

pack his rambling, allusive sentences into shorter ones, and to expand his more telegraphic utterances; it was inevitable that the English should have been, as a result longer than the French, though one wonders whether it need have exceeded its length, as it does, by one quarter again. But some of the English is nonsensical, as, for example, '... he is up against a prominent case wherein the language used is "scholastic" in the fullest meaning of the term, and wherein this same language characterizes at once a thought, a method, and means of expression. It is important, therefore, that this case of "scholastic" language be defined on the very grounds of that language which thus equates both method and thought' (p. 100–101). What Chenu actually says, properly translated, is '... The language is pre-eminently "scholastic" in the full sense of this word which thus characterizes thought, method, and means of expression. We must determine what it means at the level of language – a language corresponding

to the thought and method.'

Four pages before (p. 96) we read that the change from the medieval *quaestio* to the later scholastic *thesis* 'is in itself a denunciation of the heinous reversal . . . ' which means almost the opposite of 'bears witness to the heinous reversal' conveyed by the French 'dénonce le renversement . . . ' A page later (p. 103) we are told that 'With the word *pneuma*, we are at the extreme opposite of any religious connotation', where the French simply says that it is found in an opposite sense to its religious one in certain authors. These are egregious errors; lesser ones abound; I am willing to send the publishers a list of 31 mistakes of translation or interpretation in the course of these *seven* pages alone (p. 96–102). And these pages are fairly representative of the rest of the book. It should be said that all this does not make the book unusable; but it certainly cripples its usefulness.

Columba Ryan, O.P.

ST THOMAS AQUINAS: COMMENTARY ON THE NICOMACHEAN ETHICS. Translated by C. I. Litzinger, O.P., 'Library of Living Catholic Thought', Henry Regnery Company, Chicago; 2 vols, n.p.

Aristotle's *Ethics* is still probably the best book ever written on natural virtue as the means to a goodness attainable (in theory at least) by a man who limits his aims to what he can do with his soul and body before death divides them. But the modern humanist who returns to this classic and basic text will find, of course, that Aquinas has been there first, patiently and conscientiously following every turn and nuance of his Greek master's thought. Yet, as in all St Thomas's Aristotelian commentaries, what impresses one most in the end is not so much the dogged persistence as sheer intelligence – the intelligence that triumphed so brilliantly with so meagre an equipment (by post-Renaissance standards) of scholarship.

The Latin version of Aristotle's text, attributed to William of Moerbeke, has been translated as well as the commentary; and both, presumably,

from the Cathala-Spiazzi edition, though this is only stated in respect of the version. Nor is it stated whether, or how far, the Cathala-Spiazzi text has been revised. A feature of the present work distinguishing it from the English versions, published during the past decade or so, of the commentaries on the *De Anima* and the *Physics* is that here an 'Analytical Outline' of each *lectio* is printed in a parallel column alongside the Aristotelian text about to be commented on. It is not obvious that much is gained by this added complication; but future students will be the best judges of this point. Meanwhile it is only just to welcome and warmly recommend a very honest and painstaking work of a Thomist scholarship. It reflects much credit not only on the translator himself but on the American Dominican Province of St Joseph as a whole.

Kenelm Foster, O.P.