

ST THOMAS AQUINAS: SUMMA THEOLOGIAE. Latin Text and English Translation. Introduction, Text, Appendices and Glossaries. Vol. IX: Angels (Ia, I-ixiv), Kenelm Foster, O.P., pp. xxviii + 340. Vol. XLIII: Temperance (IIaIIae, cxli-cliv), Thomas Gilby, O.P., pp. xxiv + 272. *Blackfriars*. London: *Eyre and Spottiswoode*; New York: *McGraw-Hill*. 42s each.

Fr Foster begins the Introduction to his edition of St Thomas's tractate on the angels with the splendid declaration: 'The central point of Christian belief is that the maker of the universe is now a man: hence the triple theme of Catholic theology: the divine and human natures and their mysterious union.' Where and why, he goes on to enquire, do angels come in—things *ex hypothesi* neither human nor divine? First, he replies, through the Scriptures, and secondly by a kind of rational necessity, given St Thomas's approach to his subject. Fr Foster fully recognizes the difficulty of the subject for modern readers, and he has provided the volume with two sensitive and, at the same time, balanced appendices, one on Angelology in the Church and in St Thomas, and the other on Satan. Both these are of value in their own right. Some of the most useful explications and discussions, however, are to be found in the very ample footnotes with which the volume is provided. Altogether this is a very successful and welcome work. The style is flexible and sprightly, without becoming too much of a paraphrase. There are, however, a number of small misprints, and there is a serious omission from the Latin text on p. 12 and from the English translation on p. 25.

Fr Gilby deals with St Thomas on 'temperance with his customary originality and liveliness. He admits both the limitations imposed by the imperfect physiological knowledge of the thirteenth century and also the underdeveloped and to some extent negative attitude to sex. It is not easy to be constructive with a discussion

which is primarily concerned with restraint in the pleasures of the table and of sex. Fr Gilby does, however, manage to elicit a great deal of relevance to the modern world from St Thomas's (which is often also Aristotle's) discussion. He remarks that for St Thomas the gourmand is more intemperate than the gourmet and that he defines drunkenness more in terms of the gullet than of the bloodstream. He suggests that St Thomas's alleged anti-feminism must, despite the hagiographers, be blamed on his reading and not on his experience. He tells us what St Thomas would probably have had to say about tobacco, snuff and psychedelic drugs. And he boldly demotes two of the *sed-contras* to the status of objections to the thesis (cxlvii, 4 and cxlviii, 2). There is an illuminating appendix on Thirteenth-Century Food and Drink: 'Altogether it was a plentiful and healthy table of big dishes without much variety, of tankards and beakers, not medicine glasses. . . . The glutton of the treatise is not a gourmet, the drunkard not an oenophile or connoisseur.' Other appendices deal with Nature and Person in Sex, Natural and Unnatural in Morals, and Primary and Principal Ends. It is perhaps surprising that, with his flair for the *mot juste*, Fr Gilby should not have rendered *temperantia* by 'self-control' rather than by 'temperance', which to many people today merely signifies almost or quite complete abstinence from alcohol.

These are two large volumes and are excellent value for the price.

E. L. MASCALL

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF FAMILY RELIGION, by Eve Lewis. *Steed and Ward Stagbooks*, 1968. 239 pp. 32s. 6d.

The child of junior-school age is supposed to rely on mainly concrete thinking, to be, as Mrs Lewis says, 'likely to be uncertain and out of his depth when presented with abstract ideas'. Recently my eight-year-old son, when I corrected a historical mis-statement, informed me with maddening superiority that he knew more about history than I did, 'of course, because I'm younger than you. If I'm younger I'm nearer to history.' When I had grasped the reasoning behind this claim I suggested that a person standing in the doorway of a house actually saw much less of it than someone standing ten yards away. He admitted this,

'but', he said, 'I didn't mean just *seeing*. You can *see* more from there, but you don't *know* as much about the house.' At this point I abandoned the struggle, metaphysics not being my subject. The point of this story is to illustrate the fact that generalizations about the mental abilities and spiritual capacities of children at a given age are not to be interpreted too closely, and all books about religious education are inclined, initially, to minimize the individual element in the teaching of religion.

Apart from some minor queries this is the only fault I have to find with Mrs Lewis's