REVIEWS 43

Professor Rand is always an amiable commentator and often refreshing in his judgments. He has some sympathetic comments on the Latin style of the Summa and also believes that Aquinas never forgot the last phrase in the definition of man as 'an animal, mortal, rational and capable of laughter'. St Thomas, of course, speaks of ludus, play, in the Summa, but there is a less well-known passage in the Prologue to the so-called De Ebdomadibus of Boethius where he says that the contemplation of wisdom is suitably compared to a game because ludus delectabilis est et contemplatio sapientiae maximam delectationem habet. (p. 59-60). Again, the author is refreshing when. after saying that St Thomas wants to sum up Theology, but does not merely collect opinions, he continues: 'One will find what many had to say and what true doctrine is, in the Summa Theologica. But the flavour of the work is philosophical rather than theological. Step by step, on the basis of what others have thought, he is thinking it out for himself. Nor is there anything partisan in his thought. Modern analysis may show him anti-Augustinian, but in his reverence for St Augustine and all the great Doctors of the Church he is not anti-this or anti-that or even a pro-Thomist or a neo-Thomist, but a humble seeker for the truth wherever it may be found, hospitable to physical science as well as heavenly, ever sharpening his mind and acquiring the calm of wisdom. Behind it all is the peace of God that passeth understanding'. (p. 65).

There are thirty pages of notes and two appendices. It is interesting to learn that St Thomas's Cato is neither Elder nor Younger but a later writer (p. 16. There is only one citation of the *De Amicitia* in the *Summa* (II-II 129 a 3) and then the text is really from Sallust and not Cicero.

DAMIAN MAGRATH, O.P.

THEORIE DES MITTELSTANDES. By Fritz Marbach. (Verlag A. Francke AG. Bern; Fr. 12.50.)

Is it possible to combine St Thomas with Karl Marx? Dr Marbach in his 'sketch of the problem' suggests such a synthesis as a contribution to its solution. One thing is certain: the relevance of medieval thought is much more obvious to those who habitually think of the 'middle' group in modern society still as a Stand, not as a class, in terms of status rather than contract. But we have gained something, or at least history has not stood still since the thirteenth century. The grave mistake of many Catholics in theory and of some Austrians in practice has been to attempt to restore the medieval ordines in a modern setting and without reference to the intervening centuries. On the other hand orthodox Marxism was far too destructive of freedom and human dignity in its attempt at direct socialisation of all means of production and equally guilty of ignoring the incessant flux of history. If Socialists can give up something of their rigid theories in the face of overwhelming facts, Thomists may well admit that the application of the perennial philosophy in its economic aspects must take on new forms conditioned by the situation which makes Socialism still the dominant political ideology.

German writers have an irritating habit of producing large volumes of penetrating analysis and calling the result a Versuch or Einführung. But it is genuine modesty and a truly scientific spirit which leads Dr Marbach to devote over 400 pages to an Aufriss des Mittelstands at all, and it is very properly and patiently occupied largely with problems. For this is almost the first attempt to deal with the subject preparing the way for a definition, critically examining the views already put forward, distinguishing the social groups and determining the diverse types of the middle classes. Not the least of our grounds for confidence in this guide is the determination with which from the beginning he rejects the identification of the social with the natural sciences. Thunder, lightning, smoke and fog, must be examined by other methods and from a vastly different standpoint than those applied to the great social realities of conscience, law and right.

EDWARD QUINN

THE FORMAL DISTINCTION OF DUNS SCOTUS. By M. J. Grajewski, O.F.M. (Catholic University of America, Philosophical Series, Vol. XC. \$2.25.)

With the exception of St Bonaventura the great Franciscan thinkers have attracted too little attention in recent years. The revival of interest in Duns Scotus is therefore a welcome change, and Dr Grajewski is to be congratulated on his very lucid exposition of one of his chief contributions to philosophy, the exact nature of the formal distinction. His treatment of the difference between it and the real distinction is clear and admirable, and he has also succeeded in showing the metaphysical, psychological and theological implications of the subject, although his treatment of these is necessarily summary, particularly in regard to the Godhead and the Trinity. A fuller discussion of this last problem would be desirable even within the limited scope of a thesis for the doctorate. The weakest part of the book is, however, his section on the historical background, for his discussion of Duns Scotus's forerunners is both sketchy and haphazard. It is difficult to understand why relatively obscure thinkers like John of Berwick and Adam of Lincoln, whose views are anyway only known through certain notes in a Cambridge manuscript, have been mentioned when John de la Rochelle, Eudes Rigaud and Pecham have been omitted. The same is true of the treatment of the secondary sources. Dr Grajewski obviously knows his material, but his refusal to use Dr Schmaus, and Dr Harris and Fr Longpre's general work on Duns Scotus has made it more difficult for the general reader to familiarise himself with the subject. Also, the almost tabular arrangement of the different chapters, whilst making for clarity, does not conduce to easy reading, and the frequent use of the uncommon preposition 'anent' is somewhat irritating. Dr Grajewski has, however, made one reader understand the importance of the formal distinction in philosophical thought, and wish for a fuller treatment of