

It is not an easy matter to determine from this volume upon what principle Professor Smart and his fellow editors were proceeding at the assemblage of contributions to their three-volume history. The opening piece on Coleridge in this set of nine is followed first by a clutch concerned with individuals as the chiefest men of some religious grouping, Emerson among the Transcendentalists, for example, and Newman among the Tractarians, and then by another clutch which have no protagonist, 'Russian Religious Thought', for example, and 'British Agnosticism', the ninth piece returns to the older fashion of acknowledging individuals with a commemoration of William James and Josiah Royce.

These are separate pieces. The concurrence of one with another, in the unjust assessment of Paley made by Professor Welch of Berkeley in the Coleridge essay and by Professor Cameron of Toronto in the Newman, for example, is evidently fortuitous. Professor Livingston of William and Mary, treating british agnostics, alone has attempted to place his topic among the others, and he contents himself with less than half-a-dozen parenthetical instructions in the shortest form: '(see Ch. 8, 'The British Idealists') is a paradigm here. The editors themselves have allowed to pass un-noted by cross-reference the interesting circumstance that while Dr Reardon of Newcastle suggests we look to Mohler's *Symbolik* for notions akin to Newman's idea of development, Dr. Burtchæll of Notre Dame has, in his essay on the Catholics of Tübingen, fixed upon von Drey as likest Newman in this matter.

That editorial refusal to inform the volume with a cohering view of nineteenth-century intellectual history is repeated by the essayists within their individual contributions. They usually present a straightforward account of what their people were writing, eschewing analysis, defence, or attack. Perhaps not every one of them was wholly content in this. Professor Welch, for example, is constrained to register a scholarly demur by the use of inverted commas even while completing a bow to majority opinion. F.D. Maurice is here termed, on p. 1, Coleridge's 'most famous "disciple"', and, on p. 24, at the close of this essay, without much intervening discussion of the justice of such fame, his 'greatest "disciple"'. Perhaps, having been allotted modest word-lengths, the essayists modestly decided to give what space they had to their prime subjects. Word-length considerations may be surfacing when Professor Livingston is habitually shortening James FitzJames Stephen's name, and lumping him with his most distinguished brother, who entertained a quite different notion of our life, as 'the Stephens'. If space has indeed been so limited, the editors might better have persuaded each other to drop the trivial russian piece and the interesting but irrelevant piece on british idealists. A reader who is prepared to pay £30.00 for this volume is likely to be expecting more than competent expositions.

There are hints that the essayists could have managed more. In the midst of a review of New Englanders, Ahlstrom recalls himself to his mutttons by the remark, 'This is not the place to develop a general theory of the Catholicizing tendency'. Professor J.E. Smith of Yale livens things a little when he risks what he terms a 'succinct' comparison of the thoughts of James and Royce at the very close of the volume. And there is even a moment of near-irrelevant impishness in Dr Burtchell's quick observation of 'that quality which German universities possess and Italian armies lack: a willingness to follow a leader'. What could have been done is shewn in Professor James Cameron's essay on 'John Henry Newman and the Tractarian Movement'.

Despite his unsympathetic reference to Paley, despite his too uncritical acceptance of Newman's account of the lutheran *sola fide* and *semper peccator, semper justus*, and despite, again, his elevation of Solovyev to a status with Pascal and Kierkegaard, Professor Cameron has composed an essay of enlightening and enlarging power. Joseph of Arimathea, Augustine, Hooker, Fénelon, Benjamin Franklin and Wittgenstein are drawn 196

into the civilizing conversation he conducts with the reader, *Measure for Measure*, *Praeterita*, and *Mein Kampf* are alleged in his attempt to make available what is going on in Tractarian writing. Professor Cameron sets out on the complex and sensitive task of elucidating the *ethos* of Newman and other members of the movement. 'We may take *ethos* here as signifying "disposition", "temper", "moral nature", "character", even "sensibility", all of them belonging to a particular circle of friends and fellow-labourers'. Newman's reverence for bishops, Pusey's gift of tears at parting, Keble's writing verse in the manner of a minor Wordsworth, are given a shared context. Professor Cameron shows that Tractarianism was in many ways 'an enlarging influence upon English Christianity'. Not only, it is to be noticed, upon the Anglican Church. 'This *ethos* survived in the little Oratorian community at Birmingham'. Well, for a while, perhaps; as Professor Cameron notes, 'the sharing of a common *ethos* is a precarious mutable thing'.

Properly, Professor Cameron would have us attend to Newman more than to the rest. There's no mention here of Hurrell Froude's dunking his younger brother head-down in a stream to make a man of him. But, then, every movement has its oaf. More significantly, he would have us realize, as we come from *The Christian Year*, that the autopsychographic wonder of the *Apologia* is most properly put alongside *The Prelude*. In attending to Newman, whichever of his works we take up to read, we have ourselves to engage with the large questions of the relation of orthodoxy and right morality, of the necessity of doctrinal formulas, of the peculiar character of religious language. In this essay, most acceptably, paraphrase is substituted by a nice enthusiasm. 'He was not the most learned of the Oxford leaders; simply as a scholar he was never in the same class as Pusey. But he was the greatest mind the movement had, the most fascinating person, and a writer of genius'.

This is a lengthy essay, and it might be objected, since Newman is a special case, and since the Tractarian *ethos* so little intellectual, and contributing less to nineteenth-century religious thought than, say, the work of those who had parts in *Essays and Reviews*, that the editors have here, again, forgotten their responsibilities to the buyer. But to cavil at scope being given for the best thing in the volume would indeed be ungracious.

HAMISH F.G. SWANSTON

LAW IN PAUL'S THOUGHT BY Hans Hübner, T & T Clark. 1984. pp. xi + 186. £10.95.

The appearance of this book in English in 1984 is a bit like having the soup course after the dessert. Its fundamental thesis, and its fundamental pre-suppositions, have already been discussed at considerable length by E.P. Sanders in *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, 1983 (American edition) and by H. Räisänen in *Paul and the Law*, 1983, and though Hübner is aware of this, and appends a discussion of both books, it is a very brief discussion indeed and barely touches some of the most important matters. Nevertheless the appearance of Hübner's book must be warmly welcomed in its English dress (the original German edition came out in 1978), for two closely connected reasons. First, we can now see at first hand, if we do not read German, the thesis against which both Sanders and Räisänen reacted. Secondly, at a time when the whole question of Paul and the Law has become so controversial, and then the exegesis of almost every Pauline statement on the subject has become contested, it is valuable to have what is at root a traditionally Lutheran exposition of the matter, whether in the end we find it convincing or not. The only real regret is that the presentation of his case is so obscurely put, at least much of the time. It would have helped greatly if succinct summaries of his position in the manner of Sanders could have been inserted more often.

The intricacy of his case defies over-brief statement, but put baldly it is that in Galatians Paul simply envisages the abolition of the Law, so far as Christians are concerned, and the main reason for this is that as living by the Law means living by it totally, with every last bit of it being observed, and as no one can manage to do this,