

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

OCTOBER 1957

SCHOLARLY RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION
IN THE JESUIT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

JESUIT SCHOOLS OF THE WORLD: PART II

THE GEORGETOWN LATIN PROJECT

WHY A CATHOLIC COLLEGE?

Vol. XX, No. 2

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

The intellectual apostolate has been a subject of discussion in recent months. In this issue FATHER WALTER J. ONG and FATHER WILLIAM J. GIBBONS write about the place of scholarly research and publication in the Jesuit college and university, and means of developing and stimulating these activities.

FATHER WILLIAM J. MEHOK continues his survey on Jesuit educational institutions of the world with the hope that a more accurate picture of the educational apostolate of the Society may be drawn.

Today our colleges and seminaries are faced with the problem of teaching Latin to students with little background in the study of the classical languages. FATHER THOMAS R. FITZGERALD of the Novitiate of St. Isaac Jogues, Wernersville, Pennsylvania, describes a project undertaken at Georgetown University which applies the modern linguistic methods to the teaching of Latin.

FATHER FRANCIS J. SHALLOE, Guidance Counsellor of St. Peter's Preparatory School, presents a forthright statement to parents on the need for Catholic college education for their sons.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

October 1957

CONTENTS

SCHOLARLY RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION IN THE JESUIT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

Walter J. Ong, S.J. 69

DEVELOPING A SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM OF SCHOLARLY RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

William J. Gibbons, S.J. 84

JESUIT SCHOOLS OF THE WORLD: PART II

William J. Mehok, S.J. 97

THE GEORGETOWN LATIN PROJECT

Thomas R. Fitzgerald, S.J. 113

WHY A CATHOLIC COLLEGE?

Francis J. Shalloe, S.J. 119

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

. 123

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

Managing Editor

RICHARD D. COSTELLO, S.J.

Advisory Board

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
PATRICK A. DONOHUE, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
DAVID R. DRUHAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
HUGH M. DUCE, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
EUGENE F. GALLAGHER, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
ROBERT F. HARVANEK, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JOHN F. LENNY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
JEROME J. MARCHETTI, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
GERALD R. SHEAHAN, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
WILLIAM M. WELLER, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 East 84th Street, New York 28, N.Y.

COPYRIGHT, OCTOBER 1957

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Scholarly Research and Publication in the Jesuit College and University

WALTER J. ONG, S.J.*

Although the Society of Jesus has been engaged in educational work for four centuries, the present subject is not an easy one to treat. For time has a way of complicating issues, or at least of enriching them. This is particularly true in America—I interpret my subject as referring chiefly to Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States, understanding “college” and “university” to mean what they mean in the United States—because, as has frequently been pointed out, the American is a complicated individual, the product of a past which is basically European but which has also assimilated to itself other than European experiences. Somewhat uncertain of his complex past, or confused by it, the American often tends to mythologize it for his own peace of mind, to make it meaningful and simple by minimizing its real complexity and imputing to it what it did not have—a resolution of the tensions and problems with which he himself has to deal. In this fashion we American Jesuits are likely to feel our problems as simply extensions into the present of problems which the Society faced for generations and solved. Some of our educational problems are of this sort, but many of them are not of this sort at all. Some of the most basic problems concerned with the conduct of institutions of higher education—colleges and universities—are new and unsolved. It may well be, therefore, at the outset here to face some of the ways in which our educational present, which has of course grown out of our educational past and is continuous with it, is nevertheless quite different from that past.

First of all, the Jesuit educational effort in the United States is directed to a much more mature and advanced group of persons than earlier Jesuit educational work or than most present-day Jesuit educational work elsewhere. This is true even in our pre-college and pre-university educational work, for in most countries outside the United States this work begins with boys at around the age of nine or ten or even earlier. Much

* Presented at the Meeting of College and University Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Marquette University, April 22, 1957.

more is it true of our college and university work, for with the exception of a few isolated cases, such as Campion Hall at Oxford or the École Sainte-Geneviève at Versailles or the genuine universities administered by our fathers at Beirut in Lebanon and in a few other places, there are outside the United States very few educational institutions above the secondary school level, other than seminaries, for which Ours are responsible. Ours may work with university students as chaplains, but commonly we do not administer and conduct full-blown universities and we never have. As Father Ganss's excellent work, *Saint Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University*, has shown, most early Jesuit universities in actuality consisted of what would today be a secondary school (a very good one, with an intensive curriculum) and a faculty of theology which taught practically no one but students for the priesthood who themselves commonly finished theology around the age of twenty, younger and less mature than many of our present undergraduates.

Secondly, at the college and university level, education is much more a liberal education in the United States than elsewhere. In the Netherlands or Germany or France or Italy or England, when a student goes to the university he goes there to specialize, even in his undergraduate work—in mathematics or in physics or in economics or in the classical languages or in philosophy or sometimes in a special combination of such items. The undergraduate doing mathematics at Oxford or Leyden or Paris studies nothing but mathematics—no history, no literature, nothing else. European universities today still generally preserve the theoretically professional orientation of the medieval universities. Liberal education is provided—supposedly in its entirety—in the secondary schools, which, to be sure, do keep the student until he is generally about a year older than he would be at the end of American secondary schooling. These secondary schools, which provide this liberal education, were dissociated from the universities at the time of the Renaissance, when their aims became vastly different from those of the universities, and they have remained dissociated ever since. Such schools constitute the Renaissance and post-Renaissance “colleges”—*collèges*, *Colegios*, *kollegien*, *collegia*, in the sense in which this term occurs in most Jesuit educational documents except in the present-day United States. We have had such “colleges” in the United States, but, beginning with Harvard College, they have tended to grow up into universities, thus establishing inside the American university certain non-professional, liberal attitudes typical of the Renaissance humanists' outlook rather than of the standard European university tradition. In this milieu, what was more natural than that the old Jesuit “colleges” conceived of in the United States at first according to Old World models as humanistic secondary schools, should

follow suit and grow into universities themselves—institutions more variegated and more integrated in the bourgeois society around them than European universities have ever been? This fascinating evolution of our old “colleges” into present-day American colleges and universities should be kept in mind in any discussion of scholarly research by members of our faculties, if only for the reason that it may militate sometimes against scholarly research. Because of their history, our colleges and universities may tend to feel to some of their faculty members as merely extensions of high school. This tendency is less marked now than formerly, but it was a very real tendency at the time I was in a Jesuit college.¹

The relative maturity of our college and university students and the existence of some kind of ambition to impart a humanistic or liberal education to those students, or at least to those of them in the colleges of arts and sciences and often enough in some vague way to others, too, has introduced into our curriculum patterns which were quite unheard of in the early Society. Until very recent times in the Society’s schools, literature, as we know, was a subject with which students terminated their classroom contact at about the age of fourteen. Practically speaking, literature was cultivated less for what we should today call “appreciation” than as a means of familiarizing a boy with Latin so that he could read and speak and write it fluently enough to get along in the learned or professional world. We must not forget that everywhere in Western Europe and America until not much more than a hundred years ago the study of literature meant commonly the study of Latin literature only, with a dash of Greek. The vernacular was not taught as a regular school subject, except to very tiny boys when they were learning to write and perhaps to identify the parts of speech. But it was frequently prescribed that a boy be able to do these things before he was admitted to a regular school.

Because of our own complex history a myth has been generated in our minds which imputes to earlier Jesuits attitudes toward literature which few of them had, and which the curriculum had not at all. Father Martin Antonio Delrio, S.J., famous for his book on magic and witchcraft and for many other books, in the Preface to his edition of Seneca’s plays, *Syntagma tragoediae Latinae* (Antwerp, 1614), is quite outspoken in stating the common view that the “lowly humane letters” (*humiliores et humaniores litterae*) are for little boys, to toughen them for the weightier disciplines of philosophy, medicine, law, and theology, and that the

¹ Because it should help him to assess the value of my remarks, the reader will perhaps pardon this note on my personal history: Before entering the Society of Jesus I had four years of Jesuit high school, four years of Jesuit college (A.B., with a major in Latin and minors in philosophy and English), and worked in the business world for two years after graduation from college and before entering the novitiate.

only concern adults should manifest with poetry, drama, and literature generally is to undertake to edit it for the use of little boys or to teach it to them. Despite all his Stoicism, Seneca might have been just a little shaken to hear this from his editor. But the fact is that in Father Delrio's world, generally speaking (there were some exceptions), we find no course in literature for boys at the level of juniors or seniors in high school, much less at college level, not to mention the graduate school level. Philosophy was not much better off, since formal courses in it terminated—as they terminate in European schools today for all those who do not specialize in philosophy at the university—around the age of seventeen, or even sixteen.

To get a better view of the novelty of the situations with which we are faced today and which we take for granted as age-old, it is well to recall also that in the Constitutions of the Society and the early *Ratio studiorum* the only textbook mentioned for formal courses in religion—other than strictly professional courses in theology—is the catechism. When a boy knew his catechism, his formal religious education was complete—although the Sodality and other means were available for his growth in personal holiness and apostolic activity. In the past generation the Society all over the world has been undertaking the truly revolutionary work of devising textbooks which can be used for regular secondary-school courses in religion, and in the United States—almost alone—an effort is being made to work out satisfactory courses in religion or theology at the college and university level for students other than those studying for the priesthood. In the highly specialized European university to this day, a person doing an undergraduate degree, for example, in mathematics, would no more think of enrolling for a course in theology or “religion” than a medical student would in an American university. We are obviously living in an intellectual world of a different shape from that of two hundred years ago and even from that of the present day outside the United States.

A third factor may be mentioned as relevant to our understanding of our present real position, a factor in many ways more radical than the age of the students we deal with or the liberal bent of the educational setting in which we operate. This factor is the condition of the entire intellectual enterprise of mankind since the discovery of evolution. By evolution here I mean not only cosmic evolution and the evolution of species, but the evolution of thought itself. The perspectives in time and space opened by the geological and anthropological sciences, and the awareness of the profundities of history which has grown with these same perspectives, have made man acutely aware of the fact that all thought, including the most abstract scientific thought, is a growing thing. With our improved

penetration of the past, the remoteness of the intellectual world of even St. Thomas Aquinas, not to mention Aristotle, from our own has become distressingly evident. This is not to say that we cannot at all follow the thinking of men in the past, or that we cannot learn something from them. Quite the contrary: we *must* study them. But it is to say that to get back into the routes of their thinking is a laborious business. To find what St. Thomas means by *intentio* or what Aristotle means by *hypotasis* involves a tremendous amount of work, of back-tracking through the labyrinths of intellectual history. We know that we can never recapture the totality of St. Thomas' view of the universe, even if we wanted to, if only because we cannot forget enough of what man has thought and discovered since his time. Extrapolating in the other direction, we have only to take thought to be aware that the science of physics, let us say, fifty thousand years from now—or even the science of geometry—will exist in a condition which we at present could hardly recognize. These sciences will doubtless encompass what we now know in their fields, as modern geometry encompasses Euclidean together with a great many other geometries, but the dialogue in which all human knowledge is held will have advanced so far that the very terms in which it is carried on even a few generations from now, and much more fifty thousand years from now, will involve concepts which we have never yet learned to form. For the differences detectable over a range of several thousand years are only the increment of day-by-day differences.

An intense consciousness of this developmental pattern in human knowledge is today part of the standard equipment of every moderately well-educated man. It has led not only to the historical outlook now taken for granted in the better studies of medieval scholastic philosophy and of all philosophy, but to Einstein's feeling that even the formulae of theoretical physics had to be complemented with a detailed account of the developmental process itself whereby these formulae were evolved, such as we find in the book Einstein wrote with Leopold Infeld, *The Evolution of Physics*.

The enlargement of our perspectives regarding the development of human knowledge in time has been accompanied by a corresponding enlargement of perspective regarding its development in space. We are becoming daily more and more aware not only of the similarity of various human cultures scattered over the face of the globe but also of their divergencies. Our understanding of the Scriptures has been revolutionized by the study of Semitic culture and its differences from Western European culture. And what must the effect be of our attitude toward such a basic subject as grammar when we realize the fact that whole far-advanced civilizations have done entirely without it, and that to this day

the Chinese never teach a grammar of their language in school as a matter of principle—not only because grammar is less possible in Chinese than in English but also because, as they will tell you, to erect and enforce a grammar of Chinese would kill the language by stifling its normal development and making it less effective as a means of communication?

It has, of course, been as true in the past as in the present that human knowledge was a divergent and growing thing. But by the present time, having grown through history in the reflectiveness and self-consciousness peculiar to spiritual beings, we have come to an awareness of this aspect of knowledge more intense and urgent than ever before. It has been true that in the past the Society has had a strong tradition of scholarly research and publication—perhaps running more to compiling and less to original discovery than we might have wished, for such are the habits of the clerical mind—but a tradition nevertheless strong. However, today the need to develop this tradition further has become more and more apparent, particularly in the United States. The chief reasons seem to be those just suggested. First, the Society has never been in the work of higher education at all to the extent to which she is in this work in the United States today. Secondly, studies which Jesuits of an earlier age purveyed regularly only at a lower curricular level—such as literature or philosophy, not to mention theology—are now purveyed at a much higher level in our colleges and universities. Thirdly, we live in a society acutely aware that human knowledge is a growing knowledge.

This third fact is the most important, for it means that an adequate induction into knowledge, an induction which will inspire students and remain as a viable part of their intellectual possessions, must be one in which knowledge is communicated to them as a growing thing, with promise of still greater growth. In a world which, consciously and subconsciously, knows as much about development as ours does, real interest in a subject has become inseparable from interest in the further development of the subject. This applies to college and university education generally, but it applies the more urgently the higher one moves in the curriculum and the more capable the student in question. And who can say how many students judged incapable are so precisely because they have never had an instructor who could communicate this sense of living and growing knowledge? I myself feel convinced that at the upper-division college level it has become quite impossible to communicate a subject in any viable fashion without communicating at least some sort of feeling for the growth of the field being taught. Radically, all human knowledge is held in a dialogue setting. The most abstruse mathematical theorem is, in the last analysis, something that some designable individual *says* to others. To pretend that it is otherwise, that knowledge lies in

the mind not as a germ or growing thing which was started with the help of other persons and with which one has to work all one's life always in terms destined of their very nature to be communicated to others, but that it lies in the mind as an inert mass picked up from somewhere outside human society, is not only to court pedagogical failure but to play false with truth itself.

This condition of knowledge as a growing thing is radically the basis for the absolute need for research and publication in our colleges and universities. Development, which comes from research, is not a frosting on the cake of human knowledge. It never was, although men may have implied or even said so in the past—Francisco de Vitoria, the sixteenth century theologian, states that there are no new discoveries possible in physics—and now it cannot even be made to appear to be. Research is of the very stuff of human knowledge. If you do not work on the knowledge you have, it will work on you—will generate from within your own prejudices and presuppositions all sorts of bogus conclusions, implied or at times stated outright. Because medieval and Renaissance theologians had not worked out enough detail in the relations of cosmology and revealed truth, there was generated in their minds, without their being aware of it, a quite false notion of this relationship, terminating in the ill-starred Galileo decision. The tragedy is that some illusion that knowledge is static can be maintained today by restricting one's contacts to pupils, and to pupils who have a very elementary outlook—that is, to those who by definition are not as yet in touch with the reality of the situation and hence cannot feel the growth of knowledge as a mature scholar can. This, I am afraid, is what we all do if we do not keep up with the research in our fields. And thus restricting one's contacts is possible only at the sacrifice of the pupils' own minds, only by a terrible kind of injustice on the part of the teacher, who thus deforms those most sacredly charged to his care—and, what is worst, most deforms those who have the greatest possibilities.

But do we have to do research ourselves? Can we not just keep up with that done by others? Speaking generally, I am most profoundly convinced that a school, a faculty, a department, and, as far as possible, the individuals in the department need to do research themselves. For if knowledge is set in a dialogue and moving forward in a dialogue setting, it is by taking part in the dialogue that we learn. A bystander is too uninterested, too uncommitted. And if there is anything that our American Jesuit education suffers from, it is the fact that too many of us are not committed to the subjects we profess, not dedicated to them with that total dedication which, for us, should be part of our religious dedication to God Himself, Who makes human knowledge to advance. By commit-

ment I mean dedication of the sort which makes us genuinely afflicted, makes us sad, when fields we are interested in—biology or law or medicine or government or mathematics—make little progress and makes us happy and enthusiastic when we see the results of original and profound thinking in our fields. There is no way to dedicate oneself to learning from the outside. One's dedication is from within the subject. And this dedication for us lies itself not outside, but inside, our own religious vocation. In my limited experience, the one thing which lay teachers detect all too often in religious is a horrible insouciance, not about their students as persons, but about the subject into which they are most solemnly charged to induct these pupils. There is, I believe, no way to be a real college or university teacher while remaining exterior to one's subject and uncommitted to its propagation and development.

Since the intellectual universe, like the physical universe, is a developing one, and since creation and its activity, sin excepted, is God's work, as Catholics we should be more interested than non-Catholics in furthering intellectual development. For to further it is to intensify the spiritual component in the universe, and thus to open new frontiers for the free working of grace. It is true, of course, that increase in knowledge is a risk: it opens new possibilities for evil as well as for good. But the very existence of a spiritual being, man, in the universe has involved a terrible risk. For all but the last few hundred thousand years of its five billion years of existence, the universe was free from sin for the simple reason that, so far as we know, there was no person in it to do any sinning. Yet Almighty God colonized it with mankind, let man spread over the face of the earth, impregnating the impersonal mass of the cosmos with intellect and will in the persons of men. This was a risk, a calculated risk, we might say, on God's part. This introduction of the spiritual, the free component, into His material creation made moral evil possible. Yet it opened an avenue to grace in the mass of brute matter which was the cosmos. God took this risk and He increases it daily as He brings man into a position of greater dominance over the forces of brute matter.

For, although such increase, any increment in the intellectual or spiritual component in the universe, is a further risk, it increases the field of operation for grace itself. Grace moves where God wills, and yet it does not move the sea or the mountain or even the ape. The Holy Spirit moves where He will, and yet we note that public revelation on a major scale, the revelation given to Abraham and his descendants, waited a long time—most likely some four hundred thousand or more years after man's first appearance on earth—until the intellectual achievement of the alphabet, this strange device invented only once in the history of mankind, and then it was given to one of the peoples who had the alphabet. How

could public revelation have been passed on in a paleolithic age, or even in most neolithic ages, when men were scattered over the earth for tens or hundreds of thousands of years in tiny isolated clusters unable to enter into effective communication with one another and even ignorant of one another's existence? Theology is becoming increasingly aware of the development of revelation not only "from above," through communication from God, but also "from below," through the preparation of the cosmos and of human society and of the intellectual equipment of the human consciousness itself for the effective reception of revelation and the continuous penetrating of its meaning. The development of man's intellect is certainly part of this preparation, and this development, we now know, is spread out not only through the life of the individual but through the collective life of the human race. Such development, whatever risk it entails, is necessarily God's work. For it seems that God's work is always, from our point of view, a risk.

If it is true that intellectual universe is a developing one and that its development is God's work and hence something which can claim our allegiance even more than that of non-Catholics, what are some of the pressing needs in this development felt by American and particularly Jesuit Catholic education today? I cannot hope to rehearse them all, but it may be of some service to indicate those which seem to me to be the most pressing.

There is first the need for research in theology, for theology, above all, is a science which cannot afford to stand still. Mixing God's revealed word with misunderstanding is horribly disastrous, and we are pretty sure so to mix it if we do not have a working knowledge of the science of our times and do not keep this knowledge in constant contact with theology. Otherwise new questions arise which cannot be understood in old frames of reference, and which, being misunderstood, are provided with incorrect answers. The theological frames of reference have to keep pace with other thinking, and even, if possible, get ahead of other thinking. What might the results have been if, at the time of the lamentable Galileo decision, theology had been developed to the point where it could have provided an adequate understanding of the relationship of divine revelation to the physical sciences, at least such understanding as exists today, and if linguistic and cultural studies had only been further developed themselves and laid hold of by theologians to interpret Josue X, 12? We should not have the unfortunate facts on the historical record that until 1757 all books which said that the earth went around the sun were *ipso facto* on the *Index of Forbidden Books*, that Catholic schools could not, at least until this date and in practice often did not until long after this date, teach that the earth went around the sun, that as late as the

year 1820 a book so stating was refused the imprimatur in Rome, and that only in 1822 was the general permission to print such books in Rome finally granted.

The development of theology has become an urgent, and even desperate, one in American Catholic colleges and universities where mature students are constantly dealing with and themselves developing questions crying for theological answers or commentary which the theology taught in seminary courses does not provide. There is a need here for what we might call a "university theology" to complement the post-Tridentine seminary theology, with its strongly pastoral and apologetic bent. The strength of this seminary theology lies in great part in its conservatism, but it is simply not enough to be conservative if we wish to Christianize a universe which we now know is in active evolution. If we have to bring our university students—even undergraduates, but much more graduate students—to take part in the forward movement of thought, as we do, then we have to provide them with a theology which is participating in this forward movement, for this forward movement itself must be Christianized, impregnated with grace.

The irony of our theological situation has become critical, and it consists in this. Here in the United States we have the largest and most effective venture which the Church as such has ever made in higher education—far larger, far more effective, and far more explicitly Christian than that in the Middle Ages, when the huge faculty of arts, not the relatively tiny faculty of theology, commonly provided the rectors of universities such as Paris. Yet, despite the fact that we have for the first time in Christian history a huge network of universities directed by theologically trained men, we have no major theology faculty at any university with the exception of that at Catholic University, which has, understandably, a strong pastoral bent, and, alone, can hardly make its principal concern the burning intellectual problems of the *university* milieu. We must face the fact that today where original theological work is being done by Catholic theologians, it is where the theological faculty is part of a university—as at Innsbruck or Strasbourg or Louvain—operating and thinking at the intellectual fronts which a university keeps open, or where the theological faculty is inside a city which is a major university center—such as at Paris or Lyons or, until recently, at Zikawei in China—and in which contact with the intellectual front is not only inevitable but assiduously cultivated. In the United States we have failed to bring our theology into vital contact with our own university milieus, isolating our theology faculties from the university campus, with the result that even a place such as Austria, with a total population of some seven million, by no means all of them practicing Catholics, has been incomparably more

productive theologically than we. We are also faced with the curious fact that no university offers a theological course open to women. Undoubtedly many others have had the same experience as I when I was approached by a brilliant young Catholic woman with the complaint, "I can go to any university to get a degree in any other subject I wish if I can master the material [she already has her doctorate in one subject], but when I apply to a Catholic university for a course leading toward a theological degree, I am told that this is not a fit subject for women!"

Something similar obtains in philosophy, where the real problems raised in the minds of the most active and promising students are all too often scanted or avoided in favor of other problems which it has become customary to treat. The need for research and publication here is, I dare say, the greatest perhaps in cosmology. Although it might be argued that working out a cosmology of the world as we really know it is primarily a theological task, that a Christology of the post-Darwinian and post-Einsteinian universe is our basic need here, nevertheless there is the problem of a contemporary philosophical cosmology to be faced. Such a cosmology cannot come into existence so long as we think of the enterprise of constructing it as a process of catching up with the scientific front, of shooting down so-called difficulties lobbed back from this front (which we have meanwhile never even visited), or as a process of retouching old medieval cosmologies. A viable and meaningful cosmology must be the work of those somehow at the scientific front themselves, pushing it ahead, sharing its enthusiasms and its visions. It is significant that the one Catholic cosmology which has caught the imaginations of thinking men, won their admiration, and sometimes won them to the Church, has been the cosmology—call it theological or philosophical as you will, for it is both—generated in the mind of a man who was at the forefront of anthropological discovery, our fellow Jesuit Père Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, who was one of the co-discoverers of the Peking Man. For the effect in strictly scientific circles of a Jesuit completely devoted to his God, to the Church, and to the Society and at the same time sincerely committed to the advance of science as God's work, I can refer you to the wonderful tributes to Père Teilhard in *Science* for January, 1956, and the *American Anthropologist* for February, 1956. The former concludes with the statement by Professor Hallam L. Movius, Jr., of the Peabody Museum at Harvard University, that the spiritual "was as vital to him as the purely physical evidence, and in his ability to sustain and teach this belief he was head and shoulders above those of us who are left here to carry on the work." If we are going to hold our best university products for Christ, to inspire them to give themselves to Him and to His Father, we are going to have to provide them with the same sense of challenge in cosmology and the

rest of philosophy which they are meeting in the best courses they get from other departments in the university.

The need for research, of a peculiarly perceptive and active type, is just as great in literature as in philosophy. Literature requires scholarship, firsthand working with sources, and their constant reworking, for in literature, above all, we have an active and moving front. Our knowledge of literary history makes it impossible to teach the epic or Shakespearean drama or the novel as static moments in the past, or to appreciate their beauties in terms of such moments. We know that there was a time when there were no epics, in the classical and post-classical sense of this term, and a time when there was no drama of the Shakespearean sort, and a time, not very long ago, when there was no novel. Literature and literary forms are a part of the mysterious pattern of cosmic evolution planned by Almighty God and must be evaluated with some appreciation of this pattern. Literary species, or genres, like biological species, arise and disappear, and in doing so give rise to new species. In this setting we do not even know what to teach unless we keep ourselves intimately aware of the pattern of development, for the study of literature here becomes the study of a growing thing in which, as T. S. Eliot has pointed out in his capital essay, "Tradition and the Individual Talent," the past is not only forming and giving meaning to new works but the new works themselves are altering and enlarging and deepening the meaning of the past.

Thus it becomes imperative that all literature—even ancient literature—be taught by persons who are aware not only of scholarly developments in their fields, but also of developments in contemporary literature, felt and known intimately as the wave front of a long past. In W. B. Stanford's work, *The Ulysses Theme*, which traces this theme from Homer and before down to the present day, the fuller meaning of Homer's Odysseus becomes more evident from our knowledge of the Ulysses of James Joyce and the still more recent Ulysses of Nikos Kazantzakis. An interpretation of Ulysses or of any other item from past literature which works from no familiarity with contemporary literary developments is at best a half-interpretation. For it approaches past literature out of the twentieth century without really understanding the twentieth century. It seeks to interpret literature for present-day man without taking into account the literary activity of present-day literary men. It is thus basically an illiterate presentation of literature. Of course, the converse is true: contemporary literature can be mastered only with some knowledge of its past.

Time was when it was possible in Jesuit schools to look on literature in the classroom as primarily and directly a means of inculcating morals.

This view of literature is a very ancient one, Platonic and older, and it was encouraged in earlier Jesuit schools by the extreme youth of the pupils studying literature and the consequent need to strain literature of anything but the most simple and obvious kind of "message," as well as by the absence of courses in religion after the catechism, with the consequent inclination to make other courses substitute and give depth to catechetical lessons. This may be all right when literature is taught up to the age of fourteen years and no further. It will not do for intelligent undergraduates at the lower-division level, much less at the upper-division level, and still less at the graduate level. Literature is not independent of morals any more than life is, but it is not written normally simply to teach a thesis in ethics. It is written for reasons far more complicated than that. If we are going to get from it anything satisfying to the mature mind, we are going to have to approach literature in a humble spirit of appreciation and inquiry, as a manifestation, and an exceedingly complex and mysterious one, of man's relationship to the reality around him. This will permit no cavalier attitudes. It demands research and continuous revision of research.

As a fourth and last sample for illustration—for I cannot attempt to review all the subjects even in the college of arts and sciences, much less those in all areas of instruction—we can take the social sciences. Here the disasters attendant upon a lack of research and publication by Catholic scholars is all too evident in the past. In the past we find that, as a result of not having active scholars at the intellectual front in Catholic institutions of higher learning, the sociological revolution in human society had almost passed by before the Catholic consciousness became aware of it. We make a lot, and rightly, of the papal encyclicals on social justice. But, to tell the truth, Catholic documents on social justice were slow in coming and were at first very few. And they were still slower in being felt. The failure and mistakes of Catholics which lost the nineteenth-century urban immigration to the Church was in great part a failure in research and scholarship—in not being at the forefront of the thinking of the age. The great spate of intellectual activity which heralded the present-day interest in the social sciences and the founding of socialist parties and which was marked by the presence of Saint-Simon, Robert Owen, Fourier, Comte, and John Stuart Mill was a phenomenon well under way a century and a half ago. Saint-Simon was born in 1760, and this year marks the hundredth anniversary of Comte's death. If the Church in the eighteenth and nineteenth century had had a group of men at the forefront of the intellectual movements of the time, taking part in and spurring on in a Christian context this great, if often erratic, development of thought, how different would be the fate of the urbanized workers in

Continental Europe, where the very existence of changed social conditions was not recognized generally by the Catholic conscience until whole generations too late!

We are doing somewhat better today—two centuries after the birth of the men whose work marked the orientation of Western thinking toward the social problem—but even today a recent book reviewing the contribution of Catholic thinkers to sociological thought is all too evidently a brave attempt to make the most of relatively scant evidence. What is significant here is not that we do not teach the social sciences. We teach them—perhaps even too many and too much of them. But we teach them all too often as something we have stumbled upon or borrowed or even found forced upon us, not as something we have made our own by passionate intellectual commitment and sacrifices. Sometimes, alas, it is even worse: we have been schooled to resent these studies, and many others, as intruders in what was supposedly an orderly universe before their advent.

In this brief and inadequate treatment of the necessity of research and publication in our colleges and universities I have passed over the natural sciences. My warrant for this is the fact that in these sciences the need is the most obvious of all from the point of view which I consider most basic and which I have sought to develop here, that is, from the point of view that knowledge is something which must be continually advancing if it is to be anything at all. We have enough television sets and other mechanical marvels as obvious, and sometimes noisy, by-products to make it perfectly evident that the natural sciences are advancing. Everyone knows, or can well imagine, that physics fifty thousand years from now will be something projected far beyond what physics is today, will include today's physics, but in modes of conceptualization so enlarged and elaborated and, no doubt, in many ways so simplified that we should not be able to enter into a knowledge of this physics of the future without passing somehow through the historical development which will have intervened between physicists of that day and physicists of our time. And so with chemistry, with medicine, and other such subjects.

What I hope to have brought home here is that this condition of continuous growth, simplification, recapitulation, and irresistible *élan* obtains in all human knowledge—not only in physics and in chemistry and medicine and the other natural sciences, but also, in a different but equally real way, in the study of literature and philosophy and theology, too. We have only to think of the knowledge of literary forms and their history, or of the state of philology and linguistics in Cicero's day or St. Isidore of Seville's day as compared to our own, or of the discussion concerning existence itself in Aristotle's day or St. Thomas' as compared

to our own (M. Gilson, not St. Thomas, is the one who has made a point of the existentialism in St. Thomas' writings), or of the condition of Scriptural study in the time of St. Jerome as compared to our own time, to sense how development is built into our process of knowing in these areas, too.

In this paper I have, I am aware, said nothing of practicalities such as teaching loads, departmental organization, administrative needs, and the like. These are administrative problems to be solved, and I am inexperienced and probably incompetent as an administrator. But they must be felt as problems in the proper context, which for a college or university is necessarily that of teaching—and, by this very fact, necessarily that of research and publication. Administrators, too—indeed, administrators especially—must have a vision of what the stuff of education consists in, of *what sort of thing it is*. Not only is the educational process complicated in terms of the persons involved, but the subject “matter” itself is not a capsule in the minds of those who teach it, nor can it become such in the minds of those who really learn it. For administrators to suppose, even subconsciously, that it is a capsule rather than a growing germ, vitiates and makes ineffectual the whole process of higher education. In this paper I have tried to present a vision of knowledge which makes it clear that that is not what knowledge is.

What I have tried to say is, then, in summary, that new discovery, and the publication which goes with it and which is the sharing of this new discovery with others in the world in which we have learned to make the discovery, is not something superadded to the process of knowing and learning and teaching. It is integral—indeed, central—to these processes themselves. When a college or university faculty is out of touch with research to the extent that its members are making no contribution to research at all, who is going to be in touch with research? Such a faculty cannot avoid in some sort deforming the mind of its students when it should be forming them. It cannot help being false to its most sacred obligation, which in our case is communicated to us from God by our superiors, the obligation to help men to know.

The obligation which the Society of Jesus has in its educational enterprises presents always an inspiring challenge. But today in the United States at the college and university level it is more of a challenge than ever before. If what I have said here by way of appraisal is outspoken, it is so because Jesuit education in this country has behind it a solid enough achievement to enable it to be outspoken in its self-criticism without danger of suffering from discouragement, and because we feel that opportunity to develop in research and publication is a more real opportunity today than at any time hitherto in this land. If we feel acutely, and even des-

perately the need for Jesuits really competent in their fields and devoted whole-heartedly to intellectual activity, the growth in the number of Ours meeting these requirements is notable. The appearance of a series as excellent as "Jesuit Studies" is a favorable portent. But we must never forget that we are faced with an opportunity so great that we have hardly even begun to do it justice. In particular, the opportunity to develop what I have called a "university theology," a theology of original research and publication in intimate touch with the most active intellectual fields in our time, is one greater than the Church has ever known anywhere in her past history. The chief reason for being outspoken in our self-appraisal is this: the need to know the *real* place in history of our educational activity, to know the past in the real present and the present in the real past, so that we can see the work which God has willed that we undertake as the stimulating challenge to creativity that it is.

Developing a Successful Program of Scholarly Research and Publication

WILLIAM J. GIBBONS, S.J.*

The scope of our topic is broad, too broad to elaborate detailed principles, to focus attention on more than a few difficulties, or to arrive at immediately applicable conclusions. Yet its very breadth affords opportunity for certain general observations which might otherwise go unmade, and for some discussion of actual problems in several related areas. If in the course of the observations and discussion we are able to indicate the conditions normally conducive to successful research and publication in the university and college, then this paper will have achieved its primary aim. Thence can be inferred what type of program the author regards as more likely to effect the desired results. Needless to say, there is no intention of entering here into critical evaluation of existing research and publication programs, or of implying that there is only one road to the goal envisioned.

An assumption basic to what follows has to do with the finality of the

* Presented at the Meeting of College and University Delegates, Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Marquette University, April 22, 1957.

university as such. And what is said of the university applies by analogy to the undergraduate college in the liberal tradition of the arts and sciences. We take our cue from the message of Pope Pius XII to the Pax Romana meeting in Montreal in 1952, wherein he said:

... anybody who considers the university as a community of teachers and students dedicated to works of the spirit cannot deny that its mission is to be a center radiating intellectual life for the benefit of the national community, in that atmosphere of healthy freedom that is proper to all culture.

Another Roman document, somewhat older but not without implications for the topic under discussion, is *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* with its directives for ecclesiastical faculties granting canonical degrees. Article 21 sets forth the requirements for full incorporation into the collegiate body of professors. The first three requirements are an indication of what Roman thought would be regarding minimum standards for any university calling itself Catholic. These are given as: (1) *doctrina copia et bonis moribus et prudentia praeferat*; (2) *Laurea congruenti praeditus est*; (3) *certis documentis, praesertim libris vel dissertationibus scriptis, se ad docendum idoneum probaverit*. The truly intellectual character of the university, and the unmistakable emphasis upon scientific competence, scholarship, and research are evident from the above passages.

We take it that the proper and principal function of the university is the discovery, ordering, and transmission of rationally organized knowledge, not excluding that derived from systematic application of reason to divinely revealed truth with a view to its better understanding (*fides querens intellectum*), and that all other functions are secondary to this. With due allowance for the formational and guidance functions necessitated by the spiritual, emotional, and even physical immaturity of the undergraduate, especially in freshman and sophomore years, the same assumption is made herein as regards the American four-year college of the liberal arts category.

In thus stressing the intellectual, there is no intention of denying, ignoring, or minimizing the place or importance of the other aspects of complete education, particularly on the undergraduate level, be they physical, ascetical, artistic, emotional, or such practical affairs as choice of a career or job placement. It is the *whole* man we educate on any level, and not merely intellects abstractly considered. This is, in fact, a very important consideration when it comes to a proper evaluation of the conditions for successful research, or for the development of the scholarly mind. Need we note that intellectuals are men, and not mechanical brains! However, the hierarchy of values consequent to the university's nature and purpose demands that in such institutions first place be given the quest of knowledge and the pursuit of truth. Only there does it find its *raison d'être*.

It follows that the college and university has a formal object distinct from that of home, parish, or other non-academic agency or institution. One looks elsewhere for more direct, and presumably more efficient, engagement in social action, promotion of community welfare, control of juvenile delinquency, resolution of industrial disputes, practice of family counselling, editing of popular journals, settlement of immigrants, and so forth. Nor is the university as such, though it be Catholic, designed to act as a center for parochial work, retreats, convert-making, chaplaincies, and the like. If the university, or rather its faculty, concern themselves with such activities (as indeed they will and at times quite appropriately), this must be only incidentally and peripherally. The university does not find in these works the justification for its existence. Its duty to society is fulfilled on a different and more intellectual level.

The conscientious scientist, teacher, or research worker will of course have a regard for the practical consequences of his discoveries, lectures, and writings. As a citizen, or as a priest, he may even join with others to safeguard or promote moral and religious values, and to facilitate their integration on the plane of daily living, with the findings of science. But his wisdom and his sense of dedication to learning will keep him from neglecting his primary role, and they will make him eager to see that truth does not suffer because of pragmatic considerations. Only a distorted notion of the university's precise responsibility to the community and to society could occasion the confusion of functions and excessive involvement in peripheral activity, too often witnessed today among academic people and even urged by supposedly scholarly associations. The confusion is the more tragic when the university's proper function is thereby neglected. Church and State, and also free associations of citizens, can and will create institutions and agencies to perform the type of non-academic function indicated. But who will replace the university or college which shirks the specific task only it can perform?

Perhaps Catholic academicians more than others need to be on their guard against confusion of function and diversion of effort. For Catholics, and more especially the clergy, are often drawn strongly by that illusive word *apostolate*. They wish to do things, to influence people, to achieve visible results quickly, and like Martha may be neglecting the one thing necessary to the over-all success of the work. They turn at times to action programs, even before sufficient thought has gone into scientific analysis and interpretation of the factual situation, and all this in the name of apostolate. The teacher or administrator in university or college who falls into this behavior pattern not only deceives himself as to role, but may well be betraying the higher interests of the Church. For Mother Church, who in ages past gave birth to and nourished the universities, in

our day must help them pay due attention to all truth, supernatural as well as natural, and to effect the integration of thought and outlook without which modern man is condemned to intellectual confusion, and even in some cases, to loss of eternal destiny.

Now the term apostolate is not and cannot be purely univocal, though those prone to activism incline to overlook the necessary distinctions. Such activities as collecting funds for foreign missions, running summer camps for boys, evangelizing Indians in the Andean altiplano or de-Christianized masses in urban centers, establishing welfare agencies for migrants, and the like, are or can be apostolic works. They must be done by someone if the Church and society are to function as they should and if men are to attain their end here and hereafter. But there is also a true apostolate of the intellectual order, which has its own proper characteristics and methods of operating, and to which not all apostolic souls are either called or inclined. The conditions of work of this apostolate, and the type of preparation needed, are distinctive and very demanding. To ignore this apostolate, or to confuse it with or submerge it in the other types of apostolate referred to above, is to do a grave disservice to the Church, to society, and need I add, to the universities.

Perhaps a word is in order on how the term *research* is herein taken. Good's *Dictionary of Education* provides a working definition satisfactory for our purposes, in saying that it is "ideally, the careful, unbiased investigation of a problem, based insofar as possible upon demonstrable facts, and involving refined distinctions, interpretations, and usually some generalizations." The same source then goes on to point out that the concept of research is capable of subdivision into various types, not only according to subject field, but also as to method and purpose.

Mention may here be made of division into that which is analytical, and that which is historical, quantitative, experimental, synthetic. All have their proper place and distinctive methodology. There is, moreover, the traditional distinction between basic and applied research, as well as between the individual and the team or group approaches. Then, difference in depth needs to be noted, as between the research of the undergraduate or graduate student, working on term-paper, thesis, or dissertation, primarily for his own formation, and the research of the mature scholar, the value of whose contribution is practically a foregone conclusion. Finally, there are in research many levels of intensity, ranging from the leisurely pace of the scholar completing a magnum opus over a lifetime, to the crash program which is lavish of funds and manpower in the hope of producing significant results in the shortest possible time, on the assumption that probabilities favor such an outcome.

The very complexity of the concept "research" and the diversity of

forms which it takes in practice, ensure that there is no single formula for a successful program. Too much depends on the availability of facilities, of funds, of qualified personnel, and on the background and even the personalities of those involved. There are, of course, certain minimum conditions required for all significant research, as well as the common objective of pushing back the frontiers of knowledge and arriving at a deeper understanding of truth. It is of these factors we intend to speak. My own experience, perhaps it is well to mention, has been primarily with the selection and training of better undergraduate students, and the setting of them on the road to scholarship. This has been supplemented with some experience with graduate students and younger faculty members interested in research and publication. Our work at Loyola has been principally in the area of demography, in its large-group aspects, with special attention to socio-moral implications.

These preliminary remarks about function and role have been somewhat long, but deliberately so in order to set forth the terms of reference within which it helps to think about research. The discussion which follows touches on four points: (1) who is to do research and publication? (2) what constitutes suitable preparation and background? (3) what are the conditions for fruitful activity along these lines? (4) how to identify a "successful" program?

I. Who is to do research and publication?

The genuine university, I take it, is not composed solely of clerics nor is its scope confined to the ecclesiastical sciences and philosophy. In conception and functioning, it is broader than a single diocese, order, or congregation, even though legal title and ultimate supervision repose in one or other of these. The very concept *universitas studiorum* seems to presuppose that qualified talent is recruited wherever it is available, and that secular learning is given its appropriate place next to sacred. Hence, the faculty presumably will embrace laymen as well as clerics and religious, while the student body will embrace those destined for the lay as well as for the clerical state. These are gathered together, as Pius XII indicated in his 1952 message to Pax Romana, into a genuine community of teachers and students, radiating an intellectual life to which all are at least temporarily dedicated.

In such a university atmosphere the very diversity of intellectual interests and competencies provides some safeguard against the narrowing of vision and thought which are the occupational hazard of the specialized technician or of the student in a functional training school. Precisely because the true university and, on its own level, the liberal arts college

are concerned at least indirectly with *all* human efforts to discover and organize truth, they ensure a certain transcendence of outlook which in our civilization is associated with liberally educated man. Without such an outlook, scholarship tends to lose perspective, and the mind begins to focus on excessively specialized problems or frankly utilitarian aims.

The ideal, we are well aware, is rarely adequately in the concrete. Even the best universities and colleges experience inter-faculty and divisional rivalries, which contribute nothing to breadth of vision, as well as the erection of intellectual barriers between some of the departments. But if these things happen in the more ideal situation, and with physical proximity, what can be expected when a particular faculty or division completely isolates itself from the university campus atmosphere by geographical separation well-nigh absolute, and perhaps intended as such. Under such circumstances the concept of *university* has been done violence, and with the shattering of its integrity there has gone out the richness of intellectual life which is its essential note.

May I at this point digress briefly to recall that if modern empirical science—physical, biological, or behavioral and social—shies away from the *philosophia perennis* and from theology, the responsibility is not one-sided. The post-Tridentine seminary, at least as found in the United States rather generally, has with Kempis sought out the cloister and the mountain top, and run away from the university city. It has even been implied, quite erroneously, that spiritual maturation and intensive intellectual activity are in conflict, and that the seminary must not run the risk of promoting the latter at the expense of the former. In effect, this trend of thinking has brought it to pass that the better-trained philosophical and theological minds live in places of solitude which may foster contemplation but hardly intellectual communication. If the scientists in other fields live in ignorance of certain aspects of truth which we as Catholics consider essential, where will their ignorance be purged?

But the loss is not on the side of the scientists, as Pius XII very clearly pointed out in several addresses to academicians during 1955. To the Pontifical Academy of Science, he said frankly:

Unfortunately, for some time past science and philosophy have been separated. It would be difficult to establish the causes and responsibilities for a fact so detrimental. Certainly the cause of the separation must not be sought in the nature of these two ways [inductive and deductive], each of which can lead to truth. Rather, it must be sought in historical contingencies and in persons who did not always possess the necessary good will and competence.

At one time men of science thought that natural philosophy was a useless weight, and they refused to allow themselves to be guided by it. On the other hand philosophers ceased to follow the progress of science, and they halted in certain formal positions which they could have abandoned . . .

But it is necessary to emphasize another point. If science has the duty of striving for coherence and of seeking inspiration from sound philosophy, philosophy itself should never attempt to define truths which are drawn solely from observation, and from the use of scientific methods. An infinite variety of entities and laws of matter is possible. Only observation or experiment, understood in the very broadest sense, can point out which among them the Creator, in fact, desired to make into reality.

The context of the above indicates that the Holy Father spoke especially of the physical sciences and philosophy, but the principles stated apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the relations of philosophy and scholastic theology to the various empirical sciences.

That the Pope was thinking of broader applications may be gathered from a passage in his address to the International Thomistic Congress (September, 1955):

Each of the branches of knowledge has its own characteristics and must operate independently of the others, but that does not mean that they should be ignorant of one another. It is only by means of mutual understanding and cooperation that there can arise a great edifice of human knowledge that will be in harmony with the highest light of divine wisdom.

Close cooperation, then, among the sciences is requisite for the adequate pursuit of truth. So too is it for the functioning of the university truly worthy of the name. Need more be said to stress the point that if one out of necessity confines his research to an area of specialization, this should not be in isolation from the findings of the other sciences, or without fairly frequent contact with other scientists.

To return to the question: Who is to do research and publication? Both cleric and layman, both teacher and student, each on his own level. If truly scholarly research is normally done by the individual who already has completed his academic preparation, this does not preclude the efforts of those still in their studies. Significant student research and publication are not only possibilities but realities. In fact, they are among the best ways of training the next generation of scholars and intellectuals. This requires, of course, adequate supervision as well as inspiration and instruction. That is where the community of teachers and students which is the university, becomes a necessity.

Briefly then, every serious student and faculty member in the university or college should be engaged in some kind of research, the minimum being that required for a deeper understanding of his subjects of instruction or coursework. Without at least this minimum, minds grow sterile, formalism sets in, and education tends to become a transmission of notes or textbooks from one generation to the next. It is in recognition that such research is integral to the educational methods of college and uni-

versity, that the much-abused term-paper came into existence and continues in our midst. Properly used, such undergraduate and graduate research experience will pave the way for more original and scholarly effort. Certainly it will reveal who has special aptitudes and inclinations in the direction of such work.

Selecting particular students, especially undergraduates, for research activity proves a difficult though not unrewarding task. In our experience, it has proved best to make a thorough study of the academic background, of the interests and achievement, of the personality traits of the individuals in question. Inter-departmental consultation is carried on and advice sought from appropriate teachers and authorities outside the department. After selection, initial training and orientation become the major tasks. The adjustment of young students to research requirements, even when intellectually well within their capacity, is difficult, but perhaps less so than guiding those who have grown older into such pursuits after they have matured unaccustomed to them. In the case of undergraduates, we have found that instructions as to methods and project supervision constitute only part of the task of making a student into a researcher and scholar. There are also financial problems, home difficulties, future plans, personal orientation questions to take into account. As indicated above, it is the whole man, not just part of him, that one deals with in developing the scholar.

Were it assumed more generally that better students and the interested faculty members would engage in research, the task of getting projects under way and of maintaining interest would be less difficult. This comes back to the question of the intellectual climate of the college or university. As one student aptly put it: There must be an atmosphere of *quest* around the campus; this becomes contagious, so that neither students nor faculty rest satisfied with the positions which, in the words of Pius XII, might well have been abandoned.

As I see it, interest in and some participation in research is a real test of the degree of intellectual commitment on the part of student or faculty member. The core of the university or college, if the institution is to perform its function properly, must be composed of just such committed persons. Otherwise, not only research, but learning as such will languish and education will lapse into formalism. As to actual numbers who can or will make a high degree commitment to the organized intellectual life with a view to production, this is a function involving many factors: educational background, admissions policies, institutional standing, departmental competence, socio-economic status, geographical location, and so forth. But one thing is certain, the pyramid effect, well known in the educational world, is at work. Unless one starts with a sufficiently broad

base, allowing opportunity for mistakes and losses by the way, the final outcome is likely to be disappointing or nil.

II. *What constitutes suitable preparation and background?*

Preparation for scholarly research implies not only adequate training in the major subject area, but also recurring inspiration drawn from close association, at least by reading, with the fertile minds in the fields. Even in the case of undergraduates, we have insisted that they meet leading scholars as occasion offered, either on or off campus, and that they attend at least some of the scholarly meetings in their area of specialization.

In this connection it is well to recall that all beginners in scholarship, research and publication tend to be unsure of themselves. They do not yet know where they stand in relation to others. If this were not so, then their ignorance would be the deeper and they would hold little promise of future achievement. Encouragement, therefore, is necessary and essential if this diffidence is to be overcome and a manly self-confidence is to be achieved. Failure to provide such encouragement at the crucial moments has stopped more than one would-be scholar dead in his tracks. The devastation is the greater, if perchance the lack of encouragement takes the form of censuring the young student for his inquiring mind or of warning him inappropriately of the dangers of vanity or intellectual pride. Those who speak thus—fortunately their number is not great—know little of the actual temptations besetting the really serious student trying to find himself intellectually.

Age is an important factor in training to research and scholarship. The younger mind normally is more flexible, alert, and ready to accept criticism and guidance. Its outlooks and habits of thought are still in process of formation, and capable of being directed toward deeper intellectual commitment and away from activist substitutes. At Loyola, we have found selected young men of twenty-one, or thereabouts, mature enough to do significant work and to achieve publication. Is it too much to hope that the day will come when members of the clergy who show scholarly instincts and academic interests can have the opportunity, while still young, to develop similar competence and to secure the necessary training and degrees! As things now stand, in the average seminary such early preparation of scholars would be quite difficult if not impossible. Here is a major reason why clerical scholars are lacking in this country or are unduly late in developing. In trying to assess the strength and weakness of American Catholic education on the higher level, and to evaluate the whole contemporary situation of the Church vis-à-vis the intellectual world, this factor must be taken into account.

At present an indispensable book for orienting young would-be scholars is *The Intellectual Life* by Père Sertillanges. It places balanced stress on the various elements involved: spiritual orientation and detachment, physical conditioning, academic preparation, schedules of work and study, adjustment to the methodological requirements of the different sciences, moderation of social relationships with those not committed. It also lays stress upon the fact that scholarly commitment and dedication to the intellectual life implies something of a vocation—carefully to be distinguished from an assignment—and that such vocation requires fostering and response.

If our American Catholic colleges have been short on producing scholars, as any publisher's trade list will reveal, let the blame not be laid on lack of talent and potential. Nor is there an absence of good will among a reasonable number of better students. It would seem that the real reason for the scarcity must be found in institutional failure to foster the vocation of scholar and intellectual, perhaps at times on the false assumption that in the present world crisis external activity is of more importance. While all of us here realize that "Americanism" as originally understood by some Europeans is a caricature, we may be slower to realize that activism and insufficient appreciation of the things of the mind tend to characterize many American Catholics of the day.

III. *What are the conditions of fruitful activity?*

The contemporary world is indeed one of intense activity. The Soviet Union trains activists to subvert everywhere. The so-called free world in turn engages in endless activity to counter the activity of the subversives. I am not suggesting that we shut our eyes to the threat and behave like ostriches, albeit contemplative ones. On the contrary, I am urging that we take time out to examine the deeper philosophical issues involved, before we are carried away by the very philosophy we profess to abhor.

The Marxist philosophy, and indeed that of all materialism and socialism, views collective activity and work in a social setting as the most proper function of man. Under Marxist socialism all the population is divided into either manual or intellectual and professional workers. There remains no place for leisure in the original and proper sense of the word, only for "rest" and a politically inspired "culture." Even the intellectual worker may be put on a 9 to 5 schedule, or some similarly regimented program, and periodic vacations are provided in the Crimea or its equivalent. This folly of Marxism will at times be found duplicated in some American Catholic institutions, in which the mind is supposed dutifully to work on a tight schedule of this sort. As we plunge ever more

deeply into this philosophy of work, and unwittingly imitate the "this worldliness" of the socialist and collectivist, the spirit of true scholarship is lost along with opportunity for the same. All that remains is technology and the disciplines requisite thereto.

Those trained without proper understanding of leisure (I do *not* mean laziness or idleness; the intellectual or scholar inclines to neither), are incapable of being productive scholars in the sense herein intended. Before they can become such, they must learn or re-learn the meaning of leisure.

Josef Pieper has put the matter rather succinctly in his admirable little book, *Leisure, the Basis of Culture*:

The practical problem involved might be stated thus: Is it possible from now on, to maintain and defend, or even to reconquer, the right and claims of leisure, in face of the claims of "total labor" that are invading every sphere of life. Leisure, it must be remembered, is not a Sunday afternoon idyll, but the preserve of freedom, of education and culture, and of the undiminished humanity which views the world as a whole. In other words, is it going to be possible to save men from becoming officials and functionaries and "workers" to the exclusion of all else? There is no doubt of one thing: the world of the "worker" is today taking shape with dynamic force—with such velocity that, rightly or wrongly, one is tempted to speak of daemonic force in history. (p. 59)

The preparation of the scholarly mind, of the intellectual, the researcher, the writer, is made extra difficult by this cultural environment in which we live and have lived for some time. There is something depressing about the inability of Catholic institutions of higher learning to come to grips with the problem and to transcend the environment.

The fostering of scholarly research is properly accomplished in a true university atmosphere, the characteristics of which are already evident. Many institutions will share in the work. Each will have its own character, traditions, special areas of interest and competence, and the physical requirements for research, namely laboratories, workrooms, and the like. There will be specialization by institution, as well as by department, but not to the exclusion of healthy competition between institutions. The idea of a single center for each field, in a country the size of ours, is somewhat disconcerting. The idea is especially disconcerting when it is proposed to staff such a center exclusively or principally with clerics. If our assumptions regarding the nature of the university have validity, then such isolated islands of specialization are condemned to ultimate sterility.

Given the university atmosphere, or its approximate equivalent in a college of the arts and sciences, there are additional requisites for successful programs of research. Among them I would give high rank to the following: (1) the early selection of promising students, not merely the most

brilliant but also the most committed, and the encouragement of them to do research on a trial basis; (2) securing grants whereby specific projects within the capabilities of the personnel involved can be brought to completion without financial worry; (3) provision by the administration, to the extent possible, of facilities for research in the various departments, and/or the library, so that privacy, materials, opportunity for consultation, secretarial help, typing assistance are readily available; (4) the selection of projects of current interest and import which are likely to find publication; (5) planning a continuing line of research within a given department, so that there is always something significant to be done, but not such as to bury the individual in a "team approach" which leaves him nothing as his own. These are but some of the principles which can help toward creation of the conditions requisite for fruitful research and publication.

One word of warning is in order. When administration, overhead, bureaucracy begin to stand in the way of the project or projects, then a college or university should realize that it is killing research and publication with too much supervision—perhaps with too much kindness! If the right kind of students and faculty members have been selected and encouraged, they will need a minimum of supervision and a maximum of opportunity for free activity and expression. They will have neither the time nor inclination to file unnecessary reports, obtain multiple clearances, fill out endless forms and questionnaires. If those chosen are not the right kind, then no amount of centrally directed initiative will produce results.

IV. *How to identify a successful program?*

Identification of a successful program of research and publication is much easier than trying to formulate a uniformly applicable methodology or approach. Published results which are truly significant, and recognized as such by those competent to judge, provide the clearest indication of success. The frequency, length, and form of the publication will depend not only the type of project, but also on the customs and practices of the several subject fields.

If the results are truly significant, then such publication will not be confined merely to journals or books published by the university itself on a subsidized basis. Other publishers and journals will see the value of what is being done and accept at least some of the findings for publications.

Catholic scholars and institutions should recognize among themselves a tendency which casts doubt on the over-all value of some of their pub-

lished research. I refer to the practice of using almost exclusively American Catholic magazines as outlets for their findings. The world of scholarship, even of philosophical and theological scholarship, does not stop at the limits of the Mystical Body. There are non-Catholic, and even non-Christian scholars who wish to hear significant ideas, including those having to do with the clarification of the Church's position on matters of moral and doctrinal import. It cannot be assumed that such scholars will have on hand the exclusively Catholic journals, or that they are accustomed to read them if they do. Intellectual communication with such scholars, as also in the case of membership in learned societies, must be through other channels of a more general nature. Then there are the Catholics who for one reason or other do not subscribe to or read the exclusively Catholic journals, and also those outside the country who do not have or cannot afford the American Catholic publications. The findings of research should be somehow made available to all these individuals, and a scholarly dialogue with them should be encouraged.

In saying that research is significant, I mean it is currently relevant in the particular field and fits into the developing body of knowledge in either the speculative or practical order. There is also relevancy which transcends the particular field, and derives from the interest of intellectuals generally in a special problem, such as the long-term effects of nuclear fall-out or the implications of contemporary rates of population growth. Timeliness in getting research under way, and in bringing it to completion, has much to do with success in securing help for research and in getting results published.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the signs of developing programs of research and publication are more evident within Catholic universities and colleges. There still persists a certain amount of fumbling associated with inexperience, lack of sufficient personnel, rivalries and jealousies which we could well be spared. But the beginnings are there, and they need to be fostered. Care must be taken lest premature attempts to unify programs and fit them into over-all patterns may not kill off the initiative without which progress cannot be made. The most successful program, be it remembered, is one that develops naturally out of a prevailing intellectual situation, and not one centrally designed and imposed in an arbitrary manner.

Jesuit Schools of the World:

Part II

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

This article is the logical development of an earlier one¹ using the same definitions and basic framework except that in the present instance (Survey II) the only students and schools considered are non-Jesuits, whereas the earlier article (Survey I) also included scholasticates and Jesuit students. Furthermore, this article attempts to distribute schools and students by countries, by level of education, and, to a limited degree, by the extent of control which the Society has over the schools.

This survey tells us that during the school year 1956-57 there were 667 Jesuit educational institutions in 70 countries of the world with a total enrollment of 638,984 non-Jesuit students. These were enrolled in 1,854 different schools: 290,076 in 838 elementary schools; 183,707 in 627 secondary schools; and 165,201 in 389 high institutions.

At first glance it would appear from the scope or universe and from the totals given that these two surveys are so dissimilar as to make comparison impossible. An attempt at reconciling them without the employment of too much complexity, sophistry or educational jargon is made in Table 1. Before proceeding with this reconciliation, however, it might be well to refresh the memory on some basic definitions and on the sources of information used. An institution, educational or otherwise, is used synonymously with a rector, superior of a house, or the most immediate district or mission superior (i.e., one who is or should be included in the section of Province catalogues entitled "Ordo Regiminis Superiorum") together with all the houses or schools subject to him. Our chief concern is with those superiors who have under their control at least one school, whether it is owned by the Society or not, that is, with educational institutions. In most instances such a superior has more than one school under his charge, and these constitutive parts of an educational institution we have designated simply as schools.

In Survey I a sampling procedure was employed, and information on number of institutions and schools was gathered exclusively from Province catalogues, and information on enrollment was obtained from

¹ Mehok, William J., S.J., "Jesuit Educational Institutions of the World: 1956-1957," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XX, No. 1 (June 1957), pp. 44-57. Hereafter this earlier article shall be referred to as "Survey I" and the present one as "Survey II."

Province catalogues and, in a few instances, especially for mission parochial schools, from the *Annuario Pontificio*.

In Survey II the procedure approaches a census or complete count. Sources of information were a combination of Province catalogues, annual reports of Provincials to Father General entitled "Tabulae Statisticae 1957, C. Tabulae Statisticae Collegiorum"; *Annuario Pontificio* 1956; and UNESCO, *World Survey of Education*, 1955.

With this by way of a prologue, we can turn to Table I for a reconciliation of the differences between Survey I and Survey II. Limiting ourselves in both to all the Provinces, Vice Provinces, Regions and Missions of the Society except that we include only the Vice Province of Croatia of the Slavic Assistancy, we find in row 1 that there are three more institutions in Survey II than in Survey I. One of these is explainable as an error of omission and the other two as arising from the appointment of new Superiors.

Rows 2 and 3 are best explained by row 4 which gives the total number of educational institutions and schools administered by Jesuits and their enrollments, including both Jesuit and other students. The large difference between Surveys I and II is explainable not by the creation of new schools but rather by their discovery. This can best be explained by an illustration of the Netherlands Province although the same applies to the two Canadian Provinces, that of New England, the Vice Province of Japan and, to a lesser degree, to several other areas. When Survey I was made, all we had to guide us were the Province catalogues which gave a brief notice that there was a parochial school or that one of the priests of the community had charge of it. For the above mentioned areas there was no such mention of some schools, yet from the annual report we learn that in the Netherlands, to return to the example, there are 3,202 students mentioned in one section (we shall designate it as "Jesuit" schools) and 4,137 students in a section designated parochial schools. No parochial schools are mentioned in the Province catalogue, hence we must estimate the number of parochial schools this enrollment represents. From the *Annuario Pontificio* we compute the average enrollment per school for the dioceses of Holland in which Jesuits have houses and this average is 211.21. Dividing 4,137 by this number we obtain an estimate of approximately 20 parochial schools that are administered by Jesuits in Holland although the Province catalogue makes no mention of them nor do we know to what institutions they are attached. Further, we know that the Society average is approximately 2.6 schools per institution and can deduce that these 20 schools are under the control of 8 superiors or that they represent 8 educational institutions. Further subsumptions could be made, but for the sake of simplicity the matter is left here.

TABLE I

Reconciliation of Two Estimates of Jesuit Educational Institutions, Their Constituent Schools, and Enrollment, 1956-1957

	SURVEY II			SURVEY I			DIFFERENCE: II Minus I		
	Institution (A)	School (B)	Enrollment (C)	Institution (D)	School (E)	Enrollment (F)	Institution (G)	School (H)	Enrollment (I)
1. All Superiors	1,086	—	—	1,083	—	—	3	—	—
2. Non-pertinent	-36	—	—	-26	—	—	-10	—	—
3. Non-educational	-255	—	—	-298	—	—	43	—	—
4. TOTAL: Educational	795	2,108	646,785	759	2,000	596,232	36	108	50,553
5. Of Jesuits	-170	-254	-7,801	-170	-254	-7,801	0	0	0
6. Others Exclusively	625	1,854	638,984	589	1,746	588,431	36	108	50,553
7. Mixed: S.J. and Other	42	0	0	42	0	0	0	0	0
8. TOTAL: Other	667	1,854	638,984	631	1,746	588,431	36	108	50,553
9. Schools Added	0	0	0	36	108	36,398 ^a	-36	-108	-36,398
10. Subtotal	667	1,854	638,984	667	1,854	624,829	0	0	14,155
11. Increase II over I	0	0	0	0	0	7,000 ^b	0	0	-7,000
12. Remaining Difference	0	0	0	0	0	7,155 ^b	0	0	-7,155
13. TOTALS: Reconciled	667	1,854	638,984	667	1,854	638,984	0	0	0

^a Estimated thus: 588,431 divided by 1,746 = 337.0166 (average per school, Survey I) times 108 = 36,398.

^b Explained in text.

By a similar process we can compute the number of parochial schools and institutions in any instance where the catalogues do not account for the total enrollment of "Jesuit" and parochial schools as found in the annual reports. Row 4 shows the net increase of Survey II over Survey I to be 36 institutions which are composed of 108 parochial schools. You will note that this does not increase the number of superiors later on, but merely transfers them from non-pertinent or non-educational institutions to educational institutions. Row 4 of Survey II, then, represents all the schools administered by the Society, both scholasticates for Jesuits and schools for all other students.

Since we are presently interested only in the latter, in rows 5 and 6 we remove the scholasticates. In doing so, however, we get an erroneous number of "other" institutions and must correct for this in row 7. An example brings out the reason for this step. Take the Province of Bombay in which there are 8 educational institutions composed of a total of 24 schools. Three of these institutions have a combined number of 4 scholasticates, leaving 5 institutions with 30 schools for other students. Since all three rectors of scholasticates are also rectors of schools for lay and other non-Jesuit students, there are 3 "mixed" institutions. Hence, the true number of institutions for other students is 8, but the number of their schools remains 30.

We still have to justify the discrepancy of enrollment in 36 institutions and 108 schools which Survey II has in excess of Survey I (rows 4 and 6). This is done in rows 9 and 10 by multiplying the average per school of Survey I by the number of schools lacking ($337.0166 \times 108 = 36,398$) and adding these three figures, (36 institutions, 108 schools and 36,398 students), to their respective positions in Survey I to make it compatible with Survey II. Even so, there still remains a difference of 14,155 students. How can we explain this, since theoretically the two surveys should balance at this point?

It will be recalled that when Survey I was made, 20 Province catalogues (of 62) were for the year beginning 1956, that is for the school year 1955-56, as the new catalogue for these 20 Provinces had not yet arrived. By the time Survey II was made, all but 6 had come. It can be assumed, and was actually verified, that the annual increase in enrollment for the 14 remaining Provinces would account for some of the difference. This was computed, and, on the basis of an annual increase of 2.5%, the time increase for the 14 Provinces accounted for about 7,000 students (row 11), still leaving 7,155 students to be explained (row 12).

Here a factor enters which should have been detected earlier, that is, the reliability of *Annuario Pontificio* figures. In the first place, the *Annuario* employs a unique method of reporting number of schools, and,

secondly, enrollment figures are often a year or two older than the date of publication.

First, the unique method of reporting can best be brought out by an example of the two Canadian Provinces. The *Annuario Pontificio's* entry for the diocese of Fort William, Ontario, in which the Society has houses and presumably schools, gives the following figures on schools and enrollment: 31 schools for boys enrolling 2,858 and 31 schools for girls enrolling 2,557, or an average of 92 and 82 pupils respectively. The similarity in number of schools and enrollment seems to indicate coeducational schools. If this is the case, conventional methods of computation would report the existence of only 31 different schools with a total enrollment of 5,415 male and female pupils, or an average of 175 per school. If one were perfectly consistent, he would have to make an adjustment such as this in every instance in which an estimate of average enrollment per school was based on the *Annuario*, since in some countries coeducational schools do not exist and the averages computed by conventional methods would coincide with the *Annuario* figures. Such a process is unnecessary and virtually impossible owing to lack of information on coeducation in the various dioceses. Suffice it to state that this point explains, at least in part, the difference of 7,115 students in row 12.

Furthermore, *Annuario* figures are for the school year 1955-56 and in many instances for earlier years and it can reasonably be expected that there would have been some increase in enrollment during the intervening years. The process of isolating the components is so complex, and of so little practical value, that it is merely indicated to give a reasonable explanation of the difference.

New directives to those compiling Province catalogues have now been sent out and it is hoped that the ones asking for the designation of parochial schools and an estimate or exact figures on enrollment in them will eliminate the cumbersome and doubtfully exact methods of computing the number of schools and their enrollment. With this rather lengthy explanation, we see in row 13 how the two surveys can be reconciled and that both, allowing for the different universes which they embrace, are correct.

With this reconciliation made, we can proceed to an analysis of institutions, schools and enrollment by level and by country. This is done in Table 2, and an inspection of it shows that the meaning is quite simple and clear. Thus, in the entire continental United States (including two educational institutions and their three schools of the Northern Mexican Region) there are 115 educational institutions administered by Jesuit superiors (1); which comprise 309 schools under some Jesuit's care (8); enrolling a total of 191,898 students (9); of which total enrollment, ap-

TABLE 2

667 Educational Institutions Administered by Jesuits in 70 Countries of the World According to Number of Constituent Schools and Enrollment on the Elementary, Secondary and Higher Levels; Total, and Percent of Total Enrollment in Schools to Which the Society of Jesus Does Not Hold Legal Title, 1956-1957

COUNTRY	INSTI- TUTION (1)	Schools (2)	ELEMENTARY Enrollment (3)	SECONDARY Schools (4)	Enrollment (5)	HIGHER Schools (6)	Enrollment (7)	Schools (8)	TOTAL Enrollment (9)	Parochial (10)
ALL COUNTRIES	667	838	290,076	627	183,707	389	165,201	1,854	638,984	.32
AFRICA	37	67	23,279	53	7,494	7	826	127	31,599	.56
Egypt	3	4	2,336	1	510	0	0	5	2,846	.00
Ethiopia	2	1	900	1	310	1	636	3	1,846	.00
Belgian Congo (Be.)	14	33	12,288	34	3,864	2	110	69	16,262	.72
Ruanda-Urundi (Be.)	1	1	46	1	183	0	0	2	229	.00
Algeria (Fr.)	2	2	160	2	390	0	0	4	550	.00
Fr. Equat. Afr. (Fr.)	1	6	2,213	1	369	0	0	7	2,582	1.00
Madagascar (Fr.)	8	5	2,955	8	1,102	2	58	15	4,115	.53
Morocco (Fr.)	1	0	0	1	75	0	0	1	75	.00
Mozambique (Po.)	3	4	905	1	90	0	0	5	995	.00
S. Rhodesia (U.K.)	2	11	1,476	3	601	2	22	16	2,099	.60
AMERICA, N.	181	174	85,878	114	43,584	187	118,627	475	248,089	.28
Canada	27	33	11,033	13	3,862	9	1,473	55	16,368	.66
Cuba	5	3	1,463	7	2,150	0	0	10	3,613	.00
Dominican Republic	4	2	1,382	5	712	2	86	9	2,180	.00
El Salvador	2	1	560	3	357	2	64	6	981	.00
Guatemala	1	1	400	1	31	0	0	2	431	.00
Haiti	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	2	29	1.00
Honduras	1	2	2,300	0	0	0	0	2	2,300	1.00

COUNTRY	INSTL- TUTION (1)	Schools (2)	ELEMENTARY Enrollment (3)	Schools (4)	SECONDARY Enrollment (5)	Schools (6)	HIGHER Enrollment (7)	Schools (8)	TOTAL Enrollment (9)	Parochial (10)
AMERICA, N. (Continued)										
Mexico	10	17	9,825	14	3,424	9	828	40	14,077	.09
Nicaragua	2	3	414	3	862	0	0	6	1,276	.00
Panama	1	1	535	1	395	0	0	2	930	.00
United States	115	90	46,369	58	30,139	161	115,390	309	191,898	.23
Br. Honduras (U.K.)	1	9	10,352	3	572	0	0	12	10,924	.95
B.W.I.—Jamaica (U.K.)	3	4	812	2	710	2	757	8	2,279	.29
Alaska (U.S.)	6	8	433	2	108	0	0	10	541	.30
Puerto Rico (U.S.)	2	0	0	2	262	0	0	2	262	.00
AMERICA, S.	80	111	45,632	83	18,992	49	9,782	234	74,406	.27
Argentina	6	7	1,883	5	1,022	4	495	16	3,400	.00
Bolivia	3	3	1,805	3	845	0	0	6	2,650	.31
Brazil*	21	19	7,811	21	4,805	16	3,220	56	15,836	.05
Chile*	8	7	5,063	8	2,037	4	1,560	19	8,660	.05
Colombia	16	12	3,279	22	5,567	16	3,403	50	12,249	.01
Ecuador*	7	2	822	7	1,602	1	201	10	2,625	.05
Paraguay	1	1	175	3	194	0	0	4	369	.00
Peru	5	5	1,842	2	955	0	0	7	2,797	.14
Uruguay	5	4	1,004	4	331	2	235	10	1,570	.18
Venezuela	7	6	4,655	7	1,254	6	668	19	6,577	.00
Br. Guiana (U.K.)	1	45	17,293	1	380	0	0	46	17,673	.98
ASIA	128	311	80,738	129	52,619	64	24,827	504	158,184	.41
Ceylon	4	10	4,030	9	2,373	0	0	19	6,403	.44
China—Taiwan	8	7	649	3	1,443	0	0	10	2,092	1.00

TABLE 2—Continued

COUNTRY	INSTI- TUTION (1)	Schools (2)	ELEMENTARY Enrollment (3)	Schools (4)	SECONDARY Enrollment (5)	Schools (6)	HIGHER Enrollment (7)	Schools (8)	TOTAL Enrollment (9)	Parochial (10)
ASIA (Continued)										
India	68	265	65,448	76	34,459	32	16,420	373	116,327	.47
Indonesia*	8	4	1,038	6	2,447	3	100	13	3,585	.39
Iraq	1	0	0	1	709	1	35	2	744	.00
Japan	7	5	1,185	3	1,878	6	2,552	14	5,615	.21
Korea—South Korea	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	.00
Lebanon	6	3	2,280	7	1,591	5	1,579	15	5,450	.22
Nepal	1	1	251	1	259	0	0	2	510	.00
Philippines	14	8	4,167	16	4,797	13	4,001	37	12,965	.03
Syria	2	2	620	1	167	0	0	3	787	.00
Macau (Po.)	1	1	92	0	0	0	0	1	92	1.00
Portuguese India (Po.)	3	3	636	2	553	0	0	5	1,189	.42
Hong Kong (U.K.)	4	2	342	3	1,863	3	140	8	2,345	.00
Singapore (U.K.)	1	0	0	1	80	0	0	1	80	.00
EUROPE	223	155	52,239	237	58,973	75	9,995	467	121,207	.24
Austria	4	0	0	3	857	2	124	5	981	.00
Belgium	21	17	4,986	17	6,737	8	1,382	42	13,105	.00
Denmark	2	2	688	1	263	0	0	3	951	.28
France	30	21	4,539	32	8,465	4	1,034	57	14,038	.08
Germany	13	1	278	14	4,698	3	189	18	5,165	.49
Greece	2	0	0	2	15	0	0	2	15	.00
Ireland	9	5	645	10	1,397	2	167	17	2,209	.11
Italy	45	14	2,627	38	7,668	31	4,065	83	14,360	.04
Netherlands	16	16	3,292	15	4,047	0	0	31	7,339	.56

COUNTRY	INSTI- TUTION (1)	ELEMENTARY		SECONDARY		HIGHER		Schools (8)	TOTAL Enrollment (9)	Parochial (10)
		Schools (2)	Enrollment (3)	Schools (4)	Enrollment (5)	Schools (6)	Enrollment (7)			
EUROPE (Continued)										
Portugal	5	3	137	6	1,008	0	0	9	1,145	.00
Spain	54	50	22,445	84	18,637	18	2,090	152	43,172	.17
Switzerland	4	0	0	1	185	4	738	5	923	1.00
U. K.—England, Wales	12	24	11,651	10	3,684	0	0	34	15,335	.71
—Scotland	2	2	951	1	461	0	0	3	1,412	.48
Yugoslavia	3	0	0	2	411	2	50	4	461	.00
Malta, Gozo (U. K.)	1	0	0	1	440	1	156	2	596	.00
OCEANIA										
	18	20	2,310	11	2,045	7	1,144	38	5,499	.82
Australia	11	8	675	9	1,968	6	1,092	23	3,735	.74
New Zealand	1	0	0	1	40	1	52	2	92	1.00
Pacific Islands (U. S.)	6	12	1,635	1	37	0	0	13	1,672	.98

(1) Total number of educational institutions administered by Jesuit Superiors.

(2) Number of all elementary schools in (1) which are administered by Jesuits.

(3) Students enrolled in all elementary schools in (2).

(4) Number of all secondary schools included in (1) which are administered by Jesuits.

(5) Students enrolled in all secondary schools in (4).

(6) Number of all higher schools included in (1) which are administered by Jesuits.

(7) Students enrolled in all higher schools in (6).

(8) Total number of all schools included in (1). Sum of (2), (4) and (6).

(9) Total enrollment of all schools. Sum of (3), (5) and (7).

(10) Proportion of students in (9) who are enrolled in schools administered by Jesuits but not owned by the Society.

* Number of institutions and schools and their enrollment based on Province catalogues ineunte anno 1956. Proportions in (10) are estimated. For South America, proportion is based on average of

the rest of South America, exclusive of British Guiana; for Indonesia, based on average enrollment per school multiplied by number of schools not owned by the Society.

proximately 23% attend schools administered by Jesuits but where the Society does not hold legal title to the physical plant (10). The totals given in columns (8) and (9) are broken down by level of education offered, as it is understood in the United States, in columns (2) to (7) inclusively. Much is not said in this arrangement, but, like uranium, we must take the facts as we find them, at least for the present.

Certain observations and generalizations can here be made which are forced on one's attention simply from having scrutinized the facts and having reflected on them. First, an apologia for the rather awkward distinction introduced concerning ownership of the physical plant of the school. The first reaction is not to bother with parochial schools (that is, parochial, diocesan, interdiocesan, regional and all others that the Society does not own) but limit ourselves to Jesuit-owned schools. This was once considered and rejected when it was discovered that practically all the higher education in Australia, nearly all of our training of diocesan clergy, and even a certain amount of our secondary education (e.g. Yakima, St. Boniface, Winnipeg; Missoula, etc.) would have to be omitted since we do not own these schools.

Since in most cases there are only one or two Jesuits who devote time to the administration and teaching in parochial elementary schools, why not apply the test of number of students per Jesuit per school as the basis of exclusion? On this principle we could save most of the higher education and secondary education that we want to include and eliminate the parochial elementary schools that we might want to exclude. This would not work either, however, because, depending on the ratio of students per Jesuit chosen, we might find ourselves forced to exclude some of larger colleges and universities, such as Fordham, St. Louis, Detroit and Marquette and still include some of the smaller parochial elementary schools. The only practical solution, then, is the one employed here, but one must keep in mind the insignificant looking but most informative column (10) of Table 2. In general it can be said that this proportion of students in schools not owned by the Society represents elementary enrollment with an occasional secondary school and a goodly number of diocesan seminaries conducted by the Society.

Whenever possible, the data given in the annual report were used, but occasionally adjustments had to be made to place all schools on the same basis. Sometimes the person reporting duplicated, that is repeated the same students under schools which purportedly belonged to the Society and again under parochial schools. Whenever this was suspected, the figures for Society-owned schools were checked against the Province catalogue and the duplication was removed insofar as that was possible. We believe this procedure to be reasonable.

Another form of editing of original data arose in conjunction with missions which fall within the territory of a See presided over by a Jesuit Bishop. This can be exemplified with Kisantu, Belgian Congo, although Alaska, British Guiana, Salisbury, parts of India and other such regions would serve the same purpose. The Province catalogue tells us that there are 32 schools administered by Jesuits in the Kisantu mission and indicates that only 10 of these, representing an enrollment of about 2,600 students, are owned by the Society; the remaining 22 belonging to the Vicariate. The annual report states that there are about 32,000 parochial school pupils in the mission. Since it is most unusual in such areas to find schools which average over a thousand students each, further inquiry was made. Consulting the *Annuario Pontificio*, it was found that the entire vicariate has 2,723 schools enrolling 79,103 students. Obviously the 22 school administered by Jesuits could not account for so large a proportion of the students available and accordingly an adjustment was made. In a certain sense the figure given in the annual report could be defended on the basis that the Vicar Apostolic, being a Jesuit, is responsible for the education of all Catholic children in his territory; still this is an unusual situation and the supposition for all other schools is that there is a least one Jesuit directly connected with a specific school which is obviously not the case here. Hence, whatever editing and adjusting was done was meant not to minimize the educational efforts of certain areas but rather to reduce them to the same basic assumptions as the rest of the Society where such unusual conditions do not prevail. In doing so, I think a more accurate picture is presented than by giving unadjusted and inflated figures and attempting to explain them in footnotes.

In an effort to gather together and simplify what has thus far been said and to add further miscellaneous information, Table 3 was prepared. Column (4) of that table gives the proportionate distribution by continent of all students here under discussion, and columns (1) to (3) inclusive give the component parts of each row by level of education. Thus, for the whole world, 45.4% of all students are enrolled in elementary schools; 28.7%, in secondary schools and 25.9% in higher schools, that is colleges or universities. The continent of North America accounts for 38.8% of all students, and higher education in North America accounts for 18.6% of all students enrolled in all Jesuit-administered schools of the world.

Columns (6) and (7) subdivide column (4) according to whether the Society owns the physical plant of the schools in which students are enrolled or whether it is owned by the diocese, ecclesiastical region or some other corporate body which is not the Society. Thus, 27.8% of all students of the world are enrolled in Jesuit-owned schools of North America.

TABLE 3

Proportion of 638,984 Students Enrolled in 1,854 Schools Administered by Jesuits According to Level of Instruction and Ownership. Proportion of Students in Terminal Schools. Proportion of Non-Jesuit Teachers in Certain Schools. 1956-1957

CONTINENT	LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION			TOTAL (4)	OWNERSHIP		Terminal Students (7)	Non-S. J. Teachers (8)
	Elemen- tary (1)	Second- ary (2)	Higher (3)		Parochial (5)	Jesuit (6)		
TOTAL	.454	.287	.259	1.000	.322	.678	.061	.697
AFRICA	.036	.012	.001	.049	.028	.021	.004	.680
AMERICA, N.	.134	.068	.186	.388	.110	.278	.008	.721
AMERICA, S.	.071	.030	.015	.116	.031	.085	.004	.698
ASIA	.127	.082	.039	.248	.101	.147	.014	.801
EUROPE	.082	.092	.016	.190	.045	.145	.030	.583
OCEANIA	.004	.003	.002	.009	.007	.002	-.001	.489

- (1) Proportion of students in (4) enrolled in all elementary schools administered by Jesuits.
 (2) Proportion of students in (4) enrolled in all secondary schools administered by Jesuits.
 (3) Proportion of students in (4) enrolled in all higher schools administered by Jesuits.
 (4) Distribution of all students enrolled in all schools administered by Jesuits.
 (5) Proportion of students in (4) enrolled in schools administered by Jesuits but not owned by the Society.
 (6) Proportion of students in (4) enrolled in schools both administered by Jesuits and owned by the Society.
 (7) Proportion of students in (1) and (2) pursuing studies which *de se* do not admit to higher studies.
 (8) Proportion of non-Jesuit teachers to all teachers in some schools [chiefly "Jesuit" schools, i.e., column (6)].

Please note that these proportions are based on students and not on schools. From the way information is now gathered, there is no precise method of estimating the number of schools since Jesuit and non-Jesuit-owned schools differ so greatly in average enrollment. A systematic sample consisting of about one fourth of all the schools indicates that around 60% of the schools are Jesuit owned and that 40% are not. Assuming that the schools in the sample were correctly assigned on the basis of ownership, then we are almost certain that the absolute number of parochial schools administered by the Society is somewhere between 700 and 850 and, accordingly, the number of Jesuit-owned schools for non-Jesuits is between 1,000 and 1,150, both totalling 1,854. The average size of parochial schools is about 260 students and that of Jesuit-owned schools is about 400 students.

The reader is to be cautioned that the figures on school ownership are

nowhere available as such, but that the author relied on his judgment based on certain external indications and a limited amount of consulting with persons acquainted with local conditions. Thus, for an individual country or continent [column (10), Table 2] there may be some error, but for the entire survey, errors in one direction would tend to cancel errors in the opposite direction, and, hence, for a larger number of schools, they would tend to cancel out each other. To illustrate this, take the Collège de Saint-Boniface, Manitoba. All indications point to the conclusion that this is a Jesuit-owned school: it has a goodly-sized Jesuit staff, the enrollment figures are given in the Province catalogue (contrary to the practice of that Province for non-Society owned schools), it seems to be included under "Jesuit" schools in the annual report, yet, I am told by one who knows the actual situation, the physical plant is not owned by the Society but by the Diocese. Undoubtedly there are other such instances, some tending to exaggerate "Jesuit" enrollment, as exemplified here, and others tending to underestimate it. This simply strengthens the position originally taken by making the survey all-inclusive and introducing distinctions later.

Column (7) of Table 3 is given since the information was available but it was not thought to be of sufficient importance to give for each country. Since much depends on the definition of a terminal student, this will be explained briefly. First, for extrinsic reasons, it does not refer to any school, even adult education, attached to a university or university college, but is confined to primary but principally secondary schools. Secondly, it excludes all primary schools which normally admit to general secondary or academic secondary schools and it also excludes general secondary or academic secondary schools. Hence, it includes primary and secondary terminal, commercial, vocational or professional schools; teacher-training institutions not connected with a university; special education for physically, mentally and otherwise handicapped students; and adult education not connected with a university.² Briefly, it includes all elementary and secondary schools which *de se* do not admit, either mediately or immediately, to the university.

It is to be noted that the proportions in column (7) are included elsewhere. Thus, the 100.0% in column (4) is made up of 6.1% terminal students, as defined above, and 93.9% academic students. Consequently,

² The terminology and classification here used is gradually becoming standard and can be seen exemplified in UNESCO, *World Survey of Education*, 1955, Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1955, pp. 50-51 and *passim*.

Since there is some confusion on the point, persons in special schools for those aspiring to become brothers in the Society, if they are not novices nor have taken vows, logically come under the scope of this survey.

this 6.1% will be distributed, in varying degrees, in columns (1) and (2) of Table 3.

Supplying data from the original study, this aspect provides some interesting sidelights. The country of Spain accounts for 53 schools enrolling 11,940 of the total 160 schools enrolling 39,012 terminal students. For the year beginning 1957, of the total number of 390 novices in Spain, 124 are novice brothers.

Column (8) is unrelated to the rest of the table supplying some interesting information, but which, because of the many restrictions that must be placed on it, was omitted from the previous table. The annual reports tell us that there were 25,380 teachers in "Jesuit" schools, 7,688 of whom were Jesuits and 17,692, or 69.7%, were not. Whether these are full-time or part-time teachers or both, or what, if any, administrators are included is not known. Furthermore, it cannot be determined how many schools these represent. Theoretically, they should be teachers of 432,935 students in Jesuit-owned schools, but actually that is not the case. All we can say is that figures in this column seem to apply to schools in which there is a sizeable number of Jesuits teaching. What is salvageable from this data is the ratio of Jesuit and non-Jesuit teachers, which ratio, for the sake of brevity, is given as the proportion of non-Jesuit teachers to total number of teachers in certain schools. Subtracting this ratio from 100.0% gives the proportion of Jesuit teachers, as, for example, 30.3% for the entire Society.

Were we to extend this ratio to all schools, and not only to those which compilers of the annual reports deemed worthy of consideration, the proportion of non-Jesuit teachers would probably be slightly higher.

Since most of the readers of this article are especially interested in the schools of the United States, an attempt will be made to present briefly all of the findings of the more complete study. There are 171 rectors and superiors in the United States (including 1 of the Lithuanian Vice Province and 3 of the Northern Mexican Region). Of these, 12 are duplicates (e.g., Fordham has 4 superiors of whom only one shall be computed) and 21 do not administer any schools thereby leaving 138 separate educational institutions, including those for Jesuits, and these are composed of 348 schools. Deducting 28 institutions comprising 39 schools for members of the Society, and adding 5 "mixed" institutions, we have 115 educational institutions for non-Jesuits composed of 309 schools enrolling 191,898 students.

Table 2 tells us that these are thus distributed: 90 elementary schools (mostly parochial) enrolling 46,369 students; 58 secondary schools enrolling 30,139 students and 161 colleges and university schools enrolling 115,390 students. There are only 5 terminal schools enrolling a total of

2,598 students. Proportion-wise this enrollment is distributed: 24.2% elementary, 15.7% secondary and 60.1 higher students. Only 1.4% of the primary and secondary students are terminal.

In terms of the entire Society and on a basis comparable to Table 3, American schools account for 7.3% elementary, 4.7% secondary and 18% higher, or exactly 30.0% of all students enrolled in the world. About 23.0% of these are in Jesuit-owned schools and 7.0% in those owned by somebody else. These latter are chiefly in parochial grade schools, two or three high schools and a few diocesan seminaries. The given absolute number of teachers is 2,579 Jesuits, and 7,264 non-Jesuits, the latter representing 73.8% of the total. These educate about 147,186 students, which is the number of students in Jesuit-owned schools.

An attempt was made to reconcile the results of this survey with the figures appearing in the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*³ for the school year 1956-1957 and it was found, after making due allowance for Jesuits reported in the J. E. Q. as well as all the American mission schools, parochial schools and diocesan seminaries which are not reported there, that this survey shows an excess of about 6,000 students over J. E. Q. This difference would almost balance out if the graduate summer-school enrollment were added to the grand total of the J. E. Q. All this is speculation since only those who submitted reports to their Provincials for the annual reports know if such was the case.

Perfect conformity between J. E. Q. figures and those sent to Provincials to be included in Province catalogues will probably never be attained since the Provincials want their returns early, often before enrollments are completed, so as not to delay publication of their catalogues. The schools, therefore, must often resort to estimates based on the previous year's enrollment, and in recent years this would tend to underestimate true enrollment; or they must resort to pre-enrollment which usually overestimates true enrollment. Hence, the preponderant use of the second method could explain the difference of about 6,000 students if we are not satisfied with the summer-school explanation. In any event it is to be remembered that this type of error or discrepancy is an error in the data and not error arising from sampling, or statistical error properly so called. There is no sure way of detecting or estimating non-statistical error nor is there a better way of correcting for it than to supply accurate data in the first place.

We come now to statistical error which can be measured. Throughout this survey we have been making estimates either to supply missing in-

³ Costello, Richard D., S.J., "An Analysis of National Statistics: 1956-1957," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XIX, No. 3 (January 1957), pp. 147-155.

formation or to edit data where it obviously does not conform to the general practice of the rest of the Society. The all important question now arises as to how accurate these estimates were. Put otherwise, how nearly can we expect the true value to approach the value here computed? Assuming the annual reports and Province catalogues to be accurate except in the cases indicated, theoretically it would be possible to compute limits of statistical error to any degree of confidence short of absolute certainty, but neither time nor the availability of necessary equipment made this possible. Hence, a crude, but valid, method was employed and it was found that we can say with the certainty which is greater than usually expected in such studies that statistical error should not exceed 6,000 students, plus or minus, for the total enrollment of 638,984 students. No valid assertions can now be made for individual countries or continents beyond this, that the fewer the estimates the smaller the statistical error. In practice this is almost the same as saying that figures for countries having a smaller proportion of parochial school enrollment will be more reliable statistically.

If the reader has followed me thus far, undoubtedly many questions will have arisen in his mind. Many of them will be the result of a lack of clarity on the part of the author struggling to convey to others what he has but recently and not too firmly grasped. This defect can be remedied with time and the questions from interested readers.

Although all reasonable care was employed in making this report factually accurate, one would be most naive in thinking that it is without mistakes. Such mistakes are best detected by those who are actually engaged in educational work in the various countries here reported. It is our sincere hope that these generous persons will take the time to inform us of any mistakes or obscurities whether they be great or small. Part of the work of a statistician is to supply the factual information upon which decisions are made. Decisions in matters pertaining to one of the most widespread and important works of the Society, its educational apostolate, will, barring divine illuminations, be as sound as the facts on which they are based. This survey is an attempt to consolidate and synthesize some of the facts concerning Jesuit education which may some day lead to decisive action. Viewed in this light, I am sure the reader will share the author's zeal in making subsequent revisions and expansions as accurate and consistent as humanly possible.

The Georgetown Latin Project

THOMAS R. FITZGERALD, S.J.

Experts in the rapidly maturing field of linguistics are convinced that competence in languages is acquired primarily through an oral-aural method. This method has been employed with marked success, for example, in the language training programs of the Armed Forces and in the Georgetown School of Foreign Service.

The linguists point out that to read a language fluently one must rely heavily on tongue and ear, and on the conditioned reflexes in these organs constructed through practice. If the eye is skimming down the page, covering 50 or 100 words per minute, there is little time for the leisurely process of grammatical analysis: "*Hund*, noun, nominative, singular, subject, meaning 'dog'; *schläft*, verb, third person, singular, present indicative, active with change of thematic vowel, meaning, 'is sleeping.'" If the page is to be read, not just decoded, one must intuitively recognize the meanings of groups of words. Thus ordinarily the thought of a clause must be grasped as a unit. It is precisely here that tongue and ear can help.

Take the German sentence: "Machen Sie es zu." Here the most significant syllable is "zu." A person accustomed to listening to German and to speaking it will instinctively, on hearing the sentence just quoted, be on the lookout for the final sound. Germans so enunciate the sentence that no one doubts which word is most important, and the American who has heard German and has been drilled in the reproduction of its sounds and intonations will, when he reads the sentence, intuitively focus on the final "zu," without of course failing to grasp the rather generic words which precede it.

A similar example might be adduced from French. If a Frenchman were asked whether something was above or below the table, he would reply either "au-dessus" or "au-dessous." Each answer contains three syllables, yet only the final syllable of each reply is significant. To it the French tongue will give importance (so much so that the American ear may not even hear the first two syllables), and to it the French ear will instinctively advert. Likewise the American student, if he has been orally-aurally conditioned, will automatically concentrate upon the final syllable on reading, in context, either of these words.

These examples may serve as a basis for some understanding of recent advances made by the linguists. Long ago they were able to identify the

basic sounds emitted in the oral production of any language. These sounds, and the science concerned with them, are both called "phonetics." More recently linguists have succeeded in distinguishing basic sounds in terms of significance. The sounds which operate in terms of essential perceptual distinctions are called "phonemes";¹ the science which treats of them is "phonemics."² By distinguishing phonemes the linguists are able to analyze a language's structure of expression. Once this structure has been recognized, the linguist can construct exercises whereby the student, by oral and auditory repetition, in a minimum amount of time will acquire that intuitive grasp of group of words *qua* groups that is essential to true reading.

Today all major universities have departments of linguistics. Georgetown University has been making a distinctive contribution, for during the past eight years it has experimented widely in the employment of electronic equipment for language learning. The utilization of tape recorders for oral and aural drill by language students is one phase of the research which is still continuing at the Georgetown Institute of Languages and Linguistics. This technique has been successfully applied to the learning of French, German, Spanish, Hebrew, and many other languages.

The success of modern linguistics techniques is the best proof of their validity. Skeptics who have the opportunity should give a summer to the study, under competent instructors, of some foreign language, and at the end of the summer compare their progress with the accomplishments they had made in language according to the time-honored method of grammatical analysis. The many American Jesuits who, during the post-war decade, have done studies in Europe have been particularly impressed by the need of oral-aural conditioning for gaining facility in a language. Many of them testify that only when they were forced to hear a language spoken and to express themselves in that medium did they acquire that *Sprachgefühl* which made rapid, accurate reading truly possible. The more complicated the language, the more helpful is the oral-aural method. The late and revered Fr. Pierre Charles used to remark that German, because of its complexity, would not be read with facility by most non-Germans unless they had been forced to speak it a little.

¹ This is not to say that a phoneme by itself is meaningful. The smallest meaningful linguistic unit is called a "morpheme," and usually is composed of several phonemes.

² For comparatively easy explanations of the basic concepts and techniques of Structural Linguistics one might consult: Edgar H. Sturtevant, *An Introduction to Linguistic Science*, Yale University Press, 1947; Zellig S. Harris, *Methods in Structural Linguistics*, University of Chicago Press, 1951. As regards terminology, the linguists are not yet in complete agreement. This factor complicates the non-linguist's initiation into what is, of its nature, a difficult science.

Can linguistic advances be applied to the teaching of Latin? Experts of the Georgetown Institute of Languages and Linguistics unhesitatingly say "yes." Already they have examined in detail the problem of Latin and have outlined a program whereby they will have ready on tapes, by the summer of 1958, a complete course. One linguist of the Institute, Dr. William M. Austin, is especially well qualified for the Latin project since he has a doctorate in linguistics from Princeton University and has done advanced work in the field of Greek and Latin structure. Furthermore a Jesuit Latinist will, during the second semester of this year, devote himself to the Project on a full-time basis.

For somewhat pragmatic reasons it has been decided that the results of the Georgetown Project will be offered first to the novitiates. Jesuit Novices must acquire an elementary speaking skill in Latin as well as the ability to understand Latin when it is spoken. They must also learn to read the language with some facility, for it is an indispensable tool of their philosophical and theological studies. Finally, in their Latin instruction the Novices should acquire a proficiency in reading the language that will permit them to gain the maximum benefit from the *institutio litteraria* of their juniorate days. The practical needs of the Novices make them apt subjects for a direct method of Latin instruction, whereas among extern students and their teachers there is a strong prejudice against "spoken Latin" since its utility for them is not as readily evident. If the new Latin methods prove themselves in the novitiates, they will be more readily adopted by colleges and high schools. Furthermore there will be produced, over the years, a group of Scholastics familiar with the new methods and therefore able to employ these techniques in their own teaching.

The Georgetown Institute of Languages and Linguistics has proposed the following program:

Phase I. September 1957 to September 1958.

The Latin texts now being published in revised form by the University of Michigan will be studied by members of the Institute staff. The exercises therein contained will be recorded on tapes and will be adapted to the Georgetown "informant" teaching technique.

The Michigan graded readings will at the same time be examined and, insofar as proves feasible, will be supplemented with selections from a variety of authors pagan and Christian.

The Institute will prepare estimates and recommendations concerning the minimum amount of linguistics equipment that the novitiates will need if they are going to try the new Latin course. No elaborate laboratories will be necessary.

During the summer of 1958 the first teacher-training program will be held at the Institute. The work of the summer session will be so ordered that the participating teachers will be able, during the academic year 1958-59, to present the new Latin course and utilize the latest linguistic techniques. Each Jesuit novitiate has been invited to send one teacher. At the 1957 meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, in Milwaukee, the academic delegates of the various novitiates expressed their interest and said they would recommend to Superiors that their respective houses be represented at the 1958 summer session.

Phase II. September 1958 to September 1959.

During the academic year 1958-59 the new course will be employed in classrooms of those novitiates which, on the basis of the 1958 summer session, have decided to give the system a test.

Meanwhile at the Georgetown Linguistics Institute work will be begun on a Latin course for the high schools. This will be a more difficult undertaking since teacher shortage and financial necessity usually demand that high-school Latin be taught to classes of at least 30-35 students.

During the summer of 1959 the first training program for teachers of high-school Latin will be offered at the Institute.

Phase III. After September 1959.

The two new Latin courses will, on the basis of classroom experience, be evaluated in their entirety and changes will be instituted as necessary.

It must not be supposed that students trained under the Georgetown method will be completely ignorant of inflection and syntax. Some years ago, when the direct method was first applied to the study of modern languages, the learning of grammar was almost completely omitted. Experience, however, quickly showed that a knowledge of basic grammatical structure is necessary for an accurate command of a language, particularly on the part of those who attempt to teach it. Anyone who examines recent texts for the study of foreign languages, for example, the "Assimil" series that has been so widely used in Europe during the past ten years, will find that a practical command of inflections and syntax is gradually acquired by the elementary student. But the approach to reading is oral-aural, not grammatical. Linguists are convinced that a facility in reading foreign languages is acquired more readily if ear and tongue are employed in the initial stages than if the student devotes himself to detailed grammatical analysis. The linguists also point out that

this is the natural method, the one whereby all small children learn the language of their parents.

Nor do the linguists overlook the necessity of graded readings. Oral-aural formation must be followed and supplemented by rapid reading in selections of increasing complexity and difficulty. At Milford Novitiate a program of graded Latin readings has recently been employed with eminently satisfactory results.

Again, the Georgetown Institute does not propose to replace classical Latin with ecclesiastical Latin. As Fr. Fadner of the Institute indicated at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, the linguists are interested in Latin as such.³ But the Latin about which they are speaking is not complicated by such wide divergencies as exist among the writings of, let us say, Homer, Plato, Sappho, and Theocritus. Latin, unlike Greek, is not composed of a multiplicity of dialects.

Those who believe that the spoken Latin which Novices would learn is radically different from Ciceronian usage are invited to make an experiment. Let them take representative manuals of scholastic philosophy and theology such as Boyer's work on the Incarnation and Dezza's manual of ontology, and compare their Latinity with that of the *Pro Milone*. It will be readily evident that the philosophical and theological treatises have peculiarities of vocabulary, as is to be expected in works of a technical nature, but that the syntax, inflections, and style are reasonably close to those of Cicero.

Next let them analyze a few pages of Tacitus' *Annales*. They will find that, from the point of view of syntax, inflections, and style, Boyer and Dezza are more "classical" than is Tacitus; also that Tacitus' vocabulary is not altogether Ciceronian.

This experiment might then be repeated with the *Bellum Gallicum*. Caesar's Latinity is quite distinctive and un-Ciceronian, yet we have Cicero's assurance that the *Commentarii* are "recti et venusti."

One might next turn to the poets, and consider to what extent Virgil, Horace, and others are "classical" in their usage. Then the writings of Plautus and Petronius might be examined. The stylistic resemblances between these authors have induced some students of the history of the Latin language to conclude that many of Plautus' characteristic expressions are not archaisms that earlier disappeared but rather an informal, spoken Latin that was in use at Rome throughout the classical age, though its popular conversational traits excluded it from those documents

³ Word-frequency in the classical authors, incidentally, has already been fairly well determined. The pioneering work was done by P. B. Diederich, *The Frequency of Latin Words and Their Endings*, Chicago, 1937.

of Golden and Silver Latin that are the products of conscious artistry. Certainly Plautus and Petronius do not conform to Ciceronian usage.

Finally one might consider just how "classical" are the *Epistulae* of Cicero. Not only are there stylistic and syntactical peculiarities, but the *Epistulae* have an unusual vocabulary constantly adorned with Greek words and phrases. Though the scholastic Latin of the 20th century does not strictly conform to classical usage, it is no more foreign to Ciceronian Latinity than are the writings of the great Latin prose authors and poets who have been mentioned in the last few paragraphs. The Novice who is exposed to spoken Latin will not be trading with the enemy but will be subjected to a formation whereby he should more easily and more accurately read any Latin author of the Golden or the Silver Age. For he will have received oral-aural drill in "Latin as such," in the language which was common to all the classical Roman authors. Furthermore such argot of Latin as the *dico quod* construction will, without being completely omitted, be properly minimized.

It is the hope of the Georgetown Institute that the young Jesuits will, through use of the materials now being prepared, more readily read their Cicero, Virgil, Horace, and Tacitus, and more easily understand the lectures and master the textbooks of philosophy and theology. If the new linguistic techniques are successfully applied to Latin in the novitiates, then a reappraisal of Latin instruction on the high-school level will, of course, be indicated.

Why a Catholic College?

FRANCIS J. SHALLOE, S.J.*

When you, good parents, sent your boy to St. Peter's Preparatory three or four years ago, your choice was a vote of confidence in us as educators. We have worked hard with you as a team and so far, I think, we have done a good job. The job, however, has only just begun. It can prosper or be spoiled by his college choice.

To whom will you turn for correct advice about his college choice? You are too busy with your own duties to have made a proper study of the problem. Surely you will not consult an engineer nor an accountant nor a lawyer nor a doctor. They are experts in production or in numbers or health or law, but they know only one college, the one that they themselves attended. We educators seek their advice in the field of their specialty, and so do you. They consult us about the education of their children, and so do you, wisely. Education is our business; that is why you are here today.

The Prep authorities and teachers have assigned to me the delicate responsibility of advising your boy concerning his college choice. I want to tell you what I tell him, because I am acting for you as well as for the Prep. I advise him to attend a Catholic college. I tell him that he is bound in conscience to attend a Catholic college, or none at all. I tell you, his parents, the same. You have a right to know the reasons; I shall tell you some of them today.

I am talking about the undergraduate college, the one he will go to when he leaves Prep. Since His Holiness Pope Pius XI in his encyclical made an exception in favor of government sponsored military schools, I see no objection to Annapolis, West Point, or the Coast Guard, Air Force, or Merchant Marine Academies.

Secondly, I have no objection to his attending any graduate or professional school for graduate or professional work. I have no hesitation in advising the Catholic college graduate to go to any university anywhere in the world. Let him take the best graduate work he can afford. If he is then a graduate of any college represented here today, or any other Catholic college, he is adequately prepared. He has a creed that will provide the ready answer to assault upon his dogmas; a culture that will make him proud of the spiritual riches of his ancestors.

I tell your boy that he is bound in conscience to avoid a secular college

* Address given at St. Peter's Preparatory School on the occasion of Catholic College Information Day, December 2, 1956.

because of the dangers to his faith and morals in these institutions. Boys have said to me: "If my Jesuit Prep education is what it is cracked up to be, I won't lose my faith." Parents have said: "I sent him to your school to give him the very best Catholic high-school education. What is the matter with your Catholic education if he is in danger of losing his faith?"

The answer is, that when we graduate him, there is nothing the matter with his Catholic education except that it is not finished. We do not turn out bad Catholics, we turn out young ones. If the rain comes through a building when it is under construction, you do not say that it is a bad building, you say that it is an unfinished building. We ask that you follow the Catholic educational plan until he is a Catholic man; this is the plan you started when you carried him to the baptismal font. He is not a baby any more; but he has a little way to go before he is a man. When he was a baby, you didn't hold him naked out the window to show how strong his little body was. When he graduates from one of our Catholic colleges, your job and our job is finished; from that day he and he alone must face the judgment.

Why is the faith of a Catholic boy in danger in a secular college? Some professors attack religion and morality. They teach that there is no God, that there are no absolutes, that man has no immortal soul, that there is no heaven, no hell. If a young, raw, loyal, but unfinished Catholic dares to oppose them, he fights a losing battle; because he is a boy fighting a man. Other professors do not attack religion nor do they deny that God exists. They just ignore God. They teach all about the world of creatures without mention of the Creator. If I teach your son his duties as a son, how he fits into your family society, without mention of his father, I am talking nonsense and insulting his father. Or if I say let us pretend that you are a son without a father, I certainly should not be in the position of teaching your son how to be a good son. You cannot have creatures without a Creator. When you teach all about elements and atoms and physical laws and the scientists themselves, and avoid all mention of a Creator, you are playing in a toy world. Professors who ignore God are building little atheists who will some day deny Him.

Remember that this ordeal against faith opens without a prayer, in a classroom without a crucifix, in the company of not many fellow Catholics. It may be to a Catholic student an unhappy and lonesome life. Father Avery Dulles, now a Jesuit priest, attended Harvard before he became a Catholic. "Are there any advantages," he writes, "in attending a secular college, even in terms of material success and social prestige? Frankly, I do not believe so, though I can see that people might easily be led to believe that there are such advantages. My own observation is that the Cath-

olics whom I knew at college were not particularly admired. In the more snobbish groups at least, they were looked down on for their religion, and perhaps even more so for not being faithful to that religion."¹ I would add that they are probably disliked also by their Catholic high school classmates because they are pretending to be superior to them.

"I should estimate," wrote Father Dulles, "that most of the nominal Catholics with whom I was acquainted at college no longer adhered to the Faith on the day that they received their diplomas." Recently the Catholic chaplain at a large and famous non-Catholic university said that he had made a survey of Catholics at the university since 1890. He found that 57 percent had lost the Faith.

I don't know what percentage of any community might be saved, but I would not willingly join a community if I knew that the chances for salvation for Catholics in that community were reduced by 57 percent. I think it is fair to assume also that what deprived 57 percent of these college students of the Faith must have had a weakening influence on some of the 43 percent who still had some faith left. Of course nobody with his eyes wide open throws away his Faith any more than a sane man with his eyes wide open throws away his life, but how slow to register is the slogan—the life you save may be your own.

I would like to mention at this point that you don't go to college to learn to earn. You go to college to learn to live. Later as an apprentice on a job or a student in a professional school you will give earning some attention. The college must develop your personality as completely as it can be developed. Therefore, it should be emphasized that the college is making you, YOU, and that is its main job. Now the YOU that you will be is shaped not only by what you are taught explicitly, but by viewpoints and attitudes towards life. In a Catholic college you will look at life completely and not separate it into little bits, like the cubby holes in your desk. Secular colleges have a way of cutting people to bits, de-emphasizing individuals in favor of society, ignoring Faith, Hope and Charity in favor of the natural virtues, separating science from truth; being positive and dictatorial about useful but unproven theories and screaming academic freedom in the face of eternal truth.

There is a Catholic way of looking at things that you will find in a Catholic college inside and outside of the classroom, and that you will not find anywhere else. The emphasis is on the individual rather than on society. YOU are important. You are not going to be plowed under for

¹Avery R. Dulles, S.J., "Catholics in Secular Colleges," *Catholic Mind*, Vol. XLIX, No. 1065 (September 1951), p. 561.

the alleged common good The emphasis is supernatural rather than natural. You cannot grow up happy without Faith, Hope and Charity, and these are supernatural virtues.

Education will give you little if it does not give you peace, in this world and the next. St. Augustine defines peace as "tranquilitas ordinis:" the calm that comes over us when everything is in good order. St. Thomas points out that order means putting things where they belong. If you are going to put everything just where it belongs, you have to follow a blueprint which shows where YOU fit into the total picture, as one who is the master of the world of creatures around you, under God, whether these creatures be chemicals or atoms or cells or anything else; as one who walks an equal of your fellow man, asserting your rights and recognizing your duties; as one who looks up and sees God. No man has ever discovered a more perfect blueprint for peace than the one which God carved in stone on Mt. Sinai. No man has ever discovered the power by which a man can be molded to this blueprint except Jesus Christ, our Lord, when He instituted the seven sacraments. There can be no peace from an education which lacks this blueprint and this power.

I have confidence that your boy, young as he is, good but unfinished, understands these values fairly well. He will not, unless he is deceived or forced, abandon this formula for peace in this life and the next. He has begun to acquire that sense of values which the Catholic college will bring to full flower. Now that you have heard some of the reasons why he feels as we do, I know that you will not want to face God, having done less than your clear duty.

INDUSTRY AND LIBERAL ARTS: According to a *New York Times* dispatch dated August 11, Yale University reports that business and industry are showing an increased interest in liberal arts students who are working toward advanced degrees.

Commented William C. Caples, vice-president of Inland Steel Company: "The complexities of business are such that someone who understands history, literature and philosophy, who is in a position to do some disciplined thinking, has the type of mind that will ultimately succeed." Said Albert J. Nickerson, president of Socony-Vacuum Oil Company: "While a man's technical knowledge may be his best tool during his first five years or so with our company, in many cases this curve tends to flatten out on the value chart and is met by the ascendant curve of the man's skill in human relations and other factors."

News from the Field

R.I.P.: Father Michael A. Clark, Province Prefect of Studies for the Maryland-New York Province, 1936-41, died on July 11, 1957, after an extended illness. Father Clark had also served as principal of Canisius High School, rector of Xavier High School, principal of Loyola High School (Baltimore), minister of St. Peter's Preparatory School, and superior of Inisfada, Manhasset, L.I. Father Clark, an amiable and gentlemanly priest, labored diligently during his life in the diverse ministries of the Society, and we pray that in Heaven he will intercede for those now entrusted with these ministries.

THE 1957-1958 DIRECTORY of the Jesuit Educational Association will be available at the end of October.

MANUAL REVISED: A new edition of the *Manual for Jesuit High-School Administrators* has been prepared and is available for distribution. The new edition is the result of a thorough reconsideration of the 1952 edition. New material has been added, some chapters expanded, and the bibliography has been substantially increased. The Manual may be obtained from the Jesuit Educational Association, 49 East 84th Street, New York 28, N.Y. Price: \$4.50 plus postage.

RECORDS SHATTERED: Enrollment in Catholic schools, colleges, and seminaries has increased nearly 15 percent in the last three years. The 1956-1957 enrollment was estimated at 4,875,200. It is expected that grade school and high school enrollment will reach 5,400,000 by 1960, and increase of 100 percent in the fifteen-year period 1945-1960.

TAX SAVINGS: Parochial and private schools of California save the state \$93,600,000 annually in operation costs alone. Catholic schools in Boston, Mass., save the tax payer \$15,000,000.

HEALTH GRANTS: Nine Catholic colleges recently received grants totalling \$119,384 for the training of public health specialists. Among the Jesuit colleges Boston College received \$32,544, Marquette University—\$18,862, Loyola University (Chicago) — \$5,750, Seattle University — \$3,020. The awards were given by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to relieve the acute shortage of specialists in state and local health agencies.

ALUMNI GIVING: A record total of \$106,041,205 was contributed to institutions of higher learning by their alumni in 1956, an increase of approximately 42 percent over 1955. Xavier University was first among Jesuit colleges for percentage of alumni who were donors to 1956 fund appeals. Creighton University was among the top ten in the country on the list of Alumni Gifts to Fund.

G.I. ORDINANDS: In 1954 two former members of the U.S. armed services personnel were ordained Jesuit priests; in 1955, six; in 1956, sixteen. This year thirty-one of the 146 ordained were former servicemen.

FORTY YEARS IN ERROR? The Stamford (Conn.) Board of Education is now questioning whether it has been acting illegally for the last forty years in providing health services to parochial and private school students. Stamford assigns public school nurses and physicians to the city's five parochial schools on regular schedules. A spokesman of the State Department of Education said that 36 school districts supply health services to private school pupils, while 28 towns provide free transportation. The Stamford Board of Education last year voted five-to-four against a proposal to provide public school bus transportation to parochial school students.

EXPANSION: *Boston College*—two new dormitories added; work on relocated football field and stadium well advanced.

Creighton University—drive for library building under way. Stephen P. Mitchell, alumnus and a former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has consented to serve as chairman of the drive.

St. Louis University—ground broken for new Pius XII Library.

Marquette University—Walter Schroeder Hall, new dormitory for 600 students, to open in September.

Shadowbrook—cornerstone of new novitiate laid.

University of San Francisco—construction begun on new faculty residence.

Creighton University High School—cornerstone of new high-school building laid.

Boston College High School, Canisius High School—new faculty residences completed.

AWARDS: Xavier University won first place in the annual midwestern Jesuit Intercollegiate Latin Contest for the sixth time in eight years.

The *Argus Eyes* of St. Peter's College won permanent possession of the N.F.C.C.S. trophy by taking first place in the one-act-play festival for the third time in five years.

At the Robert Marks National Invitational Debate Tournament held in Cincinnati, with 24 colleges participating, Fordham won first place and Holy Cross second place.

Edward Kolodziej, recent graduate of Loyola University (Chicago), received a Marshall Scholarship from the British government for graduate study at the University of Manchester.

Nine Fordham students received Honorable Mention in the recent announcement of winners of the National Science Foundation Fellowships for 1957.

The *Bellarmino Quarterly* (Fairfield Preparatory) and the *Blue and Gold* (Ateneo de Naga) repeated last year's triumphs by winning first place awards from the Columbia Scholastic Press Association.

Jesuit High (New Orleans) won second place in the state wrestling meet. Bobby Roberts, sophomore at Jesuit High, was voted the best high-school wrestler in Louisiana.

APPOINTMENTS, ELECTIONS: Father William Dunne, former president of University of San Francisco, appointed to the N.C.E.A. as Associate Secretary.

Father John F. X. Sweeney of Woodstock College was elected president of the Catholic Theological Association of America.

Father Robert Henle of St. Louis University was elected president of the Philosophy of Education Society.

Father Charles Donovan of Boston College was elected president of the Massachusetts Council on Teachers Preparation for the coming year.

GRANTS: Loyola University (New Orleans) received a citation and a grant of \$6,000 from the Research Corporation of New York for outstanding achievement in effective and successful teaching of physics. Loyola had the honor of being the first undergraduate physics division so honored. It was cited for "its outstanding record in producing physics majors."

A grant of \$72,024 from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis was awarded to the Poliomyelitis Respiratory and Rehabilitation Center at Creighton Memorial-St. Joseph's Hospital.

A fellowship to the Rockefeller Research Institute, graduate division, worth \$3,500 was won by Loyola College graduate John Tormey who may be the first graduate of a Catholic college to receive this fellowship.

LUCK OF THE IRISH: On April 11, 1957, at John Carroll University a convocation was held in honor of the Right Honorable Robert Briscoe, Lord Mayor of Dublin. Mr. Briscoe received the degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*. The Lord Mayor then presented gifts to the University, one a white Irish rug on which were imprinted a diagonal red cross and the shields of the four Irish provinces, another a cut glass ash tray bearing the star of David and three Irish words meaning freedom, justice and patience, his own seal.

TV VICTORY: After long negotiations and determined attempts by the Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State to block authorization, approval has finally been given by the Federal Communications Commission to Loyola University (New Orleans) to construct a television station using Channel 4.

TV CURRICULUM: The University of Detroit will offer a complete freshman Arts and Sciences curriculum on television this September.

Courses, credit or non-credit, in English, Spanish, history, religion, and psychology will be offered.

TV DENTISTRY: Closed circuit television as a teacher aid will be used by the School of Dentistry, Marquette University. Instead of 105 students attending several different dental demonstration classes, students in the same class would watch monitor screens as they show the work done elsewhere in the school.

QUAKE SERVICE: The United States Army recently signed a contract with John Carroll University for a research study of blast vibrations. Father Henry Birkenhauer, director of the Seismological Observatory and dean of the Graduate School, will prepare a report to be given before a group of ordnance officers and civilian scientists at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland.

OLD RELIABLE: Weston College Observatory has been listed among the ten most reliable in North America by the Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America.

PRE-EMINENT PRE-MEDICAL: During the past ten years approximately 95 percent of Regis College pre-medical students applying to medical school have been accepted.

INSTITUTES FOR RELIGIOUS WOMEN were held again this summer at Gonzaga University. General topic of the Institutes were the Sacramental Life and the Mass, Understanding Human Nature, and Personal Holiness.

LAY APOSTOLATE: During the past summer a Study Week on the Lay Apostolate was conducted at St. Joseph's College. The study week aimed at explaining the meaning of the lay apostolate, the need for lay apostles, problems and methods of the apostolate—in short a clearing-house for ideas on the lay apostolate.

PLASMA STUDIED: March 20, 1957 saw the beginning of a new research project in the Department of Physics at Boston College. Sponsored by the Air Force, studies will be undertaken on the properties of a plasma, or partially ionized gas, and their interrelationships. Particular attention is to be devoted to the interaction of such a plasma with strong magnetic fields.

ADVANCED STANDING: The mathematics department has announced that Xavier University will grant advanced standing to graduates of Catholic high schools in the Cincinnati area who participate in a new program of mathematical training. Students who demonstrate superiority in mathematics will be able to enter a three-year program in which they will study Plane and Solid Geometry, Trigonometry, College Algebra, and Analytic Geometry. On entering Xavier they will be granted advanced standing.

GERMAN AREA STUDIES: An interdepartmental minor in German area studies, possibly the first of its kind in the United States, will be introduced this fall at Marquette University. The new minor, to include courses in German history, political science, economics, philosophy and literature, was recommended by Marquette's Institute of German Affairs.

FM MARATHON: Fordham University's non-commercial radio station WFUV-FM celebrated its tenth anniversary on March 1. For the occasion a radio marathon was held during which time \$3,000 was raised to help the station continue its high quality programs.

OUR EURIPIDES THE HUMAN: The final public examination of the Greek Honors Course of Holy Cross College was held on May 5. Eight students (all alumni of Jesuit high schools) were examined in the text and background of ten plays of Euripides by such eminent professors as Professors George Grube, University of Toronto; Mark Edwards, Brown University; Bernard Knox, Yale University; James A. Notopoulos, Trinity College (Hartford); and Miss Margaret Ann Norton, Secretary-Treasurer of *Folia*.

ARMA VIRUMQUE CANO: On May 19, six freshmen representing the department of Classics of Georgetown University presented a public defense of the entire *Aeneid* for examination on the translation, literary criticism and historical background. All six students were alumni of Jesuit high schools.

SEPULTUS, a Latin play by Martin du Cygne, S.J. (1616-1669) was presented by the Juniors of St. Andrews-on-Hudson.

FROST FIRST: *The Stylus*, literary magazine of Boston College, presented the famous poet, Robert Frost, in a lecture and reading of his poems to mark the 75th Anniversary of the magazine. It was the first time in which Mr. Frost had lectured on a Catholic college campus.

GEORGETOWN-AT-FRIBOURG: Booklets explaining Georgetown's Junior Year Abroad are available by writing to Georgetown University.

INTEGRATION IN NEW YORK: According to a survey conducted in New York, the enrollment of the public schools in the borough of Manhattan (one of the city's five boroughs) is made up in this way: Negro—34.5 percent of the students; Puerto Rican—32.5 percent; all others—33 percent.

TOP CADET: Cadet John H. Vickers, a graduate of Fairfield College Preparatory School, was top man in this year's graduating class at West Point. He won twelve of the twenty-nine military and academic awards presented to the graduating cadets, more than any other graduate in the past 155 years.

MEMORIAL CRUCIFIX: A crucifix carved in prison camp by a Jew-

ish companion of Chaplain Kapaun has been placed on the wall of the lobby of the chapel of Kapaun Memorial High School. The crucifix had been carried in procession by the companions of Father Kapaun when they came to "Freedom Village" in Korea after a prisoner-of-war exchange.

ON THE SLIDE: Thirty-five students of Jesuit High (Dallas) are taking a spare-time voluntary course on the use of the slide rule.

BUSY BEES: There were 113 grammar schools represented in the annual Spelling Bee conducted by Canisius High School.

TOP TEEN: Don Parker, Loyola Academy, was named "Top Teen" by the *New World*. He was prefect of Senior Sodality, high-ranking student, band leader, and is an astronomer who has built his own telescope.

HERCULEAN TASK: Last spring the senior Greek students of Gonzaga Preparatory, Spokane, Washington, accomplished a herculean task when they presented Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* in the original Greek.

PH.T. DEGREES: "Putting him through college" degrees (Ph.T.) were conferred at LaSalle College on 105 seniors' wives at a "commencement" honoring students' wives. Special honors went to a Mrs. O'Donnell, wife of senior J. O'Donnell and mother of thirteen children.

SCHOLARSHIP OPPORTUNITIES: A booklet listing all scholarships available at Catholic colleges and universities has been compiled. For further information write to Rev. William Jones, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Denver.

WHY TEACH? is a compilation of very interesting and useful statements on the teaching profession. It was edited by D. Louise Sharp and published by Henry Holt Co., New York (price: \$4.00).

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE ENGLISH PROVINCE of the Society of Jesus, 1773-1953, has been compiled by Edmund F. Sutcliffe, S.J. It is obtainable only from the Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15, England.

MARQUETTE JOURNALISTS: When the Suez crisis developed in the autumn of 1956, Edwin Shanke, a graduate in journalism from Marquette in 1932, was in charge of handling news at Suez for the Associated Press. In London, the news on Suez was written for the Associated Press by Alvin Steinkopf, class of 1922. Handling the story in New York for the Associated Press were David Brown and Blake Sullivan, both graduates in journalism from Marquette. Also in New York, Jack Casserly, class of 1951, wrote the news for broadcasts by the Columbia Broadcasting System. Wallace Carroll, class of 1928, director of the Washington Bureau for the *New York Times*, supervised coverage of the news in Washington for the world's most influential newspaper.