

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

VOLUME I

NUMBER 2



October 1938

Jesuit Educational Association

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J. . . . *National Executive Secretary*
- MICHAEL A. CLARK, S.J. . . . *Regional Director of Secondary Education
Maryland-New York Province*
- ALLAN P. FARRELL, S.J. . . . *Regional Director of Higher Education
Chicago Province*
- MATTHEW J. FITZSIMONS, S.J. *Regional Director of Higher Education
Maryland-New York Province*
- JOHN W. HYNES, S.J. *Regional Director of Education
New Orleans Province*
- JOHN J. KEEP, S.J. *Regional Director of Education
Oregon Province*
- JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J. . . . *Regional Director of Secondary Education
Chicago Province*
- JAMES E. MALONE, S.J. . . . *Regional Director of Education
California Province*
- WILLIAM J. MCGUCKEN, S.J. *Regional Director of Education
Missouri Province*
- WILLIAM J. MURPHY, S.J. . . *Regional Director of Education
New England Province*
-

Published Quarterly by

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

EDWARD B. ROONEY, *Editor*

55 EAST 84TH STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June, 1938

CONTENTS

CLASSICAL CULTURE AND THE RATIO STUDIORUM

Alphonse M. Zambara, S.J. 5

"CONTENT" AND THE RATIO (A REPLY)

George D. Bull, S.J. 10

THE CONVENTION OF RELIGION TEACHERS

Bakewell Morrison, S.J. 17

RADIO AND EDUCATION

Charles A. Robinson, S.J. 28

A GRAMMAR INFORMATION TEST

Julian L. Maline, S.J. 36

RECENT PUBLICATIONS 41

Classical Culture and the Ratio Studiorum

by ALPHONSE M. ZAMIARA, S.J.

FATHER GEORGE D. BULL, S.J. in his thoughtful article on "Present Tendencies in Our Educational System" in the June 1938 JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY proposes a lofty ideal for the teaching of literature. I am very eager to know how the Ratio may aid us in attaining that ideal.

I am in enthusiastic accord with Fr. Bull's statement that literature, Cicero and Demosthenes and Virgil etc.—should be taught not "mainly from the formularistic angle," "merely as examples of how to write a speech" or a poem, but also "as crystallizations of the thought and feeling of mankind in the great and differing crises of the human spirit through the ages," and that "it is only if they are taught this way also, that they can be called liberalizing or the 'humanities'."¹ My question is: Was this the objective of the Ratio schools in the teaching of Latin and Greek, and shall I, therefore, find in the Ratio the methods and procedures for securing this cultural objective?

Presumably the answer ought to be in the affirmative. The Ratio embodies our educational ideals. It is the norm for the humanistic formation of our scholastics. The *Epitome* (297,1) tells us: "Secundum principia et methodum Rationis Studiorum scholastici nostri solide instituantur in grammatica, humanitate, rhetorica . . .," and the recent General Congregation in its forty-first decree states: "Ejusque (*i.e.* Rationis Studiorum) methodus et leges in Nostrorum Juniorum institutione sancte observentur."² And yet, if we study the Ratio, we shall find, I believe, that the Ratio's express objective in the teaching of Latin and Greek was not a knowledge of the classic literatures "as crystallizations of the thought and feeling of mankind in the great and differing crises of the human spirit through the ages," but a practical mas-

tery of Latin expression, oral and written. Latin was the living language of sixteenth and seventeenth century scholars; it was the language of the schools, of the church, of international communication; nearly all available learning was in Latin books. It is quite intelligible, then, that from the "Infima Grammatica" to "Rhetorica" the emphasis was on knowledge of Latin grammar, and correct, copious, elegant self-expression in Latin. The multifarious exercises in Latin and Greek composition, outlined for each of the five classes; promotion of students on the sole basis of Latin and Greek writing, the warning about "eruditio" (*Regulae Prof. Human. 1*) "modice usurpetur . . . non ut *linguae observationem impediatur*," the insistence on Cicero's orations in the rhetoric class "ut *artis praecepta* in orationibus expressa cernatur," (*Regulae Prof. Rhetor. 1*) make abundantly clear that the primary object was self-expression.

In view of this it is not surprising to find Fr. T. Corcoran, S.J. affirming of the Post-Renaissance schools: "It was not so much a body of knowledge as a mastery of self-expression which was sought in the strictly formative period of training. The cultivation of the medium of thought was naturally prominent as long as Latin remained a usual vehicle of expression."³ Fr. William T. Kane, S.J. comes to the same conclusion. He says that of the five classes of the Ratio "The first three aimed chiefly at a mastery of Latin; the other two at a study of literature chiefly with a view to developing the student's power of expression."⁴ Fr. William J. McGucken, S.J. classifies the Renaissance schools as concerned chiefly with style. He says: "Their mistake was in overrating form at the expense of content, of striving for artistic effect through the exquisite cadenced prose and neglecting the thought back of the *esse videatur*."⁵ Does not this mean that literature was then taught "mainly from the formularistic angle," for the sake of the form rather than the content?

However, in all fairness may it not be said that the Ratio schools, while, perhaps, not aiming primarily at this liberalizing effect, in practice did commonly attain it? Such is Fr. T. Corcoran's judgment about the Post-Renaissance schools. After defining culture to be "a knowledge of the finest thoughts of the world's best

minds on subjects of permanent human interest," he affirms that "such culture though *largely attained through the secondary education of the time*, was not formally aimed at in its curriculum". (Italics inserted)⁶ How, then, was it attained? Was it merely a by-product, more valuable, perhaps, in the long run than the primary result aimed at, yet, only a by-product? Moreover, was this by-product attained through the persistent effort at correct, copious, elegant self-expression in admiring imitation of models adequately conveying "the finest thoughts of the world's best minds on subjects of permanent human interest," and must we return to similarly persistent admiring imitation of the classics in order to attain this culture now? Or did the ancient classics inevitably liberalize and humanize the sixteenth and seventeenth century pupil of the Ratio schools, because contact with the world's greatest minds became deep and intimate through the keen spirit of emulation in class contests, academies, public programs, and the like? Or was this liberalizing effect attained principally because the Ratio teachers were expected to be, and were "scholarly and cultured men" who studied their classics "first and foremost to be able to contemplate them, know them for their own sake rather than for the use they are to make of them afterwards?"⁷ Was it any one of these elements, or some combination of them, or some other element of the Ratio not mentioned here, to which the attainment of culture in the Ratio schools can be rightfully attributed? Or shall we maintain that the Ratio schools did not achieve this cultural objective? And shall we, therefore, conclude that methods and procedures for the teaching of literature "as crystallizations of the thought and feeling of mankind in the great and differing crises of the human spirit through the ages" must be sought outside the Ratio?

I am earnestly seeking an answer to those questions in the confident expectation that the answer will enable me to attain to Fr. Bull's high ideal in the teaching of the Latin and Greek literatures, in complete accord with Ratio principles and methods. In the meantime, may I suggest, for the sake of opening a discussion, what seems to be a basic element of the answer? Personally, then, I should, as things are now, begin with training the

class to think in Latin (and Greek). I should consider it a first essential that the class understand their Cicero and Virgil and Livy and Horace, their Plato and Homer and Demosthenes and Sophocles, without translating into English. I should have them reach "the finest thoughts of the world's best minds on subjects of permanent human interest" directly, and not through "the clumsy intermediary of the mother tongue."⁸ With this end in view I should have the students declaim their classics with understanding and feeling, and learn large sections by heart. I should have them summarize, outline, paraphrase in the language of the author. I should eschew translating from Latin or Greek into English, and from English into Latin or Greek altogether, except for an occasional phrase or clause. To bring their minds and emotions into intimate contact with the classics I should set them original Latin and Greek composition work in imitation of the authors they were reading,—not slavish, verbal imitation, except most rarely, but imitation of the structure and development of thought, in force and copiousness of expression. If "eloquentia anglica" had now to be my primary or ultimate objective⁹ in the teaching of the Latin and Greek literatures, I should add similar imitation of the ancient authors in English, and occasionally require translation into English as an exercise in English expression, never as a medium for understanding the author. Should not this be a first step in the teaching of literature "as crystallizations of the thought and feeling of mankind in the great and differing crises of the human spirit through the ages?" Is it not in accordance with some basic ideas of the Ratio?

REFERENCES

- 1 JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, June 1938, p. 10.
- 2 Cf. also *Epitome* 313, and for the "scholae mediae" 397,3.
- 3 *Studies in the History of Classical Teaching*, Longmans Green and Co. 1911: Ch. X. The Reading of Authors, p. 156.
- 4 *An Essay Toward a History of Education*, Loyola University Press, 1935: Ch. XIV. School Education from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century, p. 271.
- 5 *The Catholic Way in Education*, The Bruce Publishing Co. 1934: Ch. IV. The Catholic College and a Liberal Education, p. 43.

- 6 *Studies in the History of Classical Teaching*, p. 156.
- 7 George D. Bull, S.J., "Present Trends in Our Educational System," in *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY*, June 1938, p. 10
- 8 DeSauze, E. B., Ph.D., *The Cleveland Plan for the Teaching of Modern Languages*, p. 6. Cf. also "Translating Latin" by William R. Hennes, S.J. in *Reading and Translating Latin*, Loyola U. Press, 1929. p. 44: "When we make translation the method by which the pupil is to reach the meaning of a Latin sentence, when we make it the first point to which he is to give his attention, we are forcing him to consider his Latin text as a message written in code. Meaningless in itself, and therefore incapable of being read, it must be slowly deciphered, and only then can it take on any semblance of meaning."
- 9 Cf. Farrell, Allan P., S.J., "Permanent Values in the Ratio," in *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY* for June 1938, p. 38,4.

“Content” and the Ratio

A Reply to Father Zamiara’s Question

by GEORGE D. BULL, S.J.

FR. ZAMIARA’S question comes, I think, to this: Is the purpose of the Ratio (*i.e.* the *finis operis intrinsecus*), in as far as it makes use of the Classics, to form the student merely in style, or does it *also* intend that he be formed interiorly? Or, again: Is it the exclusive purpose of the Classics, as the Ratio intends them to be used, that the student shall be trained in *words alone* and in the various structures of words; or does it intend also that the Classics shall be so used as to beget clearness and vigor of intellectual activity in the student, richness of imagination, and depth and balance in his aesthetic emotions? Or finally, does the Ratio intend that of the four elements into which by a precision of the mind, we may break up a classical creation, form, imagination, intellect and emotion, that the first element, form alone, is the only one of importance?

I have put the question in various ways, to escape the ambiguities which attend the use of the common formula: “Form versus Content.” Protestant and other hostile critics of the Ratio are forever telling us that Jesuit training in Classics was “formalistic”; and not one of “content.” And as “content”—in their sense—is surely not the object of the Ratio, they have triumphantly concluded that formalism is the only alternative.

Before replying directly, therefore, to Fr. Zamiara’s question, I should like to make a comment on this formula “Form versus Content.”

The “content” of the Classics for these critics of ours has meant almost exclusively the *things* of classical writing. They insist on detail, such as the armor, the kind of ships, the houses, the clothing, the food, used by the classical man. Or, on a somewhat higher plane, (but still dominated by the sense of *thing*), they use the text as a springboard for disquisitions learned and no

doubt useful, on the laws, the customs, the school system or lack of it, the sociological, the economic, and other aspects of classical civilization.

In a word, "content," as the term is used in this hostile milieu, means and carries with it, the aura of a search through the great masters, for facts which will increase the sum of human knowledge. It is what is called the scientific approach to the classics. The immediate object is the *thing*—not the man. The immediate object is not the student with a mind to be made more perceptive, an imagination to be enabled and emotions to be ennobled from contact with the highest peaks of unaided intellect, imagination, and aesthetic emotion, achieved by man. The object is not to make the student more a man. The mere knowing *what* classical civilization was does not humanize him. There is, antecedently, no strict reason why he should have found these facts in the great books themselves. He could have done substantially as well, had he read dictionaries, encyclopedias and other informational books.

"Content," therefore, in the sense assumed by an age which is vitiated by "scientism" is not what the Ratio proposes in the study of the Classics.

Must we, in consequence, accept the alternative as this same modern states it? Must we say that if "content" is not the objective, surely "form" is all that the Ratio purports to achieve?

Here, again, it is necessary to find what lurks under the word "form"—as the modern is likely to use it. "Form" may be made synonymous with mere words, whether taken singly or in such groups as give the "form" to a grammatical sentence, to a lyric, to an epic, or to a speech. But "form" may also mean words and their arrangements precisely in as far as they are the *externalization* of forms which are within the man who is using words. In this sense form is truly "self-expression." It supposes that there is a "self" to be expressed. It implies that the great masters have acquired certain "forms" of the highest humanistic value, that is, that they have gone through an experience of permanent worth and have externalized that experience in words.

Now, to say that an educational system is "formalistic" in this latter sense, is surely to say nothing in derogation of it. It means

merely that the student is to be put in contact with the "forms" of the great masters. It means that their whole experience is to be re-presented (*i.e.* to be present again) in the inner life of the student. He is to become instructed not only in the fact of who the author was; nor of *what* he thought, nor even of *what* he imagined and felt. The student is bent toward trying to experience within himself that totality of idea, imagining and feeling of which form in the sense of *mere extrinsic* style, is but the externalization. If he is interested in the style predominantly, it is because the style in this full sense, is the man. And *man* and not *thing* must be the object of literary study.

So far, then, I have tried to make this point: we must not accept the false dichotomy of the modern: that there are but two approaches to the study of the Classics: the formalistic and that of content (as the modern uses these terms). There are really three approaches: (a) the *factual* or scientific, *i.e.* the preoccupation with *thing*. (b) the *formularistic*, *i.e.* the preoccupation with the mere mechanics of writing and the reduction of the great masters to little *formulae*, whether of the mere mechanics of grammar, the mere mechanics of lyric, the epic, the tragedy or the speech; (c) the cultural, *i.e.* the attempt to *cultivate by contact*; the attempt to enter into sympathy with the highest experience of man *as man* and to relive that experience, to express the self thus formed, as far as may be allowed by the limitations of the student's own natural endowments.

Now, it is this latter approach that I maintain is the one indigenous to the Ratio. It was because I thought there was at least a slight danger of its being dimmed, or neglected or even questioned amongst us today, that I spoke as I did in Milwaukee. Fr. Zambara asks me to point out where it can be found in the Ratio. The question is almost like asking where the human soul can be found in the human body. He says (p.1) that the Ratio's express objective " . . . is a practical mastery of Latin expression." If he means this in the sense of (b) above, *i.e.* the *formularistic* sense, I must retort his own question: Where will he find that only the *formulae* of writing or speaking, the mere mechanics of style without reference to the creation of the inner forms which

language is to externalize, are the "express objective of the Ratio"? How does he prove that it is "practical Latin expression" and not self-expression through the *practical* mastery of Latin which is the Ratio's aim? What account will he make of the fact that Greek also was taught and in some schools spoken—if the inner self by contact with the best human experience, was not within the Ratio's purview; or of the fact that the Society was the first in that new Europe to take Greek from the lecture platform and make it an integral part of a school curriculum? Why should a system interested only in the mechanics of style have incorporated in its "praelectio" such things as an "argumentum" even for poetry? Why did it prescribe *both* a "lectio cursiva" and a "lectio stataria"?* Why were Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian approved as the books for rhetoric, if the mere formulae of rhetoric and not the great rhetoricians themselves were the only things the system esteemed? What of the devices, such as the academies? Was the deeper penetration they envisaged merely a closer contact with extrinsic forms? Did Jesuits intend debates, discussions, original papers and speeches by students whose whole interest was circumscribed by the mere shell of lyric, epic, tragedy or speech? What will Fr. Zamiara make of works such as Fr. Ambram's *Cicero* or of Fr. La Cerda's *Virgil*? Are they expounding only the language? Why the long paraphrases in the *Delphini*—if the whole approach is formalistic? Does Jouvancy, solemnly approved by the Society, eschew the *experience* of the great masters and look only to the formulae? We find the Fathers of the Rhine Province insisting that "a knowledge of philosophical principles is a prerequisite in the teacher, for a competent interpretation of poets and orators and for the writing of good verse and even of good prose."** Surely, a teacher could communicate a "practical mastery of Latin expression" (in Fr. Zamiara's sense) without such an equipment. Why (to quote Fr. Farrell again, p.249) was ancient history laid under contribution as a background for the classic literatures and studied, too, in its *original sources* in the

* Bainvel, *Causeries Pedagogiques* p.124 sqq. Quoted by F. P. Donnelly, S.J., in *Principles of Jesuit Education in Practice*, P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1934.

** Farrell, *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education*, p.235

works of Livy and Herodotus, Caesar, Sallust and Xenophon, Tacitus and Thucydides?

Now, I do not pretend that these things are an itemized reply to Fr. Zambara's question. I intend them to be but straws in the wind. I intend them to indicate where the complete reply is to be found. And that is, not in the mere text of the Ratio of 1599, but in the history of that text precisely in as far as it is the conclusion of fifty years of debate and experiment under the aegis of some of the most learned men of the century. The tradition of Nadal and Ledesma and Peter Canisius, stands behind that text to give us its meaning, not less than does the towering figure of Claudius Aquaviva.

We must remember that the Ratio, as we have it, is a codification made at the express wish of the Provinces. They wanted practical rules. They did not want essays. Like every code, therefore, the Ratio assumes rather than exposes, its philosophy of education. And anyone who forgets to read those rules in the aura of their sources from 1548 onward, is likely to know the letter rather than the spirit of the whole system. When he sees such expressions as "observatio linguae," "compositio" or "eloquentia," he is likely to find them unlighted by all that lived in the minds of the men who made them and meant them, as handy rules of guidance within a tradition.

Now, obviously, it would be impossible to give here a convincing array of the relevant facts in that whole background; the facts, namely, which provide the light for discerning that terms like "compositio" cannot mean exercise in the mere mechanics of style and this alone. But fortunately, it is not necessary to attempt this here. Fr. Allan Farrell has done it admirably, copiously, and, as it seems to me, with finality. In more than one place, he has given an object lesson in interpreting some feature of the Ratio against the whole background of its history. I select what he says about "erudition," because erudition is the focal point of Fr. Zambara's question.

Fr. Farrell says (op. cit., p.300) "*Erudition as understood nowadays* (italics inserted) was no part of the Renaissance aim. The Latin and Greek authors were not read to afford scope for ex-

cursions into the by-paths of history, fable, the evolution of literature, comparative philology and the like . . . Thus, though the teacher was told to bring in necessary allusions to history and fable, to Greek and Roman antiquity, to men and manners and morals, he was expected to do this briefly with a view to clarifying the author's meaning rather than to exhausting an *extraneous* topic."

Now, the word *extraneous*, which I have italicized, is the key to the object lesson I am trying to point out. "Eruditio" may be extraneous, *i.e.* apart from the Ratio's scope; or, it may be germane. It is not extraneous when it is directed to the removal of obstacles to contact between the student and the great master he is reading. It *is*, when it becomes the springboard for mere Wissenschaft. A whole philosophy of education, then, is implied by the mere fact of the warning against erudition which Fr. Zamiatra quotes. If the Ratio had as its tradition the mere utilitarian value of writing and speaking, if it were merely a kind of 16th century Berlitz, if the tradition within which that code of rules was meant to function had no tendency to anything but the mere mechanics of style, there would be no need to post such a warning any more than there is such a need today in the Berlitz milieu. But the men who were reducing to code, as far as might be, the essential outlook of Jesuit educators, felt that there was such a need. And this prescription of the Ratio embodies their fear not that "eruditio" would be an objective (this they never question) but that it would get out of hand and come between the student and the person of the author, as externalized in his language.

Now, as I said above, I offer this merely as an example of how a full reply to Fr. Zamiatra's question would have to be made. The "express objective of the Ratio" becomes clear beyond cavil, when we go beneath the mere formulated rules and find in their sources the things they were intended to secure. The hostile and eager criticism of those who belong to an alien culture (men like Monroe), looked only to the rules themselves, or interpreted the activities of the Jesuit schools in the light of the "scientific" view of what "content" should be. The Ratio never lost the sense of man any more than it lost the sense of God. It never intended

the mastery of language at the expense of the student's inner development of intellect, imagination, emotion; in a word, of inner as well as outer form. "Eloquentia," unless it be given the modern and unwarranted sense of mere declamation, implies a self to be expressed, which is highly personalized because it has been at home with the master personalities. "Compositio" has an inner as well as an outer aspect; the facility it connotes is that of a self which has learned to be at ease in the company of the great.

And if it be said that all this is but an interpretation of the Ratio, I agree. But I remind the objicient that no code, not even the *Codex Juris Canonici*, is delivered from the need of interpreters. And the debate moves then (as I have said) to the sources from which such a code has been drawn and the living tradition within which the codifiers moved. And I feel certain that in the years of deliberation and debate and experiment, in the presence of great names and grave learning, in the whole lineage of our Ratio, no one can find ground for the charge of "formalism," or sincerely hold that Jesuits are caught on either horn of the modern's pseudo-dilemma: "content or form."

I hope I have answered the essence of Fr. Zambara's question. To subsidiary points such as the practice of the Ratio schools (a phrase I am not clear upon) I have attempted to make no reply. I have admitted that "content" as the modern uses the term is no preoccupation of the Ratio. And I have denied that "form" alone, in the sense of this same utilitarian and "scientific" culture is the only alternative the Ratio could have. And, in consequence, I maintain that the Ratio itself is the warrant for my original statement: "Literature should be taught . . . not *merely* as examples of how to write a speech or a poem," but as "crystallizations of the thought of mankind in the great and differing crises of the human spirit through the ages."

An Interpretation of the Work of the Convention of Religion Teachers

Campion, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin
August 21, 22, 1938

by BAKEWELL MORRISON, S.J.

THE Delegates to the Convention, that is, the Director of the Department of Religion from every college and university of the Chicago and Missouri Provinces with one or more teachers from the same school as well as the Director of the Department of Religion of Fordham and Georgetown universities, were welcomed most cordially by the Reverend Rector of Campion as they assembled in the commodious "Fathers' Club Room" on the morning of Sunday, August 21, for their first session.

There was a great deal of good will and high purpose in the delegates but there was also a certain uncertainty about what was to be accomplished during the sessions. The Convention, heralded by several notices and questionnaires, was not unprepared for, but it was long since many of the delegates had assembled at Campion for a similar religion teachers' convention (1932) and some had never before gathered with their fellow religion teachers for any concerted planning and action. Now it was apparent that the Provincials of Chicago and Missouri Provinces wished something done about religious teaching. Yet what was to be done remained fairly nebulous.

It was at once obvious that a name was desired, since membership in learned societies is an item that appears well when one makes out reports for the North Central. Hence a name was chosen, and even a past was discovered. There was continuity between this Convention and the laborious Seminar of 1932, which resulted in the sudden development of the texts published by Bruce and constituting the backbone of the Science and Religion

Texts. The delegates chose to call themselves the "Institute of Religious Education of the Jesuit Educational Association, Mid-West Section."

Heartened perhaps by this move the delegates set about dissipating their vagueness with sharp and practical detail by reviewing the exact status of religion teaching in the represented colleges and universities. It was thought best that this be done by a report from each college and university on the texts used, the methods employed, the hours devoted to the work of teaching religion.

Therefore, each school reported on itself, detailing the purpose that was its guiding force and the details of actual work customary, the textbooks, and the hours assigned to religion. The questions put to the heads of departments as they explained their programs gave evidence that there was much interest and even some anxiety over the variety of text and method that were disclosed. Evidently no school presented a program very like that offered by any other school. There were some similarities, of course, but the general impression created by these reports was that variety, whether studied or accidental, was certainly the outstanding superficial feature of teaching religion in our colleges and universities today.

All naturally professed the same general objective, which can only be the proper formation of representative, staunch and vitally functioning Catholics. But the attainment of this objective was very clearly being sought in various courses with varying texts and even with varying methods. These reports and their discussion fully occupied the rest of the morning session.

The *second session* seemed at the moment the most fruitless but it actually achieved more than any other because the debate was on fundamentals. Certain things became crystal clear as the session got under way. Outstanding and at once was the divergence of opinion on what should be taught our students and divergence of opinion on how the matter should be taught. Two schools of thought were evident. There were those who wish *theology* taught the student. There were those who do not wish *theology* taught the student but do not wish *religion* taught. These two contrasting views may profitably be reported here in some detail.

The first school of thought, which might be called that of the "scientific theologian," may be summarized somewhat as follows. Theology is a science. Viewed piece-meal it is perhaps bewildering and the separate parts suffer by isolation. But as a whole it is dynamic, moving the intellect to a new and fresh appreciation, and establishing the mind on the solid bases of rational explanation and reasonable argument for the faith that is in one. As a science it simply must be taught wholly. A great deal must be seen. And this great deal must be interpreted and expounded and the student must be permitted to see the metaphysical and rational bases which support the dogmas of faith.

Consequently, the whole of theology as seen in a course in a theologate must somehow be put at the service of the student and must be brought down to his level in such a way that the wholeness is very apparent and the details are observed and digested in a context with an interpretation which renders them actual and presently valuable. The student himself must understand and the student must be able to expound for the benefit of others. Moral will be scattered through the whole field and, as the occasion offers, will be explicitly adverted to and taught.

Some selection, of course, must be made. Some tempering of the dryness and the detail of scientific theology must be made. But these ends are to be achieved rather by sheering off such things as adversaries and objections and by combining classic theses into more practical units than by omitting very much of the total amount of matter that is seen in the four years a student spends in preparation for his life as a priest.

This view has tradition behind it. It also suffers from one great possible weakness in that busy men find it easier to review their own courses in theology and re-present that to classes than to take up religion in a definitely new context and with a definitely psychological orientation. This system is actually "in possession" in many places. New minds, taking over the problem of bringing the religion courses to an even newer fruitfulness and an even more powerful attractiveness and efficiency, are still content to remain within this general framework in order to secure results. This view, however, is only superficially in the way of tradition,

if "tradition" may be the word proper to express existing and unrevised systems of teaching the religion courses in our colleges and universities. There is every evidence of a vigorous intention of putting the student in full and powerful possession of the dynamic Faith which Christ gave the world to save it. And there is every desire to bring the theses out from their hiding places in textbooks into the living reality of vital facts which are the life of man. Yet the science of theology must be taught and the completeness of theology must be maintained.

Orientation is allowed for, sometimes very definitely, sometimes latently and as a natural correlative of the Apologetics. Three years, at least, will be well consumed in presenting this system to the student; four years would more adequately allow for competent handling. And special problems will be emphasized with vigor and elaboration.

The second school of thought may be classed as the "psychological." The approach to the student is not made with the science of theology but with the vitality of religion. The student's mind and his heart are considered the double object at which the religion courses must aim. College level teaching requires college level texts. And college men (and women), living so vividly in a world which attracts them with every sense and through every emotion, are better met and stimulated, refreshed and established with the psychological approach in the teaching of religion than with another science. Consequently the student must be met with new ways of viewing his religion. He must be shaken from the rigid formulation which his high school has perhaps given him. He must be taught to savor an atmosphere first rather than to rationalize his religion. To this end, dogma is not omitted nor even neglected but dogma is thrown into new contexts and the Mass and prayer and the Sacraments are made the vehicles through which his religion is brought to him. He is met with the actual presentation of the uses of his religion and through these ideals and practices he is taught the underlying and motivating dogmas, but in a context which is miles away from the theology course which every priest has had.

Because this school of thought is very consciously aiming at

the "whole man" who is under instruction and wishes through the teaching of practice to arrive at the steady grasp and intellectual appreciation that the faith imperatively requires, even the expression of the plan may seem nebulous. But, based on new and different texts, the plan is concrete enough.

The freshman year would be consumed in teaching matters neither apologetic nor dogmatic in the strictest sense. Apologetics and dogma are reserved for the sophomore year. Then, it is thought, the student mind is beginning to be sufficiently formed in the art of constructive thinking to be able to taste and relish the more directly intellectual aspects of the faith and then the student mind is better prepared for the judicious selection of fundamentals and of dogmas with which he must have his mind stocked and developed.

Thus in two years the minimum essentials are presented to the student and taught him with sufficient thoroughness to guarantee that his mind be not flabby and his heart be not untrained, rudimentarily at least.

The business of the religion department in the upper division becomes the development and presentation, more or less to an elite, of the culture that is Catholicism. Again, the science of theology is permitted only a veiled presentation, and the cultural aspects and vitality of the faith are made the definite objectives. Furthermore, the religion department feels quite at ease in transmitting to the other departments of the university or college a just share in establishing Catholicism and in enlarging and making practical the applications of the faith. Courses in other departments than the religion department are recognized as being of distinct and formal value in the complete training of the Catholic mind and in the proper orientation and stimulation of the Catholic heart. It is neither thought (nor hoped) that the religion department has exclusive responsibility for forming the ideal Catholic in our schools. Literature is a vehicle through which the faith finds expression. Science is a field wherein the faith finds help. The social sciences abound in critical matters which are not always so helpfully seen in the context of dogma and often are best transmitted in the medium in which they live.

Besides, both ways of thought must find more room for the enlargement of the teaching on the Encyclicals. Both sides must give more express attention to the present-day problems which loom so large in the social field. The Pope wants it. The General orders it. The situation calls for it. And surely in this specialized field, the "psychological" approach is better than the scientific?

This summary of the two ways of thought omits all the vivid details of the argument. Interest was high. The bigness of the matter was understood. The delegates clearly appreciated the need of coming to some understanding on these vitally significant points.

Still another matter waited for attention before adjournment of the second session. Fathers Michael I. English and William L. Wade had written a special "opus," a course of applied religion centering on the three Encyclicals, *Rerum Novarum*, *Quadragesimo Anno* and *Divini Redemptoris*. They were moved to this work by the insistence of our Holy Father for a laity properly educated along these lines, by the definite orders of our Very Reverend Father General that these matters be well taught, and they had been actively encouraged by the General Prefects of Studies of their Provinces. Father Wade could not be present but Father English had been expressly invited in order that he might give an account to the delegates of the work done. No suitable text for college courses in the matter had hitherto been available, but the recently finished work of these two Fathers was considered sure to meet the present need. Father English gave the report on the new text. It is called "Rebuilding the Social Order." It is worked out into Units with suggestions even as to the number of hours to be devoted to each unit. The Units are so arranged as to give the teacher hints for prolonged personal study before teaching, yet so simple and in fact so clear as to be usable even though the teacher has little time for preparation. Sociology and Economics are a desirable background but a knowledge of each or both is not needed in order to teach the text successfully, as it is not a course in sociology or economics but in applied religion. The text in fact fills a very pressing need. The delegates manifested the expected interest in Father English's report.

The *third session* was devoted to the very precise business of debating and adopting the Aims which the Committee appointed had worked out. These Aims may be taken as the fruits of the Convention. They give words to a tentative ideal. It was quite understood that as Aims they were not mandatory. The implications of method contained in them were intended to be suggestions rather than dictation. No effort was made in proposing the Aims to command compliance. The Aims were to be studied by each Department Head and applied as his wisdom and the opportunities of the situation in his school made it feasible. They were to be considered thoroughly. They would orient thinking for the coming year and would prepare the minds of delegates for a more pointed and more definite meeting next year.

We quote the Aims here, omitting the debate that accompanied the first reading and omitting the discussions, resulting in emendations of the first reading, which were incorporated in the Aims and find actual expression in the present statement of the Aims.

THE AIMS

General Aim. The general aim of the religion curriculum in the American Jesuit College is to present the essentials of Catholicism in so intelligent and appreciative a fashion as will result in personal apostolic Catholic living by our graduates. This general aim cannot be obtained unless each course has pointedly as framework and reference the following key doctrines: 1) The concept of the supernatural life; 2) the dogma of the Fall and the Redemption; 3) the Sacrifice of Christ and the Sacrifice of the Mass; 4) the fact of the Mystical Body; 5) the authority of the Church. For example, in teaching the Sacrament of Baptism the student should be made clearly to understand and appreciate that Baptism gives the supernatural life and incorporates him in Christ, and that this life is even more distinct from natural life than the intellectual is from the animal.

SPECIAL AIMS

A) *Aim of the Freshman Year for the Well-Prepared Catholic Student.* The aim of the freshman year should be the spiritual, intellectual and psychological orientation toward Catholic

living. Specifically this means that the student learns 1) how to pray; 2) how to assist at Mass; 3) to grasp the essential meaning of the liturgy; 4) to understand the motives for the practice and development of Catholic virtue; 5) to appreciate personal relationship with Christ, His Mother, and His Saints.

B) *Aim of Sophomore Year.* The aim of the sophomore year is the clarification and intellectual strengthening of the student through appreciative understanding of the apologetic and dogmatic foundations of the Catholic religion in their individual and social implications. This is to be achieved by a selection of dogmas and a careful limitation of apologetic arguments.

C) *Aim of Upper Division Courses.* The aim of the upper division religion courses is to develop and enrich Catholicism as a culture. Naturally, then, the Religion Department will offer courses to further this purpose. A course, for example, in the Encyclicals will be obligatory where such a course has not already been required. Further it is recommended that each Department in the College offer one or more courses that will emphasize the Catholic viewpoint in that particular field. As a suggestion, the English Department should require a course in Newman and/or Literary Aesthetics based on Scholastic Philosophy, or something similar. The History Department should require a course in Disputed Points in Church History, or a similar course. A common course should be required of all Science Majors dealing with points of apparent conflict between religion and science.

D) *Aim of Freshman, First Semester, for Unprepared Catholic Students.* Freshman Catholic Students who have not had adequate Catholic training in high school should be provided with a special remedial course. The aim of this course should be to put them in possession of the necessary minimum knowledge of Catholic doctrine in order that they may be prepared to follow the regular religion courses thereafter.

E) *Non-Catholic Incoming Freshmen.* Provision should be made for courses in Natural Religion for incoming non-Catholic students. If these students can be persuaded to follow courses in supernatural religion, this is obviously to be desired. When the courses in Natural Religion are accomplished, a Survey course

in the Catholic religion should be offered these students, and persuasion should be used to induce them to take this course.

It might appear from reading these Aims that the "psychological" view won the day at the Convention. Such would not be true to the facts. While the Aims do largely express the "psychological" view, they are not exclusive. It was even thought that they might be incorporated in the programs of the "scientific" school with most interesting results. At any rate their tentative character made them unlikely to interfere with any arranged program. They were planned to be a sort of mental atmosphere in the rosy light of which each Department Head might contemplate, study, and eventually formulate his own working plans.

With the adoption of the Aims the Convention still had things left to do. It had already been made a matter of record that "full-time" teachers of religion were to be multiplied as circumstances permit. If the full-time teacher of religion were to absorb all the religion teaching, a possible danger of loss of apostolic interest on the part of the other teachers in the college or university who would teach no religion was suggested. This danger was not thought to be very real. The zeal and self-sacrifice demanded of teachers in other departments who handle one or more courses in religion were applauded, particularly as the Convention, with its high ideals for religion teaching, realized fully how much time and study these added courses would require from teachers not of the religion department. One of the most reasonable complaints that might be raised by members of other departments who were "borrowed" for part-time work in the department of religion was thought to be easily able to be avoided. If each teacher, aggregated to the religion department, were given one or at most two courses which he taught regularly and year after year, his efforts would be sensibly reduced and his effectiveness measurably increased.

The matter of collateral reading was given attention in the *fourth session*. One quasi-syllabus was studied briefly. The book lists, the questions to be used in securing proper reports on the books read outside of class by the students, the general amount of work to be required by the department in each course were

gone over. There seems complete unanimity on the need and desirability of such requirements.

The question of a syllabus for each course in the religion department came in for consideration, too. A sample copy in general outline was given out for study. This matter of a syllabus allowed the convention an opportunity to face the problem of uniformity within the college of matter and manner for the same courses when taught by different instructors.

It became quite apparent that the delegates were keen to continue relations among themselves. A "clearing house" where pertinent and valuable materials might be stored and passed on was discussed. The present seems to offer nothing better than the individual willingness of department heads to share their own inventions and industries by personally sending them on to each separate Director when and as they are created. But it was made a matter of record that each Department Head must keep by him a complete list of all the other Directors and must feel obligated to communicate his discoveries and his "opera" to the others. The delegates heartily welcomed a proposal read from the Chair: That the Father Provincial of both the Chicago and Missouri Province be petitioned that an Institute of Religious Education might be held next year. This institute would last a week, would consist of assigned papers and assigned ground-breakers who would lead the discussion of the papers. The points of debate or clarification would be derived from current problems, world problems, curriculum difficulties, the subjects treated in this Convention, or in general from topics germane to religion teaching.

This proposal has since been graciously approved by the Provincials concerned and the Institute will be held next year at Campion at a date to be fixed for after August 15th.

The last topic broached was "Department Meetings." These were briefly evaluated. Suggestion was made that a minimum of three a year was desirable, and in these meetings orientation, stimulation, interchange of ideas, the basis for uniformity in teaching and in requirements could all be achieved in a mild sort of way. At any rate, the necessity for the Religion Department to

consider itself an entity with just title to complete existence was made clear.

Then the proper courtesies were observed in voting sincere thanks to the Rector of Campion for his hearty hospitality and to the Provincials for making the Convention possible. After that the Convention adjourned.

A summary of the fruits of the Convention is easy to make. For the first time in the experience of many of the Department Heads present the whole business of religion teaching was aired. This alone would have justified the Convention. But concrete good resulted. The "Aims" were expressed. The "Institute" was founded and is to live and function. There was a sense of power and of critical responsibility manifested. And there was a heightening in every delegate's mind of appreciation for the work of the Religion Departments. Religion teachers are indeed among the most powerful forces in each of the colleges and universities. Vocal in a wieldy, compact group, they can now go forward in enlarging their field and in developing their effectiveness with a sense of union and of vivid cooperation which heretofore may have been somewhat lacking. The debate on the "psychological" approach to religion teaching showed clearly that newer instruments are recognized as needed, and gave evidence that the trends of the times are happily presenting to the Defenders of the Faith marvelously potent tools. Hopefulness and alert determination to produce the finest possible results in the minds and hearts of the students committed to the care of our colleges and universities were clearly the basis for a rationally founded prospect of greater fruits and more vivid vitality in advancing the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ upon earth.

Radio and Education

by CHARLES A. ROBINSON, S.J.

“LET me write the nation’s songs, and I care not who writes its laws.” Once that citation was more than an idle boast. The increase in literacy, however, and the multiplication of daily newspapers lessened the persuasion of song and developed an excessive credence in the printed word. Later, the cinema and color photography and printing became the occasion for many persons to quit reading altogether, and thus lessened the influence of the press. But the very perfection of photography, with its own exposures of its tricks, has led many to doubt what they see. In the meantime radio has taken the ascendancy. Most listeners continue to believe what they hear, to such an extent that an extremist wrote recently, “In 1940, we will not vote for party or policy, but for a human voice.”

Internationally, nationally and locally, the power of radio is fairly evident. England has made concession to Italy as the price of ending the disturbing broadcasts in native languages from Italian stations to British colonies. It has also instituted drastic changes in its own policy to the extent of using various native tongues in its short-wave broadcasts. Russia broadcasts to Germany and other countries. Germany does its technical best to destroy the reception of these programs and at the same time sends out Portuguese and Spanish programs to South America. Even the United States has started a tentative short-wave broadcast in Spanish to offset the German influence. Now our southern neighbors are supposed to be Catholic. If programs from the United States are not prepared under Catholic auspices, they will lose in effectiveness or they will do damage to the Faith of the South Americans.

In the national field, the tremendous influence for molding thought into concerted action is evidenced by the way the people as a whole are fired with zeal for the cause, when a great speaker steps before the microphone. Only the other day, we could listen

to the dynamic Fuehrer and hear the echoes of his applause. We know what a "Fire-side Chat" effected at the time of the Bank Moratorium. Possibly, the best example is that of China, where the radio has been almost the sole instrument in unifying the Chinese for the first time in more than a thousand years.

Radio is a great power for good and evil which will be in use for ages to come. What influence do we exert upon its present and its future development? Can we do more than we are doing now to apply "Ad majorem Dei gloriam" to the radio field? As men of zeal, we should be able to find some solutions to the problem; and as men of action, we should exert our energies to carrying the plans into execution.

Radio conditions in the United States are not uniform, so that no one plan will fit all localities, but there are some general principles that have application under all circumstances.

By a legal fiction, and a decision of the Supreme Court, the radio-bands, assigned by international agreement for the use of the United States, belong to the people, and are to be used for "the public interest, convenience and necessity." For all practical purposes, the bands are owned by those who have obtained licences, without cost to them, to build and operate stations, according to definite specifications as regards equipment, power, hours of operation, etc., but always for "the public interest, convenience and necessity." This phrase has been the object of much wrangling and of diversified interpretations, both serious and comic. But the Federal Communications Commission and the licencees of stations seem to be in accord to this extent, that the phrase implies the necessity of using the broadcast band in some way for raising the general cultural level of the people, either by formally educational, instructional, musical or religious programs. The Commission frequently demands accounts of the stations concerning their allocation of time for such programs. The station owners claim to be doing great things along these lines. Witness President William S. Paley of the C.B.C., who on April 5, 1938 broadcast the following:

" . . . I believe that it is the judgment of most thoughtful people that in no other country and under no other plan of operation in

the entire world has this new means of mass communication been used so effectively for the entertainment, the information and the education of the whole people . . . ”

Witness President Lenox R. Lohr of the N.B.C. before the Third Annual National Federation of Sales Executives Convention at Dallas, Texas, May 19, 1938:

“Last year, the two networks of the National Broadcasting Company broadcast a total of 20,000 hours of programs. Only 30 per cent of these hours were commercially sponsored. The remaining 70 per cent were sustaining programs, paid for out of the revenue which we obtained from commercial sponsors. Among these sustaining programs were many which exert an immeasurable social effect upon their listeners. To mention but a few, there are America’s Town Meeting, the Music Appreciation Hour with Waltar Damrosch, the Metropolitan Opera, the NBC Symphony concerts under Toscanini, the University of Chicago Round Table, The National Farm and Home Hour, and the National Radio Forum . . . It has been demonstrated, . . . that an equal opportunity can be given to broadcast all sides of important controversial issues, thus expressing every view rather than the censored or one-sided views forced on listeners by dictatorial governments.”

I use these quotations to show the claims of the owners of the great chains. The facts are frequently different. For example, in Russia, Party members and their children can even obtain University degrees by passing examinations in the courses they have followed by radio. But the “Claims” give us an opportunity we should not overlook. Would a Bellarmine or a Suarez allow to pass unchallenged many of the anti-social and anti-Catholic principles that have been enunciated in Round-table discussions on the air? Would they not make friends with the “Mammon of Iniquity,” and have themselves invited to take part in such discussions? Haven’t we men capable of using the Socratic method in open debate? Aren’t we needed, if “All sides of controversial issues” are to be broadcast?

Besides the great chains and clear-channel stations, there are regional and local stations. Some of these are state-owned, as in Wisconsin, or municipally-owned, as in New York, or Peoria. These stations bear constant watching. We, as tax-payers, whose money is used for the upkeep of such stations, should insist that our rights as Catholics be not infringed. The New York City station had already broadcast programs imbued with Communism.

Of course, this might be expected, since the manager is a Communist. In such cases, we should at least demand time for broadcasts to refute those already given, if we do not go so far as to demand the removal of the manager.

In many localities, individual members of the Society have made good use of the time given to them by commercial stations. More work of this type could be done. We are supplied with a large audience for the principles we wish to spread, and at the same time the schools we represent get free advertising. When an exceptionally good program has been worked out, it might be recorded so that it might be used on other stations in other parts of the country.

Privately-owned stations, it is true, can easily refuse time to any Tom, Dick or Harry, who asks for it; but since these stations must work for "the public interest, convenience and necessity," they can hardly refuse time to any representative group of citizens in their respective communities. Where the Catholic population is numerous as in Boston or San Francisco, we ought to form such groups. Where the Catholics are decidedly in the minority, as in Florida or Colorado, we ought to get into whatever groups are being formed, so as to be able to exert some influence on the type of programs broadcast and on the persons chosen to prepare and deliver the programs.

I have said nothing of our own ownership of stations, because we own only two at present and both of these are purely commercial stations, doing less for education and culture than some of the commercial stations dissociated from any connection with educational institutions. Recently, the Federal Communications Commission, at the request of Commissioner Studebaker of the U. S. Department of Education, allocated certain shortwave channels for educational use. If any one is interested in applying for, establishing and operating a station under the allocation, he may write to William D. Boutwell, U. S. Department of Education, Washington, D. C., for particulars.

Many of Ours do not see the utility of radio in the field of education. I suggest that they read from the Report of the Advis-

ory Committee on Education by Radio (1930),* in which both the objections to and the advantages of broadcasts to schools and adult radio audiences are listed on pages 32-36. In appendix B of the same publication, pages 89-136, are short citations of the opinions of educators and state superintendents, using the radio facilities for educational purposes. Since the Report was published, progress has been made both by improvements in methods, and by a more general adoption of those methods found practical, as well as by the use of written aids, such as charts, outlines and quizzes. Even such subjects as arithmetic have been taught in the Cleveland schools by radio, with an added efficiency of 8 per cent among the pupils.** The University of Illinois has broadcast the regular lectures of certain professors, while the University of Purdue has broadcast the regular classes in certain subjects, with students as well as the professor taking part. Doubtless many of the listeners would not be capable of passing an examination on the matter they have heard over the air, but they grasp enough to be on guard against other propoganda that they may read or hear, while some of them are sufficiently stirred to ask for guidance for further reading.

It has been demonstrated by the Ohio School of the Air and by other experiments conducted at Cleveland, Rochester, and elsewhere, that formal class-room teaching by radio is not only possible, but when properly done by an exceptional teacher, is much better than the average teaching in the class-room. The majority of teachers in any locality are decidedly mediocre. However, it is generally possible to find a few, who have exceptional knowledge of a subject and the ability to impart that knowledge. If these are

* The Report may be obtained from the U. S. Office of Educ., Washington. \$1.00 Cf. also "Biennial Survey of Education in the U. S. 1928-1930" Bulletin No. 20, 1931. For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. Price 5 cents. Also: "Radio, The Fifth Estate," the Jan. 1935 issue of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

** "Radio, the Assistant Teacher," by B. H. Darrow. (R. G. Adams & Co., Columbus, Ohio) gives details of the Ohio school of the Air. The history of the early movements in this field and the stages of progress can be seen in "Radio in Education," by Armstrong Perry (The Payne Fund, One Madison Ave., New York. \$1.00). The Yearbooks (beginning with 1930) of the Institute for Education by Radio, entitled: "Education on the Air," Ohio State U., Columbus, O., with good indexes, contain interesting material for those who wish to learn more in detail of the work.

broadcast to the class-rooms once a week, or even daily for a portion of a class period, the students profit by this good teaching and learn more as a result, while the ordinary teachers are benefited by the practical demonstration, as well as by receiving new incentives to improve themselves.

Whether we approve or not, formal education work by radio is going to increase. The U. S. Department of Education is making a weekly broadcast on a National chain from Washington, D. C. The National Education Association would like to get a centralized or federal control of all such broadcasts to schools, leaving the broadcasts of University level under the control of the State universities. It was the Editor of the N.E.A. Journal, who, while Chairman of the National Committee on Education by Radio, wrote and spoke frequently in favor of a reallocation of radio broadcast bands, with a reservation of 15 per cent of them for educational purposes. Such a Bill was actually introduced in Congress and I believe it might have passed, in spite of the opposition of commercial broadcasters, if I had not insisted on having written into the Bill, words to this effect: "Such time to be shared by all educational institutions, public and private." When this same editor resigned the chairmanship of the National Committee on Education by Radio, his successor was able to push the principle of cooperation with commercial stations and supply them with educational and civic programs of real value. This is the prime object of the Regional Radio Boards, in New Jersey, Colorado, Texas, etc., fostered by the Committee at the present time. In Colorado, a Jesuit is one of the four Directors of the Board. This is as it should be, whenever such Boards are formed. It gives the opportunity for checking much evil, as well as for spreading good. Sometimes the threat of withdrawing from such a Board will prevent the broadcasting of some program which could not be stopped in any other way.

There is another field in which we are in danger of falling behind the time, the field of training for radio work. Only this summer there were more than sixty colleges or universities offering courses in the field of radio, and of these, only two were under

Jesuit control and three others under Catholic auspices. I list the school, the teacher and course.

Canisius College, Buffalo, M. I. Griffin: Radio Writing
University of Detroit, Detroit, Alvin O'Konsky; Radio Speech
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

William Coyle: Radio Broadcasting

Rev. Ignatius Smith, O.P.: Radio Speech

Marywood College, Scranton, Pa., Sister M. Rosalia: Radio in the
Classroom

College of St. Francis, Joliet, Ill., Sister Mary Dolores: Audio-
Visual Education.

It is not yet too late to use our abilities of adapting our classical and philosophical training to the preparation of Catholic men and women to take their places in this vast and ever growing field of influence. Experience has shown that just as narration, dialogue, and drama had to be modified for use in the cinema, similar modifications have to be made for use on the radio.

Then there is the question of radio appreciation, which is hardly touched in any of the schools of the country. Since Jesuits as a rule do not devote much time to radio, it may be difficult for them to realize the amount of time devoted to the radio every day by externs. For instance, investigations in Wisconsin and New York, have shown that the boy and girl of high school age listens to the radio about two hours a day. Unless they are trained to discriminate, what will they acquire? In the Second National Conference on Educational Broadcasting, Chicago, Ill., November, 1937,* Merrill Dennison stated that 75 per cent of all programs were "Tripe," and Raymond Gram Swing stated more moderately, yet no less tellingly: "If what the radio as a whole provides the American public as a whole is a balanced picture of American democratic civilization, we may well be frightened for the survival of that civilization." This recalls to mind the statement of Mahatma Gandhi: "You think your souls are saved because you can invent radio, but of what elevation to man is a method of broadcasting if you have only drivel to send out?"** We must teach how to distinguish chaff from wheat, in radio as well as in journal-

* Education by Radio, Vol. 8, No. 5, May, 1938. A Bulletin which has been sent gratis to all Rectors and Provincials in the U. S. for years.

** "The Annals," "Radio, The Fifth Estate," quoted on page 122.

ism. We must remember that the listener of today is the broadcaster of tomorrow.

This article has been written by request for the purpose of awakening Ours to the importance of radio work. Some of Ours have been doing what they could, in addition to their usual tasks. These men deserve praise and encouragement and cooperation. They should be assisted in pooling their resources. Prefects of Studies might also further the work by lessening the teaching load of men so occupied. They might also introduce into the curriculum of studies, courses in Radio Appreciation, Radio Writing, Radio Advertising, Radio Speech, and Radio Production. These things should not be left undone, if we hope to keep in the forefront of Education in the United States. As watch-dogs of the Papacy, we must continue to guard against this great power of radio becoming a tool of Satan, rather than another useful instrument in the service of Jesus Christ.

Some other useful references:

The NBC Educational Bulletin. Weekly. Free on request to educators.

"Radio as a Cultural Agency," 1934. Proceedings of a National Conference held at Washington, D. C. Publ: National Committee on Education by Radio, Offices, now at One Madison Ave., New York.

"Educational Broadcasting, 1936," Edited by Marsh. Univ. of Chicago Press. Proceedings of the First National Conference on Educational Broadcasting.

A Grammar Information Test

by JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.

BACK in the days when our golden jubilarians of 1938 were teaching the rudiments of Latin in the first year of high school they probably complained early and often of the astounding ignorance of English grammar which their high-school freshmen displayed. Certainly teachers of first-year Latin in our high schools of today do thus complain, probably more emphatically and more insistently than did their predecessors of some forty years ago. It would, indeed, be surprising if there were not now good grounds for the lament, seeing that in the last several years writers of elementary English textbooks and teachers of teachers of English have been fairly agreed in condemning as futile the study of formal grammar in the elementary (grammar!) school, and in pleading for the study of functional grammar in its stead. "Research has indicated," we are told, "that the successful study of grammar requires the same level of mental maturity required for the study of calculus."*

Whatever be the merits of the functionalists' plea and program, and whatever be the cause of the high-school freshman's ignorance of grammar, the "Grammar Information Test" presented here was designed to find out how well pupils know the elements of formal grammar when they enter the high schools of the Chicago Province; "*minus enim jacula feriunt quae praevidentur; et nos tolerabilius mundi mala suscipimus, si contra haec per praescientiae clypeum munimur.*" A secondary purpose of the test was to discover what grammatical principles and terminology ought to be presented early in a first-year English composition book written with an eye to the needs of the teacher of Latin.

An examination of several first-year English composition books and of Henle's *First Year Latin* and *Latin Grammar for*

* Rachel Salisbury, "The Psychology of Composition," *English Journal*, XXV (May, 1936), p.365.

High Schools determined what grammatical items should be tested; and a subsequent study of Cohen's "English Grammar and the Teaching of Latin" seems to show that the only significant topics omitted are the number and gender of nouns, pronouns, and adjectives.*

The test, as one reading of it will make clear, is not difficult. In all cases but one (that dealing with the parts of speech) the questions provide all the grammatical terminology which the pupil needs to use in his answers. And the correction key, which lists the correct answer to each question, allows for alternative answers in the seven cases where such a provision could be reasonably demanded. For instance, the imperative sentence (A-1) "Run home, boy" is counted as correctly answered if listed either as imperative or as declarative, because some grammarians classify imperative sentences as declarative.

The test was given on the first or second day of class in September, 1937 (that is, before any grammar could be learned in high school), to the entering freshmen in the five high schools of the Chicago Province, and returns were received for the six hundred freshmen in four of these schools. In the reproduction of the test page below, the number printed after each test item represents the percentage of these six hundred freshmen that answered correctly.

By examining these scores the reader may see for himself that at least in the eastern half of the Middle West the complaints of the teachers of Latin are rather well justified. He may note that only 13 of the 77 items were answered correctly by more than 75 per cent of the pupils; and of those 13 items 5 deal with the recognition of sentences as declarative, exclamatory, etc., and 5 others with the identification of parts of speech—very elementary matters. At the other end of the scale he will find that only 15 percent correctly identified "although" as a conjunction in item D-1; only 23 per cent recognized the noun phrase in L-3; a mere 24 per cent correctly identified the nominative, or subjective, case in J-2; and only 24 per cent correctly encircled the second auxiliary

* Harry Alan Cohen, "English Grammar and the Teaching of Latin," *Classical Journal*, XXXII (April, 1937), 393-405.

verb in N-3. Finally, of the 77 items in the test only 43 (56 per cent) were correctly answered by one half of the pupils tested.

To treat some of the results in another way, the test results show that of typical class of, say, 36 freshmen only 16 could identify the indirect object in (E-2) "Conductor, read us that telegram again;" only 9 could tell the case of "hat" in (J-2) "This is John's hat"; only 18 of the 36 could single out the simple subject in (C-4) "My oldest sister, Helen, called me at three o'clock this morning"; and only 25 of them could properly label "and" in D-5 as a conjunction. Noting all this, one begins to sympathize with the teacher of Latin who is given a typical class of this kind.

Although the percentage of correct answers on any item is not exactly the same for any two of the four schools, the differences between the four schools are not so significant as to invalidate the obvious general conclusion that the teachers of Latin have good reason for asserting that freshmen entering Jesuit high schools in the Chicago Province know little formal grammar and that the English class may well begin the work of the year with a study of the elements of English grammar.

A GRAMMAR INFORMATION TEST

School..... Class..... Your Name..... Date.....

- A. Are the following sentences DECLARATIVE, EXCLAMATORY, IMPERATIVE, or INTERROGATIVE? Write your answers in the blanks at the right.
1. Run home, boy.....(77)
 2. I have no home.....(81)
 3. Then, where do you sleep?.....(88)
 4. I sleep wherever I can find a place.....(81)
 5. Poor fellow, what a life you lead!.....(81)
- B. Are the following sentences SIMPLE, COMPOUND, COMPLEX, or COMPOUND-COMPLEX? Write your answers in the blanks at the right.
1. Tell me your companions, and I will tell you what you are.....(30)
 2. They are boys from my own neighborhood, averaging about fourteen years of age.....(28)
 3. Most of them are taller than I am.....(29)
 4. Not one is over sixteen, and one is only eleven.....(66)
 5. Now, can you tell me what I am?.....(44)
- C. In the following sentences draw a **straight line** under the SIMPLE SUBJECT. Draw a **circle** around the SIMPLE PREDICATE (also called Predicate Verb).
1. My oldest sister, Helen, called me at three o'clock this morning. (49-79)
 2. Where was I going? (85-43)
 3. Each of you may have one guess. (40-50)

N. Draw a **circle** around the AUXILIARY VERBS in the following sentences.

1. Has the count arrived yet? (42)
2. What in the world does he look like? (38)
3. If only he had come yesterday, I would leave now. (36-24)

O. Are the underlined verbs in the following sentences TRANSITIVE or INTRANSITIVE? Write your answers in the proper blanks.

1. Mr. Cook, I like your spaghetti..... (74)
2. Your meat is cooked perfectly..... (26)
3. Your sauerkraut, however, seems tasteless to me..... (43)

P. In the proper blanks copy out the SUBORDINATE (also called Dependent) CLAUSES used in the following sentences; and tell WHAT KIND OF CLAUSE is used (adverbial, adjectival, noun).

1. This is the car that my brother drives.
Copy clause..... (71) Kind of clause..... (44)
2. He likes it because it is a heavy car.
Copy clause..... (59) Kind of clause..... (38)
3. The car I like best is a light car.
Copy clause..... (46) Kind of clause..... (30)
4. That our tastes differ is quite obvious.
Copy clause..... (49) Kind of clause..... (34)

Q. DIAGRAM the following sentence, using any method that you have been taught— if you have been taught any method.

1. Suddenly a loud voice told them that they must leave. (59)

Recent Publications on the Subject of Jesuit Education

Literature, the Leading Educator by Francis P. Donnelly, S.J.
Pages xv, 278. Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1938.
\$3.00

*The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education: Development and Scope
of the Ratio Studiorum* by Allan P. Farrell, S.J.
Pages xviii, 478. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1938.
\$4.75

Educational Foundations of the Jesuits in New Spain, 1570-1600
by Jerome V. Jacobsen, S.J.
Pages 304. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1938.
\$3.00

NOTE—*The statistics of the enrollment of students in Universities, Colleges, High Schools of the Assistancy will appear in the next issue of the JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY.*