

would be welcome. The four authors all tend to assume a dichotomy between 'Irish' and 'English' intellectual traditions that did not exist: the name of Bede hardly occurs. The important essay by Bischoff is a very much more considerable piece of work and it is good to have it in English. There is a curious error to the effect that Benedict Biscop lived for years with Arch-

bishop Theodore—unless one thinks a two-year period is properly so described—that looks very like a translator's error but is in fact what the German text says. Still the fault is venial: this is a very good essay. The book is nasty to look at but very cheap for these days.

ERIC JOHN

ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AND STATE by S.T. Coleridge, edited by John Colmer. *Routledge & Kegan Paul*, 1976. pp. lxxviii + 303 No price

The Collected Works of Coleridge, sponsored by the Bollingen Foundation, is an enterprise of scholarship on the grand scale. The sixth volume (of thirteen) to appear is *Church and State*. The actual text is preceded by 68 pages of introductory material, accompanied by detailed editorial footnotes, and followed by six appendices; the index takes up pages 239 to 303. In general, the extremely high standard of printing and pleasing presentation of the previous volumes is maintained, though there are occasional printing errors (e.g. on pages xxix, lxii, 99) and some irritations: for example, Coleridge's Greek quotations have been 'silently' corrected 'where appropriate' (a dubious practice where Coleridge, above all, is concerned) and, less forgivably, Eliot's *Notes* is mis-titled twice.

But more interesting than such minor blemishes is a larger problem about the role of such scholarship. The editorial apparatus has four main purposes: to trace Coleridge's sources; to relate the text to Coleridge's other writings, even citing his uses elsewhere of individual phrases; to provide some background to the events which prompted the appearance of *Church and State* (the constitutional debate centred on the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829); and to trace the influence of the work on later thinkers. In all these areas, John Colmer does a predictably competent job.

But there are dangers involved. A minor one is an air of constant objectivity which is occasionally inappropriate or misleading: e.g. a footnote credits *all* Roman Catholics ('still') with an interpretation of 1 Cor. 3:15 (p. 106n), while another is, at least, tactless in its formulation concerning the same religious body: 'Joseph Blanco White described the evil effects of the Roman Catholic religious system on

the innocence and sanctity of the female mind in *Practical and Internal Evidence Against Catholicism*, chap. 5' (p.123n)—one might compare this with the formulation 'Ridley was burned for his supposedly heretical views' (p. 142n) and detect a certain bias. But the Blanco White example is in fact symptomatic of a deeper flaw: in that case, Colmer has clearly adopted a phrase of Coleridge as his own editorial statement, thereby allowing no distancing from Coleridge which might turn into critique. On more important issues, a similar encapsulation within Coleridge's thought occurs negatively, by editorial silence. For example, Coleridge's argument concerning the kind of appeal to be made to Irish Catholics to support the British Constitution rests upon a presumption that Irishmen *are* British and that Ireland is rightly to be governed under that Constitution; one would welcome at least an editorial reference to the history of this dubious notion; all that is offered are footnotes elucidating specific historical allusions in Coleridge's text. When Coleridge embarks on more general historical arguments and theses (e.g. about Henry VIII and monasteries), no footnote cites historical works which might guide the reader in judging Coleridge's interpretation of history. What is apparent here is an attitude to the text which sees it first and foremost as a text *by Coleridge*, to be read alongside other texts by Coleridge, *not* as a work to be read and quarrelled with as an attempt at political theory, historical interpretation and political intervention—a work to be *judged* in those terms. On one of the few occasions when Colmer does challenge Coleridge, the result seems bizarre: a passage which indignantly sketches the decline of education into utilitarian instruction receives a footnote: 'The main issue, which Coleridge

does not face here or elsewhere in *C&S*, was not between religious and secular education, but the voluntary principle' (p. 61n). Colmer's own concerns may be apparent here, since elsewhere he remarks: 'The central problem for Coleridge, as it is for us today, is what is the Church's role in a pluralist society?' (p. xxxv). I doubt if these were, or are, the 'main issue' or 'central problem' which might induce one to read *Church and State* today. But, fairly obviously, this edition is not really intended for those who want to read Coleridge; it is for those whose 'central problem' is Coleridge himself, his sources and influence, but more especially the relation of each of his works to every other. And insofar as I share that fascination I, too, shall await the other volumes—particularly volume 15, the never-to-be-completed *Opus Maximum*. But I suspect that in celebrating this Coleridge, the *Collected Works* is in considerable danger of completely and finally encapsulating him.

Nevertheless, one can still be provoked

DOMINIQUE ET SES PRECHEURS, by M. H. Vicaire. Editions Universitaires, *Fribourg/Du Cerf*. Paris. 1977 pp. xxxix and 444. FF 94.

This collection of articles by Fr Vicaire was compiled by his friends and colleagues in honour of his seventieth birthday, and is prefaced by a congratulatory 'presentation' by M. D. Chenu. It consists mainly of material already published elsewhere (including nine articles from *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*), but there are three completely new pieces, and one which has been seriously reworked for the occasion. There is also a complete bibliography of Vicaire's writings.

There can be no doubt that Vicaire is the giant of modern Dominican historiography, and the publication of this volume is wholeheartedly to be welcomed. Many important studies will become more widely known and accessible, such as the meticulous demonstration that the long tradition of belief that St Dominic was an inquisitor rests on thoroughly unreliable evidence, and that there is no justification either for the contention that he was, if not an official inquisitor, nevertheless filled with a 'zele precocement inquisitorial'. Also reprinted here are two articles showing the role of Dominic and the Dominicans in establishing a chair of

by *Church and State* into reconsidering the relation of the religious and educational apparatuses to the State; one can also recognise that few, if any, of the works that have so far appeared about the current struggles of the Irish for 'emancipation' (or that other 'constitutional' issue, the EEC) will be worth reprinting in 150 years time; and we still have something to learn from Coleridge about the differences between theoretical thought and empiricism. But that may be simply to say that England is seriously lacking in a tradition of political theory; it is our poets whose works we edit in lavish format, not our political philosophers. But if we are to read *Church and State* at all, we should perhaps remember that in the margins of the copy he presented to James Gillman, Coleridge wrote a ten-page letter; faced with the beautiful Bollingen edition one is unlikely to so desecrate it. Luckily, John Barrell's *Everyman* edition is also available, in paperback, ready to be scribbled on.

BERNARD SHARRATT

theology at Toulouse; and a fascinating account of the financing of the Jacobins in that city (which shows how untrue it is to claim that the friars had no popular backing there). There are two articles, one of them new, on the 'demography' of the Order in France in the thirteenth century. It is in meticulous work of this kind that Vicaire is at his best, and has placed us all deeply in his debt.

Apart from the seriously historical articles (of which I have only mentioned a few), there are some more 'homiletic' contributions, where Vicaire seems more concerned to make a point than to analyse and order historical evidence. Here I find him sometimes very moving (as in the excellent article on the nature and inspiration of early Dominican mendicant poverty, which is on the whole well documented and uses the important and massive publications of M. Mollat on poverty); but I also find him rather inexact at times. The previously unpublished article on 'charismatic prayer in the middle ages', though full of beautiful material, is unconvincing, chiefly because of an unclarity about quite what is supposed to be dem-