

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Shakespeare and Catholicism **by H. Mutschmann and K. Wentersdorf**

Review Author: Miguel A. Bernad

Philippine Studies vol. 1, no. 2 (1953): 186–188

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

recommended in the book is far from being radical. There is no attempt to scrap the traditional periods for skills.

After an initial chapter which gives deserved tribute to the Philippine Normal College, the authors employ a device which is both clever and symptomatic of the present stage of educational literature. The diary of a teacher is unfolded, to describe the gradual conversion of a traditional teacher to the methods of the modern activity program. This section is frankly emotional writing.

Chapter III is the least satisfying of the book, as it is an uncritical collection of various statements of objectives, interlarded with the principles of psychology and democratic education. This section is not needed and is not truly a philosophic treatment of the underlying principles of integration. Both chapters II and III highlight the tendency of modern educationists to supply slogans with which to stir up teachers to a renewed sense of mission. It would seem that the ordinary teacher, if left alone, would succumb to the monotony of the task of imparting wisdom to the young; so periodically the professionals in the field feel called upon to declare a new movement and to issue a new catchword. Integration was one such word and it seems at present writing to be declining in popularity in the United States in favor of the new expression, "education for life-adjustment."

There is much philosophy stored in the term, 'integration'; but it is a philosophy based on the dualistic concept of man's nature. Monistic evolutionistic ideas lead to the acceptance of integration as merely man's adjusting to environment. Biological integration with the surroundings has little in common with the concept of integration as referring to man's ordering within himself of the various levels of existence—the sentient and rational, the natural and supernatural.

Integration conveys the truth that personality consists in the basic unity, richness and harmony of character. A person can be said to be integrated in as much as he is free from tyranny within and from tyranny without, and in proportion as he develops all his capacities, and controls them in function of a fundamental ideal. The authors propose as the fundamental ideal democracy. It would seem more logical and more in keeping with historical facts to set up as the fundamental ideal that of Christianity, which is the true basis for democracy.

NICHOLAS A. KUNKEL

SHAKESPEARE AND CATHOLICISM. By H. Mutschmann and K. Wentersdorf. Sheed and Ward, New York. 1952. pp. xvii - 446. \$6.00

When two German scholars attack a problem, one may expect a treatise so thorough as to leave little further to be said on the subject. Such is the case with this volume, an exhaustive yet interesting treatment of Shakespeare's religion.

The thoroughness of the investigation may be gathered from the following outline: The work is divided into seven parts (thirty-three chapters), of which Part One is a survey in six chapters of the situation of Catholics in Shakespeare's England; Part Two deals with Shakespeare's Catholic origin; Part Three with his youth and marriage; Part Four with his friends; Part Five with his family, his last years, and his death. Part Six is an examination into his friends and acquaintances, and Part Seven into the various theories which have been put forward regarding his religion. The book concludes with a three-page synopsis of findings (pp. 383-385), and with 58 pages of appendices, genealogical tables, index, and bibliography.

The authors' findings are briefly as follows: Shakespeare was born of staunchly Catholic parents, was brought up a Catholic, and at school was taught by a Catholic schoolmaster (Simon Hunt) who later became a Jesuit. Avoiding Anglican ceremonies, he had his marriage performed by a Catholic priest, Father John Frith. The widely accepted story that he left Stratford as a result of his poaching in Sir Thomas Lucy's deer park is shown to be impossible (Sir Thomas apparently had no deer park at the time in question), and evidence is adduced which seems to show that Shakespeare's real reason (besides family troubles) for leaving may have been to avoid further persecution at the hands of Sir Thomas Lucy for his (or at any rate his family's) Catholicism.

In London, most of his friends (fourteen out of twenty-six) were either Catholics or pro-Catholic. His literary patron, the Earl of Southampton, was a Catholic, and "his closest professional colleague and friend, Ben Jonson, was a Catholic convert." This is not to say that Shakespeare continued to live an exemplary Catholic all his life. He appears to have lacked the stamina of his father and of his other relatives, who willingly suffered for their faith. Like many another weak Catholic of the day, Shakespeare escaped the common lot of "Papists" by conforming outwardly to Elizabethan and Jacobean anti-Catholic laws. But he appears to have died "a Papist" (as an Anglican clergyman called him), fortified by the Sacraments.

So much for Shakespeare the man. As for his writings, whether or not one is disposed to accept the authors' verdict that "he gave expression to his love for the old faith in his works," it seems plain enough that Shakespeare's works were written by a man whose doctrinal beliefs, attitude toward life, and entire frame of mind were consistently and deeply Catholic.

Perhaps it is in dealing with Shakespeare's writings that the two learned scholars tend to overprove their point. There is no

need, for instance, to take Falstaff as a deliberate attempt to caricature the Puritans. Sir John was a rogue and a gluttonous old sinner for whom, none the less, Shakespeare (like many a Shakespearean fan) must have entertained much affection. The fact that Old Jack's many failings were demonstrably deducible from Puritan tenets need not compel us to take him seriously as an intended caricature of Puritanism. With Shakespeare, as with all things else, one must preserve a sense of humor.

Another defect in the book is the absence of footnotes and of detailed documentation. This is a very minor matter in a work of such obvious scholarship as this. Anyone who wishes to check up on the facts can easily do so with the aid of the bibliography. Nevertheless, in a work dealing with a controversial subject, the more obvious the documentation, the better.

Despite such minor defects, the book deserves the highest praise. One can now hope that the life of Shakespeare may soon be rewritten in the light of these findings, and that his work may be reexamined anew with clearer vision and truer perspective.

MIGUEL A. BERNAD

THE PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNISM. By Giorgio La Pira and others.
Fordham University Press, New York. pp. 308. \$15.00

In Easter Week of 1949 the Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas at Rome held a series of meetings at which papers were read on the philosophy of Communism. The present work is a translation from the Italian of the twenty-three papers read. The introduction, by way of summary, it written by Father Charles Boyer, S.J. Although this work bears the same title as Dr. McFadden's well known *The Philosophy of Communism*, the approach is different in the two works. The papers of the Pontifical Academy were not intended as an *introduction* to Marxist philosophy. Rather they presuppose in the reader a certain familiarity with that philosophy, and proceed to analyze its more metaphysical, yet practical, aspects. All the studies are very well done.

In view of the statement made by Pope Pius XII that, even if Communism were to cease to be atheistic, its false views on property would alone condemn it, the paper entitled "The Social Function of Property and Its Metaphysical Foundation" will repay careful reading. The metaphysical argument for private ownership is based on personality and is here well worked out.

It is something of himself which man communicates to material reality in which, in a certain way, he is magnified. It is the widening of the subjective field of will and power in the objective sphere of