

who managed brilliantly to integrate into a canon of poetry this extraordinary mixture. The religious scene alone was fraught with conflict and contention that touched everyone, especially in its political manifestations and doctrinal implications. The “bare ruined choirs” of Sonnet 73 may indeed refer to the monasteries destroyed by Henry VIII; and *Macbeth* may indeed have “a rich vein of reference to the Gunpowder Plot of 1605,” which may indeed have been “a plot by Sir Robert Cecil to cast discredit on the Catholics” (Milward 15); and *Julius Caesar* and *Hamlet* may indeed be “in part Calvinist plays” (Daniell 28); but the contending views, taken all together, would seem to suggest that Shakespeare’s work reflects—without doctrinal assent or particular ideology—a poet rather than a polemicist at work: that is to say, Shakespeare’s emphasis is aesthetic and moral in a humanistic, non-partisan way (“dialogic,” to use Mikhail Bakhtin’s word, a notion consistent with Keats’s “negative capability”). After all, he was as much influenced—so his works imply—by Plutarch and Ovid and Seneca as he was by the Geneva Bible and the old morality plays. The worldview of the poems and plays certainly seems to have a Christian foundation, but it is so leavened with Greco-Roman “pagan” thought and values as to constitute a worldview all its own, *sui generis*: what Harold Bloom calls the Shakespearean “secular religion” that describes “the outward limit of human achievement: aesthetically, cognitively, in certain ways morally, even spiritually” (*Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead, 1998, xvii).

*Shakespeare’s Christianity* is a worthy collection of essays that contributes to an important discussion. The editorial perspective is balanced, and the bibliography is useful if not extensive. It could have been improved, however, by more careful editing, especially on the publisher’s end. Peter Milward’s essay still bears the marks of oral presentation (“what I now wish to speak about” [1]; one must infer (from the dedication page) that the “2003 Shakespeare Institute” referred to in the preface is somehow attached to Wheaton College, as is the “Head of Special Collections,” for we are not explicitly given this information; and proofing errors mar each of the last three pages of text: (“That [it] is a working of his soul [...]” [129]; “nevertheless” on p. 128 should read “never”; no period should follow “breathed” on line 1726 of *The Rape of Lucrece* (129).

J. R. Holt  
Centenary College of New Jersey

---

***The Third Spring: G. K. Chesterton, Graham Greene, Christopher Dawson, and David Jones.*** By Adam Schwartz. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005. ISBN 0813213878. Pp. xv + 416. \$64.95.

In the mid-nineteenth century, John Henry Newman described his conversion and the conversion of many of his Anglican contemporaries as a “Second Spring”



for the Roman Catholic Church in England. This putative warming of the Christian climate was necessarily mild, of course, because those conversions were in part acts of resistance to the ascendant agnosticism and religious indifferentism of English society and to the increased influence of evangelicalism and theological liberalism in the Anglican Communion proper. Nevertheless, Newman's publicly reasoned conversion, and the career of his sometime ecclesiastic rival, Roman-trained Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman, would make an enduring mark on the religious topography of Great Britain. Newman's conversion had emphasized the doctrinal continuity and stability of the Roman Church, in opposition to the emotive, ahistorical vicissitudes of "private judgment." Wiseman imported what Schwartz rightly terms an "Italianate model" of the Catholic Church (20): a vision of the Catholic Church Cardinal Bellarmine defined (in response to England's James I) as "the perfect society," seamlessly hierarchical and culminating in the prominent and sovereign personage of the Pope. This ultramontane and anti-individualist understanding of Catholicism was rejected and resented by correspondingly named "cisalpine" English Catholics in the late Victorian period. Those English of Old Catholic families were much more accepting of their marginal role in English life, were accommodating of the secularizing and liberalizing trends of its culture, and seemed largely uninterested in the Church's Roman center.

Nonetheless, it was the Church of Newman and Wiseman that non-Catholic English intellectuals discovered in their search for ballast amid the storm of modern cultural change. The story of the Third Spring begins there. Schwartz's study considers four twentieth-century English literary converts to Roman Catholicism in separate chapters composed as concise, but substantial, intellectual biographies. He begins each chapter by highlighting a specific problem that the respective writer had focused on from early in life, and follows the evolution of the writer's thinking on the matter through (and beyond) discovery that its solution was to be found only in the Catholic Church. G. K. Chesterton's early doctrine of gratitude before "the plain fact of existence" leads eventually to conversion to Rome and joyful celebration of Aquinas's existential metaphysics. Graham Greene's intimate sense of evil, sin, and repentance would buoy his attraction to the one Church that preached the sacramental forgiveness of sins. Christopher Dawson had an early devotion to Christian mysticism as well as the public, cultural "function" of religion as the dynamic force of European culture; he would find the union of the inward and outward in the same place Greene and Chesterton discovered it. Finally, David Jones recognized from his earliest youth the unique and essential function of signs and sacraments in the life of humankind, which he defined as *homo faber*. Only Catholicism consecrated, rather than misunderstood or debased, this central action of the human person.

What draws these largely discrete biographies into unity, and what gives the volume a significance extending beyond describing a "handful" of (albeit important) converts, is Schwartz's judicious emphasis on the centrality of the Italianate model



of the Church to each of these writers. Each saw the Catholic Church as the last, best hope for resisting or reversing the modern tide of theological liberalism and modernism. Jones may have been a modernist poet, but his sacramental poetic served largely as a blow against modernity in favor of the valuable, traditional vision of premodern England and the eternal, sacramental truths of the Church. Dawson may have accepted the notion of historical progress, but he saw modernity largely as a recrudescence of paganism whose antidote was the permanent authority of the Church. Hence their conversions were at once the fulfillment of beliefs long held but imperfectly realized, as well as the decision specifically to reject the drift of the culture at large in an act of religious counter-revolution. Had Newman not been so successful in articulating Catholicism as the sole historical realization of doctrinal continuity and certitude, and had Wiseman not been a dogged executive of the Italianate model, it is improbable that these writers would have been moved to conversion.

The Third Spring of the Catholic Church in England was probably no more pervasive than the Second; nonetheless, the four figures Schwartz studies testify to the way myriad discontents with modernity (however understood) frequently led to one authoritative answer. In its public life, at least, and in the life of its converts, English Catholicism, like modern Catholicism more generally, came increasingly to turn around the fulcrum of the Papacy. The long English tradition of fearing the Pope as a "foreign prince" and of deprecating Catholics as "priest ridden" and slavish "Papists" ironically became less vulgar, politically expedient prejudice and more the crude expression of a profound contemporary truth. In an age of modern capital, in which "everything solid melts into air," and in which a superficial democratic consumerism comports nicely with a commercialized regime of the modern state dominating most facets of public and private life, the visible Church as a rock of stability and continuity between the past and present appeared to many converts as the one thing necessary.

Schwartz's approach to his subject appears cautious and knowledgeable in every detail. His book emerges from a dissertation in history and, as such, makes theoretical generalizations only as the outgrowth of close readings of his chosen authors' published and unpublished texts. Unwilling to conceal a commitment to an appreciative intellectual history, his attention focuses on sympathetically setting forth the ideas and themes that Chesterton, et al. disclosed in their own autobiographical writings. His project therefore deepens and broadens our understanding of the intellectual and spiritual life to be found in the works of these authors. Many other historians treating these and other figures of twentieth-century Catholicism have failed to engage their subjects to the degree Schwartz has. Jay Corrin's *G. K. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc: The Battle Against Modernity* (1981), for instance, remains a helpful chronicle of the Third Spring period in England but only superficially explores the ideas that galvanized the period's major figures. Arnold Sparr's *To Promote, Defend, and Redeem: The Catholic Literary Revival and*



*the Cultural Transformations of American Catholicism, 1920-1960* (1990) provides a valuable account of American Catholic intellectual life but, like Corrin's study, remains more a work of institutional history than intellectual biography or literary criticism. Peter Huff's more recent *Allen Tate and the Catholic Revival* (1996) serves as a concise intellectual biography but seems more interested in Tate's historical exemplarity than in understanding the dynamics of the writings on which his historical importance is based. Schwartz's chapters are long enough to provide a reliable account of the life of his subjects and to offer informed interpretations of their major works. In this sense, his is the most helpful form of intellectual biography. That said, Schwartz's book admires rather than fawns; he does draw on the work of several conversion theorists in an attempt to get behind his subjects' own self-understanding, and he does critically engage all the major scholarship on the various writers.

Despite the capacious achievement of this study, Schwartz does leave some gaps in his biographies *qua* biographies, and in his interpretations of the authors' works *qua* literary works. In the chapter on Chesterton, for instance, we are told repeatedly that the Anglo-Catholicism of Chesterton's wife, Frances, guided Chesterton to "orthodox" Christianity and also retarded his entrance into the Catholic Church. And yet, in the penultimate paragraph of the chapter, the following sentence appears: "once inside the Church, he did not regret his voyage (and Frances did join him in 1926)" (108-09). Excusable in itself, in context this parenthetical aside seems like a Nabokovian joke. Perhaps more significantly, Schwartz proves to be a good reader of Jones's fragmented, sometimes difficult, poems. He does not indulge the temptation to rely exclusively on Jones's compelling prose accounts of his artistic method (although the balance may tip in that direction). Even so, his account of Jones would have benefited from more extensive grappling with the challenge of how literary modernism confronts—indeed revolts against—modernity. He acknowledges that Jones and T. S. Eliot, despite being modernists, "argued that art should transmit tradition (albeit in a distinctly personal way) rather than the author's individual experiences and emotions" (368). This is a true observation as far as it goes, but increasingly we are in a position to acknowledge the relative centrality of Catholicism—of the specific vision of Catholicism that Jones and Eliot shared, and which they absorbed in part from French symbolism—to modernist art. Pursuing this line may have aided in demonstrating how crucial an understanding of the Third Spring is for understanding modern British culture (and literary modernism) as a whole.

Literary modernism and the Catholic Literary Revival, of which the Third Spring is a major chapter, share one curious attribute. The history of each had already, in a sense, been written while it was still unfolding. From Ezra Pound and Virginia Woolf to Robert Graves and Laura Riding (whose 1927 *A Survey of Modernist Poetry* gave literary modernism its enduring name), modernists were concerned to establish the historical distinction of their artistic practices. Similarly, writers



during the Catholic Revival (Dawson most prominently among them) were quick to declare that revival's reality while its achievement was very much in question. Wilfrid Ward published *George Ward and the Catholic Revival* as early as 1893, and Jean Calvet followed with *Le Renouveau Catholique* in 1927, when Jacques Maritain's leadership of a French literary revival was just reaching its height. Largely on the strength of Newman's and Chesterton's writings, such early "historians" announced the achieved fact of the revival, which in actuality accelerated its development from germinal fantasy to a manifest "apostolate of the pen." Most later histories of the Catholic revival, writing after its demise, simply end their story by falling into silence and wonder before Vatican II and the transformation of Catholic life it wrought. The revival had once flourished, but times had changed. The voices of the revival suddenly no longer "spoke" to the present. Such unexplained conclusion may have been responsible history, but it leaves significant questions unturned.

Schwartz's history stands out as a worthy exception. Having been attracted to the Catholic Church on the basis of its traditions and sacraments and its authoritative doctrinal stability, Greene, Dawson, and Jones were deeply troubled by the apparent abandonment of these following Vatican II. Greene would of course protest the suppression of the Tridentine rite. Jones, Schwartz observes, was mercifully spared encountering the *novus ordo* vernacular Mass, because by the time of its institution he was living in a nursing home where the resident priest was himself too old to learn such liturgical innovations. Chesterton died long before the Council, but Schwartz keenly suggests how he would have felt about it. Vatican II did not merely introduce a vernacular liturgy. It cemented the collapse of the Thomistic philosophy and theology that had subtended the Catholic Literary Revival. Chesterton's doctrine of gratitude for existence, for *ens*, led him to write *Saint Thomas Aquinas* (1933), his most celebrated theological work, where his long-nurtured gratitude dilated into an encomium for Catholicism's great metaphysician of the Incarnation and celebrant of the goodness of all things. Chesterton became a Catholic in part because the Pope, in his teaching authority, had written *Aeterni Patris*, the encyclical elevating Aquinas to the normative philosophical doctor of the Church. The apparent eclipse of Aquinas would have struck him a blow as severe as the loss of the Tridentine rite seems to have struck Dawson, Greene, and Jones. The Catholic sociologist Andrew Greeley has questioned the sincerity of converts who turn to Rome in search of papal authority, and liberal Catholics in general no doubt look at the vernacular liturgy and post-Thomistic theological pluralism as triumphs rather than defeats. But Schwartz correctly observes that the post-Vatican II disencumbering of these things all but stripped the Church of what made it seem so exceptional, so valuable, to those English converts who constitute the Church's Third Spring. His book is not merely a history; it is a gauntlet thrown at the feet of contemporary Catholicism.

James Matthew Wilson  
East Carolina University