, falls short of the poorest cobbler, for his is a calling of God, and theirs is none'. Prayer and meditation were the refusal by God's servants of his greatest work, the deliberate adoption of 'the easie part'. 'The standing pool is prone to putrefaction', says Governor Bradford of New England.

The Puritans also happened to discover that their recipe for salvation in the next world was excellently suited to success in this; indeed the attaining of worldly success became a sign of God's favour, and a promise of the assurance of eternal salvation.

It is easy to laugh at the mass of theological errors and half-truths which are implicit in such thinking, but it bred the men who gave us Cromwell's New Model army and the real aristocracy of the Industrial Revolution—the Wedgwoods, Boultons, Rowntrees and Cadburys. And even to-day who hears of strikes and bad industrial relations in great industries run by the Quakers? And how much of the dedicated spirit of men like Montgomery can be attributed to their perception of the world as the monastery in which the battles of the spirit are waged. Such men see the asceticism of many Catholics as a sporadic series of meaningless formalities: useless, introverted and flabby.

This attitude of mind, or climate of opinion, was not confined to the stricter sorts of Puritans. It is to be found at the very root of Thomas Arnold's urge to reform the great schools of England; and his creation of Rugby—the New Model of the English public-school system—was only part of a general policy on the nature of religion, and on the relationship of Church and State.

To Arnold, religion was 'the sovereign science of life in all its branches'. He had no time for a religion that did not attain practical and real results. Indeed, he held that there was no more fatal error than to 'acquaint the mind with the truths of religion in a theoretical form, leaving the application of them to be made afterwards'. For him religion was dynamic: it was not a system of observances and set points.

It was for this reason that he was so opposed to Newman and the rest of what he called the Oxford Malignants. They were separating the secular from the spiritual, and making the church 'an affair of clergy, not of people, of preaching and ceremonies, not of living, of Sundays and synagogues, instead of one of all days and all places'. For him the Church was the living society of all Christians, and he saw the challenge of the Industrial Revolution as being that of making it our business 'not so much to reform the Church, as to create one'.

It is in this context that we need to see his famous sermon to the boys when he had taken over Rugby school and had begun a drastic and unpopular series of purges and expulsions: 'It is not necessary that this shall be a school of three hundred, or one hundred, or fifty boys; but it is necessary that it shall be a school of Christian gentlemen'. Behind these reforms and purges was a desire to assemble at Rugby a prototype of the new Christian society. It was based on a determination to expel what Arnold referred to as the antichrist of priesthood and to restore the laity to a discharge of their proper duties. He wanted to revive the order of Deacons, to allow them to follow a secular calling; but above all things, he wanted to abolish the distinctions between clergy and laity. He did so in a characteristically radical manner by turning the laity, at least that proportion of it fortunate enough to attend Rugby school, into a new kind of priesthood.

This had its funny side. The great authority given to the prefects caused one of them, the poet Arthur Hugh Clough, to lie awake at nights worrying how he might do good to the school; and although it was with truth asserted that the boys taught by Arnold transformed the face of Oxford within a generation, there were always two sides to this question, as can be seen from this review in *The Times* of the 50's of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*:

'The model Rugby sixth-form boys were apt to regard themselves as members of a semi-political, semi-sacerdotal fraternity; they exhibited an inclination to extend the monitorial system to the world and to walk through the University at least as they did through Rugby with their canes and calling out "Silence! Silence!" Their contemporaries amused

themselves with their obstructive self-consciousness, their oppressive sense of responsibility, their conscientious tendency to entangle themselves in theological difficulties of the second magnitude and their nervous anxiety to look after other people's moral welfare'.

This criticism was probably the work of an Old Etonian, but before we approve and accept it we must remember that St John Bosco was driven to run his schools on lines very similar to Arnold's, and that his Arthur Hugh Clough was a young boy known as Dominic Savio, who died whilst he was still at school and was canonized in 1954.

One of the most striking effects of Arnold's policy was that, as an assistant master wrote to his biographer, 'every boy felt that there was work for him to do—that his happiness as well as his duty lay in doing that work well'. The notion of vocation was once again taken out of its priestly confinement and extended to all members of the Church, and 'zeal', a sense of mission and of personal responsibility are the keynotes of the best products of Arnold's system.

What really appeals to me about Arnold is his grasp of the truth that we are members one of another. He would have applauded Donne's celebrated phrase that no man is an island. In fact there is a distinctly Pauline quality not only in the impact his personality makes upon one, but in the nature of the tributes paid to him after his death.

His son, Matthew Arnold, said of him in his memorial ode 'Rugby Chapel':

But thou would'st not alone
Be saved, my father! alone
Conquer and come to thy goal,
Leaving the rest in the wild.

And although the poem, written it must be confessed by one who had become an agnostic, ends with the characteristically Rugbeian cry of

On, to the bound of the waste,
On, to the City of God . . .

one cannot help believing that its subject possessed a deeper understanding of what is meant by the social and political consequences of the doctrine of the mystical body than many post-reformation Catholics. Mistaken he might have been, Erastian he certainly was; but he did get hold of and put into successful operation a truth much neglected since the days of the early church: that by virtue of our baptism we are members of a real and existing community, not a spiritual proletariat ruled over by a clerical oligarchy.

But Arnold's attitude is part of a much wider climate of opinion,

radical but increasingly to be adopted by all classes, which was to determine the ethos of English political aspiration and reform. It ranges from Kingsley to Hopkins, from Disraeli (in *Sybil*) to Acton.

It was something larger than the political parties it created, first Liberal, then Labour; and it has left an indelible streak in the English character. It was implanted at the Reformation—or even earlier, if one thinks back to those crucial ten years in the life of St Thomas More when, slowly and unwillingly, he came to abandon the radical prince for the reactionary pope. This Radical attitude to authority seems to possess three characteristics:

(1) That we are most ourselves when we are members of a great community. This was at the very heart of Arnold's policy for Rugby.

(2) That the authority needed to establish and maintain such a community could only be brought about by the total participation of all its members in its responsibilities and duties: the liturgy of sacrifice is replaced by the liturgy of democratic procedure; pronouncements and promulgations are replaced by proposals and votes.

This is a thoroughly empirical attitude to authority. As Burke says, 'let me see the facts and let me see the men, then I will tell what we have to do'. Since authority is dynamic, you cannot stand aside and pick bits and pieces, choosing this, evading that, fiddling this. You must accept it wholly and in spirit, not merely in letter. It produces a mind which is earnest and scrupulous to the point of priggishness, to whom a canon lawyer is either an anathema or a contradiction in terms; but to whom authority is dynamic and not a mere set of static rules and proscriptions.

Rules and pronouncements are all right to start with, but for their authority to be effective they must be carried alive into the heart of each individual, until such rules become his own. Thus authority can only be learned and obeyed if it is exercised—in the school, on the parish council, or on the social welfare committee. These are the humble and unnoticed seed beds which make possible the establishment and growth of the English reputation for political maturity.

Only by patient study and discussion is the authority of a principle grasped, understood and made part of one self. However much one may pride oneself on the possession of all the best seminal principles, such seeds will be condemned to sterility if they lack the right soil—the tilth of argument, study, discussion and practice.

This brings me to the third and most important aspect of the radical attitude:

(3) Since authority must be made part of us in order to be under-

stood, the liberal education of the understanding is to be seen as the essential re-inforcement to and a part of moral education; and this union of liberal education and moral earnestness is the most distinguishing of all marks of the radical attitude. What has made the Labour Party great and enabled it to produce men of the stature of Herbert Morrison and Ernest Bevin is that the authority possessed by its policies was that they had been produced by a thorough analysis of economic conditions by men living and working together in community of purpose. Instead of the Oxford Colleges, their study was undertaken in draughty halls on plain wooden benches; and they belonged to that university of the working-man—the W.E.A. (Workers' Educational Association). Yet in the words of A. L. Smith, a Master of Balliol, many of them became capable of academic work as good as that of the first class honours man.

You do not destroy the authority of an attitude like that by a mere defeat in an election or by arguing at street corners in favour of Catholic Evidence. They can take comfort from defeat, in their sense of superior moral rectitude, as they grind down the enthusiastic proselytizer on details of the factory act, details of the balance of trade in the manner of Bill Cousins at his most forensic. And as long as the authority of their attitudes is visibly embodied in institutions in which they take a full and responsible part, they will continue to be fundamentally impervious either to the Conservative appeal to their self-interest, or the teaching of the Catholic Church on social questions as put forward in the latest 'pronouncements'.

What are the consequences from a Catholic point of view? Our total population is now equivalent to the effective (Easter communicant) strength of the Church of England, and changes in our role and attitudes cannot be avoided. The slow but steady renewal of the Mystical Body in this country could have unsettling social and political consequences: are we to be received by our fellow countrymen as those whose liberating touch makes all men members one of another, or is that touch to be resented as the inert and death-dealing handshake of oppressive *laissez faire*?

In its outward form, the Church is seen by non-Catholics as on a different pattern from what, to them, is beloved and familiar. It is merely impertinent to meet this criticism by a counter-criticism of democracy, or an implied preference for old recusant families. Nor is it much consolation to say that the Church was not always thus and to cite examples such as Fr Ricci and the Jesuits in China. What we really need

is for certain awkward questions to be asked rather more frequently and to be dealt with more authoritatively. How far can the Church change its political structure to adapt itself to a community which regards the sharing of powers and public accountability as part of *its* Natural Law? Is it possible to reconcile the belief that those who exercise authority in a community must be accountable to it for all their actions, with the belief that the lawful exercise of ecclesiastical authority, when vested in the bishop, is accountable only to God, or to the Pope?

If we assume that this apparent contradiction can be resolved, then certain subsidiary questions follow. What is the *least* amount of temporal power which the Church requires to do its priestly work? Cardinal Pole's failure to decide against the return of Church lands in England probably did as much as anything to make the efforts to restore the Faith to England in Mary's reign abortive; and, as far as I can see, the temporal powers of the Papacy were only surrendered after they had ceased to exist. In the past such problems were allowed to solve themselves; but modern conditions are setting their own increasing tempo; and the principle of *laissez faire* is now discredited, because it is unworkable. Any force which wishes to grapple with modern society must, in its *outward* face, be as nimble, and as able to deploy its resources according to an ever-changing master plan.

The second question is even more delicate, and that concerns the relationship of clergy and laity. Is theirs really a full and effective partnership? Are the laity right in insisting upon tying priests down to work which might be quite as effectively done by laymen? According to some recent correspondence in the Catholic Press, there are laymen who believe that a fully Catholic education can only be given by a priest, and that a vocation to the priesthood implies a vocation to teach little boys arithmetic and big boys English Literature to advanced level. Thus many priests are condemned to do what a trained professional teacher could do very much better. Are we right to insist that our shock troops and pioneers should be tied down to administration and teaching, when even Dr Manning—who has so often been cast as the villain in the liberal Catholics' melodrama—took in his stride the fact that a layman taught dogmatic theology in a seminary?

The acceptance of responsibility, however, implies the acquirement of power; and if the laity were required to help in freeing priests for work of greater spiritual and missionary importance, the question would have to be asked: what is the amount of responsibility needed by the laity to

make real the authority of the Church within themselves, and how are they to be trained for its exercise?

Such questions may seem impertinent, coming as they do from a mere convert, but what I can say with some certainty as one who was born an Anglican and became a radical is that if the Church's *outward* face does not change in this country, the second spring will be as far away in our time as it was in Wiseman's. The real stumbling block to re-union in this country is that Englishmen of all classes judge a religious claim in terms of its social consequences—for the reasons I have attempted to indicate. We English are true sons of Geneva, you may say, but we go on asking obstinately: does it help to redeem the world; and we mean by this: what is its contribution to social justice?

The contemporary English radical will tend, therefore, to regard the Church unfavourably for two reasons:

First, its emphasis will tend to seem formal, unnecessarily introverted and inward looking, as distinct from outward looking, morally earnest about social problems and dynamic. The radical will not make sufficient allowances either for the inevitable consequences of our 'penal' history and its psychological effects upon cradle Catholics and their relations with the 'owners' of their community; or for the greater psychological richness and sophistication displayed by our saints and confessors: men whose insight makes most radicals look psychologically naïve. But such virtues are half-hidden from the eye of the casual enquirer. All he notices is the failure to be intellectually curious, and to believe in the power of liberal education to assist and make real the truths of morality and religion. Where, he will ask, are the Catholic W.E.A., the Catholic residential settlements, the Catholic social research institute, the Catholic university, the Catholic *Scrutiny*?

To him the Church will stand, as it does to Jimmy Porter, as the symbol of all those vested interests that falsify experience.

The second reason for the radical's suspicion of the Church is really the consequence of the first. Nowhere will it present itself to him as the kind of community he can understand or like, and where it does exercise temporal authority, as in Spain or Southern Italy, it will arouse his passionate resentment. This is really the barrier to re-union: the apparent collision between two irreconcilable concepts of authority. On the one side seem to be arrayed the forces of modern liberal democracy, on the other a passive and acquiescent proletariat of second class citizens known as the laity, led by a body of officers who seem as completely insulated from them, socially and educationally, as any governing class

has ever been.

That I am not exaggerating the dichotomy can be seen from an important review in *The Times Literary Supplement* of two books written by Catholics on Reunion, in the course of which the writer said:

'Does Christianity involve the Church as a rival political authority to the secular state? What is now happening in Spain, in Eire, in Malta, in Latin America, or wherever else the Roman Church is powerful is as relevant to the discussion as the Marian persecution, or the ex-communication of Elizabeth I'.

He goes on to ask 'if Protestants agree that Peter is the rock upon which the Church was to be built, have they therefore to approve the architecture of the subsequent building'?

Living as we do, the privileged members of a politically mature society, the most politically mature in the world, we hardly pause to realise that this society was not built by Catholics but by men and women whom we affect to despise for the insularity of their theological thinking. What we do not see is that these men are as politically mature as we are immature, and that until we acquire their wisdom, their understanding of the social and political consequences of the doctrine of the mystical body, no Reunion will ever be possible. It is fatally easy for Catholic radicals in England to ignore the world of Catholic popular press, with its photographs of ecclesiastical haberdashery, statuary and advertisements of where to stay in Dublin, as they pick up *The Times* and read about the dealings of the Independent Judicature with a libel action brought by a priest against a Catholic journalist, or applaud Mr Macmillan for taking a tough line with Dr Adenauer. For us the ring is held by our non-Catholic contemporaries.

Against the background I have sketched it may be easier to see why Newman's effort to found in Ireland a University on English lines was as classic a piece of tragic inevitability as anything in Sophocles. But need such a repudiation of liberalism be inevitable? I want to suggest that in making that repudiation we are repudiating the very soil in which authority alone can take root, grow and attract others to its sustaining shelter. If people are denied communities, they form gangs; if they are denied responsibility, they degenerate into sycophants or rebels.

As Catholics we do indeed have the root of authority within ourselves; but the fullness of such authority is more than the seed, the mere germ; it is a great tree with many branches; it rejoices and is most itself amidst the complex inter-action of diverse responsibilities. It languishes

only when, if I may adapt what St Thomas says, men study God, but do not strive to live together in communities.

A Survey of Old Testament Studies

JOSEPH BOURKE, O.P.

Contemporary study of the Old Testament appears to be dominated by three trends, associated with three broad groups of scholars. For practical purposes these groups may legitimately be described as 'schools', but only in a sense broad enough to allow for the intellectual independence of each individual scholar. The designation 'school' is often resented and repudiated nowadays.

The first group, led by the German scholars, A. Alt, M. Noth and G. von Rad, is usually called the 'History of Tradition' school. The second, consisting primarily of Scandinavian scholars with S. Mowinckel and J. Pedersen at their head, is sometimes described as the 'Comparative Religion' school. For reasons which will appear later I personally prefer to call it the 'Palaeo-anthropological' school. The third general trend is that of 'enlightened orthodoxy'. It is characteristic of the new awakening of Catholic Old Testament scholarship, especially in France, and here the leader is unquestionably R. de Vaux. The approach of certain American scholars such as W. Albright, G. E. Wright and J. Bright is markedly similar to that of the French, and it would not be wholly inaccurate to classify these too under the same general heading of 'enlightened orthodoxy'. Let us very briefly consider the distinctive approaches of each of these schools as exemplified in their most important and most representative works.

The characteristic approach of the German school may be described by means of a double simile. The enormously complicated amalgam of tradition which we call the Old Testament is regarded as a sort of snowball. The nucleus of the snowball is constituted by the *Grundlage*, the