

eclecticism. On Christianity his witness is *suaviter in modo, fortiter in re*. 'It would be surprising if the first Christians' retrospective interpretation of the meal as something specially instituted by Jesus was wrong.'

Inevitably, there are a number of remarks with which some readers may feel a little unsatisfied. One would like to know the evidence for the assertion on page 618 that 'in eighteenth-century Cardiganshire, for instance, less than a fifth of the population could be counted as Christian'. The statement (p. 167) that 'the Calvinistic Methodists of Wales follow Whitefield's type of Methodism' seems insufficiently to recognize the autonomy of the Welsh movement and the variations of theological position within it. It is surprising to find late seventeenth-century France quoted as a scene of increasing religious toleration (p. 598), and it is doubtful if Slavonic scholars would accept the claim as to the significance of 'the third Rome' idea in fifteenth-century Russia (p. 599).

More seriously, Professor Smart's method appears at its least satisfactory, in the shape of snippets linked by generalizations in the chapter on Prehistoric and Primitive Religions, where we find the names of Frazer, Freud, Otto, Spencer and Tylor, but not Dieterlen, Evans-Pritchard, Griaule, Lienhardt, Metraux, Stanner, and Monica Wilson.

This leads on to my fundamental reserve about this book, that Ninian Smart has so definitely, and surely so voluntarily, abstained from any use of the categories of analysis and classification of religions developed by the schools of Emile Durkheim and Max Weber. His wish is presumably to show religion as something other than an epiphenomenon of social processes; but one may wonder if Smart, in emphasizing so strongly the experiential side of religion over against its cultural context and social relationships is not in fact limiting our opportunities to grasp precisely this aspect of experience. For example, what Cohn has to say about the social background to the medieval ideal of voluntary poverty, or Firth has to tell us about the setting of Tikopia understanding of mana, adds a perspective without which our understanding of Franciscan spirituality, or mana as a term of general application, would be incomplete.

But this difference of approach is presumably one that will last until social anthropologists have shown that they are not reductionists, and the followers of comparative religion have recognized that even the tree whose leaves are for the healing of the nations must have its roots in the earth. At any rate, in the meanwhile, Professor Smart will have helped a great many people through this book.

ADRIAN EDWARDS, C.S.SP

ST THOMAS AQUINAS: SUMMA THEOLOGIAE. Vol. XI: Man (Ia lxxv-lxxxiii), by Timothy Suttor. *Blackfriars; Eyre and Spottiswoods, London; McGraw-Hill, New York.* xviii + 286 pp. £2.10.

'Sometimes the orientation of a culture depends not on poetry, myth or legend, but on a highly technical treatise. The study on the *Categories* by the Aristotelian school was a case in point, and Boëthius's theological works were another. It is safe to suggest that this treatise on man was a third.' Whether or not there is an element of exaggeration in these opening words of the editor's introduction to the present volume, there can be little doubt either of its centrality in the whole scheme of the *Summa* or of the ruthless originality with which St Thomas handled his subject. As Dr Suttor says, 'one is struck by how little he repeated his predecessors, and how radically he reorganized the material they had left'. It is indeed impressive to note the almost violent determination with which the Angelic Doctor forces the concepts of Aristotelian anthropology into line with the Christian revelation; undoctored Aristotelianism would, for example, with its doctrine of the

soul as the form and the body as the matter of a human being, necessitate either that the soul perished at the moment of death or else that it lost its individuality and merged into one universal human consciousness. Nevertheless, in spite of all the difficulties he was convinced that, properly recast, Aristotelianism could do what was needed and that Platonism, for all its long history in Christian thought and the tremendous authority of St Augustine, could not. Dr Suttor is surely right in saying that although Aristotle was a useful catalyst, St Thomas's authentic genealogy as a psychologist is found in the first six Councils. It was not easy to maintain both that the soul survives death and also that the disembodied soul is less than a human being, since the human being is a composite of soul and body; nevertheless St Thomas managed it. And he would have been the first to insist that if his account was inadequate to do justice to the facts of revela-

tion, it was his account and not revelation that would have to give way. Again, in his insight that God moves natural causes in accordance with their character as natural causes and voluntary causes in accordance with their character as voluntary causes, it is open to anyone to complain that this does not really explain how God's premotion is to be reconciled with man's free will, but it does at least manifest St Thomas's determination to hold firmly on to both aspects of the problem. And when we are concerned with the ultimate mystery of the compresence of the Creator and the creature, can we in the last resort demand anything more than this?

Dr Suttor has performed his task as translator and editor most skilfully and, while not aiming at absolute uniformity, he has found many happy renderings in English for technical Latin terms. Thus *intellectus possibilis*

usually appears as 'receptive understanding' and *intellectus agens* as 'abstractive intelligence'; *virtus aestimativa* becomes 'instinct' and *irascibilis* 'aggression'. And of course we have always the Latin on the opposite page by which to identify the original. The eight appendices are mostly devoted to clarification, as are most of the footnotes, but there are also from time to time illuminating references to modern philosophers, such as Russell and Ryle; even Pavlov's dog receives honourable mention. Altogether, this must be judged as one of the most successful volumes of the series.

On page 200, line 9, *sint* should be *sunt*; and it is not clear whether anything more than a desire for variety causes *Videtur quod* to be translated sometimes by 'There are reasons for thinking' and sometimes by 'There are reasons for saying'.

E. L. MASCALL