

GOD AND THE SOUL, by Peter Geach. *Routledge and Kegan Paul*, London, 1969. 138 pp. £1.25.

Professor Geach has style. To read this volume through, even for one who has read some of the essays contained in it as articles previously published and has heard the author read earlier drafts of others, is to enjoy a series of flashes of wit, of verbal felicity and of stinging reproof that only a Pope or a Johnson could rival.

Professor Geach has learning. How many of our contemporaries could illustrate his remarks, now with an allusion to the construct state in Hebrew, now with a reference to Gödel's theorem, now with a quotation from Horace, an acknowledgment to Browning, a comparison with one of Lewis Carroll's *juvenilia*?

Although a great part of Geach's beliefs about God and man reveal themselves in these relatively few pages, readers who expect a systematically expounded theology and anthropology will be disappointed. It is a collection of papers, some of them unlikely to interest those who lack concern for and familiarity with topics of an austere philosophical character. Discussions of individualized forms or of the two ways of inserting an existential quantifier into a given context are not going to find a wide readership amongst the inmates of present-day seminaries. Nor will Geach's views on topics more fashionably canvassed always appeal to the popular vote. He is inclined to think it rational to accept as valid a causal deductive proof of God's existence, and he believes that certain practices are absolutely forbidden by Divine law.

Geach often expounds and seldom questions

the views of Aquinas on the matter under discussion. Sometimes this will seem surprising, as when Aquinas is shown to have held that the human soul which survives death is not a human being. Whatever the rights or wrongs of the new translation of '*Et cum spiritu tuo*', Aquinas would have denied that I am the same as my soul. Sometimes Geach's interpretation of Aquinas is controversial. Dr Kenny, in his book on the Five Ways which appears in the same series as the volume under review, disputes Geach's account of Aquinas's doctrine of *esse*. I myself find it difficult to avoid ascribing a two-name theory of predication to Aquinas in the light of *Summa Theologiae* I^a, qu. 85, a. 5 ad 3^{um}, although Geach on page 44 maintains that those who regard him as having held this theory are wrong. But no one has Geach's skill in producing citations from the Thomist corpus which seem relevant and interesting to the contemporary conceptual analyst.

Professional philosophers who have used some of these papers for quite untheological ends will welcome the convenience of having them available in a book. Theologians who wish to discover how the professional philosopher's tool-kit can be made to serve their own science will find this volume full of examples. Theology could scarcely be better advanced at the present day than by as many of its practitioners as are capable of it carefully scrutinizing and painstakingly criticizing the arguments with which Geach here presents them.

C. J. F. WILLIAMS

THEOLOGY AND METAPHYSICS, by James Richmond. *S.C.M. Press*, 1970. 40s.

THEISM AND EMPIRICISM, by A. Boyce Gibson. *S.C.M. Press*, 1970. 50s.

One sometimes fears that there are only three varieties of reflective writing on religion; scepticism, sophistry, and tripe. These two books do something to restore one's faith that there are others. Also, different as they are from one another, they share a point of view which is at once (in my opinion) commendable, and (which is not at all the same thing) becoming increasingly fashionable. This point of view is that which insists on the necessity and tries to show the practicability of natural theology—that is to say, of the attempt to show that, on the basis of general reflection on the nature of our experience of the world, it is reasonable for us to believe

in the existence of God. If belief in God is not something which can be shown to be reasonable by reflection on our experience of the world, it seems to me that there are two alternatives: either that it is so obvious that there is a God as not to require argument, or that belief in God is unreasonable. That God exists is surely not obvious; and it seems to follow that, unless natural theology is a viable enterprise, the only reasonable stance is atheism.

Richmond's book is a clear and useful survey of these trends in philosophy and theology which have combined to make the enterprise of natural theology seem mistaken.