

most intimately and without the aid of any vague pious rhetoric, the victim of sin, because he is the symbol of the true self, of that which we allow evil in us to neglect, ignore and crush. His is the heart that I have refused to myself, to you, and to God ... The crucified enables me to see the self I destroy in the self I neglect. He enables me to see that to neglect is to destroy. And so I come before the crucified as a non-person, seeking to be awoken to the person I am." (pp.76, 78) It is good to be reminded in this way of the need for and possibilities of meditation on Christ crucified. Moore's persistent attempt to explore such meditation is satisfactory in that it illustrates how the effort can be neither platitudinous nor anti-intellectualist. On the other hand, it often seems to regard the crucifixion as part of God's plan in the sense of being inevitable. This, I suggest, is unacceptable. According to Moore, "The scholastic distinction between an 'antecedent' will of God, that does not contain the cross, and a 'consequent' will of God that does, misses the enormity of what the cross reveals of God. Christ's blood streams in the firmament of the beginning as the sign of the universe it is to be." (p.16) Perhaps it is true that there is only one possible universe; in that sense I would agree that the Incarnation was never a contingent affair. But it is exclusively as the source of value that we know God; never as the origin of wrongdoing. It follows that however difficult it

is to imagine an unfallen humanity, and regardless of the good that can be brought out of evil, it is only as productive of the good that we can intelligibly conceive of God. The distinction between antecedent and consequent wills is far from redundant. Sin is a tragedy and the idea that it springs from what God is should, I think, be avoided at all costs. So should the suggestion that "The message of the guiltless one is precisely that I am not guilty; that the charge against my freedom was falsely pressed and mistakenly accepted." (p.108) The fact of the guiltless one only serves to highlight the basic problem of being merely human. Not only must we maintain the absolute goodness of God; the reality of our fallen state also needs to be stressed.

What is the status of Christ crucified? Moore rightly declares that it is that of sinless victim. As he also maintains, Christ is human nature going its proper way and so, in a sense, Christ crucified is also ourself. But we are not God and Christ was. There is therefore an inseparable gulf between us and him. "The difficulty of the Incarnation is not in the dogmatic realm. It is the difficulty in a commanded self-acceptance that goes far beyond the limits of our self-acceptance." (p.6) This remark illustrates a stopping-short which is present throughout Moore's account. The crucified really is something of a stranger and the fact must be remembered in any Christology worthy of its name.

BRIAN DAVIES O.P.

ON TEACHING CLASSICS, by J. E. Sharwood Smith. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1977. 93 pp. £3.75

This book is part of the Students' Library of Education, designed for 'students of education ... and practising teachers and educationists'. For education students it provides in fewer than a hundred pages a remarkably complete view of John Sharwood Smith's ideas on Classical Studies, the Classical Languages and Literature and Ancient History. To teachers, particularly of Classics but also of English, History or general Humanities, who are sufficiently open, it may give the confidence they need to launch out into the kind of teaching advocated by the 'Copernican Revolution in Classics' of the last fifteen years. Yet there will be teachers who will, if they get as far as opening the book, merely

glance through the pages and then close it, with, I suspect, resultant catastrophe for their subject within the next few years.

Mr. Sharwood Smith has done what I have always thought all teachers in colleges of education should do: he has gone back to the classroom. This gives his work an authority and realism which should commend it even to anti-Classics head teachers. He does not go for what is new simply because it is new, nor throw out the old without discrimination. When he deals with the earlier supposed value of a classical education, he demythologises pretty ruthlessly but when he comes to the new, he points out the pitfalls with equal clarity as, for example, with 'story-

LIGHT A CANDLE

SEND THE CATHOLIC HERALD TO A MISSIONARY

A PRIEST WRITES FROM RHODESIA

"Kindly convey my deepest thanks to our good friend and benefactor who has renewed our gift subscription for another year.

It is consoling and inspiring to read by candlelight in the evening time your newspaper.

Please get as many as possible to pray for us, especially our defenceless flock, that good may come from this war."

.....
Please send this coupon to the Circulation Director, The Catholic Herald,
63 Charterhouse Street, London EC1 M6LA

Please let me light one of your candles.

I enclose £9.50 for a year's subscription/£4.75 for six month's subscription (delete as appropriate) for a missionary.

Name (blocks)

Address (blocks)

.....

.....

centred' teaching, which he himself does so well but which can be fruitless if the aim of the story-teller is not to let the pupils experience the story but something quite other. Similarly, when writing of the Cambridge Schools Classics Project he puts the CLC above other available courses but quotes the otherwise favourable account of it by an experienced teacher in which its strength as a foundation for A-level Latin is questioned. I would prefer to make more explicit the teacher's hint and blame the present A-level syllabus.

Perhaps I have made Mr Sharwood Smith's book seem too down-to-earth, confined to the classroom and the school and of little general interest. This is not so. His ranging over some part of the fields of sociology, history, linguistics and literary criticism are evidence of his own wide interests and readers not already familiar with *Didaskalos*, the journal of the Joint Association of Classical Teachers, which he edits, might be somewhat daunted by the bibliography.

The reader will want to know whether Mr. Sharwood Smith makes a case for a place—or even a growing place—for Classics in the curriculum of a comprehensive secondary school. If what you look for from education includes the moral, social, imaginative, emotional and intellectual development of the students, then I fear you

are going to be convinced.

I have one reservation about the realism with which I credited Mr. Sharwood Smith. He seems to think that Classics already has an assured place in all secondary schools. If he could get himself appointed as Classics adviser to the borough in which I work, no doubt it would soon have a firmer foothold there. The borough expresses its estimate of the value of Classics by having no adviser. There are perhaps three comprehensive schools which teach Classics at all and one of them is now forced to drop the teaching of Latin (except as a cram subject in the first year Sixth, which I regard as not real teaching or learning or education) because of the idiotic form which the Catholic comprehensive re-organisation of girls' education was allowed to take. I trust his experience is more typical than mine. Hopefully, this book of his may inspire hitherto unconvinced devisers of 'comprehensive' curricula. Don't grudge the price. John Sharwood Smith expresses himself with classical directness and no verbiage. At least two gems should not be missed: a splendid simile occupying nineteen lines of pp. 4 and 5 and the witty account of 'A day in the life of a Classics teacher' which forms the main part of the Epilogue pp. 76-80.

JOAN WINTHORPE