towards ends advantageous to themselves.” Each man, Carneades holds, seeks his own advantage; human laws are dictated simply by consideration of expediency; they are not based upon or related to a natural law, a supposed law that simply does not exist. Grotius will argue against that position by acknowledging that man, to be sure, is an animal but that he is more than that. As rational, he is impelled by a desire for social life, a peaceful, organized, social environment in which he can achieve his full potential as a human being. The desire for social order flows from his very nature and is at once the source and raison d’être of law. “To this sphere of law,” writes Grotius, “belong the abstaining from that which is another’s (and) the obligation to fulfill promises.” Grotius will speak of the great society of states and the law of nations that should govern their interests. Just as the laws of each state have in view the advantage of that state, so by mutual consent certain laws originate as between all states or a great many states that have in view the advantage, not of particular states but the great society of states. This he called the “law of nations.”

The pragmatic naturalism of Goldsmith and Posner parts company with Grotius on the issue of expediency. The former acknowledge no moral obligation to act against self-interest, whereas Grotius will speak of natural justice. Although Goldsmith and Posner do not discuss claims of exploitation made by underdeveloped countries against the industrialized world or of colonies against former colonial powers, The Limits of International Law may be an aid in clarifying discussions of obligation at the international level.


Reviewed by Dr. Edward Peters, Sacred Heart Major Seminary, Detroit MI, USA

While at a popular level invocations of the Holy Spirit are common in post-conciliar pastoral practice, deeper developments in pneumatology are also being made in our lifetime, albeit with less fanfare. Advancements in studies of the Spirit are not easily achieved, however, despite the relatively underdeveloped state of these studies in the West as compared to, say, Christology or ecclesiology. Scholars wishing to make serious contributions to understanding the Third Person of the Trinity must have solid backgrounds in Scripture, patrology, systematics, and the language skills necessary to support critical research in such fields. Put another way, pneumatologists need to be very comfortable in Minge, and all that implies. Happily, Dr. Daniel Keating’s monograph, The appropriation of divine life in Cyril of Alexandria, a significantly expanded (by some 25,000 words) form of his doctoral dissertation from Oxford, shows him to be the kind of scholar capable of advancing our understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church.

Dr. Keating, I rather suspect, did not set out to write work on the Holy Spirit: his stated aim in Appropriation was to present the great Patriarch of Alexandria’s explanation of divinization, specifically, the process of our entry into the divine life over time from a God who works outside of time, and to answer, or at least to refine, some vexing questions about Cyril’s Christology (especially his understanding of the Incarnation). But one can read hardly a few paragraphs past the seminary professor’s excellent overview of Cyril’s life in the introduction, before encountering Keating’s first remarks on Cyril’s hitherto under-appreciated efforts to explore the role of the Holy Spirit in Christ’s salvific work.

Keating examines in detail Cyril’s use of Scripture, of course, and carefully assesses the latter’s creative juxtaposition of, for example, baptismal and Eucharistic narrations (and some elaborations thereon in other Old and New Testament passages) on its own merits—though certainly not in a way that ignores modern exegesis of these texts. Indeed, in several places, Keating confronts modern commentators on Cyril (e.g., Burghardt, Chadwick, Grillmeier, and Meunier) and gently but firmly asks of these and others whether, say, the conventional explanation that Cyril simply moved from a pre-Nestorian physicalist explanation of divinization, to a post-Nestorian “divination by spiritualization” needs some refinement.

Keating repeatedly makes the point that Cyril’s eclectic interests (aside from the saint’s fundamental focus on Christ, of course) and his incomplete (even by fifth century standards) systematics lead to some inconsistencies in the patriarch’s theology. Cyril is accused, for example, of falling into a bifurcated theological anthropology, with the Eucharist feeding the body, and the Spirit (especially in baptism) nourishing the soul. But I think it a special strength of Keating’s work that, besides frequently looking at Cyril in comparison to Athanasius and Origen (and in a semi-independent essay in chapter six, at such figures as Augustine and Leo the Great), Keating underscores the importance of Cyril’s diffuse, and therefore somewhat neglected, biblical commentaries for their purely theological
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of a lethal poison even when asked by the patient to do so; no abuse of a patient by a doctor. This coincided with significant advances in medical knowledge that set the tone for centuries to come. By the 4th century B.C., pharmacology, surgery, and dietetics were distinct areas of study. Dietetics were viewed by most for the preservation of health, not for treatment. Van der Eijk devotes a considerable portion of his book to the biological works of Aristotle. He provides an extended treatment of Aristotle on the nature of the psychic processes. Acknowledging that bodily conditions affect intellectual activity, Aristotle was nevertheless convinced that thinking involves a nonphysical aspect. The author assumes that his readers have a medico-physiological background as he relates Aristotle’s discussion of intelligence to his study of animals. The dependence of intellect on a healthy body is taken for granted. To the intriguing question, “Where does one think?” Aristotle, by Van der Eijk’s account, is not sure and seems to emphasize the role of the heart. Separate chapters are devoted to Aristotle on Eutuchia and on sterility.

Five centuries later Galen (129-199) discusses whether the maintenance of a healthy body belonged to dietetics or gymnastics. Galen was certainly the most distinguished of the Greek physicians. Called to the Court of Marcus Aurelius in Rome, he became personal physician to Aurelius’s son, Commodus. Like Aristotle, Galen’s work illustrates the reciprocal influence of philosophy and medicine on each other. Galen had studied at the medical school attached to the shrine at Asclepius in Pergamum and there became acquainted with the teaching of Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, and the Stoics. Among other accomplishments, he is credited as the founder of experimental physiology. In discussing the methodology to be employed in dietetics and pharmacology, Galen stipulated that both reason (theory) and experience are indispensable tools for acquiring knowledge and understanding. Empirical evidence, standing alone, can easily be misinterpreted. With respect to the prescription of foodstuffs and medicines, one must be prepared to “qualify experience.” Sometimes a substance has to be tried repeatedly to be considered an effective agent. Then, too, a single herb may at times be a foodstuff, a drug, or even a poison, depending on dosage and circumstance. Any medical claim, idea, or notion may stand in need of qualification by experience. Surprisingly, to this reviewer, a physician, Galen offers a very modern concept of absorption between the stomach and the body and of absorption through the skin. Although pharmacology and dietetics were important to the ancients, over the centuries this aspect of medicine became less important and almost disappeared. Until about fifty years ago, a dietician was always hospital based and was usually a college graduate with training in food chemistry. Concern until then was limited to diseases that necessitated strict diets, such as a low-salt diet for heart patients, low-carbohydrate diet for diabetics, and low protein for individuals with chronic kidney diseases.

Upon finishing this book, one is drawn to the conclusion that although the ancients made some serious mistakes in diagnosis and treatment when compared with modern medical practice, those physicians and philosophers have much to tell us about human nature, methods of enquiry, and even medical practice.


Reviewed by D. Q. McInerny, Our Lady of Guadalupe Seminary, Denton, Nebraska.

It is always a good thing to have new translations of the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, and, given the confusions and uncertainties that beset so much contemporary ethical thought, that is especially the case when the work in question is the Common Doctor’s *Disputed Questions on the Virtues*. This translation comes to us as a title in the Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy, a series under the editorial direction of Karl Ameriks of the University of Notre Dame and Desmond Clarke of University College Cork.

The book is the result of the combined efforts of Margaret Atkins of the University of Leeds, the translator, and Thomas Williams of the University of Iowa, who wrote an Introduction to the text. In that Introduction Professor Williams provides the reader with a helpful overview of St. Thomas’s ethical thought, giving special emphasis to his theory on the virtues. Particularly appropriate was his calling attention to the integral nature of St. Thomas’s ethical thought. He cogently develops the point that one cannot come to a proper understanding of St. Thomas’s theory on the virtues without taking into account his theory on natural law, for the first is encompassed within the second and is developed from it.

Professor Atkins’ translation of this Thomistic text is in the main quite impressive. It reads very well.