

SCRUTINY (Sept.): R. Church, G. Davies, C. Dawson, G. Every, M. Oakeshott, O. Stapledon, L. Susan Stebbing and R. H. Tawney contribute a valuable symposium on criticism and politics and on the role of the intellectual above or within the *mêlée*. Professor Tawney's observations come with particular force in view of subsequent events.

SOWER (Oct.): F.H.D. supplies the editorial notes during the absence of the Editor with the army. He finds the 'tragic failure' of intelligence which has resulted in the war 'a sobering thought to those responsible for education.'

TEMPS PRESENT (Sept. 29): Maritain argues: 'il ne s'agit d'une guerre idéologique ni d'une guerre sainte; il s'agit d'une guerre juste,' and shows the vital importance of these distinctions; but disappointingly neglects his hobby-horse, 'le problème des moyens.'

PENGUIN.

REVIEWS

SAINT THOMAS AND THE GREEKS. By Anton C. Pegis. (Marquette University Press, Milwaukee; \$1.00.)

This is the Aquinas Lecture, 1939, delivered under the auspices of the Aristotelean Society of Marquette University; and forms a companion volume to Dr. Mortimer J. Adler's 1938 lecture, *St. Thomas and the Gentiles*. It is a most interesting and valuable paper. Dr. Pegis deprecates the practice of looking at Greek thought simply as 'a predecessor of medieval thought,' because if we give the Greeks 'a meaning as philosophers only in relation to those ideas of which they are predecessors,' we inevitably falsify: 'these same Greek philosophers cannot have such a meaning for themselves.' An illustration of the misunderstandings to which such an historical bias leads is found in the thesis of Professor Arthur Lovejoy, who contends that a metaphysical contradiction, begun by Plato, is carried on through Aristotle and Plotinus to such Christian thinkers as Augustine and Aquinas. The contradiction is fundamental, concerning the nature of God. He is self-sufficient Good; the universe adds nothing to His perfection, and indeed is itself illusion and darkness. On the other hand, since good is self-diffusive, it is a necessity of the divine nature to create it: and to create all possibles, since only through the creation of all possibles is God's goodness exhausted; only so,

indeed, is God really good. Professor Lovejoy discovers this same antinomy in St. Thomas, and supports his thesis by quotation. Dr. Pegis proceeds to resolve the antinomy by showing that it proceeds from a failure to recognize that Plato, or Avicenna, are, as thinkers, inhabitants of different worlds from St. Thomas; that St. Thomas recognized this; and that he was at pains to warn his contemporaries, less critical than he, precisely of the danger of regarding the two worlds as one. 'The Avicennian God acts necessarily, determinately and mediately. The Thomistic God acts intelligently, freely and immediately.' 'Far from conceding that the Greeks or that Avicenna had a doctrine of creation, St. Thomas Aquinas implies that their philosophical views are parts of a coherent total view which is precisely *not* a doctrine of creation. If we call this second doctrine necessitarianism, then we may say that for St. Thomas Aquinas, far from being explanations of the same world, necessitarianism and creationism are really explanations of different worlds.' Hence the thesis of Professor Lovejoy falls to the ground, because 'Professor Lovejoy thinks that the doctrine of creation is common to ancient Greek and medieval Christian thinkers.' There was indeed a real contradiction among some of St. Thomas's contemporaries: the contradiction of thinking that 'they could describe their own world and what went on in it in the way in which the Greeks and the Arabs had described theirs'; St. Thomas, so far from falling into it himself, did his utmost to save his contemporaries from it.

The thesis of Professor Lovejoy is a useful peg; the author's argument is of general, and permanent, value.

GERALD VANN, O.P.

L'HUMANISME POLITIQUE DE SAINT THOMAS. By Louis Lachance, O.P. Two vols. (Recueil Sirey, Paris; Éditions du Levrier, Ottawa; n.p.)

This long exposé of political theory covers a very big field. One special interest lies in the author's hostility to the widely accepted personalist theory, according to which man in so far as he is a person transcends the social order, and in so far as he is an individual of a species, is subject to it. It is here urged that this theory neglects the essential character of political philosophy as a practical rather than a speculative science, and from a purely speculative and abstract starting point carves up the concrete reality in such a way that the authority of the body politic must in effect be stultified. It is the person that is individuated, and actions proceed from the person; hence it is ar-