

- 12 in F. M. Abel, q.v. *supra*.
- 13 Runciman, q.v. *supra*.
- 14 *ibid.* p. 260.
- 15 *ibid.* p. 340.
- 16 *ibid.* p. 280
- 17 in F. M. Abel, q.v. *supra*.
- 18 in R. P. Mandonnet, q.v. *supra*, II pp. 182–202.
- 19 in F. M. Abel, q.v. *supra*.
- 20 in R. P. Mandonnet, q.v. *supra*, IV, pp. 584–607.
- 21 in B. Hamilton, q.v. *supra*, pp. 349–50.
- 22 *ibid.* p. 352.
- 23 *ibid.* p. 356.
- 24 *ibid.* p. 358.
- 25 see footnote 2.
- 26 see footnote 1.

Reviews

ARISTOTLE'S DE ANIMA, edited by Michael Durrant, *Routledge* paperback, 225 pp, £11.99.

This consists of Bks II and III (with a small introductory portion of Bk I) of Aristotle's *De Anima* in a light revision of R. D. Hicks's classical Cambridge translation of 1907, together with major essays on Aristotle's thinking in this area by Thomas J. Slakey, Terrell Ward Bynum, Malcolm F. Lowe, Michael V. Wedin, Richard Sorabji and William Charlton.

My own personal edition of Hicks's translation (1907) sits upon the shelf just above my desk as I write. An outstretched hand automatically falls on it, rather than on the Greek New Testament, smaller and just to its left, whenever I feel the need for a Greek example—be it for typographical, linguistic or philosophical reasons—more or less at random. Frequently throughout the thirty five years that I have lived in such companionship with it this has resulted in my having replaced it some hour or so later having been caught and fascinated once again, not only by the genius of Aristotle, but by that of Hicks in presenting him. All this would have no relevance to this review except in that it might indicate the extent to which I have immersed myself in this translation of the text, and have revered its author—it is indeed a classic as a translation.

Michael Durrant, in this current presentation, stresses the classic quality of Hicks's translation, and argues convincingly for its primal role in this field, and for the value of its being once again presented; but how

good a translation is it in fact? Durrant himself effectively criticises Hicks severely in pointing to the places where he has found it necessary to rewrite, re-translate. To have translated τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι as 'the quiddity' is to him as grotesque as it has always been to me; similarly '(substance) as notion or form' is not in any way adequate for κατα τὸν λόγον — betraying, as it does, Hicks's own principles of translation. There are many less inadequate renderings which belong essentially to period which Durrant finds it necessary to update. The result is pretty readable, but is it a good translation worth reproducing? The greatness, to my mind, of Hicks's work is not so much as a translation as the way in which it in effect presents the Greek to our understanding. The Greek text of the full *De Anima*, not of course printed here, consists of approximately 20,000 words; in Hicks's original edition he has added to this, as well as his translation and the critical apparatus, some 250,000 words of explanatory notes. It is in these notes that you see him wrestling with the complexities of the text and the almost total impossibility of producing anything in the way of an 'adequate' translation. It is basically in these notes—not by way of the achieved translation—that the reader is introduced into the thought of Aristotle and helped to understand the actual text itself—the Greek. Herein, to my mind, lies the genius of Hicks—teacher, rather than translator. So what of the value of his 'translation' in an edition which not unsurprisingly makes no attempt to present the Greek and represents not a single one of his footnotes? Personally I am very doubtful.

The attempt has been made, of course, to make up for what is so essentially lacking by the putting together, with the 'text', of a number of excellent contemporary articles on the subject matter of the *De Anima*. So here we have a different sort of presentation of Aristotle—essentially a 20th Century presentation rather than a 19th Century one (which Hicks's essentially is), a popularist presentation, rather than an elitist. Which is the better, I leave posterity and history to judge, but in using Hicks in this way I think that Durrant has shown that his own categories are somewhat confused, and that he has effectively cheated us; he should either have produced his own translation, or used one of the better modern ones—but then Hicks's is both (rightly) famous, and also (presumably) conveniently out of copyright.

GILES HIBBERT OP

GOD, TRUTH AND REALITY. ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF JOHN HICK,
ed. Arvind Sharma, *St Martin's Press, New York, 1993 . pp.xii + 269.*

As you would expect from its title, this festschrift for John Hick addresses a broad range of issues. Appropriately, most of the essays concern topics which Hick himself has discussed. For example, Marilyn McCord Adams presents a defence of the relevance of aesthetic considerations to theodicy; John Cobb assesses the internal consistency of Hick's Death