

clergy formation. As Prof. Riley-Smith puts it, 'One might add that there is little point in apologizing for something if you do not know what it is' (p. 10). Above all, they present a trustworthy, expert treatment of their subjects, and while one might disagree with particulars, one cannot deny that they are trying to present a truthful account and an authentic analysis, adhering to the canons of academic historical research.

NEIL FERGUSON OP

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN by James Arthur and Guy Nicholls, (*Continuum: London, 2007*). Pp. xii+230, £75.00 hbk.

When searching for a profound quote concerning the nature of higher education, the writings of John Henry Newman provide ample offerings. Appeals to Newman's writings are often made to justify efforts in higher education ranging from the liberal education to moral education. However, beneath the surface of scholarly appeals to Newman's writings resides what one might best assess as a non-contextual understanding. More simply stated, scholars often remove Newman's writings from their context in order to serve an end otherwise unforeseen by Newman himself. Perhaps Newman's writings possess such a sense of authority that their potency is present regardless of context. Perhaps our collective ignorance of Newman's writings is such that most usage out of context go unnoticed. Regardless, James Arthur and Guy Nicholls' *John Henry Newman* stands as an attempt to not only increase our understanding of the larger context surrounding Newman's writings on education but also to serve as a corrective against impressions which might suggest that such a context does not exist.

One possible reason for the non-contextual usage of Newman's writings on education is that approximately half a century has passed since an introduction, such as the one offered by Arthur and Nicholls, has found its way into print. Arthur and Nicholls point to A. Dwight Culler's *The Imperial Intellect: A Study of Cardinal Newman's Educational Ideal* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1955) as the most recent example of such a work. As a result, Arthur and Nicholls propose that '[a] review of [Newman's] entire *oeuvre* is overdue' and thus seek to recapture the sense of context surrounding Newman's writings on education which is now in danger of being lost (p. 1). Central to their effort, Arthur and Nicholls note that 'beneath the diversity of his educational projects there lay a single aim. Newman was above all a pastor who cared for the souls of those whom God had put in his personal charge.' All of Newman's educational works were pastoral (p. 1). This emphasis on the pastoral context allows Guy and Nicholls to offer more than a simple introduction. In contrast, they propose a corrective to the non-contextual impressions offered by a number of scholars.

For example, one such corrective that Arthur and Nicholls offer is that Newman was not simply interested in higher education but education as a whole. The popularity of Newman's *The Idea of a University* led a number of scholars to assume that the sole focus of Newman's interest in terms of education was higher education. A second example of such a corrective is that Newman was interested in professional education as well as liberal education. While Arthur and Nicholls even go so far as to argue that Newman saw a deep connection between the two, defenders of liberal education often leave their audience thinking Newman was only interested in liberal education. Finally, they correct the impression that liberal and professional education are in any way separate and distinct from moral education. As a result, Arthur and Nicholls state that Newman claims 'man still has a most important faculty of the mind and will which, when

properly guided and used, remains within him to assist his recovery from the confusing effects of the fall. This faculty he [Newman] identifies as *conscience*' (p. 93).

In order to offer this overview and these correctives in relation to Newman's work on education, Arthur and Nicholls divide their effort into three parts. The first part of the book includes a chapter that offers a select biography concerning Newman's life – details related to the development of his thought on education being the ones which receive the greatest emphasis. The second and longest of the three parts offers a formal exposition of Newman's writings. Arthur and Nicholls open with a chapter on the religious character of Newman's thought and then chapters concerning moral, liberal, and professional education. In part three, they conclude by detailing the challenge that a corrected understanding of Newman's thought offers to education as it exists today. One could argue that the heart of Arthur and Nicholls book is the chapter found in the second part of their book that assesses Newman's religious character. By placing this material near the front of their book, one is able to see that the integrative impulse embedded in Newman's thought is driven by his faith. As a result, distinctions between efforts such as liberal and professional education are merely organizational and thus are also more artificial than real.

To advance their argument concerning Newman's approach to education, Arthur and Nicholls draw heavily on primary sources, using many of Newman's own writings to outline his educational philosophy. Perhaps most interesting is the inclusion of two of Newman's sermons which were previously unpublished. These sermons, in combination with other primary sources, truly usher the reader into Newman's thought. In addition, a number of secondary sources are incorporated to create a narrative detailing Newman's life, work, and thus his approach to education. Surprisingly, a sustained critical dialogue with these secondary sources is lacking in places – particularly sources which perhaps contribute to this non-contextual understanding the authors work so hard to correct. If the arguments offered in the book are at some level intended to correct several existing interpretations of Newman, the authors do not clearly identify their opponents. For example, a sustained dialogue with Frank Turner's scholarly work on Newman might prove to be helpful. Turner's essay in his edition of Newman's *The Idea of a University* (Yale University Press, 1996) leaves one with the impression that the Church and Newman's calling to serve the Church as a pastor prove to be unnecessary interpretive frameworks. Arthur and Nicholls correct this impression but offer little indication of the origins of such fallacies.

Although further details may have helped us to appreciate the corrective impulse which is so deeply woven into James Arthur and Guy Nicholls' *John Henry Newman*, this book will prove to be essential reading for anyone conducting research on Newman's educational thought. Anyone willing to spend time with their text will not only be impressed by the level of detail they employ in relation to Newman's writings but also how such writings are cast in the larger context of Newman's Christian faith. In our secular age, religion is too often overlooked as a possible driving force in the lives of individuals who lived in previous ages. The question concerning Newman is not whether he was a person of deep faith, but how that faith serves as an integrative impulse in relation to efforts he held dear, such as education. Overlooking such a context only allows a host of false impressions to accumulate. Arthur and Nicholls are to be commended for their efforts to correct such errors while offering a more charitable and accurate understanding of Newman's own understanding of education.

TODD C. REAM & BRIAN C. CLARK