

Divine Name, often to the point of ecstasy) or its equivalent, the Jesus Prayer, and her treatment harmonises with the much fuller study lately published by Gardet in *Mística Islámica*. She is particularly sensitive to what Islam shares with Christianity in general (e.g., she compares the blessing of peace with Matth. 10, 12, 13; the use of the *basma* to that of the sign of the Cross; Christian to Muslim concepts of *tasbih* (praise); the 'mihrab of the heart' to St Teresa's 'little cell'; points of liturgy, and so on). She treats matters that have seemed strange to Christians since the Middle Ages, such as God's calling down of blessing on Muhammad. She does not avoid what is alien, or what Christianity is bound to exclude (e.g., physical joys of Paradise) but there is much more for the Occidental to admire, even when it strikes fresh and strange: perhaps the prayer, 'we take refuge with Thee from Thyself'—but any choice is a matter of taste. Miss Padwick's book represents so much that is most generous in the Protestant Missions, and puts every ecumenical Christian in her debt. I cannot imagine that it will be superseded, or that anyone will better delineate for us the facts of ordinary Muslim spirituality in 1960, with all its accumulation of spirituality from the past. One small thing I wish personally, that with less classical Arabic she had given Shaykh 'Abd al-Qadir's name the form—al-Gaylani—by which he is known in Baghdad, at the shrine and centre of his cult.

NORMAN DANIEL

A DIALOGUE OF RELIGIONS By Ninian Smart; S.C.M. Press; 18s.

The necessity of a dialogue between the different religions, like the dialogue which is beginning to take place among Christians, is something which can no longer be seriously questioned. It is no longer possible to argue with an educated Jew or Muslim or Buddhist or Hindu simply in terms of 'conversion' and the attempt to do so has ended in a stale-mate. Mr Ninian Smart, who is Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion at King's College, London, has attempted to provide the basis for such a dialogue by assembling a Christian, a Jew, a Muslim, a Ceylon and a Japanese Buddhist and a Hindu, allowing them to discuss their differences in a friendly spirit. The result is very illuminating. The real difficulties which present themselves in such a dialogue are well brought out, but at the same time the subtle resemblances in the different traditions are made apparent. It must be admitted, however, that the Christian, the Jew and the Muslim, the representatives of 'revealed' religion, appear at something of a disadvantage. They always tend to fall back on the dogmas of their different revelations and give no convincing reasons for them. It is perhaps significant that the dialogue ends on the note; 'I give notice that however Hindu I may be, I remain a Hindu Christian.'

This is partly due to the fact that Hinduism has the advantage of being a philosophical system which claims to embrace all religion by transcending all differences. But it is also due to the fact that Mr Smart's Christianity is not sufficiently theological. He nowhere shows that he has any clear grasp of the doctrines of

the Trinity and the Incarnation, so that he cannot establish the Christian doctrine in clear opposition to their Hindu and Buddhist analogies. In the same way he does not appear to have a clear metaphysical conception of God and creation or of good and evil. The result is that the most important distinctions on which the whole argument turns are often left confused. Everything really turns on the problem of transcendence and immanence. Is God absolutely transcendent and an object of worship as the Christian, the Jew and the Muslim maintain, or is he immanent in such a way that all distinctions disappear in the ultimate reality? Mr Smart never succeeds in establishing the case for the 'Semitic' view or in showing how the Hindu and Buddhist view of immanence can be reconciled with it.

The view which he presents needs to be corrected by the analysis of Christian experience which is given by Dr Cuttat in his *Encounter of Religions*, which was reviewed in a recent number of *BLACKFRIARS*. In this study Dr Cuttat really penetrates to the heart of the problem. Mr Smart has nevertheless presented the problem with considerable understanding and in a way which makes it a delight to read.

BEDE GRIFFITHS O.S.B.

IRRATIONAL MAN By William Barrett; Heinemann; 21s.

It surely cannot be true that William Barrett is 'one of America's most original philosophic thinkers', though this is what it says on the dust-cover of this book. He is a former editor of *Partisan Review*, the lively and left-wing organ of the American intelligentsia, and his principal office there, at least in the immediately post-war years, was to play the polyglot chaperon of European culture to the innocent and fascinated American. Something of this comes out even now, when he has become a respectable professor—speaking of Buber, for instance, he confides that 'this old rabbi has wonderful instincts and he has sniffed out where the trouble really lies.' We are also informed that existential psycho-analysis, Sartre's invention, 'has already caught on somewhat in Europe.'

The book is meant for Americans. This is not said disparagingly, though it is meant for them so much and so painfully that it is hard to see why it has been brought over here. It is basically a sincere and committed effort to analyse and remedy what Mr Barrett takes to be the complete moral and spiritual impotence of American society. The first section of the book sets all this out, in very general terms; and the concluding section recommends some integration of the non-intellectual potencies of human life into the dominant intellectuality which is supposed to have brought about the present appalling situation. We must realise that man is *more than merely rational*—hence the title; and that our non-intellectual powers represent some of our primary moral resources.

We can do this particularly by studying Kierkegaard and Heidegger. The centre of the book is taken up with a survey of philosophy, most of which is maddeningly superficial, inaccurate and patronising, and in which almost anybody who has ever admitted any limits to what human reason can do counts at