

Nyssa, is both less outmoded and less complicated than might appear at first sight. Two things need to be remembered if one is to avoid confusion. The first is that, strictly speaking, it is not the intellect that knows and the will that wills, but the man who knows by his intellect and wills by his will; the second is that the twelve 'partial acts' into which the human act is analysed, and of which Fr Gilby gives a lucid scheme in his first appendix, are not really separate acts at all but are distinguishable constituents in the one human act. Only if this is recognized is it possible to escape some form of psychological determinism.

Fr Gilby's rendering of the Angelic Doctor's text is, as we should expect, both free (sometimes perhaps too free!) and sprightly, and his notes are illuminating and striking; cf., e.g., the references to anovulants and Ulster on page 57, to the life-history of bees on page 127 and to Aston Villa Football Club on page 193. He is ready to admit that some of the articles are not altogether helpful and he makes an important comment on page 207 that St Thomas's theory of original sin is not St Augustine's, a point which Fr T. C. O'Brien

had also stressed in vol. xxvi, appendix 6. This is in some respects a key volume in the series and Fr Gilby has handled it brilliantly.

There are, however, rather more uncorrected slips than one would have hoped; of these the following have been noted. Page 22, line 29, for first 'est' read 'ex'. Page 29, line 4, for 'voluntary' read 'involuntary'. Page 40, last line, for 'circumstantiis' read 'circumstantiae'. Page 42, line 8, for 'auxilus' read 'auxiliis'. Page 43, line 18, 'when you pause over its importance' is an odd rendering of 'cum consideratur quid aliquis fecerit'. Page 53, line 13, for 'volition' read 'nolition'. Page 69, line 1, for 'to be good and fitting' read 'to seem good and fitting'. Page 81, line 3, omit 'though'. Page 84, line 17, for 'divitur' read 'dividitur', and line 20, for 'domini' read 'domina'. Page 85, line 12, 'quae convenit intellectui' is not translated. Page 89, line 20, for 'any lack of a not good' read 'any lack of a good'. Page 93, line 23, after 'universal good' add 'apprehended by reason'. Page 112, line 24, for 'fruito' read 'fruitio', and line 26, for 'decimur' read 'dicimur'. Page 131, line 13, for 'practice' read 'theory'.

E. L. MASCALL

ALIVE TO GOD. Muslim and Christian Prayer. Compiled with introduction by Kenneth Cragg. O.U.P., 1970. £1.50.

This is a pretentious and tiresome book. Designed to draw Christians and Muslims together in prayer, it is more likely to put people off prayer altogether. The introductory essay begins with pages of rolling Victorian humanism, in a prose worthy of Dickens at his very worst; and then moves into a maze of sophistry and more modern platitude, presumably intended as theological argument—though, since Dr Cragg appears to cherish at least three totally different ambitions in this book, which he shows no signs of being able to distinguish, the general drift is unclear (as are many of the individual sentences, for that matter). And this is not just a matter of literary style; there is a crucial theological and political point. Cragg offers us one version of 'prayer without getting your hands dirty'. In one of his own compositions, he prays for a 'hallowing of science by the poetry of worship' (prayer being, as he says, 'the poetry of the soul'). And it is fairly clear what he means by poetry; reduced to its essentials, it is a way in which complacent clergymen and intellectuals can exploit the anguish of men to their own emotional and 'creative' satisfaction. Of course,

Cragg doesn't tell us this. He knows all about being involved in the world's history—in fact, he tells us that religious faiths claim to 'comfort and interpret' history (sic!). But, if you read between the lines, the whole tone of his introduction, and the principle of his selection, is a radical denial of the reality of the world's problems (including the divisions between religions), by way of the said Victorian humanism, and a bland assertion of the brotherhood of man, which is considerably less plausible than, say, St Paul's view of the matter. It is equally a denial of the reality of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ—and, in different terms, I believe Muslims are just as committed as we are to the particularity of God's action within real human history. It is hardly surprising, then, that we are invited to a style of prayer typical of Anglicanism at its most repugnant; we are to find words we can all agree to, everyone being free to *mean* whatever he pleases by them. This really is prayer with the guts left out! If prayer is only the icing upon a world and a dialogue otherwise unaffected by it, then why bother? If—true to the real tradition of Islam and Chris-

tianity—we see prayer as the very life of the soul, man's most basic and 'prosaic' activity, then of course we must pray with Muslims when it is called for, but we must pray from within the particularity of our own situation, not seeking some eirenic no-man's-land of

empty words.

There are some, a few, nice things in the anthology of prayers. But the overall effect of the book—even to the binding—is ghastly. An instance of religious and cultural vampirism to make one shudder. SIMON TUGWELL, O.P.

DER MENSCHLICHE MENSCH: KARL MARX' JÜDISCHER HUMANISMUS, by Albert Massiczek. *Europa Verlag*, Wien-Frankfurt-Zürich, 1968. 654 pp.
INITIATION À KARL MARX, by P.-D. Dognin, *Editions du Cerf*, Paris 1970. 418 pp.

Two very different books on Marx. There is nevertheless good reason to review them together. Both books are concerned with Marx's humanism. Father Dognin proposes to demonstrate the unity between Marx's early writings and *Capital*: it is the same humanism that links them together. And it is precisely this humanism that is the concern of Massiczek's book. I do not mean that books treating of Marx's humanism are rare: his view of man is perhaps the most discussed item now of Marx's philosophy.

Apart from the concern with humanism the books are widely different in scope. Dognin's book is a very solid but a general book on Marx. Its thesis is the unity of Marx's thought. Its perspective is *Capital*. Against many authors, neomarxists and others, Dognin defends the view, that *Capital* is the normal and solid fulfilment of the early writings. In *Capital* philosophy and humanism are not repudiated, but their consequences are drawn with great vigour. It is this philosophy that obliges Marx to concentrate more profoundly on economics, sociology and politics. So, for example, it is not humanism and the idea of alienation that are repudiated by the later Marx, but only, as Dognin agrees with Althusser, the idea of human essence (p. 22).

Dognin's book is composed of two parts. The first part treats of Marx's philosophy and it is clear that it analyses primarily the early writings. It deals in four chapters with four fundamental themes: atheistic humanism, historical materialism, the dialectical conception of history, the ethical problem. This part—although more extensive than the second—has nevertheless the function of an introduction to the latter: a critical introduction to *Capital*. The first section of this describes Marx's economic views in *Capital* as a reaction against liberal economics. The second and last section is the most technical: it treats *Capital* from a sociological and economic point of view, especially the theory of the surplus value.

Dognin shows a solid knowledge of Marx-Engels, later Marxism and the relevant literature. He admires Marx, but this does not prevent him from criticizing him radically. He concludes his study as follows: 'Marx a "démystifié" l'économie "bourgeoise", et plusieurs de ses intentions sont à retenir, même si elles doivent être mises en oeuvre sur d'autres bases que les siennes. Nous avons essayé, pour notre part, de "démystifier" le *Capital*: c'est un impressionnant colosse, mais ses pieds sont d'argile' (p. 411).

It is unfortunate for the non-French reader that Dognin refers only to the French translation of Marx and not at the same time to the M.E.G.A. edition. This makes it difficult to check Dognin's judgments, because it is an awful lot of work to dig up in the M.E.G.A. edition the quotations from the French translations. A French author ought to be aware that his book is not only of interest to Frenchmen. That is too modest!

Dr Massiczek's book has quite a different character. Here too Marx's humanism is the central point. The author outlines this humanism, taking as his starting point quotations from Marx, and he constantly returns to quotations. So his sketch of Marx's humanism consists in quoting and interpreting Marx's own texts. In this interpretation, based on a thorough knowledge of Marx's Marxism and all relevant literature, Massiczek goes his own way. His position can best be stated by a quotation he gives from Tillich at p. 293:

'Marx' Auffassung vom Wesen des Menschen ist nirgends ausdrücklich entwickelt, aber sie ist in jedem Wort enthalten, das Marx über die Entmenschlichung des Menschen schreibt. Es ist nicht schwer zu zeigen, dass das Wesensbild des Menschen, das Marx voraussetzt, das des klassischen Humanismus ist' (Der Mensch in Christentum und im Marxismus, p. 6).

Massiczek subscribes entirely to the first sentence, but rejects equally entirely the second: Marx reveals in every word his conception of