

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

and Eternal Life; and William Alston discusses Hick's account of religious experience, noting points of difference with his own approach, for instance on the importance to be attached to religious experience which is not mediated by sense experience. Anders Jeffner and Stewart Sutherland examine another issue which has exercised Hick, the meaning of religious language: Jeffner considers Luther's understanding of the place of logic in the articulation of Christian belief, and Sutherland offers an analysis of the notion of divine action which does not depend upon the idea of a creator God. Jagi, Seiichi [sic] also considers the nature of religious language, with special reference to the parable of the good Samaritan. He wonders how the parable comes to acquire a religious meaning given that "seen from the outside (i.e. to the objective observer) we find nothing especially religious in the parable" (p.241). He suggests that the story needs to be understood as "the expression of Self-awareness" before its religious meaning can be grasped. There are also essays on the appropriateness of religious moralists seeking to provide "a common public theology," and on the lessons of the Gulf War, with reference to relations between the West and the Islamic world, contributed respectively by Robert Merrihew Adams and Mohammed Arkoun.

But the best represented topic is religious pluralism, reflecting the evolution of Hick's own interests in recent years. Masao Abe and Ninian Smart draw on Buddhism in their discussions of religious diversity: Abe compares the ideas of God and sunyata, and Smart considers the applicability of the notion of emptiness to the relation between the religions. Maurice Wiles and John Bowker consider Christian responses to other religions: Wiles writes on "The Meaning of Christ" with particular reference to the use of "Christ" to describe God's work in other religions; and Bowker considers Jewish and Christian attitudes to other religions, including some remarks on the implications of neo-Darwinism for the idea of original sin and the idea that there is a natural human capacity to recognise the divine. Langdon Gilkey and Gordon Kaufman both consider the need for a qualified relativism in religion. Gilkey notes some of the areas where Christians can benefit from the insights of other faiths, and observes that this sort of openness to other viewpoints can be combined with a wholehearted commitment to one's own faith (p.121). Kaufman compares the different "root metaphors" of Christianity and Buddhism, and considers the value of a conversational approach to truth for the development of inter-religious understanding.

A number of other writers engage more specifically with the themes or presuppositions of Hick's *An Interpretation of Religion*. Terence Penelhum discusses the idea that the world is religiously ambiguous, defending the view that the world is ambiguous not simply in relation to the debate between theist and naturalist, but instead "exhibits multiple religious and ideological ambiguity" (p. 170). In examining various responses to this ambiguity, he denies that ambiguity is a necessary concomitant of human freedom in religious matters, and suggests that we have a duty to try to "disambiguate" our world; from this last point it

follows that the attempt to construct a natural theology remains of enduring relevance. Norman Solomon in effect questions the idea that we have such a duty to disambiguate. With reference to the Hebrew scriptures, he argues that practice rather than belief may be the determining factor in an individual's relation to God; and the reader is invited to infer that the attempt to reconcile the metaphysical claims of different faiths, for instance in the way Hick proposes, may be unnecessary from a religious point of view.

There are also some papers which deal with Hick's development of a quasi-Kantian response to religious diversity. Brian Hebblethwaite explores the tension between Hick's commitment to a critical realism and his defence of religious pluralism, suggesting that his notion of a noumenal real may invite a non-realist interpretation of religion. Keith Ward argues that Hick's use of Kant's noumenal/phenomenal distinction poses difficulties which are not posed by the orthodox Christian notion of divine ineffability, and that Hick's own position is not adequately expressed in these terms: "Bluntly, he is a theist who is concerned to show how God may be experienced in many traditions" (p.215). In place of Hick's noumenal account of the common focus of the different religions, Ward proposes a "convergent pluralism". William Rowe also offers some thoughts on Hick's approach to religious pluralism, as well as commenting on his soul-making theodicy. Finally, in addition to all of the foregoing, the collection includes a biographical piece, presented by Paul Badham, and a "personal appreciation" of John Hick by Arvind Sharma.

As one would expect, all of the essays in this volume show careful preparation, and all will reward study. It will be evident from this brief summary that the collection covers a lot of ground, and reflects a broad spectrum of opinion. On both of these points, it is faithful to Hick's own approach to the philosophy of religion, which has been marked by the breadth of its concerns and by its willingness to engage with other points of view. In sum, the volume is a fitting tribute to a man whose writings have done so much to stimulate reflection on the questions of God, truth and reality.

MARK WYNN

GOD AND CREATION: ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. Translated and with an Introduction by William P. Baumgarth and Richard J. Regan. *University of Scranton Press, Scranton, and Associated University Presses, London and Toronto, 1994. Pp.310. No price given.*

This nicely produced volume contains an English version of *Summa Theologiae* 1a, 1-25, 1a,44-49, and 1a, 103-105. It also offers a brief Introduction, a Glossary of key words used by Aquinas, and a Select Bibliography.

The editors, who teach at Fordham University, have aimed to provide a translation which steers a middle course between the two currently best known English translations of the *Summa* — that of the

440