

THE 1930s CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY DEBATES

GREGORY B. SADLER*

THE problem, issue, or notion of “Christian philosophy” has been raised at many times, articulated in myriad manners, motivated by different desires, and framed through varied sets of assumptions about the nature or meaning of both of those terms, *Christian* and *philosophy*. During the history of reflection upon, initiatives within, and even polemics about Christian philosophy, consensuses among philosophers about the matters involved have been much more often declared or assumed than actually attained. This holds even for what arguably remains the period in the last century during which the nature and possibility of Christian philosophy was examined and argued about with the greatest attention and intensity: the Francophone debates running roughly from 1931 to 1936.

The debates were officially brought to an explicit and public starting point by Xavier Léon bringing together two Catholic philosophers, Étienne Gilson and Jacques Maritain, and two rationalist philosophers, Emile Bréhier and Léon Brunschvicg, as the main interlocutors at the spring meeting of the Société française de Philosophie, to address the problem of Christian philosophy, another Catholic philosopher, Maurice Blondel participating via correspondence. Broader conflicts between numerous perspectives on the issues finally up for debate had been developing during the decade prior to the S.f.P session, and the 1930s debates rapidly drew in a number of major Catholic philosophers in addition to the three just mentioned, most notably Gabriel Marcel, Fernand Van Steenberghen, Antonin Sertillanges, Henri Gouhier, Aime Forest, Léon Noël, and Antonin Motte.¹ The scholarly interactions comprising the debates actually spanned three philosophical associations and a network of largely Francophone journals more or less interconnected by readership and authorship.² These debates were complex, scored through by numerous

* Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Marist College; also President, ReasonIO. E-mail: greg@reasonio.com

¹ By my count, nearly fifty different interlocutors were involved, with greatly varying degrees of centrality and engagement, from 1931-1936. These included mainly Catholic philosophers, theologians, and historians.

² The journals which offered the most significant forums from 1931 to 1936 were the *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, *Vie Intellectuelle*, *Revue néo-scolastique de Philosophie*, *Nouvelle Revue des Jeunes*, *Revue Thomiste*, and *Études Philosophiques*.

intersecting fault lines, the most important of which did not just separate rationalist from Catholic philosophers, but rather the positions developed by different Catholic philosophers from each other. For this precise reason, any work claiming that the issue of Christian philosophy is one simple, easily identified, long ago resolved to the satisfaction of all, any work asserting the debates to have been conducted solely between two or even three positions, reveals itself as inadequate to this rich and variegated space of intellectual history. I would echo the caution issued by one early commentator on the debates, Joseph Maydiou: «aucune analyse, présentation ou interprétation ne peut remplacer la lecture des écrits où se sont exprimés les personnages dominants de ce dialogue philosophique»³.

My goal in this thematic bibliography is not to provide a comprehensive listing of the voluminous available literature comprising, continuing, or commenting on the 1930s debates, a task carried out recently in *Reason Fulfilled by Revelation: The 1930s Christian Philosophy Debates in France* CUA Press Washington D.C. 2011, p. 283-312. Instead, in addition to providing some overview of the chronology and development of the 1930s debates, I aim to direct interested scholars towards what, in my view, are the documents most essential for serious study of these debates and the issues raised by their main interlocutors. These include the books, proceedings, and articles through which a student approaching the 1930s debates for the first time would best be able to encounter the full range of positions represented, and to thereby generate a sort of mental topography of its “lay of the land”. The bibliography is also intended to serve for scholars already well-versed in positions taken on Christian philosophy of one or more of the interlocutors, assisting such scholars in broadening their already existing base of understanding. My hope is that it might even evoke from some of the contemporary scholars of these debates needed correction or commentary in light of any deficiencies of this article.

In addition to focusing specifically on the most central literature comprising the 1930s debates and portions of the secondary literature discussing the debates, I would also like to mention the existence of two additional important and interesting bodies of literature not included in this thematic bibliography but rather reserved for further study. Both of these engage with main positions articulated during the debates, but extending the perspectives by bringing in additional considerations or concerns overlooked during the debates proper. One of these actually comprises a later, smaller, less-well-known set of debates during the 1940s and 50s among Francophone Reformed Protestant philosophers and theologians. The other extends to a more heterogeneous set of authors who reference at least some of the positions from the 1930s de-

³ J. MAYDIEU, *Le bilan d'un débat philosophique: réflexions sur la philosophie chrétienne*, «Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique», 9-10 (1935), p. 193.

bates but engage in new initiatives widening the scope of the issues involved in Christian philosophy.

1. THE 1930S DEBATES

There are a number of avenues of approach one might adopt proceeding into the body of literature comprising these tangled and complex debates. One could, for instance, begin by focusing on the works of the interlocutors generally acknowledged as the most important, those thinkers around whose arguments, criticisms, positions, and theses those of the other participants tended to constellate. One might also attempt to take into one's purview and map out the full range of positions and interlocutors represented in the literature. Or, one might adopt a strictly chronological approach, studying the works in a succession dictated by the temporal order of their publication. In my view, however, a particularly apt place to begin is with documents which by their very form place the reader right into the thick of the debates' early back-and-forth conversations.

1. 1. *Three key philosophical forums*

The proceedings of several learned philosophical societies supply important first grounds to traverse and survey. During the 21 March, 1931 session of the Société française de Philosophie, found in the *Bulletin de la Société française de Philosophie*, 31/2, pp. 37-85, Gilson and Maritain face off as proponents of the historical existence of Christian philosophy against the trenchantly opposed Bréhier and more nuancedly skeptical Brunschvicg. After critically reviewing three positions opposed to the possibility of Christian philosophy, namely rationalism, theologism (Gilson's preferred term for fideism), and that of certain neo-Scholastics, Gilson argues for the historical existence of Christian philosophies, cases in which revelation was generative of reason, during the Middle Ages. Maritain provides a doctrinal complement to Gilson's historically focused argument, introducing and examining a distinction between the nature or essence of philosophy, which cannot be Christian (or non-Christian), and the concrete states in which philosophy exists, which can be Christian. During the session, Bréhier articulates anew his opposition to the notion of Christian philosophy, claiming Christianity made no contributions to historical development of any distinctive philosophical position, but then engages Gilson in debate on historical grounds, in the course of which his position practically collapses in the face of Gilson's almost-Socratic questioning. Brunschvicg famously admits that he would not recognize even his own thought if Christianity had not existed, clearly conceding Christianity to have exercised influence in the development of some philosophical doctrines and thinkers, but he argues that claimants to Christian philosophy remain in-

adequately philosophical. He too is engaged by Gilson, but their rich discussion results in a standoff.

Unable to travel because of his near-blindness, Blondel participated in the session through an appended letter, in which he outlines a second position in addition to the Gilson-Maritain one in favor of Christian philosophy as an "open philosophy," a "philosophy of insufficiency," but, by attacking the possibility of a historical solution to the problem without first clarifying the problem of the supernatural, and by accusing the Thomists' positions of a reifying "conceptualism," sets the Blondelian position just as strongly at odds with the stances of Gilson (and by extension, Maritain) as with those of the rationalists. In the records of a second philosophical conference of primary importance during the debates, the Société d'Études Philosophiques, *Le problème de la philosophie catholique: Seance de 26 Nov 1932*, «Les Études Philosophiques», 7/1 (1933), pp. 13-44. Blondel expands upon and defends his position in conversations with additional interlocutors, including Henri Gouhier, Joseph Maréchal, Jacques Paliard, and Gaston Berger.

The following year, a much larger gathering at the Société Thomiste, hears presentations by Aimé Forest and Antonin Motte, both advancing conceptions of Christian philosophy. The entirety of their talks, along with shorter discussions by A.-J. Festugière, Daniel Feuling, and Antonin Sertillanges, and vital discussions, are to be found in *La philosophie chrétienne: Juvisy, 11 Septembre 1933*, Cerf, Paris 1933, pp. 171. Forest discusses three attitudes possible to adopt towards philosophy and Christianity: separation, reduction of one to the other, or some type of union, and advocates for the former, attempting to reconcile the Gilson-Maritain position with Blondel's, arguing the one leads into and calls for the other, but suggests that Thomism provides a necessary counterbalance and fuller prospects for a complete Christian philosophy. Motte also maintains complementarity between the Gilson-Maritain and Blondel positions, and goes further, discussing the transcendentals, mystery, and invoking the Marcellian conception of paradox. He argues philosophy's autonomy requires engagement with the whole range of realities of which it becomes aware, including Christianity, even if leads into the realization of philosophy's insufficiency, and thus its necessity to seek resources for its completion outside of itself. These presentations provoke vigorous opposition to the notion of Christian philosophy during the ensuing discussions, most notably by neo-Scholastics Fernand Van Steenberghe, Pierre Mandonnet, and Maurilio Penido. Gilson, present at the session, breaks his resolve to remain just an observer, spars with Christian philosophy's opponents, and further clarifies his own position in response to a question by Bruno de Solages.

Two particularly interesting discussions critically exploring the Société Thomiste discussions in detail are provided by Van Steenberghe, *La II^e journée d'études de la Société Thomiste et la notion de 'philosophie chrétienne'*, «Revue néo-

scolastique de Philosophie», 35 (1933), pp. 539-54, and Ralph McInerny, *Praeambula Fidei: Thomism and the God of the Philosophers*, CUA Press, Washington D.C. 2006, pp. 91-107.

1. 2. *Works by main interlocutors in the debates*

As the debates expand and continue, a variety of positions get set out both for and against Christian philosophy, many of them articulating or assuming quite different conceptions of philosophy itself. The positions of the different participants also varied in the amount of attention they garnered from other participants and commentators, whether evidenced by way of criticism of or defense against those positions, by way of comparison with other positions, or even by way of praise and incorporation. The important question to ask at this point then is: What are the main positions and who are the key representatives to focus on as most primary in the debates? Obviously, those of Bréhier and Brunschvicg, representing two distinct, and possibly incompatible, rationalist stances asserting “Christian philosophy” cannot be genuinely philosophical, must be included. The position of neo-Scholastics equally opposed to Christian philosophy, but on different grounds, articulated particularly by Van Steenberghen, Noël, and Mandonnet is also acknowledged to occupy the first order of importance. Positions developed by two Catholic proponents of Christian philosophy, the “Christian Socratic” Gabriel Marcel and the Thomist Antonin Sertillanges, are also arguably central to the debates.

Clearly though, the most central, important, and prolific philosophers engaged in the debates are Gilson, Maritain, and Blondel, acknowledged by their contemporaries during the debates as the three most significant contributors, a preeminence easily understood in light of their works dealing with Christian philosophy, in which they develop their positions in much more explicit depth and detail than any of the other participants. Three of their works published in 1932-33 immediately assume the status of focal points, centers of gravity if you will, for the continuing and expanding debates, remaining classic loci of reference down to the present.

In his Gifford Lectures, *L'esprit de la Philosophie médiévale*, Vrin, Paris 1932, pp. 446, Gilson provides copious examples, arranged by theme, supporting his historical contention that there were philosophies both integrally Christian and integrally Catholic. He also explores the notion of Christian philosophy itself in greater depth, and begins a more and more noticeable shift towards treating Thomism as the principal paradigm for Christian philosophy.⁴ Blondel

⁴ This becomes progressively more clear in a number of works: *Sens et nature de l'argument de saint Anselme*, «Archive d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge», 9 (1934), pp. 5-52; *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1937; and *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1938.

gives his position on Christian (or has he prefers, *Catholic*) philosophy, up to that point articulated only in outline, a more clear and systematic form in *Le problème de la philosophie catholique* Bloud and Gay, Paris 1932, pp. 233, where he elaborates three progressive projects or stages of Christian philosophy, and even reexamines and tempers some self-perceived anti-Thomist excesses (p. 21-42)⁵ of his earlier *Lettre sur les exigences de la pensée contemporaine*. On his part, Maritain progressively reworks and adds to his position first articulated during the 1931 S.f.P session, introducing further considerations during a 1932 presentation, *De la notion de philosophie chrétienne*, «Revue néo-scholastique de Philosophie», 36 (1932), pp. 153–86 which becomes the core for his classic work, *De la philosophie chrétienne*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris 1933, pp. 129, appearing soon after Gilson's and Blondel's books. One notable feature of all three of these works is that their authors devote space not only to critical analysis of rationalist, fideist, and neo-Scholastic opponents of Christian philosophy, but also to pointing out weaknesses of insufficiently philosophical candidates for Christian philosophy, to responding to criticisms of their own positions, and (except Gilson and Maritain with each other) even to critiquing each other's positions.

Of these three authors, Gilson most often and explicitly reprises the issue of Christian philosophy thematically throughout the course of his long career. During the debates, in addition to works already cited, he publishes *Autour de la philosophie chrétienne. La spécificité de l'ordre philosophique*, «Vie Intellectuelle», 21/3 (1933), and delivers the lectures that will later be assembled as *Christianisme et Philosophie*. Vrin, Paris 1936, pp. 168. Maritain also continues developing his position on Christian philosophy in *Distinguer pour unir: ou, les degrés du savoir*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris 1932, pp. 919, and *Science et sagesse*, Têqui, Paris 1935. Blondel also contributes a number of additional articles between 1931 and 1936, defending himself against Bréhier in *Y-a-t'il une philosophie chrétienne?* «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale», 38/4 (1931), pp. 599-606, then pseudonymously (as "X") presenting his own position in *Une philosophie chrétienne est-elle rationnellement concevable? Est-elle historiquement réalisée? Etat actuel de ce débat*, «Revue des Questions Historiques», 116 (1932), pp. 389–93. He criticizes Van Steenberghe and continues clarifying his own position in *Pour la philosophie intégrale*, «Revue néo-scholastique de Philosophie», 37 (1934), pp. 49-64. He also publishes: *Le centre de perspective où il faut se placer pour que la philosophie catholique soit concevable*, «Archivio di filosofia», 2/2 (1932), pp. 3-15, and *Office du philosophe*, «Revue Thomiste», 19 (1936), pp. 587-92.

⁵ Perhaps the most interesting admission Blondel makes is: «Parce que plusieurs interprètes du Thomisme avait peut-être perdu de vue l'élan spirituel qui l'anime, ce n'était pas une raison suffisante pour l'ignorer ou l'oublier moi-même» (M. BLONDEL, *Le problème de la philosophie catholique*, Bloud and Gay, Paris 1932, p. 47).

By comparison to these three, the other major interlocutors make somewhat smaller contributions, though important in order to gain a full appreciation of the debates and their topics. Bréhier's classic contribution remains his *Y-a-t'il une philosophie chrétienne?* «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale», 38/2 (1931), pp. 133-62, but after its publication he has no further involvements in the ongoing debates. Brunschvicg's part 1 and 1 of *De la vraie et fausse conversion*, «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale», 38/1 pp. 29-60, 38/22, pp. 187-235 (1931), and *Religion et Philosophie*, «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale», 42/1 (1935), p. 1-13, do flesh out his position, but barely engage his interlocutors and their views. After staking out their grounds, the rationalists effectively drop out of the debates as active participants. The same cannot be said for the neo-Scholastic opponents of Christian philosophy. Van Steenberghe stands out in particular, rejecting the notion as inexact and misleading, criticizing Sertillanges, Forest, Motte, and Blondel specifically in his aforementioned *La 11^e journée d'études*, approaching these issues again in *Le mouvement des études médiévales*, «Revue néo-scholastique de Philosophie», 36 (1934), pp. 475-512, and occasionally throughout his later career. Noël, perhaps taking a cue from Feuling's phenomenological presentation during the S.T. session, adapts Husserlian terminology and concepts to also argue against Christian philosophy in *La notion de philosophie chrétienne*, «Revue néo-scholastique de Philosophie», 37 (1934), pp. 337-44.

Marcel and Sertillanges, both of whom make important contributions to the debates, appear to push Christian philosophy considerably further towards theology than do Gilson, Maritain, or Blondel, let alone any of the Neo-Scholastics. Using his review of Gilson's Gifford Lectures, *A propos de L'esprit de la Philosophie médiévale par M. E. Gilson* «Nouvelle Revue des Jeunes», 4/3 pp. 308-15 and 4/12 pp. 1302-9 (1932), as a launching point for articulating his own views, Marcel argues that a point seemingly missed by the other interlocutors is that Christian philosophy at its very heart involves meditation upon the paradox or scandal of the Incarnation and its implications for reason and philosophy. He will return to similar themes much more elaborately in later writings, but during the years of the debates, he does publish one additional piece which continues this line of thought, *Position du mystère ontologique et ses approches concrètes*, «Études Philosophiques», 7/3 pp. 95-102 (1933), which drew responses by Blondel and Bréhier. Sertillanges had already started explicitly examining the issues prior to the debates in *Sur quelques caractères de la philosophie chrétienne*, in «Philosophia Perennis: Abhandlungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie» Josef Habel, Regensburg 1930 v. 1, pp. 501-10, and continued delving into the issues in several articles "L'apport philosophique du Christianisme d'après M. Étienne Gilson", «Vie Intellectuelle», 14, pp. 386-402 (1932), and *De la philosophie chrétienne*, «Vie Intellectuelle», 24/1 pp. 9-20 (1933). Sertillanges is a particularly interesting "bridge-figure" during the debates, given

his status as a Thomist proponent of Christian philosophy who criticizes both Gilson and Maritain on certain points and positively views Blondel's position, which Sertillanges goes further than in characterizing Christian philosophy as an attempt to disengage philosophy latent in dogma and as finding in faith the means for its full self-articulation.

1. 3. *Works and thinkers of the debates of secondary importance*

It is difficult to single out with any sort of absolute precision which authors and texts ought to be deemed to belong to a second tier of importance within the 1930s debates. Several philosophers and theologians to whom one might rightly call attention make what appear in retrospect important contributions, unfortunately largely ignored or overlooked during the debates themselves. Each thinker arguably articulates some new position upon or insight about the issues of Christian philosophy, and among these are Michel Souriau, Etienne Borne, Henri Gouhier, Léon Chestov, Louis-Paul Cochet, Bruno de Solages, and Henri De Lubac.

Early on, Souriau, one of the few Protestant interlocutors involved, sets out one of the few committedly Augustinian positions of the debates, in *Qu'est-ce qu'une philosophie chrétienne?* «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale», 39/3 (1932), pp. 353-85. His article, arguing Bréhier carries out a rationalist or secularist version of apologetics, and criticizing Gilson's prioritization of Thomism over Augustinianism, was unfortunately practically ignored, a fate which also struck Borne's excellent and succinct discussion of the problem of Christian philosophy in terms of reflexive philosophy, *D'une 'Philosophie Chrétienne' qui serait philosophique* «Esprit», November (1932), pp. 335-40. Gouhier's own interesting reflections, reflective of a historically-oriented approach to the problem of Christian philosophy differing in respects not only from Bréhier but also from Gilson, begin with his letter to Blondel during the 1932 S.E.P meeting, but are prolonged and further elaborated through his *Digression sur la philosophie à propos de la philosophie chrétienne*, «Recherches Philosophiques», 3 (1933), pp. 211-36, then followed up, somewhat after the debates, with *Philosophie chrétienne et théologie*, «Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'étranger», 125 (1938), pp. 151-93. Chestov set out the first and only basically fideist position in the debates through his article *Athènes et Jérusalem (Concupiscentia irresistibilis)*, «Revue Philosophique», 120 (1935), pp. 305-349, which would later be reworked into part 3 of his fuller study, bearing the same title, *Athènes et Jérusalem*, Vrin, Paris 1937, pp. 350.

In Cochet's serialized article, *En vue d'une philosophie chrétienne*, «Revue Apologétique», 58/582 (1934), pp. 257-69, 59/587 pp. 129-49 (1934), 60/594 (1935), pp. 272-95, he asserts a complementarity between Gilson's and Blondel's positions, framing as representatives of Augustinian and Thomist approaches to Christian philosophy, arguing that they both reveal limits and the insufficiency of Augustinianism and Thomism, and calling for a synthesis of both to be

developed. This theme of complementarity between Blondel's, Gilson's, and also Maritain's positions is also highlighted by De Solages' contribution *Le problème de la philosophie chrétienne*, «Vie Intellectuelle», 25/3 (1933), pp. 215-28, which likens the three approaches to mountain peaks along a common trail, from whose combined perspectives a full view of Christian philosophy becomes possible. De Lubac, continuing Solages' line of thought, in *Sur la philosophie chrétienne, réflexions a la suite d'un débat*, «Nouvelle Revue Théologique», 63/3 (1936), pp. 125-53, goes so far as to suggest the perspectives of Marcel and even the German phenomenologist Max Scheler as the next step for Christian philosophy beyond Gilson, Maritain, and Blondel.

2. WORKS ADDRESSING THE RANGE OF POSITIONS IN THE DEBATES

De Lubac's piece, whose very sub-title, *réflexions a la suite d'un débat*, gives away its retrospective status, provides a useful bridge-point between literature representing involvements in the 1930s Christian philosophy debates proper, and the secondary literature discussing the positions articulated during the debates. Over the last eight decades, a literature has developed comprising hundreds of available works in way or another discussing the 1930s Christian philosophy debates, the issues raised, the thinkers involved, the positions developed, and even identifying further matters yet to explore. It must be admitted, however, that relatively few do justice to the breadth and complexity of the debates. A number of books or articles focus primarily on one or two of the main thinkers or positions, and some of those taking in a wider purview exhibit some degree of bias towards, ignorance upon, or misinterpretation of certain of the major thinkers and positions.

To mention one representative example, Maurice Nédoncelle, in *Existe-t-il une philosophie chrétienne?*, Fayard, Paris 1957, pp. 119, covers the debate's main positions, but clearly misrepresents Blondel's position as endorsing a pious agnosticism. Nédoncelle's own summary, translated into English, then gets uncritically accepted by *inter alios* Joseph Owens, S.J in *Towards a Christian Philosophy*, CUA Press, Washington, D.C. 1990, pp. 332, who entirely ignores the parts of Blondel and all the other participants influenced by or engaging him in the debates (it must be noted, however, that Owens' interpretation of Gilson and Maritain is well-researched and insightful). Given the fact that some of these major interlocutors themselves, i.e. Gilson and Maritain, on one side, and Blondel, on the other, considered and criticized each other's positions with a lack of intellectual charity uncharacteristic to all three of them, it becomes entirely understandable that some secondary literature might adopt a spirit of partisanship, if only unconsciously or by omission. What is wanted, in works guiding a student into study of the debates, are treatments that, if not uncommitted to one position or another, at the very least exhibit fairness towards and competence in all of the main positions, providing the reader

coming to these debates with some reliable guidance. The eleven works recommended below all satisfy these criteria.

Several early overviews of the 1930s debates judiciously address, and attempt to provide a classification of, all the main positions. Blaise Romeyer's presentation in *Autour du problème de la philosophie chrétienne: essai critique et positif*, «Archives de philosophie», 10/4 (1934), pp. 1-64, reviewing the positions of Gilson, Bréhier, Brunschvicg, Maritain, Marcel, Blondel, and even Bergson, divides the debate into four thematic rather than chronological phases, and attempts to elaborate an Augustinian solution to the problem. In a Latin article, Bernard Baudoux provides an attentive history and thematic analysis of the debates, locating not only the main participants, positions, theses and lines of conflict, but also many of the less central and well-known participants, *Quaestio de Philosophia Christiana*, «Antonianum», 11 (1936), 487-552. A shorter but similarly attentive piece, less historical and more thematic in orientation is Motte's *Le problème de la 'philosophie chrétienne'* «Bulletin Thomiste», 41/3-4 (1937), pp. 230-55. Several later works are also particularly worthy of note for providing balanced, insightful, and in some cases comprehensive, treatments of the debates, the different thinkers, and the merits of the positions articulated.

The decade immediately following the debates Alex Renard publishes the first monograph specifically devoted to the Christian philosophy debates, *La Querelle sur la possibilité de la philosophie chrétienne: essai documentaire et critique*, Éditions Ecole et Collège, Paris 1941, pp. 130. During the second half of the century two Italian authors also make important contributions by their own comprehensive monographs upon the debates and their issues. Antonio Livi's body of work is well represented by *Blondel, Bréhier, Gilson, Maritain: il problema della filosofia Cristiana*, Patron, Bologna 1974;⁶ likewise, Luigi Bogliolo by *La Filosofia Cristiana: Il problema, la storia, la struttura*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Roma 1986, pp. 232.⁷

Several other works are also particularly helpful for understanding the structure, development, and contexts of the debates. Yves Floucat, *Pour une philosophie chrétienne: éléments d'un débat fondamental*, Téqui, Paris 1983, pp. 225,

⁶ Other works by Antonio Livi bearing on the issues of the debates include: *Étienne Gilson e il problema della filosofia cristiana*. Perugia 1966; *Il cristianesimo nella filosofia: Il problema della filosofia cristiana nei suoi sviluppi storici e nelle prospettive attuali*, Japadre, L'Aquila 1969; *Il problema storico della filosofia cristiana*, in V. POSSENTI (a cura di), *Storia e cristianesimo in Jacques Maritain*, Massimo, Milano 1979, pp. 23-58; *L'accordo tra Maritain e Gilson nel dibattito sulla filosofia cristiana*, in V. POSSENTI (a cura di), *Jacques Maritain, oggi*, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 1983, pp. 514-24.

⁷ Luigi Bogliolo also begins making contributions much earlier with *Il problema della filosofia cristiana*, Morcelliana, Brescia 1959; *Filosofia cristiana: problema o dramma?*, Civiltà, Brescia 1971.

while openly committed to seeking out a solution to the problem of Christian philosophy along Maritainian lines, explores the different possible positions competently and fairly. Henri Donneaud, *Étienne Gilson et Maurice Blondel dans le débat sur la philosophie chrétienne*, «Revue Thomiste», 99 (1999), pp. 497-516, provides insightful discussions of the positions of those two thinkers as well as of their relations with those of Bréhier, Maritain, and the neo-Scholastics, but also provides historical background to the conflict between Blondel and Gilson. If I may be permitted to recommend my own work, in *Reason Fulfilled By Revelation*, pp. 1-96, I provide historical and thematic introductions to the debates, issues, participants, positions, and main points of disagreement. A last word should also be said about another very useful secondary source. While not in their entirety directly concerned with the Christian philosophy debates, the three volume compendium assembled by Emerich Coreth, W.M. Neidl and G. Pligersdorffer (Eds), *Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, Styria, Graz/Wien/Köln 1987-1990, contain invaluable entries on many of the thinkers who became embroiled in the debates, the historical and intellectual milieu, and even on the debates themselves. Key articles from *Christliche Philosophie* were recently selected and condensed, with several timely additions, by Philibert Secretan, ed. into a shorter volume, *La philosophie chrétienne d'inspiration catholique: Constants et controverses, positions actuelles*, Academic Press Fribourg 2006, pp. 286.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works by participants in the 1930s Christian philosophy debates:

BLONDEL MAURICE, *Le centre de perspective où il faut se placer pour que la philosophie catholique soit concevable*, «Archivio di filosofia», 2/2 (1932), pp. 3-15.

IDEM, *Le problème de la philosophie catholique* Blond and Gay, Paris 1932.

IDEM, *Le problème de la philosophie catholique Seance de 26 Nov 1932*, «Les Etudes Philosophiques», 7/1 (1933), pp. 13-44. Includes letters from and conversations with Enrico Castelli, Jean Delvolvé, Henri Gouhier, Joseph Maréchal, S.J., Jacques Palliard, and Gaston Berger.

IDEM, *Lettre sur les exigences de la pensée contemporaine en matière d'apologétique (1896)*, in «Les premiers écrits de Maurice Blondel» P.U.F., Paris 1956, pp. 5-95, Trans. Alexander Dru and Illytd Trethowan as *Letter on Apologetics* in «The Letter on Apologetics & History and Dogma», Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI 1994.

IDEM, *Office du philosophe*, «Revue Thomiste», 19 (1936), pp. 587-592.

IDEM, *Pour la philosophie integrale*, «Revue néo-scholastique de Philosophie», 37 (1934), pp. 49-64.

IDEM, (as "X") *Une philosophie chrétienne est-elle rationnellement concevable? Est-elle historiquement réalisé? Etat actuel de ce débat*, «Revue des Questions Historiques», 116 (1932), pp. 389-393.

IDEM, *Y-a-t'il une philosophie chrétienne?*, «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale», 38/4 (1931), pp. 599-606.

- BORNE ÉTIENNE, *D'une 'Philosophie Chrétienne' qui serait philosophique*, «Esprit», November (1932), pp. 335-340.
- BRÉHIER EMILE, *Y-a-t'il une philosophie chrétienne?*, «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale», 38/2 (1931), pp. 133-162.
- BRUNSCHVICG LÉON, *De la vraie et fausse conversion*, «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale», 38/1 pp. 29-60, 38/22, pp. 187-235 (1931), later published in *De la vraie et de la fausse conversion: suivi de La querelle de l'athéisme*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1951.
- IDEM, *Religion et Philosophie*, «Revue de la Métaphysique et de Morale», 42/1 1935, p. 1-13.
- CHESTOV LÉON, *Athènes et Jérusalem (Concupiscentia irresistibilis)*, «Revue Philosophique», 120 (1935), pp. 305-349, later part 3 *Athènes et Jérusalem*, Vrin, Paris 1937. Trans. Bernard Martin as *Athens and Jerusalem* Ohio University Press, Athens 1966.
- COCHET LOUIS, *En vue d'une philosophie chrétienne*, «Revue Apologétique», 58/582 (1934), pp. 257-69, 59/587 pp. 129-49 (1934), 60/594 (1935), pp. 272-95.
- GILSON ÉTIENNE, *Autour de la philosophie chrétienne. La spécificité de l'ordre philosophique*, «Vie Intellectuelle», 21/3 (1933), pp. 404-424. Trans. as *Concerning Christian Philosophy: the Distinctiveness of the Philosophic Order* in «Philosophy and History: Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer», Harper, New York 1963.
- IDEM, *Christianisme et Philosophie*, Vrin, Paris 1936. Trans. Ralph MacDonald as *Christianity and Philosophy*, Sheet and Ward, New York 1939.
- IDEM, *L'esprit de la Philosophie médiévale*, Vrin, Paris 1932, tr. A.H.C. Downes as *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1936.
- IDEM, *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages*, Scribner's, New York 1938.
- IDEM, *Sens et nature de l'argument de saint Anselme*, «Archive d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge», 9 (1934), pp. 5-52.
- IDEM, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1937.
- GOUHIER HENRI, *Digression sur la philosophie à propos de la philosophie chrétienne*, «Recherches Philosophiques», 3 (1933), pp. 211-236.
- IDEM, *Philosophie chrétienne et théologie* «Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'étranger», 125 (1938), pp. 151-193.
- MARCEL GABRIEL, *A propos de L'esprit de la Philosophie médiévale par M. E. Gilson* «Nouvelle Revue des Jeunes», 4/3 pp. 308-315 and 4/12, pp. 1302-9 (1932).
- IDEM, *Position du mystère ontologique et ses approches concrètes*, «Études Philosophiques», 7/3 (1933), pp. 95-102, tr. Katherine Farrer in *Being and Having: An Existentialist Diary*, Harper, New York 1965, pp. 116-21.
- MARITAIN JACQUES, *De la philosophie chrétienne*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris (1933), tr. Edward Flannery as *An Essay on Christian Philosophy*, Philosophical Library, New York 1955.
- IDEM, *De la notion de philosophie chrétienne*, «Revue néo-scholastique de Philosophie», 36 (1932), pp. 153-186.
- IDEM, *Distinguer pour unir: ou, les degrés du savoir*. Desclée de Brouwer, Paris 1932. Tr. G.B. Phelan as *The Degrees of Knowledge*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1959.
- IDEM, *Science et sagesse, suivi d'éclaircissements sur ses frontières et son objet*, Téqui, Paris

- 1935, tr. Bernard Wall as *Science and Wisdom*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1940.
- NOËL LÉON, *La notion de philosophie chrétienne*, «Revue néo-scolastique de Philosophie», 37 (1934), pp. 337-44.
- SERTILLANGES ANTONIN, *De la philosophie chrétienne*, «Vie Intellectuelle», 24/1 pp. 9-20 (1933).
- IDEM, *L'apport philosophique du Christianisme d'après M. Étienne Gilson*, «Vie Intellectuelle», 14 (1932), pp. 386-402.
- IDEM, *Sur quelques caractères de la philosophie chrétienne*, in «Philosophia Perennis: Abhandlungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie», Josef Habel, Regensburg 1930 v. 1, pp. 501-510.
- SOCIÉTÉ FRANÇAISE DE PHILOSOPHIE, *Bulletin de la Société française de Philosophie*, 31/2, (1931). Includes presentations by Étienne Gilson, Emile Bréhier, Jacques Maritain, Léon Brunschvicg, Edouard Le Roy, and Raymond Lenoir, and letters from Maurice Blondel and Jacques Chevalier.
- SOCIÉTÉ THOMISTE, *La philosophie chrétienne: Juvisy, 11 Septembre 1933*, Cerf, Paris 1933.
- DE SOLAGES BRUNO, *Le problème de la philosophie chrétienne*, «Vie Intellectuelle», 25/3 (1933), pp. 215-228.
- SOURIAU MICHEL, *Qu'est-ce qu'une philosophie chrétienne?* «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale», 39/3 (1932), pp. 353-385.
- VAN STEENBERGEN FERNAND, *La 1^{re} journée d'études de la Société Thomiste et la notion de 'philosophie chrétienne'*, «Revue néo-scolastique de Philosophie», 35 (1933), pp. 539-554.
- IDEM, *Le mouvement des études médiévales*, «Revue néo-scolastique de Philosophie», 36 (1934), pp. 475-512.

Works about the 1930^s Christian philosophy debates:

- BAUDOUX BERNARD, *Quaestio de Philosophia Christiana*, «Antonianum», 11 (1936), pp. 487-552.
- BOGLIOLO LUIGI, *Filosofia cristiana: problema o dramma?*, Civiltà, Brescia 1971.
- IDEM, *Il problema della filosofia cristiana*, Morcelliana, Brescia 1959.
- IDEM, *La Filosofia Cristiana: Il problema, la storia, la struttura*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Roma 1986.
- CORETH E. - NEIDL W.M. - PLIGERSDORFFER G. (Eds.), *Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, Styria, Graz/Wien/Köln 1987-1990.
- DONNEAUD HENRI, *Étienne Gilson et Maurice Blondel dans le débat sur la philosophie chrétienne*, «Revue Thomiste», 99 (1999), pp. 497-516.
- FLOUCAT YVES, *Pour une philosophie chrétienne: éléments d'un débat fondamental*, Téqui, Paris 1983.
- LIVI ANTONIO, *Blondel, Bréhier, Gilson, Maritain: il problema della filosofia Cristiana*, Patron, Bologna 1974.
- IDEM, *Étienne Gilson e il problema della filosofia cristiana*, Perugia 1966.
- IDEM, *L'accordo tra Maritain e Gilson nel dibattito sulla filosofia cristiana*, in V. POSSENTI (a cura di), *Jacques Maritain, oggi*, Vita e Pensiero, Milano 1983, pp. 514-524.
- DE LUBAC HENRI, *Sur la philosophie chrétienne, réflexions a la suite d'un débat*, «Nouvelle

- Revue Théologique», 63/3 (1936), pp. 125-153. Reprinted with additions in *Recherches dans la foi: Trois études sur Origène, saint Anselme, et la philosophie chrétienne*, pp. 127-52. Beauchense, Paris 1979. Trans. Sharon Mollerus and Susan Clements as "Retrieving the Tradition: On Christian Philosophy", «Communio», 19 (1992), pp. 478-506.
- MAYDIEU JOSEPH, *Le bilan d'un débat philosophique: réflexions sur la philosophie chrétienne*, «Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique», 9-10 (1935), pp. 193-22.
- MCINERNY RALPH, *Praeambula Fidei: Thomism and the God of the Philosophers*, CUA Press, Washington D.C. 2006, pp. 91-107.
- MOTTE ANTONIN, *Le problème de la 'philosophie chrétienne'* «Bulletin Thomiste», 41/3-4 (1937), pp. 230-55.
- NÉDONCELLE MAURICE, *Existe-t-il une philosophie chrétienne?*, Fayard, Paris 1957. Translated as *Is There a Christian Philosophy?*, Hawthorn Books, New York 1960.
- RENARD ALEX, *La Querelle sur la possibilité de la philosophie chrétienne: essai documentaire et critique*, Éditions École et Collège, Paris 1941.
- ROMEYER BLAISE, *Autour du problème de la philosophie chrétienne: essai critique et positif*, «Archives de philosophie», 10/4 (1934), pp. 1-64.
- SADLER B. GREGORY, *Reason Fulfilled by Revelation: The 1930s Christian Philosophy Debates in France*, Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C. 2011.
- SECRETAN PHILIBERT (ed.), *La philosophie chrétienne d'inspiration catholique: Constants et controverses, positions actuelles*, Academic Press, Fribourg 2006.