The Catholic intellectual tradition is both rich and varied. It is a living tradition that continues not only as a body of work, but as a way of “doing things that is the outcome of centuries of experience, prayer, action and critical reflection” (Hellwig 2000, 3). Included within this tradition are works of history, theology, literature, philosophy, and social science. The artistic tradition is replete with architects, novelists, poets, artists, and playwrights. In fact there is no area of human endeavor and culture that does not find expression within the Catholic intellectual tradition. A distinctive feature of this tradition is Cardinal Newman’s ideal of “the integration of the arts and sciences by the believing mind under the guiding light of theology” (McCool 2000, 39).

Within this vibrant tradition there are also works that reflect deeply on ideas and practices of education and pedagogy. This is not surprising, since the Catholic Church has always placed a high value on the development, maintenance, and growth of its tradition as it is handed down from generation to generation. One of the primary tasks of any religious body is to introduce new generations to the lore and practices of its life as well as sustain individuals throughout their lives. This education in the faith takes place in many venues, customary theologies, philosophies, and practices that are a part of the Catholic intellectual tradition and the means of handing it on.

This book contains a collection of studies of prominent educators who have made significant contributions to handing on the Catholic intellectual tradition in the United States. These men and women have enriched this tradition by careful attention to educational theories and methods that find their origin in the Jewish and Christian past. Ancient
Israel was assiduous in handing on the Torah or Law, the prophets dramatically called people back to the practices of the covenant, and the sages gave practical advice for everyday living. The Acts of the Apostles and the Letters of Paul chronicle the careful attention to safeguarding and transmitting teachings in the early apostolic Christian communities.

The Catholic intellectual tradition in education embraces a rich heritage garnered from its Jewish and Greek roots; the early apostolic communities; the writings of the patristic age, scholastic philosophers and theologians; Renaissance humanists; educators in religious orders of men and women; popes; Cardinal Newman; and Thomistic philosophers such as Jacques Maritain and Etienne Gilson. Contributors to this tradition in the past three centuries have been mainly European scholars. However, in the past two centuries educators in the United States have made notable contributions to the task of handing on the Catholic intellectual tradition.

When examined closely, it becomes evident that United States educators have made significant contributions. In an era that has witnessed the emergence of Catholic Studies programs in U.S. Catholic colleges and universities and discussions about the Catholic identity of all Catholic institutions, it is necessary to identify these key contributors as well as the nature and parameters of their influence on Catholic education. However, before turning to this task we review in brief some of the more significant educational developments in the Catholic intellectual tradition.

The Emergence of the Catholic Intellectual Tradition in Education

Preaching and teaching as forms of education make up a great deal of the Christian Scriptures. Jesus was a rabbi (teacher), a prophet, and a sage. He sent his chosen apostles and disciples on teaching missions. The Acts of the Apostles is largely a description of the preaching and teaching of Peter and Paul, as well as other disciples of Jesus. Paul’s letters to the Churches reflect the deep concern of early Christians for educating in the faith and sustaining the newly formed communities in the Christian way of life. The Pastoral Letters assign particular importance to orthodoxy in teaching, the handing on of right or correct teachings.
The Church of Alexandria made a profound contribution to Christian teaching through its renowned catechetical or theological school that provided education for advanced students of Christianity through study of the Scriptures. The most notable educators in this school were Clement (150-220) and Origen (d. c. 254). Clement’s *Pedagogus* (2004), written circa 170, describes Christian learning as coming from the close relationship between Christ the teacher and the Christian student. Origen taught all the subjects of the classical or secular school as preparatory to philosophical and theological studies. Gregory of Neocaesarea praised Origen’s respect for freedom in learning, “We went into and examined with entire freedom all sorts of ideas, in order to satisfy ourselves and enjoy to the full those goods of the mind” (In Murray 1957, 157).

In the fourth century the Church at Jerusalem was graced with an excellent teacher in Cyril of Jerusalem, whose *Instruction for Those about to be Illumined* (1986), composed circa 348, provided a thorough course of instruction in the faith for inquirers and catechumens. The course consisted of daily homilies given during the liturgies of Lent. The forty days of training was comprised of eighteen lectures, which complemented ascetical practices. In this way Cyril did not teach or preach by words alone but also through these moving religious experiences.

A prominent educator in the eastern part of the Roman Empire was Basil, Bishop of Caesarea (329-379). Before entering the monastery he studied rhetoric and philosophy. His monastery prided itself on integrating scholarship with contemplation. Though many Western fathers in the patristic era, notably Jerome, Tatian, and Tertullian, opposed classical learning as harmful to the life of faith, Basil wanted his monks to be educated in Greek classics, even though he recognized some of the difficulties with these classics. His views were expressed in the tract, *Address to Young Men on Reading Greek Literature* (1933).

The greatest educator from the patristic period was no doubt Augustine of Hippo (354-430), a teacher of rhetoric before he became a bishop. In a number of treatises he described the role and functions of teachers and catechists. His truly great classic *The Confessions* (2007), written in 397, described his self-education and development which lasted throughout his entire life. In marvelous prose Augustine related how he came to religious faith through study, prayer, and exposure to
the example of Christians. He also contributed to Christian education through his *De Magistro* (1995a), composed in 389, a philosophical treatise on how one learns; *De Catechizandis Rudibus* (1946), composed in 398, an instruction on how catechumens should be educated; and *De Doctrina Christiana* (1995b), a discourse on how the Scriptures are to be interpreted and their truth communicated. The first three books of this treatise were written in 397 while the fourth was written in 426. In all his works Augustine stressed that God was the interior teacher of the soul who prompts all learning.

Augustine's gift to Christianity was a veritable theology of education. All his key educational concepts are connected with his theology of faith, understanding, free will, grace, sin, and love. His theology of education is aptly summarized here: “Education for Augustine moves from doubt to understanding and faith. His view of education has a supernatural basis since its ultimate end for the Christian is the possession of eternal happiness. For the attainment of this happiness the intellectual activity of learning is the engine” (Elias 2002, 39).

Augustine has enriched Christian education by affirming that education is essentially the search for wisdom to lead a life centered on God. He came to the conclusion that though he was versed in the classics himself, the classical writers are of little help in the search for true wisdom about God. The Bible became the center around which Christian learning crystallized for him. Augustine’s views in matters of faith shaped and determined much of Christian theology until the emergence of the great medieval theologies.

The medieval scholastic period also had its share of noteworthy educators that contributed to the Catholic intellectual tradition in education. One such teacher was Peter Abelard (1070-1142). At the beginning of his *Sic et Non*, written in 1120, Abelard announced that “by doubting we come to inquiry and by inquiry we perceive the truth.” Thomas Aquinas shared this same optimistic opinion in his *Summa Theologica*, written between 1266 and 1272. The scholastic method allowed practitioners to save the appearances of the ancient authorities while, at the same time putting forward original solutions of their own whenever the sources required further explication (Clancy 1997, 34).

Abelard, anticipating by centuries the far-ranging probing of the Enlightenment *philosophes*, insisted on the priority of understanding
over faith, reversing the axiom of Anselm: “I believe so that I may understand.” It was Abelard’s view that nothing can be believed unless it is first understood and that it was of no use for anyone to tell others something which neither he nor those he taught could grasp with the intellect. He was a Socratic teacher in the classroom who constantly probed questions of theology. Faith for him was often the best hypothesis or estimate.

Abelard believed in the importance of studying the classics in order to foster religious literacy. He contended that Paul and Augustine had made large contributions to understanding Christian doctrine because they were saturated with secular literature before their conversion to Christianity and so had learned how to better express themselves. Abelard concluded, “I therefore judge that the study of secular letters is especially commended by divine dispensation” (Clanchy 1997, 57).

The essence of the scholastic method of education was not to explicate the spirituality of the Scriptures line by line, as the monks did, but to pose wide-ranging questions and then answer them from logical principles as if for the first time. The most famous scholastic question was Anselm’s Cur Deus Homo? Why did God wish to redeem humanity by becoming incarnate, when it could have been done by any prophet or angel?

Abelard did not invent the scholastic method. In the 1070s, Anselm remarked that his audience demanded that “nothing whatsoever should be asserted here on the authority of Scripture; everything is to be argued by individual and specific investigation.” There were thus limits to the faith seeking understanding. Interrogation and response was accepted as an academic procedure before Abelard. Abelard did not clearly express that he understood the limits of understanding seeking faith (Clanchy 1997, 83).

There were two types of teaching in the medieval scholastic world, depending on whether one followed Socrates or Cicero. The Socratic Method of questioning dialogue stimulated clever students, but it could leave weaker ones confused and the syllabus short-changed. While the Ciceronian approach of carefully delivered discourses surveyed the subject elegantly and comprehensively, it did not allow for disagreement, nor did it always capture the audience’s attention. Socratic teaching is erratic and inspirational where a Ciceronian
approach is professional and practiced. Over the ages most teachers have used both modes: the Ciceronian lecture for surveying a subject and the Socratic seminar for discussion (Clanchy 1997, 85).

Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153), rejecting the scholastic method in his attack on Abelard, wrote to the pope,

Away, away with any idea that the Christian faith should have its limits in the estimates of those academics who doubt everything and know nothing. I go secure in the sentence of the Master of the Gentiles, and I truly know that I shall not be confounded. (In Clanchy 1997, 35)

To Abelard he wrote “You whisper to me that faith is an estimate and you mutter about ambiguity to me, as though nothing were certain” (Clanchy 1997, 35).

The greatest of the scholastics and perhaps the greatest contributor to the Catholic intellectual tradition was Thomas Aquinas (1225-75). Aquinas moved beyond the paradoxical Sic et Non of Abelard to build a synthesis of learning from experience and learning from faith, which has characterized Catholic education ever since. In 1879 Pope Leo XIII made Thomas’s theology the official norm for Catholic theology. This papal action did much to promote Thomism but may in the end have led to its rejection by many contemporary Catholic philosophers and theologians.

While Thomas introduced Aristotle into Christian theology, he did not depart totally from the Platonism of Augustine. What is prominent in his thought is a great respect for natural knowledge alongside revelation, an appreciation for the natural conditions of human life, a healthy belief that all truths that humans can arrive at are God’s truth, and finally a conviction that all truths are capable of being reconciled with one other. While Thomas is not quite in vogue among Catholic theologians today, every age is in need of someone who can build a creative synthesis between faith and culture as Thomas did. We are in need of someone who possesses his intellectual spirit, robust faith, and broad sympathy with the thought of the day.

Thomas’s contribution to Catholic educational theory lay in his careful analysis of human teaching and learning. For him learning takes place through one’s own discovery or through instruction by a teacher.
Teaching is thus a dynamic process in which there are two causes: the teacher and the active mind of the student. Christian educators before Aquinas, notably Origen and Augustine, had been reluctant to give the human teacher the title of true teacher because of their belief that God alone illuminates human understanding. Aquinas, however, in his treatise *De Magistro* (Mayer 1929), written in 1272, viewed the teacher as the instrumental or intermediary cause of learning.

Aquinas also contributed to education in the Catholic intellectual tradition an optimistic view of the possibilities of human intelligence; a notion that the inculcation of habits and dispositions develop the power of the soul; an emphasis on the importance of sense experience in the life of the mind; and the idea that human intelligence has influence over all aspects of life. He also suggested the overarching aim for all Christian education: the fusion of faith and reason, religion and culture (Donohoe 1958, 105-08).

Various religious orders of men and women nurtured prominent educators in the Catholic educational tradition to hand on the guidelines for faith and conduct to institutions for general education. Aquinas is representative of the Dominican Order of Preachers, who together with the Franciscans Friars were the most influential educators at the renowned University of Paris.

An older religious order that made significant contributions to the educational tradition of the Church was the Benedictines. While education was not a main feature of the Rule of St. Benedict, the rule did seem to presuppose educated monks. While medieval monasteries were surely places of learning, their learning was different from scholastic learning. The Benedictine tradition made a unique contribution to Catholic thought when it suggested that “an intellectual tradition springs from and flourishes within a larger context: concrete practices, an environment, sets of relationships, an atmosphere” (Driscoll 2000, 56). Elements of the Benedictine tradition include its attitude toward time, relationships, and community. Learning takes place through *lectio divina*, the slow meditative reading of the Scriptures and early church spiritual writers. Thus prayer and contemplation are essential practices in a person’s education. The use of sermons and spiritual talks as vehicles for education also originated within the monastic context (LeClercq 1959, 72).
According to Thimmish (1972), Jean Leclercq, the outstanding historian of monastic education, has observed that monastic culture during the Carolingian Renaissance in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was increasingly personal and creative but more literary than speculative, concerned more with experience than with abstract thought, more with esthetics than with dialectics. He sees this culture as distinct in its time from both nascent scholasticism and a new current of secular humanism. This monastic humanism, as he calls it, read the authors of classical antiquity in an explicitly Christian framework, moralizing them as necessary. It valued the whole quality of life, the prose of daily work and mutual service as well as the poetry of graceful writing and psalmody and contemplation. It integrated the life of the mind with the steady and demanding round of work and prayer that the Rule of Benedict calls a school of the Lord’s service. (Thimmish 1992)

Another distinctive Catholic approach to education emerged during the Italian and Northern Renaissance (1320-1600). Medieval Catholicism witnessed the birth of the university, especially the theological and arts faculties at the University of Paris. The educational achievement of Renaissance humanism was the Catholic secondary school. Furthermore, Francisco Petrarch (1304-74), Petrus Paulus Vergerio (1370-1445), Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536), Thomas More (1478-1535), and John Colet (1467-1519) developed the stimulating scholarship taught to the young in humanist schools. Of the Renaissance educational theory it has been said:

Combined with continued faith in the Christian tradition as articulated by Augustine, as communicated in Jerome’s Bible, as rationalized by Thomism, as synthesized by Dante, this was to be the essence of western civilization down to the early decades of the twentieth century. (Cantor 1993, 561)

The humanist approach that has been the most powerful embodiment of the Catholic intellectual tradition has been a mainstay
in the Jesuit school and college, which have flourished for centuries throughout the world. The Jesuits published a *Ratio Studiorum* in 1599, “considered the most comprehensive and certainly the most enduring set of regulations for the conduct of education ever compiled” (Castle 1958, 7). The *Ratio* contained rules for administrators and teachers. It prescribed an ordered sequence of studies and methods for various grades and levels. Inspired by Renaissance humanism, it presented a rigorous seven-year program of classical studies to be taught in secondary schools and colleges. The document was optimistic in calling for the transmission of the wisdom of the Western culture, a synthesis of secular culture with Christian life. True to its scholastic roots “it emphasized a mental training in logical argument: thesis, evidence, objections, discussion and final proof” (Bryk et al. 1993, 19).

The real spirit of Jesuit education, however, is found in Ignatius Loyola’s *Spiritual Exercises* (1522-24), the constitutions of the society, and the *pietas literata* of Renaissance humanism. Piety and virtue were fostered through attendance at liturgies, learning of Christian doctrine, daily prayers, examination of conscience, confession, meditation, and prescribed readings, including the lives of the saints. While classical authors made up a large part of the curriculum of the secondary school, Jesuit colleges gave pride of place to the philosophy and theology of Thomas Aquinas. Eventually Jesuit education influenced the educational endeavors of many religious orders of men and women (Elias 2002, 99-104).

The *Ratio* prescribed three stages of education: humanistic, philosophical, and theological. The goal of the humanistic stage was *eloquentia perfecta*, to speak Latin fluently and persuasively. The philosophical stage focused on the thought of Thomas Aquinas. The theological stage, which was also dominated by the teachings of Thomas, was the most important stage to which the others were ultimately directed.

While the Jesuits focused primarily on schools and colleges, elementary or primary schools were the special province of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. Jean Baptiste de la Salle (1651-1719) dedicated the order to the education of poor boys. In his *The Conduct of Schools* (1695) he stressed reading, writing, singing, and religion. The curriculum also included the learning of trades. This handbook emphasized the authority of the teacher and classroom management,
which were especially necessary because of the large classes that the brothers taught. Strict religious and moral training was also provided. Detailed instructions were given on the religious formation of the young boys through the catechism. Rewards and punishments were introduced as important elements of pedagogy. De la Salle also established a school for training teachers, whose profession he viewed in an exalted manner as co-workers with Christ in saving souls.

The Catholic intellectual tradition in education received another classic expression in the writings of Cardinal John Newman, notably *The Idea of a University* (1893; rpt. 1982). Newman’s ideal bore fruit, however, not in the university which he attempted to establish in Ireland but in his Oratory School in Birmingham, England. Since then his idea of a Christian liberal education has been the educational ideal for numerous schools, colleges, universities, and seminaries in the western world. Newman set before educators the goal of fostering thinking persons for participation in society, whose lives are to be formed by Christian theology. Education for Newman had both intellectual and moral functions. Newman aimed at

> Improving the condition, the status, of the Catholic body . . . by giving them juster views, by enlarging and refining their minds, in one word, by education. . . . From first to last, education, in this large sense of the word, has been my line. (Newman 1957, 259)

In his lectures, Newman explained that theology should have a prominent place in all educational institutions. If a university is to be true to its promise to teach all knowledge, it must teach theology. University education should also include a liberal education that views all knowledge as constituting a unity. For Newman the content of theology was the patristic tradition, especially the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen. To this he added the educational theory of Augustine of Hippo. Teaching in Catholic schools for Newman is a sacred calling in which teachers supplement the efforts of the interior divine teacher by their example and influence. This education was to be intellectual, religious, and moral as well as include the secular arts and sciences (McCool 2000, 43). At the university level, Newman was
more concerned with the transmission of a general Christian culture than he was in the production of specialized research.

The Catholic intellectual tradition in education achieved in the writings of Popes Leo XIII (1810-1903; pope from 1878-1903) and Pius XI (1857-1939; pope from 1922-39) a powerful synthesis of theology, culture, and education that lasted until the second half of the twentieth century. In *Aeterni Patris* (1879) Leo XIII inaugurated a revival of Thomism which influenced all aspects of Catholic intellectual life. Pius XI applied this synthesis to education in his highly influential encyclical, *Divini Illius Magistri*, issued in 1929. This letter made the case for the teaching mission of the Church and rejected certain elements of the new education which were being promoted in schools in Europe and the United States. The document stressed the rights of the church and the family in education while conceding some rights to the states. Newman’s vision of the chief characteristic of Catholic education as the integration of theology and culture is prominent in the document:

> It is necessary that all teaching and the whole organization of the school, and its teachers, syllabuses and textbooks in every branch, be regulated by the Christian spirit, under the direction and maternal supervision of the Church, so that religion may be in very truth the foundation and crown of the youth’s entire training; and this in every grade school, not only the elementary, but the intermediate and the higher institutions of learning as well. (No. 44)

The encyclical described the ultimate purpose of education in terms that resonate with the Catholic intellectual tradition. It should be directed at the formation of the supernatural person “who thinks, judges and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason illumined by the supernatural light of the example of Christ; in other words, to use the current term, the true and finished [person] of character” (No. 51). This purpose is achieved by appealing to students’ natural abilities, experience in the world, and social and economic life, all developed by the power of the supernatural.

The philosophy and theology expounded in this encyclical dominated all discussions of Catholic education until at least the
1960s. As late as 1956 Redden and Ryan could still make this statement about the role of Thomism and neo-scholastic philosophy in Catholic education:

The only complete, adequate, natural way of thought is scholastic philosophy, which supplies the rational foundations for our supernatural way of life and way of thought. There may be other non-scholastic ways of thought but none of them is complete and adequate, even if it be presupposed they are sound. . . . The Philosophia Perennis . . . furnishes basic criteria for differentiating the truth from the false and for passing judgment on all philosophies of education. (1956, vii)

Thus neo-scholasticism supplied the theological framework of Catholic education, which was guided by a particular vision of the origins, nature, and destiny of human persons. Christianity was the basis for an adequate and sound education. John Courtney Murray (1904-67), a prominent Jesuit theologian, went so far as to say that only Christian theology provides the knowledge that determines the goals, context, unity, and intelligibility of education. For Murray the whole person is Christian and Catholic: “the equivalence of these three terms is the basic tenet of the Christian educator” (Veverka 1993, 527.)

Besides the encyclical, the most enduring educational work of the Thomistic revival is Jacques Maritain’s Education at the Crossroads (1943). This work will receive extensive treatment in this book from Luz Ibarra. While a Frenchman by birth, Maritain (1882-1973) spent many years in academic positions in the United States and was very influential in presenting a Thomistic philosophy of education that attracted great attention from Catholic as well as other educators.

Until the 1960s, neo-Thomistic philosophy as propounded by Maritain and other philosophers was the underlying philosophy of Catholic education in the Catholic world. Neo-Thomism provided a bulwark for Catholics against engaging the complex, relative, and ambiguous in modern thought. Halsey (1980) termed this a triumphal ethos that dominated the entire American Catholic experience before 1960. However, Catholic education theory as rooted in Thomistic philosophy experienced many challenges in the last half of the twentieth century (McCool 2000; Elias 1999, 2002). This Thomistic
synthesis has been challenged within the Catholic community itself. It is charged with being based solely on a classicist culture of Greece and Rome, which was erroneously presented as a universal culture. The Jesuit theologian Bernard Lonergan (1973) has questioned this universality because of studies in history and the social sciences which demonstrate a multiplicity of cultures.

Since Vatican II (1962-65), many Catholic philosophers and theologians have largely abandoned the Thomistic synthesis, including its philosophy of education, in the name of contemporary biblical and historical studies as well as other philosophical systems. They are less committed to the patristic tradition and to Greek metaphysics. In fact, the last two popes have clearly not been greatly committed to Thomistic thought (Kerr 2006). Furthermore, Vatican II gave little attention to Thomistic or neo-Scholastic philosophy and theology.

While there are some Catholic scholars who still adhere to Thomism, their writings tend to deal with historical issues and do not to any great extent engage modern problems. Other philosophies have become more dominant among Catholic philosophers including analytic philosophy, existential phenomenology, and even postmodernism. Modern philosophers question whether any philosophy, even aided by theology, can validate a worldview, an integrative interpretation of the universe. The vastness of the universe, the limited nature and uncertainty of human knowledge, the partial and historical character of every viewpoint make any universal worldview philosophically impossible. (McCool 2000, 48)

Many Catholic scholars have bemoaned the lack of commitment to neo-scholasticism as the intellectual foundation of Catholic education. This is so largely because nothing has seemed to have taken its place. Gleason (1995) sees this lacuna as a crisis, since it leaves Catholic educators without a unifying philosophy for their educational endeavors.

After Vatican II, the Catholic intellectual tradition in education became decidedly more theological than philosophical. Gaudium et Spes (1965), the Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World, became the new theological basis for Catholic education, with
its statements on the relationship between faith and culture, dialogue with those outside the Catholic community, its emphasis on human freedom, and the commitment to service, especially to the service of the poor. It was this document that lay at the basis of the Land O’ Lakes statement that defined Catholic education in United States Catholic universities as exploring with freedom of inquiry the religious heritage of the world through constant discussion without theological or philosophical imperialism (O’Brien 1994, 49).

**Education in the Catholic Intellectual Tradition in the United States**

Until the mid-1960s Catholic education in the United States was almost synonymous with Catholic schooling in church-established institutions. Parish schools, secondary schools, colleges, universities, and seminaries were the chief focus of the hierarchy and the Catholic people. Most of the educators treated in the present volume wrote about these institutions. It is only around the time of the Second Vatican Council with the writings of Mary Perkins Ryan, Gerard Sloyan, and Gabriel Moran, that Catholic education included the education of young people not in Catholic educational institutions and the education of adults. This change was accompanied by a virtual abandonment of the traditional neo-Scholastic or Thomistic philosophy of education that was the intellectual foundation for Catholic educational institutions.

The nineteenth century saw the emergence of Catholic intellectuals, usually members of the hierarchy, with one notable exception, Orestes Brownson (1803-76). He decried the low academic achievement of parish schools and argued that Catholic attendance at public schools would strengthen the public schools. He was more interested in having the laity “develop their intellectual skills and to play active roles in American society” (Walch 2003, 57). The Church’s interest in Catholic education was restricted to the development of the Catholic schools, seminaries, and a small number of Catholic colleges for men and women. Debates ranged over whether Catholics should establish their own schools or make use of public institutions whose education would be supplemented by the instruction in Christian doctrine. Those who favored Catholic institutions largely prevailed.
An early voice promoting the fostering of Catholic intellectual life was Bishop John Spalding of Peoria, who campaigned for the establishment of a Catholic university along the lines of the Catholic University of Louvain, where he did advanced studies. Lucinda Nolan treats the educational efforts of Bishop John Lancaster Spalding (1840-1916), the most prominent Catholic educational philosopher at the end of the nineteenth century into the twentieth century.

The greatest boost to Catholic intellectual life in the United States came with the establishment of the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C., in 1888. The founding of Catholic University was significant for a number of reasons. First of all, “Catholics needed a university of their own to mobilize the intellectual resources of their tradition and bring them to bear on contemporary issues” (Gleason 1995, 7). Catholic University was able to promote the Thomistic revival inaugurated by Pope Leo XIII. Ideally, the university was also to be the place where the debates among conservative and liberal Catholics could be given a scholarly hearing. Many of the educators included in this collection were influenced by this development. While Archbishop Spalding was not directly influenced by the revival, his education certainly was. His essays and lectures contained many elements of the Thomistic tradition on faith and reason, reason and revelation, revelation and culture. To be sure, Spalding was at the center of the debates about “Americanizing” and “modernizing” Catholicism in this country.

Three twentieth century professor-educators at Catholic University of America were directly influenced by the Thomistic revival. Monsignor Edward Pace (1861-1938), who had a personal relationship with Leo XIII from his student days in Rome, was greatly instrumental in promoting Thomistic philosophy including Thomistic philosophy of education. Father Thomas Shields and Monsignor George Johnson brought Thomism to bear on the entire system of Catholic education in the United States. John L. Elias writes in this collection on Shields (1862-1921), Pace, and Johnson (1889-1944). Each helped to shape Catholic education in the first half of the twentieth century. These men were considered liberal or progressive in their educational theories and practices and each published widely in many fields. All were keenly interested in Catholic schooling and brought a strong psychological emphasis to their writing. In addition,
Pace was the foremost Thomistic philosopher of Catholic education. Shields together with Pace inaugurated *The Catholic Educational Review*, which provided a forum for themselves and many other Catholic educators. George Johnson, the major Catholic spokesperson of his time, guided the Church’s educational enterprise through the difficult years of the Depression and the Second World War.

Jacqueline Parascandola’s chapter on Virgil Michel (1890-1938) relates his direct and enduring influence on catechetics and religious education through his leadership in the liturgical renewal movement in the early twentieth century. Michel studied with Shields and Pace at Catholic University and is indebted to them for many of his ideas on education. Dom Virgil’s vision of liturgy as source and summit for the Christian life originated with his studies in Europe and culminated in his remarkable contributions to catechetical renewal in this country through his teaching, writing, and publishing. The liturgical movement had an intellectual and educational component fostered through liturgical weeks, the journal *Orate Fratres* (later renamed *Worship*), and liturgical arts. Jacqueline Parascandola identifies personalist philosophy, belief in the formative power of liturgy, and commitment to social justice as major components of Michel’s thought.

A definitive statement of the Thomistic approach to Catholic education is found in the writings of Jacques Maritain. Luz Ibarra establishes in her essay that the French-born philosopher and political thinker Maritain, though not a citizen of the United States, was the most influential Thomist in the U.S. in the twentieth century and occupies a well-earned place in the volume for his scholarly contributions in writing and lecturing as visiting professor in this country. His Terry lectures given at Yale University, published as *Education at the Crossroads* (1943), brought the Thomistic philosophy of education to the attention of many within and outside the Catholic Church. This philosophy of education prevailed in Catholic education until the 1960s. Maritain promoted an integral humanism in education designed to enable students to realize their potential intellectually, morally, and spiritually. Ibarra makes the case that this philosophy deserves to be retrieved in order to shape contemporary endeavors at all levels of education in the Church.

Lucinda Nolan’s chapter on Sister M. Rosalia Walsh (1896-1982) of the Mission Helpers of the Sacred Heart examines the development
in the early decades of the twentieth century of a catechetical ministry to Catholic children who attended public schools. Sister Rosalia, writing extensively on psychology of education and methods of teaching, furthered the cause of better preparing catechists for working with children. Nolan’s essay defines Walsh’s role in introducing the Munich Method and in supporting the establishment of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in the United States. Sister Rosalia was herself a beneficiary of the vision of Spalding and Shields who advanced the cause for university education of women religious in the United States.

Harold Horell’s study of the career of Neil McCluskey shows that though rooted in the Thomistic philosophy of Catholic education, he assimilated into this intellectual synthesis relevant ideas drawn from his criticism of prominent educators in the United States including Horace Mann, William Harris, and John Dewey. In his attention to moral education, adult education, and Catholic higher education, McCluskey manifested the pragmatic dimension that has characterized United States educators. McCluskey was instrumental in developing the Land O’ Lakes Statement (July, 1967), which has greatly influenced the nature and direction of Catholic higher education in the United States. The Statement provoked a decades-long debate about the appropriate character and purview of American Catholic higher education in relation to the hierarchy.

The final two educators treated in the collection, Mary Perkins Ryan (1912-1993) and Gerard Sloyan (b. 1919), began the process of going beyond the Thomistic synthesis to explore other dimensions of the Catholic tradition. They explored biblical, historical, and liturgical dimensions that were not prominent in Catholic educational thought. Both of them were heirs to the new theologies developed in France and Germany during the World Wars. Sloyan was also conversant with the theories and practices of United States education.

Ann Morrow Heekin picks up the later years of the liturgical movement in her reflections on Mary Perkins Ryan’s work in writing and publishing in the 1960s and 1970s. In today’s terminology Ryan might be described as a pastoral theologian, since she was intensely interested in relating theology to the life and practices of the church. Like Virgil Michel, Ryan (1912-1993) saw the liturgy as central in the Church’s catechetical endeavors. Ryan was also influenced by the
writings of the French theologians who moved away from the Thomistic synthesis to focus on the Scriptures and writings of the early church fathers. As an author and editor, Ryan brought attention to the pastoral nature of catechesis and the importance of adult education. In a highly controversial book, Are Parochial Schools the Answer? (1964), she argued that Catholic schools could not and should not bear the burden of all of Catholic education. Heekin’s chapter highlights Ryan’s struggles and efforts through collaboration with many of the outstanding persons in Catholic religious education to advance catechetical renewal into the post-Vatican II years, while making the claim that history has not afforded her due recognition.

Twentieth-century Catholic religious education owes an immense debt of gratitude to Gerard Sloyan, whose lifetime endeavors have touched nearly every aspect of theology. The last chapter, written by Philip Franco, frames Sloyan’s remarkable career. Having pursued recent scholarship and a personal interview with the Catholic University of America professor, Franco highlights for the reader the many disciplinary realms that have benefited from Sloyan’s efforts over the last six decades including liturgy, scripture, ecumenism, preaching, ecumenism, religious education and catechetics. It is fitting that his story closes this collection, though in no way is his story closed. Franco’s chapter ends with a section on Sloyan’s continuing efforts in a field he has been so instrumental in shaping.

The need for scholars and teachers such as those presented here has never been greater than it is today. The whole of the Catholic intellectual tradition, as a body of work, a “way of looking at things”, and a “way of doing things,” is dependent on men and women who like those celebrated in this collection are committed to the task of passing on the tradition.

While the book ends with the impressive work of Father Sloyan, the tradition of education in the Catholic intellectual tradition has continued throughout the second half of the twentieth century into the twenty-first century. Influential educators in higher education have included Theodore Hesburgh, Paul Reinert, and Roy Deferrari. Catechetical and religious education scholars have included Gabriel Moran, Maria Harris, Berard Marthaler, Francis Buckley, Mary Charles Bryce, Mary Boys, and Thomas Groome. The work of these and many others has been fostered by Catholic educational institutions of higher
education such as Catholic University of America, Fordham University, Boston College, Dayton University, the University of San Francisco, and Loyola University in Chicago. The contribution of Catholic educators to the Catholic intellectual tradition continues today in the work of young scholars attending these and other Catholic institutions of higher education. Remembering, handing on, and contributing to this rich traditional heritage remain a task of significant importance for us all.