"genus" is sometimes translated as 'category', which is especially problematic given that Aquinas also uses the more standard 'praedicamentum' at other points in the text. But Macierowski's English-Latin glossary (194-219) not only clearly marks these occurrences, but also gives a full list of all other uses of the terms in the text. An interested scholar would have no trouble amending the translation given the helpful tools provided. Second, Macierowski is at times too honest in his translations, marking all additions, even those necessary for sense, with angle brackets. Since the Latin is included on the facing page, this is unnecessarily distracting.

The content of the book is tightly focused: Macierowski opens with a helpful introduction to Aquinas, his thought, and the historical and institutional context within which he lived and worked (1-20). Though brief, it paints a surprisingly full picture of the thinker. The main body of the book is of course the translation of Aquinas' pro-and-con discussion of various aspects of God's nature, including his being (esse), eternity, immanency, simplicity, and relation to the Aristotelian categories. Even in this early work, Aquinas shows a marked ability for the clear, concise argumentation found in his later Summa Theologiae, and eschews the daunting lists of arguments and counterarguments so often found in the work of others of his time. An unexpected aspect of Aquinas' discussion is his treatment of the human soul's simplicity, which is of interest for those attracted to the mundane side of Aquinas' thought.

In the supplementary, bibliographical section (134-83), Macierowski breaks the references into subgroupings, including (e.g.) general works on Aquinas, as well as linguistic tools useful for those with a serious interest in studying the subject. Most of Aquinas' citations are thoroughly investigated, and Macierowski often includes extended Latin passages taken from the other works from which Aquinas draws. Though Macierowski's method of marking references in the translation itself is awkward at first — he uses asterisks instead of numbers, and references are listed alphabetically rather than serially in the bibliographical section at the end — the wealth of information provided makes up for any deficiencies in format.

All in all Macierowski's translation, and especially his supplementary materials, are excellent; he has evidently thought through what a first-time reader needs in order to appreciate Aquinas' thought in a critical, philosophical way. Bobik doesn't do this in his Elements, but neither does he claim to: his book is meant for a different audience, and it certainly accomplishes the more moderate goals at which it aims.

Charles Bolyard
University of Oklahoma

Susan Bordo, ed.
Feminist Interpretations of René Descartes.
US$80.00 (cloth: ISBN 0-271-01857-7);

This title is among the most recent releases in the growing 'Re-reading the Canon' series which offers feminist re-interpretations of major philosophers in the Western tradition. It includes new and reprinted work all but one published within the past fifteen years. Bordo has organized the articles into four sections, and her introduction is both helpful in providing an overview of the section themes, and valuable as a contribution to the feminist evaluation of Descartes' position in the history of philosophy.

The first section opens with a chapter on Descartes from Karl Stern's 1965 The Flight from Woman, the earliest piece by some twenty years in the collection. This section deals with the idea of, in Stern's words, 'a pure masculinization of thought' in Cartesian rationalism (46). Stern's own contribution emphasizes the complexity within Descartes' work which has been overly neglected in the 'Cartesian mentality' which has developed since Descartes and which has resulted in a 'devaluation of poetic knowledge' (30) and the rise of modern scientificism (44). This represents a flight from woman in the sense that it represents a flight from qualities culturally associated with the female (46). Bordo picks up on the idea that the rise of modern science depended on a model of knowledge 'based on clarity, dispassion, and detachment' (48), and suggests that the Cartesian legacy represents a 'supermasculinized model of knowledge' (50). This flight to objectivity represents a flight from 'that cluster of epistemological values often associated with feminine consciousness' (64).

In her introduction to the book, Bordo notes that positions such as Stern's and hers need to be read carefully. Their emphasis is on qualities that western culture has 'coded' as feminine or masculine, and then devalued or valued; this should not be misread as scholarship 'interested in exploring actual differences in how men and women think...'. (9). Genevieve Lloyd's approach is far less prone to this misreading. She emphasizes the egalitarianism at the core of Descartes' epistemology but also recognizes that this 'did not, in practice, make knowledge any more accessible to women' (78). Quite simply, women's lives did not allow them full participation in the method prescribed by Descartes, most especially not as it was practiced in the public and 'collective' (though exclusionary of women) realm of science (79). This first section is rounded out by Stanley Clarke's defense of Descartes against feminist critiques. Clarke argues both that Descartes' epistemology is capable of taking gender differences into account and that Descartes' own writings in psychology and biology can be fleshed out to provide a decidedly feminist theory of gender (83).
The themes of the first section are echoed in the next two sections of the book, but each of these sections takes a different stylistic approach to the issues. The second section develops these ideas by taking a literary deconstructionist approach to Descartes’ texts. The piece by James Winders defends Descartes against some feminist criticisms by arguing that the first two Meditations are ‘written in a manner sometimes theorized as “feminine”, if not exactly feminist’ (119). He also includes an evaluation of Foucault’s and Derrida’s interpretation of the Meditations noting that neither do justice to the feminist issues raised by this text. Adrianna Paliyenko draws some interesting parallels between Descartes and Lacan and indicates the implications of this for feminism. Luce Irigaray’s essay looks at Descartes’ discussion of wonder in the Passions of the Soul in an attempt to rehabilitate by example this aspect of knowledge. Irigaray’s language is often lyrical, but the elusive style can, as Bordo notes, “leave one feeling dazed and confused” (13).

The third section takes an historical-philosophical approach. The papers here concentrate on the impact of Descartes and Cartesianism upon women philosophers of the seventeenth century, and in the process, find early seeds of some of the feminist concerns consciously developed in the late twentieth century. Ruth Perry, for example, does not deny that Cartesianism may have had a long-term negative impact on women, but she does note that women philosophers of the seventeenth century (and she discusses many of these) saw Descartes’ method and epistemology as liberating for women (170). Thomas Waterberg concentrates on just one of these early modern women, Elisabeth, and argues that her correspondence with Descartes is important not only for her incisive criticism of the problem of interaction but also for underscoring the belief that ‘philosophy is an activity that can be pursued only in a certain setting’ (197-8), a point raised by many contemporary feminists, including Lloyd in her earlier contribution to the volume. Erica Harth and Eileen O’Neill get down to the philosophical and historical nitty-gritty, each presenting her own analyses of how the various early modern women philosophers approached Cartesianism. As if taking seriously the philosophical work of these women is not enough, Harth and O’Neill also present important insights into the issues at the core of Stern’s discussion of ‘masculinized thought’ — what is a ‘feminist’ perspective? how was gender experienced by early modern women? is there a ‘feminine’ style of thought? (247ff).

The final section brings us back to the twentieth century and some postmodern attempts to grapple with the human subject of modernity betheathed to the Western world largely by Descartes. In her style, Leslie Heywood, like Irigaray, challenges by example the model of objectivity passed down to us based partly on Cartesianism, but Heywood’s approach is far more accessible. Drawing on personal anecdotes and pop culture, she argues that the Cartesian mind-body split is, ironically, at the root of the recent ‘cult of the body’ which especially impacts women and includes the anorexia’s attempt to negate the body (274). Bordo and Maria Moussa analyze three twentieth-century rebellions against the Cartesian subject (the historical, linguistic and feminist turns) to argue that there is a core of traditional

method in all these movements (292). The volume closes with a piece by Mario Sánchez which examine Cartesianism against the backdrop of twentieth-century postcolonial fiction to argue that the Cartesian sense of self misses a great deal (312).

The volume is rich and varied. It is interesting on Descartes; it is even more interesting on Cartesianism, feminism and culture. Bordo herself nicely sums up what is exciting about studying historical figures in philosophy from perspectives such as those found in this book: ‘Where would Descartes stand in today’s “culture wars”? The answer is not obvious, and that is what makes him such an interesting thinker’ (24).

Karen Detlefsen
University of Toronto

Kenneth Clatterbaugh
The Causation Debate in Modern Philosophy, 1637-1739.
Cdn$103.00: US$75.00
Cloth: ISBN 0-415-91476-0;
Cdn$32.99: US$22.99

This book provides an excellent introduction to the debate in early modern philosophy over the metaphysics and epistemology of causation, particularly on the nature of the interactions between body, mind, and God. Covering the period from the publication of Descartes’ Discourse (1637) to the appearance of Hume’s Treatise (1738), Clatterbaugh offers a survey of this debate by highlighting the views of some of its main protagonists: Descartes (who instigated the whole discussion), Gassendi, Le Grand (whose philosophy provides a link between Descartes on one side, and Malebranche and Locke on the other), Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibniz, Berkeley, Locke, and Hume. Boyle, Robault, and Newton are also included, because their work as ‘scientist-philosophers’ substantially contributes to the philosophical debate. Indeed, Clatterbaugh writes, ‘much of the causation debate is a matter of adjustment between an emerging philosophy and an emerging science. Scientists must adjust their thinking to the philosophical conditions placed on causation, and philosophers must adjust their views on the nature of causation to the newest scientific explanations’ (8).

Clatterbaugh accordingly identifies three main stages of development: the early debate (second third of the seventeenth century); the scientific impact