

THE SOUL. A Translation of St Thomas Aquinas' *De Anima*. By John Patrick Rowan. (Herder; 30s.)

Any good translation of St Thomas into English is to be welcomed at a time when increasing interest in his work is accompanied by a decline in the power even of the educated to read Latin. This is on the whole a good translation, illuminated by cross-references and frequent footnotes. It is unfortunate that the translator did not give at least a brief account of other works on the same subject, the little treatise in Part I of the *Summa* and the commentary on Aristotle's *De Anima*, together with an explanation of the place of this *Quaestio Disputata* in the development of St Thomas' thought. But the most serious criticism of this book must be directed against its price.

E.Q.

A HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. Vol. 2. Augustine to Scotus. (The Bellarmine Series No. 12). By Frederick Copleston, S.J. (Burns Oates & Washbourne; 25s.)

When someone has just published six hundred pages of a history of philosophy dealing with every major thinker and school between the Fathers and Duns Scotus; when each of these pages is written in clear, neat English; and when each system of thought receives as judicious and sympathetic an appraisal as any of the system's most firm adherents would approve of, it must sound like ingratitude to say that one awaits his next volume with impatience. In fact it is a sign of gratitude towards Fr Copleston for having devoted himself to this task of exposition, which is so often left to text-book compilers whose minds are not adequate to expounding great thinkers. All that needs to be said of this book is that it continues the tradition of the Bellarmine series; anyone interested in philosophy will read it; anyone engaged upon writing a general survey of medieval thought will find that it has now been done so thoroughly as to leave little room for such a survey.

It still leaves room, however, for one suggestion. Fr Copleston recently said in a review of Fr Hawkins' *Essentials of Theism* that he felt like standing on the touchline and cheering on Fr Hawkins *contra mundum*. His own correct attitude in this *History of Philosophy* shows that Fr Copleston umpires philosophical duels without missing a point. Need he stick so faithfully to the rôle of umpire in his next volume, instead of joining in the duel occasionally as he would clearly wish to do? There would be many advantages in his engaging our contemporaries as we pass through the later Middle Ages; our contemporaries, not unjustifiably, often fail to see the relevance of medieval philosophy; perhaps they would see the point if it were turned against them.

D.N.