have been surprising had it been otherwise. The Reports were the result of the efforts of partisans and not of an impartial tribunal” (p. 102).

His estimate of Gandhi’s personality is:

“The sincerity of Mr. Gandhi’s desire to do full justice to the Muslims as fellow citizens of India cannot be questioned. But he was, in Nehru’s words, ‘a Hindu to the innermost depths of his being’, and however earnestly he sought to do so, he could not appreciate the Muslim point of view” (p. 110).

The production of the book particularly the cover and the binding leaves much to be desired.

KARACHI

RAIS AHMAD KHAN

M. S. Khan, AN UNPUBLISHED TREATISE OF MISKAWAIH ON JUSTICE OR RISĀLA FĪ MĀHIYAT AL-‘ADL LI MISKAWAIH, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1964, pp. 38.

Dr. M. Sabir Khan has prepared the text of this so far unpublished treatise of Ibn Miskawaih very carefully and critically. This beautifully printed booklet which covers 38 pages presents a very important text of the celebrated Muslim thinker, Ibn Miskawaih, with an excellent English translation, annotations and introduction. The author deserves commendation and congratulations for the amount of labour he has so arduously put to his project.

It was in the year 1958 that Dr. Khan asked me to check the text of this treatise and sent me a copy of the rotooffset manuscript. I am so glad that this rare treatise has, at last, seen the light of the day.

The text has been prepared, indeed, with a great labour. He has, however, unnecessarily undertaken the pain of supplying full أعراب, the diacritical marks and vowel points. Realising the difficulty one confronts in reading proofs so minutely as the Arabic أعراب and marks require, the author may be excused for certain mistakes that have inevitably crept in. See, for example, the following list:

Page 13, line 6  instead of  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“بَكَّةٌ”</td>
<td>“بَلَّة”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“الْسَم”</td>
<td>“الْسَم”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>“الْمُكْتِبَة”</td>
<td>“الْمُكْتِبَة”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“حَتَى يُحْدَثُ”</td>
<td>“حَتَى يُحْدَثُ”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having gone through the text and the translation one cannot but admire the careful edition and the English rendering. I, however, find it difficult to agree with some of the readings of the text the author has preferred. The following lines will illustrate some of the discrepancies detected by the writer:

In the expression:

the author has wrongfully referred the pronoun to Allah and translated:

(p. 22.11) "it is of the nature of the soul that, when it does not observe any plurality in Him either in Himself or in relation to something else, it understands him to be one and calls Him so." The translation should be: "on the contrary, it is the nature of the soul that when it observes that which has no plurality in itself neither per se nor in respect of its having relation with something else, it understands the object to be one and calls it so."

Again, it is difficult to understand (p. 22.15) "... I mean, the plurality which is the cause of the oppositions and differences in which through the changing conditions the basest, lowest and meanest things find themselves because of the imperfection and diffusion of existence in them." The translation may be corrected as: "I mean, the plurality which itself is the cause of diversity and difference in the remains of things (read بالعُبُرات instead of بالنييرات) in which there continue the basest, lowest and meanest things due to the imperfection and diffusion of existence in them."
The English translation of a few expressions demands to correct the edition as follows:

Page 15, line 4 instead of بثفادها ما عدنآ فان الناس على تابيعهم (ذهبو الى) إلآ ...
" 18 " 16
" 18 " 18 instead of من بذل الأمية وان من بذل الأمية واقتناه ...
" 19 " 19

Those who are interested in Arabic texts related to Political Science will however hail this treatise and will surely be grateful to Dr. S. M. Khan for placing this rare text of Ibn Miskawaih into their hands with such a beautiful translation and useful introduction.

KARACHI

M. S. H. MA’SÜMLI

Notices


The book under notice, written in Arabic, is the introductory part of a much larger work entitled I’lā’ al-Sunan which had been published earlier in litho but which is now being reprinted in type, beginning with the present introductory volume.

The chief characteristic of the main work is that it provides the Hadīth-bases, with lengthy discussions, for all the legal decisions associated with the name of Abū Ḥanifah, thus seeking to refute the common charge brought against the Ḥanafi school by other schools that the former has little or no Hadīth-foundation. It should be pointed out that the findings of modern research confirm that it was, indeed, the “Ḥanafi school” or, rather the ‘Irāqi legal tradition which developed the concept of Hadīth as a theoretical basis for law—as distinguished from the Hijāzī or the Syrian schools which laid greater emphasis on Sunnah or the practical tradition.

The present volume is a treatise on the “science of Hadīth” with a more or less Ḥanafi point of view. Generally speaking, the book pleads for a more liberal attitude towards the rijāl or the authorities of the Hadīth. A special attempt is made on page 96 to rehabilitate Muḥammad ibn Ishaq, the author of the first extant biography of the Prophet, who has been much maligned by the Traditionists as unreliable. Muḥammad ibn Ishaq is, of course, quoted by and relied upon by the highest Ḥanafi authorities. The abundant learning of the author is obvious from the pages of the book. The author also advocates and represents a liberal and catholic attitude towards the subject and in this connection describes Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Ḥibbān as “too severe”. But the basic limitations of the work are the limitations from which the “science of Hadīth” does obviously suffer as it has been developed traditionally. Its most fundamental limitation is its concentration on the rijāl or the authorities and its neglect of internal criticism. The present work, accordingly contains no trace of internal or historical criticism. Under the circumstances, a much more radical change in our attitude towards