

all artefacts are works of art' (my italics, and so throughout), and a little later that it is 'the first duty of every critic to make a selection from the products of literature, painting, music, sculpture, etc., of those which are art and those which only *pretend* to be so, or it may be do not even pretend. Every critic does this and differs from the layman only in that the critic usually holds that what he personally prefers is art, whereas the layman is more prone to *admit* that there are some things which may be art although they displease him or he finds them tedious.' But if the view expressed on page 43 is correct it would make no sense to admit that something *might* be a work of art. If it is up to anyone to decide how he is going to use the words, if he can't be right or wrong, then such doubts can have no place. One has only to decide whether the artefact has the required characteristics for the matter to be settled.

It is not difficult to see why the author wants to have it both ways. He wants to say on the one hand merely 'This is all that the dispute between rival theories amounts to, a decision to use words differently in the light of some preferred characteristics. What they ought to do is to decide to use these words in one way and then go on to apply them consistently with a clear knowledge of what this piece of legislation entails.' And on the other hand he wants to criticize these theories as inadequate, he wants to say that they fail to yield a true and definitive account of what it is for something to be a work of art. Thus he argues that certain realist theories are concerned with what are *really* non-aesthetic qualities of a work of art. But how can this be so if it is up to the critic to *say* what he is going to call the aesthetic qualities of a work of art?

This ambiguity of treatment vitiates much of Mr Osborne's *criticism* but it does allow for a fairly full and often exact *description* of a particular theory. It is here that I find the book most valuable, for whatever one thinks of his criticism, his concern to discover what a particular theory entails does make his book a valuable contribution to the understanding of such theories. Where the book moves into critical and speculative philosophizing one can only continue to lament the fact that so much admirable exegesis is not combined with a more positive and commanding philosophical insight. Had this been so there is no doubt that Mr Osborne's book would have been a most important contribution to the philosophy of art.

H. S. EVELING

INTERPRETING PAUL'S GOSPEL. By A. M. Hunter. (S.C.M. Press; 10s. 6d.)

To say that a new sense of the 'need for religion' has arisen since the war is already a commonplace. Religious writers and speakers have

become increasingly aware that they are addressing a changed and unwontedly attentive audience, a generation whose self-confidence has suddenly collapsed under the impact of the recent disasters, to be replaced very often by bewilderment and fear and a deep realization of human inadequacy. In his latest book Dr Hunter seeks to respond to this newly awakened sense of need by re-stating the message of St Paul in contemporary terms; for 'If we rightly understand ourselves, our problems are the problems of Paul'. (p. 14.)

It has clearly to be recognized that his explanation of what St Paul's message is, derives consistently and unmistakably from the Protestant and Lutheran tradition. Thus, 'It is the heart of the Gospel that God makes . . . right standing available on the sole condition of man's faith, through the redemptive work of Christ.' (p. 86.) 'The truly Pauline meaning (of faith) is utter trust—trust with a strong element of obedience . . . opposed to "works", i.e. every doctrine of redemption by human effort . . . in Luther's figure, the Christian's wedding-ring'. (p. 32ff.) Again, '*Dikaioo* means not "make righteous" but "declare righteous" or "set right"' (p. 26). In other words we are here presented with the doctrines of *sola-fides* and 'imputation of righteousness' both of which were explicitly condemned at the council of Trent. In fact the whole emphasis of the book is Protestant, and one vital point after another is interpreted in the irreconcilably Protestant sense, the sense which Catholics cannot and do not accept.

It would be a mistake however to infer from this that Dr Hunter has nothing to offer to Catholics. On the contrary, one feels greatly indebted to him for two reasons. The first is that he makes a really excellent presentation of the general scope and sequence of St Paul's thought. He has a remarkable gift for assembling the relevant material skilfully, and presenting it in a concise and concrete form, while remaining throughout in close contact with the original text. For example his treatment of the key concept of Salvation under the three headings of Past, Present, and Future strikes one as thoroughly successful, because thoroughly true to the general development of the thought of St Paul himself.

Secondly one is grateful for the author's acute awareness of, and sympathy with, the spiritual darkness and insecurity of so many of his contemporaries. For these reasons the book is by no means without value even for those who cannot accept many of the author's doctrinal interpretations. Yet the abiding impression it leaves on a Catholic mind is one of great sadness that one so evidently learned and sincere should have interpreted St Paul in a sense so widely different from that which the Catholic faith teaches to be true.

JOSEPH BOURKE, O.P.