

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

man but this conception is not, as Tillich says, the conception of classical humanism, it is the conception of Jewish prophetism. The author knows, of course, that the Jewish inspiration of Marx's thought has often been discussed. But I think he is right in claiming his book as the first attempt to prove this thesis by arguing from genuine Jewish sources, from the Bible and the Talmud down to Buber and Rosenzweig.

It is always a difficult matter to find the

most fundamental and original inspiration of a great idea. By what criteria can we decide that the inspiration by Jewish tradition is more profound than the inspiration by classical economics or by French communism or Hegel? Nevertheless the contribution of Massiczek's book to the interpretation of Marx is not only original; it is a solid attempt to *prove* the thesis of Jewish influence instead of just regarding it as an evident but unargued matter of fact.

BERNARD DELFGAAUW

BROTHERS IN HOPE (The Bridge, Volume 5), edited by John M. Oesterreicher. *Herder and Herder*, New York, 1970. pp. 350. \$7.50.

After a longer than usual delay, the fifth in the Bridge series of Judaeo-Christian studies from Seton Hall has now appeared. The Bridge seems never to have decided whether it is a periodical or a book, and Bridge V is no exception. It is not easy to see what place there is in a thick hard-back for a short speech by Cardinal Cushing when he received a Good Neighbour award. In fact most of the documents and book reviews had lost their interest long before this volume was published.

But the major part of *Brothers in Hope* consists of a series of articles which are supposed in some way or other to spring from reflection on Vatican II's statement about the Jews in *Nostra Aetate*. It must be admitted that despite a valiant attempt by Mgr Oesterreicher in his foreword to draw them together (and even to correct some of them!) they lack any real unity of purpose. They all have reference to some aspect of the Jewish-Christian dialogue, but that is the only cohesion they have. The Bridge would be a much more saleable and readable piece of work if the undoubted talent on which it draws could be more tightly organized.

For expertise there is here, in both the Catholic and (for the first time) Jewish articles. A number of them are concerned simply with the dialogue itself, and right-minded as these are, it could surely be supposed that anyone who buys this sort of book needs no convincing that it is good for Jews and Christians to get to know each other better. But the English experience of the dialogue suggests that it is most profitably pursued by a deep and serious discussion together of some point of common social or intellectual concern. Excellent studies like Miss Massingberd Ford's on the debt of

Christianity to pharisaism and Herbert Haag's on the relationship between Jesus and the tradition of his people would have been more in place as supporting such a sustained debate than appearing as they do here with no real context. The Seton Hall Institute is certainly capable of providing work of this sort. Some of the issues raised in articles in this present volume could well have been explored in depth. Professor Wyschogrod's piece on 'Israel, the Church and Election' could have provided an admirable starting point with its insistence that the Gentiles are not, and must recognize that they are not, elected; such firm and charitable argument deserves a proper reply.

It must be admitted with regret that the themes of some of the articles could not yet come into Christian-Jewish debate. The dialogue will not have come of age until they can. Mgr Oesterreicher himself has an article on the attitude of the Christian theologian to the land of Israel, but in even the most practised Jewish-Christian circles (at least in this country) the state of Israel remains outside the limits of any possible discussion. And this despite the fact that world Jewry itself is not altogether of one mind on this matter and that, if the goodwill of any Christians can be assumed, it is such Christians as these who could be trusted not to be prejudiced. In England more than at Seton Hall there is a need for a Christian to be able to speak honestly with his Jewish neighbour on this matter. Until he can, it will be increasingly difficult for those who love Jerusalem to interpret their passion to those who have serious reserves about the role of Israel in middle-east politics in the 1970's.

GEOFFREY PRESTON, O.P.