The next three chapters describe the Arab world geographically, socially, historically and in other fields. The chapters entitled *Arabs Steer their Own Course* recite the facts of historical developments from the Palestine War to the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, and later to the breakup of the United Arab Republic into Syria and Egypt. This comprehensive treatment is sympathetic and clearly brings out, from the Arab viewpoint, the deceptions of the West and the perfidy of Israel. He finds that no formulas or devices can provide a solution of Arab-Israel conflict and that history might change its complexion. In this struggle, Nasser has, in the main, "followed the classic pattern of Egyptian rulers in seeking to extend power southward into the Sudan and northward into Syria, a pattern established by the Pharaohs and exemplified by Muhammad Ali in the nineteenth century" (p. 219).

In the next three chapters, Cremeans turns prophetic and also a master analyst. He explains the philosophy of the Egyptian revolution, Arab socialism and analyzes Arab-Israel conflict and other political problems and inter-Arab relationships. He deals at length with the problems, priorities and dilemmas which Nasser has to face as an Egyptian and also as Pan-Arabist. In his Afro-Asian policies, Nasser has been powerfully influenced by Nehru and Marshall Tito and has acquired a fad for international conferences. He has developed the policies of positive neutralism and adopted certain lines of action in his dealings with African and Asian matters. The Egyptians aspire to establish a three nations'—Egypt, India and China—leadership of the Afro-Asian nations. In his dealings with the Great Powers, Nasser is assertive and therefore hardly satisfies either the Soviet Union or the United States. He has, however, been able to get away with quite a few things.

In the last chapter, Mr. Cremeans discusses at length the alternative policies the United States should adopt towards the Arabs. He recommends that the United States should present itself as a dynamic country, in sympathy with the developing countries; maintain a neutral position between the Arabs and Israel and use the military force with circumspection. It should also encourage intellectual and cultural exchanges, deal with the Arab states as sovereign entities, contribute to economic development and encourage independence and progress everywhere.

The book fully justifies the amount of labour and expense that has gone into its production. It shows depth and great sympathy in the treatment of the subject. It is easily among the good books of the year.

KARACHI

ASLAM SIDDIQI

_Bayard Dodge, Muslim Education in Medieval Times_, The Middle East Institute, Washington, D.C., 1962, pp. 119, price $3.75.

After the publication of Professor A. S. Tritton's book, _Materials on Muslim Education in the Middle Ages_ (Luzac & Co., London 1957), it was expected that if another work on the same subject, whether by a Western or an Arab scholar was to appear, it would deal with the historical development of education in Islam, especially treating of the impact of the Muslim system on the intellectual and
spiritual movements and currents that arose in Islam and how far these movements and currents were in themselves a product of this system and conversely how far and in what fashion the system in itself was affected by these cultural, intellectual and spiritual movements. It was further expected that such a work, if and when it appeared, will assess the influence of such great teachers as al-Kisâ'i, Imâm al-Haramayn al-Jwaïñî, al-Ghazzâli, al-Fârâbî, Ibn Sînâ, Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Qâyîm al-Jawziyyah, and a host of others (who in their own day were the leading lights of the Islamic world), on the doctrine and creed as also the culture of Islamic peoples.

It is sad to note that the present work, like some of its predecessors, follows the same old pattern of dealing with such aspects as elementary education, vocational training, advanced study, use of paper, translation and research, the college, the monastery, the mosque-college (al-jâmi'ah), the curriculum, etc. No doubt the historical narrative gives to the average reader an idea of what the Islamic system of education was during the Middle Ages and how it worked, but it does not and cannot satisfy a critical mind, looking forward to an analytical and interpretative treatment of the subject. Judged from this standpoint, Dr. Dodge's work can hardly be justified, as much more useful and varied information, and in greater detail, can be found in Manâziir Alâsan Gelânî's (not Gilânî; he belonged to Gelânî, a small village in the Indian state of Bihar) two-volume Urdu work, Hindustân ke Musâlmanon kâ Niğâm-i Ta'lim-o Tarbiyat (Nadwat al-Muğannîfîn, Dihli 1363/1943). Unfortunately this work is not available to Western scholars and there is a crying need for its English version or a useful condensation in a European language dispensing profitably with unnecessary details and the author's well-known digressions. In Arabic itself al-Dâris fi Ta'rîkh al-Madâris of 'Abd al-Qâdîr b. Muğammad al-Nu'aymî (Damascus 1367-1370/1947-1950) and a very recent work al-Tarbiyah fi'l-1slâm of Aḥmad Fu'âd Ahwânî (Cairo 1955) preceded by Aḥmad Shalâby's doctoral thesis, History of Muslim Education (Beirut 1954), are more useful and provide larger information.

Apart from the rather poor treatment of the subject there are certain statements of the author which cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. For instance, on pages 1-2 he remarks, "Although the traditions telling how the revelations became codified may not be reliable it is reasonable to believe that the Muslims who were able to read and write compiled one authorized version of the Qur'an about a quarter of a century after the Prophet's death." He has relied for this statement on Richard Bell's Introduction to the Qur'an (Edinburgh University Press, 1953) without himself taking the trouble of examining the sources and probing into the vast literature of hâdîth on the subject. Dr. Dodge's remark is surprising because this was no occasion for doubting the veracity or the genuineness of the hâdîth relating to the collection and compilation of the Qur'an, and if the author had raised this question, one wonders why and by what process of reasoning he has come to fix the time as "a quarter of a century after the death of the Prophet". Does he mean also to say that for a period of 25 years after the passing away of the Prophet, the Muslims, including the first and the second Califas—Abû Bakr and 'Umar—had no authoritative text of the Qur'an and that when 'Umar made it obligatory for the Um'mah to regularly hold Tarâwîh prayers during the nights of the fasting month of Râmâdân, wherein the Qur'an is (to this day) recited
part by part by _huffāz_ (memorizers), the poor Muslims read and recited the Qurʾān at random without any sequence as they had at that time no “authorized version” from which to recite?

Reverting to the subject, Dr. Dodge remarks, “Although Muḥammad himself employed scribes to write his official documents, they did not attempt to compile a written version of the _entire_ (italics ours) Qurʾān. These scribes _probably_ (italics ours) lacked parchment and papyrus, being obliged to use a form of red leather as writing material” (p. 31). This statement is so patently absurd that it would be a sheer waste of words to attempt to enlighten the author. He appears to be so much obsessed with the idea of impressing upon his readers the “unreliability” of the current text of the Qurʾān that he refuses to acknowledge even the well-known facts of history. One may ask as to by whom, when and from what material the “written version of the _entire_ Qurʾān” was compiled, if it had not been done during the life-time of the Prophet. We are sure no sensible scholar, writing objectively on Islam, would ever make such a glaringly unhistorical statement. One wonders what prompted Dr. Dodge to say something which he cannot substantiate. Surely a book purporting to trace the history of Muslim education in the Middle Ages should have been kept free from such prejudicial statements, which have been discussed much more thoroughly and extensively by scholars far better equipped than Dr. Dodge.

The author has also criticized the language of the Qurʾān by dubbing it as “the vernacular of the Quraysh Tribe to which Muḥammad belonged . . .” (p. 32). He concludes that for this reason “no single Arab was familiar with all of the words . . .” that occur in the Qurʾān which also contains “colloquialisms of other tribes” (ibid., loc. cit.). If it were a fact how was it that deputations of various tribes, living far away from Madinah and not belonging to the Quraysh, waited upon the Prophet in his mosque, understood the message that he had brought and without any temptation or compulsion accepted him as the Messenger of Allāh and embraced the religion of Islam. How was it that the Medinese themselves, who were not Quraysh, understood the Qurʾān and acted upon it?

Again, Dr. Dodge states, “In fact, subjects unrelated to the Qurʾān were regarded as being too secular to teach to the children. Muslim education was Qurʾānic education” (p. 2). So the early Muslims were prevented, for the fear of being dubbed “too secular,” from teaching arithmetic, and history (ṣīrah) and other secular sciences to their children. Dr. Dodge would have done well to have traced the origins and evolution of the profane sciences in Islam. His entire 90 pages of text throw little light on this point. In this respect Professor Tritton’s work, despite its sketchy character, is more useful and informative.

While the author doubts the veracity of the Traditions relating to the compilation of the Qurʾān, he admits that “conscientious scholars spent years in studying the reliability of the traditions, so as to compile collections of such quotations, as their research led them to regard as genuine” (p. 53). He also declares, “It is, moreover, likely that when Christians, Jews and Zoroastrians became converted to Islam they confused popular texts and verses learned in childhood with the sayings repeated to them after they had become Muslims” (ibid., loc. cit.). This is a strange piece of thinking. On the one hand he admits that “conscientious” scholars spent years in research and sifting out the
traditions; on the other, he states quite simply that some traditions are mixtures of "popular texts and verses" taught to Jewish, Christian and Zoroastrian children, before they embraced Islam. Again, about Ḥadīth the author tells us, "The persons quoting them did not always have good memories, sometimes being careless or even deliberately deceitful in repeating words attributed to the Prophet" (p. 52). Thus the two main bases on which rests the entire edifice of Islam (the Qur'ān and the Tradition) are subjected to sweeping doubts, leaving the accessories of Kalām, 'ilm al-rijāl, jurisprudence, tafsīr, logic, philosophy, etc., behind.

Such missionary injections apart, the book gives, in broad outline, an idea only of the methods of teaching followed by the Medieval Muslim scholars rather than the aims and ideals of the system of education prevailing in the lands of Islam. Dr. G. Makdisi's well-written essay "Muslim Institutions of Learning in Eleventh Century Baghdad" (BSOAS, XXIV/i. April 1961), gives a much better idea of what the Muslim system of education aimed at than the monograph under review. It is a pity that a well-planned, well-knit and fully interpretative history of Muslim education from the earliest times to the present-day still remains to be written. The work under review as well as those cited above, coupled with a thorough and critical study of the classical Arabic works, treating of books and scholars, educational institutions and mosque-colleges, endowments and foundations, biographies and bibliographies, general and local histories, including various adab works, will prove of immense help to a future historian of Muslim classical education who wishes to produce a work of intrinsic worth and lasting value. The present book is neatly printed and the get-up is fine. The Appendixes seem mostly superfluous. The jacket carries a good picture, whose source has not been revealed, of a Medieval Muslim teacher, clad in his voluminous ringed turban and flowing black woollen robes, taking a class of elderly students in one of the liwāns of al-Azhar, giving the impressing of a distinguished scholar respected by his pupils and people at large for "the ink of the scholar is more precious than the blood of the martyrs".

KARACHI

A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI

Frederick J. Simoons, EAT NOT THIS FLESH. The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1961, pp. 241.

The subject of this interesting work is more closely defined in the sub-title Food Avoidances in the Old World. Here, apparently for the first time, an attempt is made at a general survey of those curious prejudices which cause one people to recoil with seemingly instinctive horror and disgust from an animal food which may be the staple diet or even the favourite delicacy of another, perhaps neighbouring people.

Professor Simoons is a cultural geographer, and it was whilst carrying out doctoral research-work in North-West Ethiopia that his attention was first drawn to these prejudices. He observed that all Ethiopians, Christians and pagan equally with Muslim and Jew, regarded the pig as unclean and rejected pork as food; that Ethiopian Christians considered the eating of camel flesh as a Muslim trait and as an offence liable to punishment by excommunication; that