

Review of: "The Catholic School: Holistic?"

Amy Chapman¹

¹ Columbia University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review your work at this stage. I found your paper to be interesting and engaging, and I enjoyed reading it. I do have some feedback, which I hope strengthens your paper.

The section "The Question" could be strengthened if you framed the first two paragraphs there in the similar way you talked about the scope of the work earlier: that Catholic schools cannot be treated monolithically. You have good citations to back up your claims that Catholic schools teach religious education differently from other subjects, but I think it would be good hear to remind readers that this may not always be true.

When you begin writing about Lonergan's work, the writing becomes beautiful, clear, and fluid. Writing about Lonergan is clearly a strength, as there is great clarity to how you present his philosophy and how he came to understand the world. I think it would further strengthen the paper to bring that level of crisp, clear writing to the earlier sections of your paper, which at times feel like they have a bit less of a smooth flow (the ideas are clear).

I believe that you move between the past and present tenses throughout the paper. I struggle with this, too, but it makes a paper easier to read if it is in one tense. Present might be right here, even though Lonergan's work is not new, because your application of it is new (or at least happening now).

I am not sure of how familiar with philosophy, theology, or Lonergan readers will be. I have a bit of background in each, and still felt like moving through the sections on Lonergan's development of his understanding of science and knowledge was a heavy cognitive lift. The information is excellent and your argument is sound, but you might consider clarifying these sections - perhaps provide a little more explicit structure (or headings) to those sections. I think this is particularly important in the intellectual conversion section.

At the end of the section "Conversion and the School," I wonder if there might be examples of the dangers of not complementing scientific knowledge with self knowledge that are more relatable than those you offer? It might be easy for someone to think that they would never end up in such extreme positions, and thus the need to deeply consider and ensure an integrated approach to learning is not as relevant or pressing.

From the introduction of the paper, I thought that the application of Lonergan's work would be to compare religious education and other disciplines (or the sciences). Most of the section of the paper where you apply Lonergan's work is how religious education can and should be taught. I think this is excellent and strong, and I would appreciate some clarity in the introduction that that is what is to come - I would have been even more eager to read the paper! I also think the links

to Lonergan's work could be strengthened in this section. It feels like Lonergan is less present here than in other parts of the paper. For instance, in speaking about how a Catholic school remains true to Catholicism and its evangelistic role while also being inclusive of people of other faiths, how might Lonergan see that and understand it?

When you reference anonymous Christians, is there a reason you don't also cite Rahner there? It would seem appropriate given that you cite him in the above sections.

Your writing about how teachers create space for students to find themselves in what they are learning and sites for conversation is excellent. Thank you for this interesting and thoughtful contribution!