

day can we profit fully from the labours of our fathers in historical work.

The Fourth important point Chadwick makes is that Marx's view that religion is for the oppressed the heart of a heartless world, a necessary opiate for the exploited, seems to have very little to be said for it. No doubt the bourgeoisie wished, for discreditable reasons, that the workers were more religious; the fact is that many of the middle classes were genuinely religious, the workers in the great cities on the whole were not. The worker 'felt part of a class, distinguished from other classes in society. But he hardly used God to comfort himself. For he hardly used God' (p. 102). Some proletarians were of course fervent Christians, e.g. the Primitive Methodists of the West Riding. This was not always a source of comfort to the millowners. The opiate of the French workers was anti-clericalism rather than religion. Down to the day before yesterday the Radical Socialists could always divert the workers' organisations from the pursuit of their interests by crying out: *Cléricalisme, c'est l'ennemi*.

Finally, Chadwick says something about the word secularisation itself. It begins as an emotive word: it means either the triumph of intellectual light over the darkness of superstition; or it represents a sense of doom: Jerusalem is laid waste and the prophets are killed. Nevertheless, we must strive to see it as an objective process. Chadwick attempts a definition: 'the relation (whatever that is, which can only be known by historical enquiry) in

which modern European civilisation and society stands to the Christian elements of its past and the continuing Christian elements of its present' (p. 264).

He sees as an apt emblem of the to and fro movement of the European mind in relation to the Christian religion and its institutions the fluctuations in use of the Panthéon in Paris. It started out a church dedicated as a thank-offering by Louis XV for recovery from illness but was in the end financed out of the proceeds of state lotteries and was given a different use with every revolution from 1789 onwards. Now it is cold and empty, 'a national laicized memorial'. Comte had the mad but endearing idea of putting under the dome a statue of a mother and child—'Humanity caring'. Chadwick comments: 'What the later nineteenth century seemed to show was that no new Madonna would serve; that (if you did not want a museum or a car park) the only image which would serve was the former little child, at the breast of the former Madonna; understood in a new way, surrounded now not only by a fresco of St Geneviève but by an unprofaned Voltaire as well as an unprofaned Fénelon. Once the human race has an experience which it has found to be in part authentic, it does not let go' (p. 265).

This Gifford Lecturer knows how to instruct and delight, and does both in this book. I strongly recommend it to believers and to unbelievers; it purges and nourishes and tastes good as well.

J M CAMERON

THE TUBINGEN SCHOOL, by Horton Harris. *Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1975.* 288 pp. £9.50.

Dr Harris has now completed the second instalment of his trilogy. Strauss has been. Ritschl is to come. And here is what, in italic print and on his first page, he terms '*the most important theological event in the whole history of theology from the Reformation to the present day*'. He has assembled biographical material for eight theologians whom, oddly assorted though they are, he reckons together as the Tübingen School. After separate sections on each, he presents a more general description and evaluation of their combined achievement.

Dr Harris discerns the beginnings of the School in the publication of Strauss's *Life of Jesus* in 1835, which, in its denial of the miraculous element in Christianity, constituted a declaration of the irreconcilability of conservative and liberal notions of a theologian's work. Dr Harris has already written about Strauss (cf. my review-article in this journal, October, 1974, pp. 470-476); in this book he now attends to those who seemed to their pietist contemporaries to be sharers in Strauss's wickedness. The great man of the School, F. C. Baur, had, indeed, taught Strauss, but he was not popu-

larly associated with the heretic until he himself published, also in 1835, what seemed the more dangerous because the more covertly atheist book, *Christian Gnosticism*. Baur's eminence among the young liberal lecturers from the several faculties at Tübingen who met for donnish talk and students singing at the nightly convivialities of the 'Neckar Tyranny' led to the formation of a distinct School of theological, philosophical and political dissent. The young men founded their own journals of theology and politics, published an astonishing number of important historical works, and made their own enemies. And they shared into middle-age the frustrations of being denied university jobs appropriate to their scholarly accomplishments. Dr Harris suggests that the dissolution of the group began when, in 1847, Zeller, who was later to be the most honoured theologian of his time, went off to Bern, Schwegler abandoned theological studies, and one of the young drinkers could lament 'we see one another at midday for coffee but not otherwise'. Of the School's ending it is safe to say with Dr Harris that it 'died with its head' in 1860.

Talk of the scandal of Vischer's inaugural lecture, of Zeller's broken engagement with the serious Bertha, of Volkmar's difficulty in persuading the Zurich university librarians that Tischendorf's edition of the New Testament was not too dangerous a volume for their shelves, or even of Ritschl's estrangement from Baur, does not, however, warrant a man's paying out £9.50 unless such pleasantries are managed within a careful demonstration that Vischer and the rest are truly significant in the history of nineteenth century learning. It is evident that Dr Harris, having put together his biographical notes, found it difficult to demonstrate this significance. Previous writers, Mackay, for example, in his *Tübingen School and its Antecedents*, 1863, or Berger in his *F. C. Baur: les origines de l'école de Tübingen et ses principes*, 1826-1844, were, says Dr Harris, unable to appreciate 'how dramatically the Tübingen investigations had changed the whole course of Biblical criticism'. I take a greater delight in Mackay's account because that author does at least have a view of the place of the Tübingen men in a tradition of theological scholarship: it may be that Berger's work is less satisfactory, but if he did not notice that within a generation 'every other theo-

logical direction, be it conservative or mediating, Lutheran or Reformed, was compelled to take issue one way or another with the Tübingen School, and to defend its own position', then it may be that the changes resulting from the School's activities were not so dramatic as Dr Harris thinks.

The distinguishing challenge of the School was, Dr Harris states, 'the principle of a purely historical interpretation of the Bible'. Samler, Eichhorn, and Schleiermacher were before Baur as historical critics of scripture, so the distinction of the School must consist in the purity of its historical method. Dr Harris has adopted the stance of Lipsius who wrote, in an 1860 letter to Baur, that it was 'the purely historical interpretation', that is, 'that interpretation which *excludes* the absolute miracle' which sets the School apart from others. Dr Harris points out with some relish that the refusal of historical value to any narrative which includes miracle stories itself necessarily prevented the achievement of that presuppositionless investigation for which the School laboured. This is a matter whose discussion, with others, would require, as Dr Harris says, 'a voluminous work running into many hundreds of pages', while some half of his own pages are committed, as he again says, to some 'rather meagre' material, so that 'in some parts the content may appear rather thin'.

Certainly the material of the biographical sections is sometimes thin, and even more often unpleasant. Dr Harris is full of snide remarks about each of his subjects. Karl Planck, uncle of the famous Max, is said to have been 'best known for his extremely complex philosophical system which no one but he was ever able to understand'; Higenfeld is said to have 'waged an unceasing struggle to obtain a professorial chair', and to have engaged his remaining energies in 'a crusade for truth', or rather, 'the truth at any rate as he himself saw it': Zeller, it is suggested, seemed to Strauss well able 'to conceal carefully the less attractive features of Schwegler's life and personality', but that quick killing of two reputations with one sneer proves on investigation a falsification of Strauss's remark, for he was actually congratulating Zeller on making a lively biography by his skilful weaving of anecdotes and letters so that 'you have indeed portrayed the man just as he was'; Volkmar is less the victim than the occasion when Dr Harris says

that Strauss remarked that 'there was method in his madness', for the literate Strauss seems in his letter to have avoided that misquotation; none, however, is so delicately downed as Köstlin who is introduced as 'the least interesting member of the Tübingen School'.

Dr Harris comes at last to recognise that he is not much interested in any but one member of the School. When he comes to evaluating the School's writings he suggests that 'to describe all the by-ways taken would lead us too far afield, and we shall, therefore, confine ourselves to the main features of Baur's own total view, which formed the basis of the original Tübingen perspective'. Much of the material in the previous sections is thus rendered not only meagre but irrelevant. And it soon appears that Dr Harris dislikes Baur at least as much as he does the rest of them. His quick run through theological works of intricate argument and scholarly precision leads him only to moralising impertinences. Of Baur's urgent desire to find some way of interpreting every scrap of evidence so that he would be able to bring about a total view of the early church's historical condition, Dr Harris shortly allows 'In this desire he was right'. He then states equally baldly that 'Baur chose the wrong total view'. This is too fast a way with a most complex matter. And too fast a way with a theologian who realised its complexity. Certainly few today would hold with Baur's conviction that *Actis*

was a second century attempt to reconcile Pauline and Jewish-Christian parties in the Church by a re-writing of the history of disputes which had been for so long violent between them. But there cannot be all that many more who would think Sir William Ramsey the most satisfactory instructor in how the New Testament documents are to be read. Dr Harris approves of Ramsey because, having once been enthusiastic for Tübingen theories, he came to appreciate 'the traditional beliefs of the Church'. Dr Harris employs this phrase and others like it whenever he would make a value judgement on a theologian's work, but, in company with most who delight in such accounts of orthodoxy, he rarely comes anywhere near defining the content of his phrases. He is quite plain, however, in his statements about those who do not observe the traditions. Baur not only chose 'the wrong view' but 'spent the rest of his life distorting the evidence in order to maintain it'. He became blameworthy on every score. At their quarrel Ritschl simply abandoned the Tübingen thesis in a wholly commendable respect for the truth, but Baur, concerned as he was with himself, 'could not but see in Ritschl a younger rival who threatened his whole life's work'.

Not thus are enlightening studies made of great men, but it seems at least that we may expect the third part of Dr Harris's trilogy to be rather more kindly written. That cannot but be a gain. HAMISH F G SWANSTON

ST THOMAS AQUINAS: Summa Theologiae. Vol. xxxviii: Injustice (Ila Ilae Ixiii-lxxix), by Marcus Lefébure, OP. xxiv + 292 pp. £5.50. 1975. Vol. LVI: The Sacraments (III lx-lxv), by David Bourke. xxiv + 168 pp. £3.10. 1975. Blackfriars; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode; New York: McGraw-Hill.

Since, for St Thomas, evil has no existence of itself but is parasitic upon good and every particular evil is a privation or absence of good, Fr Lefébure's edition of the tractate on Injustice needs to be read in conjunction with Fr Gilby's edition of the immediately preceding tractate on Justice. However, this very fact of the negativity of evil means that St Thomas's discussion of the vices of injustice is inevitably a discussion, albeit an indirect one, of the justice of which injustice is a corruption. In Fr Lefébure's words: 'the treatise on injustice constitutes in effect a code of proper behaviour written as it were

in mirror-writing' (p. xvi). And in fact the questions which it contains, dealing as they do with such topics as bodily injury, theft, forensic injustice, defamation, fraud and usury, cover a great deal of the Angelic Doctor's teaching on matters of moral theology. Fr Lefébure, in a concise and penetrating introduction, stresses that for St Thomas man, even on the natural level, has two fundamental characteristics: he is both social and also goal-seeking; and appreciative reference is made to such modern writers as T. H. Green, Dr John Macmurray and Mr Raymond Williams. And, quite apart from the underlying reference to