

economic nature. The author seeks also to renew our appreciation of the art of teaching. The ideal which is held up before the Jesuit teacher, he says, includes the qualities of the apostle, the scholar and the gentleman. Fr Farrell ends: 'It would be possible to suggest a specific plan of studies, but it has been thought best not to do so lest the relevant point of the chapter be lost in the confusion of centrifugal discussion. . . . Certainly however the Jesuit schools will hold to their aim of furnishing their students with a supernatural philosophy of life, and they will continue to regard the classics and philosophy as admirable means to achieve this aim.' JOHN TODD.

REVIEWS

PHYSICS AND PHILOSOPHY. A Study of Saint Thomas's Commentary on the Eight Books of Aristotle's Physics. By James A. McWilliams, S.J. (The American Catholic Philosophical Association, Washington; \$2.00).

This is the second volume to appear in this series of Studies, which aims at providing publication for noteworthy and philosophically important material which otherwise might not see the light of day. It is the 'instrument of further research, rather than a research itself.' The book is divided into two parts: the first contains an introduction to the Physics, with other sections on the laws of movement, and a translation of the first five *lectiones* of S. Thomas's commentary on the third Book. The second part contains a précis of the commentary on all eight books, a note on the sempiternity of movement, and an analysis of the commentary on the eight books. The work concludes with tabulated references to the *Contra Gentes* and *Summa*, a useful bibliography of more or less contemporary literature, and a not very ambitious index.

In general, the work is a useful one. The analyses help the student to obtain a bird's-eye view of what is a very extensive and complex work. The author recognises the pressing need for the *Philosophia Perennis* to get to grips with modern scientific thought. The chapter on the laws of motion contains a useful comparison of the views of Newton, Descartes, S. Thomas, and Aristotle, on the subject of Inertia. I think that if more space and ingenuity had been spent on extending this comparative study the book would have been enormously strengthened in its appeal. In particular, that part of the book which carries the independent conclusions of the writer seems weak. There is an 'Elenchus' of meanings of the word 'Infinite' running to half a page which is pedagogically a mistake as it leads the student to approach the Physics through learnt definitions instead of observed facts. This is a pity in view of the denial of many scientists that our Physics are inductive, and the more so because of the close connexion of this term with the doctrine of the Analogy of

Matter, which seems to the present writer the root cause of such approximations of the old Physics to the new, as are to be found, for example, in the comparison of theories of inertia which Professor McWilliams notes. On this point of Induction it seems that the Professor (page 25) seeks to contradistinguish Physics and Metaphysics, on the ground that the former science is inductive, but the latter not so. He argues that Metaphysics is concerned with separated forms, which are simply Act, but do not 'exist,' (presumably in what may be called an independent manner, apart from the observer), whereas Physics is concerned with what exists in the sense of what may be sensibly perceived by us. These objects are not simply in act, like the separated forms of Metaphysics, but are both in potency and act, simultaneously. Thus, he concludes, Metaphysics studies the purely actual, or the purely potential; but Physics is the study of the actual in potency. This, he considers, is the existential, and thus the basis of induction. The strict inference from this is that it is one thing to be in Act, and another to Exist; therefore some things are in act which do not exist. If 'Exist' is the Latin '*Esse*,' then Metaphysics is in a bad way, for it lacks an inductive basis.

The commentary is well summarized, but with certain lapses. Thus on page 30 the author fails to reproduce S. Thomas's terminology and the sense of the text is lost. Saint Thomas is saying that '*Motus*,' unlike 'Being,' reduces to certain categories which are in fact predicamental; namely, Substance, Quantity, Quality, and Place. Now 'Being' is predicated of the categories on its own account, and is thus the common analogue of them all. Movement, on the other hand, is predicated of the categories not on its own account, but because it is an imperfect act, whose principle is precisely the form peculiar to the category in which it is; getting bigger, for instance, is in the category of Quantity, because the principle of the action is number. Since, therefore, movement is predicated of the categories, to which Being is common, the division of movement, because it is a division of the categories, is also a division of being, and thus a sufficient Division. The commentary succeeds in formulating the rather abstruse Division, but fails to assign clearly the reason for its completeness to the fact that it is a division of 'Being,' simply remarking that 'Being, of course, is analogously common to them' (i.e., the categories). This failure, taken technically, would cause the theory of movement worked out in the Physics to break down irreparably, as it would destroy the universality of its principles. FELIX WATTS, O.P.

CHRISTENTUM ENDE ODER WENDE? Die religiöse Sinndeutung der Gegenwart aus der Vergangenheit—für die Zukunft. By Johannes Reeb. (Benziger & Co., Einsiedeln/Köln, 1941.).

It is strange that no historian of Catholic theology should have been tempted to write a history of lay-theology. So far as I am aware, the very interesting index X of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, giving some 700 names of lay theologians in the Middle Ages, has