

of Ruiz and Hopkins (p. 195-6). Furthermore he enters into the semantics of language in general to illuminate the particular usages employed by the biblical writers. In doing so he incorporates the ideas of certain philologists and students of semantics like Spitzer and Alonso, whose theories he has summarized elsewhere in *CBQ* (1963), pp. 371 ff. Only by this open method of study, our author thinks, can inspiration be understood realistically. Otherwise it becomes some romantic handing down of the divine message ready made.

Schökel's knowledge and understanding of European language and literature is enormous.

The fitness of some comparisons is open to question and the point of relation occasionally superficial. But in a general discussion of this kind that can scarcely be avoided. The book is of special interest to theologians and scriptural students and will help to expand their horizons. But it is clearly intended for a wider audience. Technical discussions are trimmed and the patristic and magisterial references consigned to the footnotes. The frequent excursions into literature—and English writers are well represented—will bring the book within the range of any ordinary reader.

AELRED BAKER, O.S.B.

ST THOMAS AQUINAS: SUMMA THEOLOGIAE. Vol. VIII: Creation, Variety and Evil (la xlix-xlix), Thomas Gilby, O.P. 42s.; Vol. XIX: The Emotions (I. II. xxii-xxx), Eric D'Arcy. 35s. *Blackfriars*; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode; New York: McGraw-Hill.

The treatise on Creation in the *Pars Prima* is, of course, very central to St Thomas's thought; as Fr Gilby says in his Introduction, 'One of St Thomas's original contributions to religious thought is to have developed the truth that creatures wholly dependent on God are also real in themselves'. The treatise on Evil is hardly less central, with its insistence that evil is neither an existent nor a good, but is a defection from good. The theses argued here are particularly congenial to Fr Gilby's racy and often colloquial style, always with the proviso (which, of course, is here fulfilled) that we have the original Latin with which to compare his rendering. The very ample footnotes make up for the comparatively brief Introduction and Appendices. The latter contain welcome translations of the opusculum *De aeternitate mundi* and of the dubious article 3 of question 47 from the codex Monte Cassino 138, though unfortunately without the Latin originals. Appendix I, on Derived Existence, is instructive and illuminating; in commenting on St Thomas's avoidance of the verb *existere* Fr Gilby might have remarked that St Thomas does use the word (as in, e.g., I, Q. 48, 3) when quoting from the Pseudo-Areopagite. Among non-trivial misprints we may note: p. 34, I. 14, *creationem* for *creationem*; p. 142, I. 7, *principiorum* for *principium*. On p. 53, something has gone wrong with II. 25 to 27. On p. 83, I. 25, 'one' should be inserted before

'causal'. On p. 95, I. 14, *res esse distinctae* is not translated. On p. 99, I. 28, should not *optimum* be rendered by 'very good' rather than 'best', so avoiding lining up St Thomas with Leibnitz on the best of all possible worlds? These are, however, comparatively minor points in a very useful volume.

Dr D'Arcy had indeed a difficult task, as he explains in his Introduction, partly because of the lack of unique equivalents in English for the terms of Aristotelian psychology and partly because of St Thomas's close adherence (too close, it is suggested) to physical movement as a model for the emotions or *passiones animae*. There is in fact a very useful, though brief, discussion of the use of models in intellectual enquiry in general. One would have welcomed some attempt to relate the concepts of St Thomas to those of twentieth-century psychology, but one cannot ask for everything and Dr D'Arcy has performed very skilfully a complicated and exacting task.

One general point. Is it really necessary, in these days of high costs, for each volume to contain the same ten pages of general introductory matter? When the series is complete this will add up to 590 pages of repetition, equivalent in bulk to something like three or four additional volumes. Might not this space have been better utilised or, failing that, dispensed with altogether?

E. L. MASCALL

THE LOGIC OF SAINT ANSELM, by Desmond Paul Henry. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1967. 258 pp. 50s.

St Anselm has attracted the attention of British philosophers more than any other medieval writer so far; Dr Henry has published

a translation of his dialogue *De grammatico*, Mr M. Charlesworth a translation of the *Proslogion* and Gaunilo's reply on behalf of the

Fool, while other philosophers are at present engaged in research on Anselm. Dr Henry's new work makes a valuable contribution to Anselmian studies and should enhance Anselm's reputation among British philosophers; it ranges widely over the Anselmian *corpus* and whets the appetite for detailed consideration of continuous texts.

One great virtue of the book is that medieval authors are cited both in Latin and in English translations, printed in parallel columns. The translations are for the most part excellent, though every reviewer will doubtless have some hesitations about certain translations of technical terms. But in general it can be said that the reader who has no Latin will be able to follow the discussion and ought not at any point to be seriously misled by the translation. This is much more than can be said for most books on medieval philosophy. Some sections of the book presuppose familiarity with the logic of Frege and Russell (and with the Polish notation), as well as with Lucasiewicz's formalization of Aristotle's syllogistic; this is not unreasonable in view of the intended audience.

The work effectively begins with Anselm's discussion of paronymy in the *De grammatico* ('When things get their name from something, with a difference of ending, they are called *paronymous*. Thus for example, the grammarian gets his name from grammar, the brave get theirs from bravery'—Aristotle, *1a12 ff.*). The problems of this dialogue are set by Boethius's commentaries on Aristotle's *Categories*, and concerns the distinctions between *what is said of a subject* and *what is not said of a subject* and between *what is in a subject* and *what is not in a subject*. Anselm's arguments are extremely difficult to present to a modern reader, and I shall not attempt to summarize them here. The main issue is whether *literate* (Dr Henry's preferred translation for *grammaticus*) is a substance or a quality. Some of the problems seem to have been created by Boethius, for if Dr Henry is right that what is said of the subject is always a definitionally based truth for Boethius and Anselm, no room is left for the possibility described by Aristotle at *1a29-b3*, namely of things that are both said of a subject and are also in a subject.

Dr Henry continues with an analysis of some fragments of Anselm first published by Dom F. S. Schmitt in 1936. These are principally concerned with the expression '*facere esse*' and its possible combinations with negation. The ambiguity of '*facere*' as between

CHRISTIANITY IN ITS SOCIAL CONTEXT

S.P.C.K. Theological Collections, No. 8

Gerard Irvine (Editor) 19s 6d net

Essays on the extent and importance of the influence of the social context of Christianity in its expression of doctrine, its liturgy, its literature, and its expression of Christian living.

EUCCHARISTIC THEOLOGY THEN AND NOW

S.P.C.K. Theological Collections, No. 9

19s 6d net

Essays which seek, through an historical awareness of past and contemporary controversies, to discover understanding of some present difficulties.

Contributors: R. E. Clements, Austin Farrer, G. W. H. Lampe, C. W. Dugmore, Alf Härdelin, John Wilkinson, C. B. Naylor.

JESUS AND THE GOSPEL TRADITION

C. K. Barrett 25s net.

'As a textual study Professor Barrett's book is brilliant, and should for a long time prove an invaluable introduction to the problem.'

Times Literary Supplement

S - P - C - K

Marylebone Road,
London, N.W.1.

the English 'do' and 'make' is a great embarrassment to the translator of this text; in some cases 'do' is the more natural translation, in others 'make'. Dr Henry uses 'do so that *p*' for '*facere esse*', but even so he is not always able to sustain 'do' in passages which he considers later in the book where the distinction is being applied. Anselm's main distinction is between the four forms: do so that *p*, do so that not-*p*, do not do so that *p* and do not do so that not-*p*; he is interested in examples where the first form is improperly used where one of the others would be more exact. In the final part of the fragments, the distinction is extended from '*facere*' to '*velle*', for which four parallel forms are provided. It is, I think, a pity that instead of giving us a translation of each part of the fragments which he cites, Dr Henry sometimes provides an analysis instead; this would have been better in the commentary, so that the reader without Latin could have satisfied himself as to the correctness of the analysis.

In the two following chapters, Dr Henry presents a great deal of evidence from the other works of Anselm to show that he was constantly applying the analysis of the fragments to a wide variety of problems. Both here and in the chapter on paronymy Dr Henry has recourse to Lesniewski's ontology in order to elucidate Anselm. This logical system is introduced rather baldly, with little discussion, and the reader may feel that the sign 'ε' used to represent 'is' merely reproduces in symbols

the latter's ambiguity. One of the great virtues of Frege's logic is that it represents differently 'is' occurring as part of a predicate and 'is' as the sign of identity ('is no other than'). If Anselm's arguments can only be represented in a logical system which fails to make this distinction, one is inclined to say: so much the worse for Anselm!

The concluding chapters deal with four lesser topics from a logical point of view. The most interesting is perhaps that on *Truth and Ethics* in which Anselm's doctrine of *rectitudo* is compared with the ethical views of William Wollaston, later attacked by Hume. However, *rectitudo* is a large topic, and Dr Henry only nibbles at its fringe. It is the central concept of Anselm's dialogue *De veritate*, but perhaps Dr Henry did not want to digress into the philosophy of logic as distinct from logic proper. I was, however, in general disappointed that the emphasis throughout the book is on interpretation and that there is not very much discussion of Anselm's doctrines as such. Nevertheless, anyone who wants to consider Anselm's views in future will have to take this analysis of his logical methods seriously. In particular, Dr Henry shows that Anselm is no ordinary-language philosopher and is sometimes prepared on logical grounds to assert what on an ordinary-language basis would be nonsense. In this, Anselm presents a challenge to much contemporary British philosophy.

TIMOTHY V. POTTS

THE NEW THEOLOGY AND MODERN THEOLOGIANS, by Hugo Meynell. *Sheed & Ward, London, 1967.* 214 pp. 16s.

The title of this book suggests, and the cover asserts, that it offers 'the interested beginner' an 'introduction to the theologians and theological issues of today.' It is important at the start to make clear that it does no such thing. The 'interested beginner' will finish the book at least as ignorant of most of modern theology as he began. Rather, Dr Meynell offers a slightly miscellaneous collection of essays, united by concern to warn the Church against certain general 'tendencies' of 'modern theology'.

The 'modern theologians' actually mentioned turn out without exception to be Protestants. Since I am a Protestant, this puts me in an odd position. I am unable to judge whether or not the Roman Catholic Church needs this warning against protestantizing. And I am in danger of appearing denominationally biased and defensive when, as I must,

I judge Dr Meynell's analysis and critique unfortunate.

Even within Protestant theology, Dr Meynell's criticism is very narrowly based on the 'dialectical theology' of the twenties as continued in the systematics of Bultmann and in some aspects of Tillich and Barth. Dr Meynell himself never makes this clear, leaving the impression that modern theology in general is being discussed.

The author's material charge against 'modern theology' is that it narrowly interprets all the gospel's claims 'in terms of my existence here and now', eliminating its factual basis in past events and its factual claims about what is to come as the last destiny of man. As a positive programme, the demands for recovery of the theological relevance of historical inquiry, and for recovery of an eschatology