

*graffiti* (pp. 113-128) with the first-class photographs of the actual wall (pls. 4-13), and by using his or her common sense.

Of one conclusion from the recent excavations this reviewer is as certain as is Professor Guarducci: the little shrine found by the official excavators directly below the papal altar of St Peter's marks the spot that Roman Christians from the mid-second-century onwards believed to be the burial-place of the Apostle. That conclusion is indeed clinched by one late-second-century Greek *graffito* discovered close beside the shrine—*Petos eni* = 'Petros eni' = 'Petrus inest' = 'Peter is within' = 'Peter is buried here' (since there is abundant evidence for *ἐνεῖναι* and 'inest' used in this sepulchral sense). The authoress of this book did not herself discover that inscription. But the establishment beyond all doubt of the final letter of 'eni' as 'i' is due to her; and we must congratulate her on her definitive reading of the only, but vitally important, text at the shrine in which St Peter's name quite *certainly* occurs.

J. M. C. TOYNBEE

HINDU AND MUSLIM MYSTICISM *Jordan Lectures 1959* By R. C. Zaehner; University of London, the Athlone Press; 30s.

MUSLIM DEVOTIONS *A Study of Prayer-Manuals in Common Use* By Constance E. Padwick; S.P.C.K.; 35s.

There are as many kinds of mystics as of men. The Californian with a fancy to practise yoga may not be very serious, but the curious reader of Knox's *Enthusiasm* or Cohn's *Pursuit of the Millennium* will remember the pathetic eccentrics who pass from a delusion of deification into inspired antinomian behaviour. How are we to distinguish the tried and tested ascetic who after a hard-earned mystical experience follows the same course? Such cases are probably exceptions; and certainly the experience itself, natural and acquired, is remarkable enough, this 'realization of the undifferentiated unity'—a direct knowledge of the immortality, even the eternity, of the soul, but not of a Creator or a loving God.

BLACKFRIARS readers already know Professor Zaehner's special interest in the emergence of the idea of a loving transcendent God in Hindu mystical writing, but he rightly insists that this revelation remains ambiguous and uncertain, even in Ramanuja's commentary on the Bhagavad-Gita. About the 'realization of unity' and 'liberation' of the soul there is little doubt, however: despite the confusion of mystical authors who can neither agree upon the terms to describe it, nor on its interpretation, the experience of different epochs, cultures and religions is closely comparable. Professor Zaehner shows how variously, too, it can be interpreted by the observer: that, for example, though we can take it as what the mystic himself claims for it, or place it in a monotheistic frame, we can also give it a Jungian explanation which admits its value while denying its evidential validity; and there are other possibilities. The Hindu mystic (for whom God may enter the process, if at all, only as part of the technique) may even describe

the object of his mystical knowledge in terms like those that Marx and Engels use to define matter. All that is certain is that whoever can master the technique can achieve the experience.

If traditionally it is difficult for a monotheist to appreciate the 'gloomy Brahman from glowing Ind,' the Muslim mystic, the Sufi, has enjoyed a better understanding among Christian writers. Professor Zaehner devotes four of the Jordan lectures primarily to the Hindus, four to the Muslims, each group being made to illuminate the other, both where the Sufis are historically in the debt of the Vedanta, and where common experience is mutually explanatory. I am not convinced that it is safe to use Islamic terminology to give precision to a Hindu text (p. 58), but generally the process elucidates effectively. The lecturer stresses the infection of Sufi teaching by Hindu sources, through the influence of al-Bistami (its 'yogification,' one may say), more than do Nicholson or Massignon. (Gardet, new *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, s.v. *Allah*, agrees more nearly, but Anawati, in the recent *Mistica Islamica*, ignores this aspect). Professor Zaehner is unusually critical of al-Ghazali, for inconsistency and syncretism, and a failure to penetrate the dangers of monism. Perhaps what Margaret Smith did for al-Muhasibi, or Massignon for al-Hallaj, he will one day do for al-Junayd; he prints an excellent translation of a part of the *kitab al-fana*, as well as al-Sahljaji's and 'Attar's versions of al-Bistami's *mi'raj*, and extracts from Ramanuja's commentary on the Gita. An admirable long quotation from Martin Buber is used as a key to much of the material. Professor Zaehner's is a wise and stimulating approach to often intractable sources.

Ordinary Muslims are suspicious of many of the Sufis. Al-Hallaj, they say, was playing at politics and al-Ghazali despite himself was half a Christian. Yet the later Sufism (despised by some Western writers) has influenced the daily life of millions of Muslims. The interest of Miss Padwick's book is precisely that she shows us the piety of actual and widespread practice (her study is based on prayer-books bought in a range of cities between Algiers and Delhi), information that she would herself 'most gladly have had at her disposal on arriving in Arabic lands.' Modestly disclaiming scholarship, she leaves it to others to examine the authenticity of the popular attributions of prayers to individual saints and sufis; but the purpose she sets herself she achieves with loving care. I do not understand the objections of her friends that her sources do not give 'a true picture of the religious life of the rank and file'; of course we study devotion among the devout. We can perceive from the *Garden of the Soul* the characteristic Catholic devotion of its age, which is quite different from attempting to measure the degree of devotion then prevailing among Catholics.

Most of her book is planned round the prayer-rite (i.e., *salat*), and the sources are quoted extensively and constantly. An excellent short introduction prepares the reader for ideas which are peculiarly Eastern (e.g., the 'mosaic' of well-known items of prayer rearranged in new patterns) or Muslim (e.g., the notion of the *baraka*). She notes elements common to Muslims and Eastern Christians, such as the *dhikr* (recollection based on the constantly repeated invocation of the

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