

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-

onstrated. The article on the spirit of St Dominic misquotes sometimes in rather a cavalier fashion. Throughout the book there is a constant reference to the centrality of preaching in the Dominican ideal, which is, paradoxically, more unusual than it ought to be in writers on Dominican spirituality; but I am not convinced as Vicaire is that we can describe St Dominic's achievement in terms of a harmonious weaving together of the cenobitic, canonical tradition of *vita apostolica* with the itinerant preachers' *regula apostolica*. Humbert and Bromyard both give evidence of a continuing tension between these two elements which are plainly both present in the Order; for that matter, the same tension underlies the conflict between Jandel and Lacordaire in the nineteenth century and the dispute in our own century as to whether or not preaching could legitimately be held to be the proper *telos* of the Order's life. Vicaire seems to me too keen to keep St Dominic as a canon, even if a canon with extra elements added. But Dominic the preacher was not just a supplemented version of Dominic the canon, he was a new creature; the subordination of the Acts 4 tradition to the Matthew 10 tradition (evident in St Thomas' defense of the medicants) leads to very different results from Peter Damian's absorption of Matthew 10 into Acts 4.

Vicaire rightly stresses that an essential element in the Dominican preaching was the fact that they had a canonical mandate. But he is surely not right to infer from the terms of the papal confirmation of the Order that the friars received a mandate simply by virtue of their Dominican religious profession. It is apparent from the Order's early legislative documents that they regarded it as the job of the Order to give a mandate to its members (witness the Primitive Constitutions II 20; 31, or II 12 in Raymond's Constitutions; also Acts of the General Chapter of 1235 and 1236). That it could give such a mandate to its members without further reference to any other ecclesiastical authority is, of course, novel and important.

Vicaire even goes so far as to maintain that the members of the lay Order of Penance set up by Munio in 1285 shared in

the Order's mandate to preach. This is unconvincing. Vicaire's view depends, first, on his belief that Dominican profession of itself conferred a mandate to preach, against which I have already argued. And secondly he draws our attention to the differences between Munio's Rule and the Franciscan Rule drawn up by Claro in 1284. It is certainly an important and original feature of Munio's Rule that he takes the Dominican laity directly under his own jurisdiction, but this does not involve any automatic conferring of a mandate to preach. Vicaire's further claim that the Dominican Rule substitutes spiritual works of mercy for corporal amounts to very little in fact, as neither Rule specifies any works of mercy at all, spiritual or corporal.

The fascinating article on the image of St Dominic for his brethren in the 13th century (previously unpublished) piously understates the first Dominicans' neglect of St Dominic's tomb (of which Jordan complains, Lib. 123-4), and overstates the way in which the figure of Dominic was mediated by the Constitutions. Although obviously Dominic was important for the early *inspiration of the Order*, he was not a 'model for preachers' (Jordan effectively rejects the idea of *imitatio Domini*—Lib. 109 envisages only a rough and ready following in Dominic's footsteps); the relationship between the image of Dominic and the Dominicans is quite unlike that between the image of Francis and the Franciscans. It is an important piece of evidence about the primitive Dominican spirit that the friars could and did dissent from and neglect Dominic.

There are, then, some points on which I do not find Vicaire convincing; but even in disagreement, one cannot but be aware of how much we owe to him and his work. If we sometimes think we can see further or more clearly than he does, it is largely because we are standing on his shoulders. This new publication is a worthy tribute to a great scholar, and it is the reviewer's privilege to add his voice to the chorus of congratulation.

SIMON TUGWELL, O.P.