What delights and fascinates me is the language as such. And he composed poetry almost by instinct:

Composing verse, synthetic verse, is with me a need.) Writing on his extraordinary gifts, Menzel, a contemporary of Rueckert, says: "In richness of similes and thoughts, Friedrich Rueckert excels all modern poets; nay, the blooming spirit which exists in him transforms the language itself, by means of rhyme, symphony, and alliteration, into an immense forest of flowers. No poet has had the same power over the language as he." (Ibid., p. 166)

In the Oriental literary movement itself, Rueckert holds a rather unique position which has been summed up by Schimmel in the following words:

Rueckert re-united (in himself) the entire knowledge of his century about the Oriental poetic art, which he transformed into German poetry with almost uncanny facility. None of the translators (Nachdichter) of Oriental works to come after Rueckert has equalled him in marvellous fidelity of form; none has reproduced the clang and tone, the characteristic style of each work of art from the Islamic or Indian cultural field so truly as the modest Frankish Professor, whose not-easily perceivable fecundity has to this day made it almost impossible for his works to be suitably honoured or to be given the publicity they deserve. (“Introduction”, p. 33)

The strength of Rueckert's translations, therefore, lies not so much in their literal accuracy as in their faithfulness to the peculiarities of form and spirit. This would hold true also of the contents of the Orientalische Dichtung.

Karachi.
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Price 35/-, pp. 137.

This remarkable study of Dr. Morris S. Seale was written in 1960 and was approved by the University of London for the degree of Ph.D. in 1961. The aim and object of the study is "to seek to establish the influence of the Greek Church Fathers on the teaching of the Qadariya, the Mu'tazila and the Murji'a".

The author has reproduced the representative doctrines of the "three Muslim heretical" sects, as he calls them, side by side "the writings of such Christian theologians as Clement of Alexandria, (born c. 10 to 20 B.C.) Origen, (c. 185—254) and John of Damascus" (+792). He has based his study on the unpublished MS. of Ibn Ḥanbal's polemical treatise al-Radd 'ala l-Zanādiqah wa'l-Jahmiyah (British Museum Or. 3106), an English translation of which forms the bulk of the study. In the opinion of the author the treatise "gives us a clear view both of Jahm's essentially Greek position and of undiluted Muslim orthodoxy as represented by Ibn Ḥanbal,"
This is beyond contention that Christianity and Islam have many similar doctrines. Islam, in fact, claims that it gives the same message which was given by Jesus Christ, the belief in One God and in the Message of prophets. The gulf between the two widens apart when Christianity identifies itself with the doctrines like those of Trinity and Atonement of Sin etc. “The similarity of the subjects discussed by both Christian and Muslim theologians,” therefore, does not prove the influence of one upon the other. Even if we consider “the genesis of the ideas themselves,” the discrepancy in doctrines showed its appearance in the camp of Islam from within and not from without. For example, the difference among the Ansār and the Muhājirūn on the election of a successor of the Prophet was surely not stimulated by any factor from outside. Again, the claim of the Shi‘ites in favour of ‘Alī was, beyond doubt, free from any external influence.

The causes of the appearance of various doctrines should, therefore, in my mind, be searched elsewhere instead of accusing Muslim authorities of tending “to restrict themselves to passing references to foreign influence, with the intent to disparage these ideas rather than to point informatively to their source”.

Muslims have been in close touch with the Jews, the Christians and some other non-Muslim settlers of Arabia and the border lines of the peninsula from the very life-time of the Prophet. This is also a fact that innumerable Jews, Christians, Sabians and others came into the fold of Islam. Hence, the Jewish, Hellenic and Zoroastrian ideas or doctrines were not new to the Muslims. As for the influence—a point which is so much emphasised these days—even rival groups and inimical nations are influenced mutually inasmuch as either group or nation reacts against the other and tries to outwit the other after studying carefully the behaviours and the intentions of the rival group.

Nevertheless, we must not ignore the fact that Islam recognised the brotherly relationship of human individuals, gave them equal status and the right of free thinking. It was the freedom of thought allowed by Islam that urged the Muslims to display their own thoughts and adhere to their respective views. It is, therefore, contrary to facts to think that the advocates of various Muslim sects were influenced by the teaching of, for example, Origen and John of Damascus and other Christian Fathers, Muslim savants hardly attended the discourses of the non-Muslim teachers. In the absence of any evidence to this effect it is difficult to submit to the notion that the Muslim savants were influenced by Christian Fathers. Even a cursory glance over the early sects in Islam reveals the truth that the leaders of the sects and also their followers were devout Muslims who never approved of any blasphemy, and never tolerated any criticism against the Qur‘ān and its teachings and were always anxious to refer to the Qur‘ān and the Sunnah. The arguments advanced by John (+745) and others, as quoted by Imām Ahmad Ibn Hanbal (780-855) support the contention. The Khārijites and the Qadarites of the first century relied wholly and solely, on the Qur‘ān in favour of the doctrines they upheld. The letter of Imām Ḥasan al-Baṣri (642-728) in reply to the query of ‘Abd al-Malik regarding the former’s view about qadar strengthens the views expressed above (cf. Der Islam Bnd. xxi). The arguments advanced by ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd
and Wās'l ibn 'Atā in favour of their five cardinal doctrines, tawḥīd, 'adl, al-manzilah bain al-manzilatayn, Beatific Vision and Freedom of Will are derived from the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. Some of their arguments are, in fact, borrowed from Umm al-Muminīn 'Āy'ishah, Ibn Mas'ūd, Ibn 'Abbās, Ubayy ibn Ka'b and other Şâhâbah (vide Islamic Culture, Jan. 1948, Hyderabad).

Another point which may be kept in view in this connection is the fact that terms qadar, jabr, 'irjā' are not, strictly speaking, Islamic. They existed in pre-Islamic days. Even before the propagation of Islam the Arabs believed in the pre-ordained decree of Allah, as they expressed their optimistic views and delayed their action cherishing hopes for the best. In his Mu'allaqah 'Amr b. Kulthūm says:

و اناسوف تدركنا الدنيا مقدرة لنا و مقدرة

Turfah b. al-'Abd al-Bakiy, another Mu'allaqah poet says:

ستديلك للأيام ما كنت جاهلاً و ياتيك بالأخبار من لم تزود

The author himself has quoted traditions in favour of predestination which show that the Şâhâbah themselves believed in preordained decree of Allah, which on no account be regarded contrary to Divine Justice. Justice concerns the good or bad voluntary action for which taklīf, holding responsibility, is imposed on man provided his understanding and intellect remain in tact. The entire religious commandment and prohibition are based on the intellectual capacity. An underdeveloped individual, an insane and a boy who has not attained puberty are excluded from religious taklīf in Islam. The Qur'ān, therefore, declares “Man can only have the fruit of his endeavour” (Al-Najm : 39).

That in matters related to faith Muslims were very strict, and they criticised the views of the Muslim philosophers who appeared only after the second century of the Hijrah, is another strong evidence that Muslim savants were strict enough not to accept anything bearing foreign impression.

In these circumstances, it is well-nigh impossible to accept the conclusion of Mr. Seale that “Muslim heterodoxy is dependent on Patriotic teaching which it reproduces before proceeding to diverge from it and follow its own original course” (p. 95) inasmuch as no evidence of a direct influence of the Christian Fathers on the leaders of early Muslim sects is available in the first and even in second century of the Hijrah. In the absence of any translation of the works of Philo, Clement, and Origen in the early two centuries of the Hijrah and in view of the fact that early Muslims were too devoted to the Qur'ān to turn to foreign teachings, it remains no better than a conjecture to speak of “the influence of the Greek Church Fathers on the teaching of the Qadariya, the Mu'tazila and the Murji'”.

This little book, however, presents, perhaps for the first time, a comparison of the doctrines of some Muslim heretical sects with the similar ideas of Christian Fathers of the early Christian centuries. Its value has increased a great deal by the inclusion of the English Translation of İmâm Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal's so far unpublished treatise on the “Refutation of the Zanādiqa and
the Jahmiya" (pp. 96–125). The book also contains two Appendices on "Mu’tazila Creed"—three extracts reproduced in English from Ibn al-Murtadā’s Al-Munyah wa’l-Amaż (p. 6), Al-Ash’ary’s Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn (vol. I, p. 148 f.) and Al-Shahrastānī’s al-Mīlāl wa’l-Niḥal (pp. 30, 31)—and "on Maimonides and Outside Influences" (The Guide for the Perplexed, tr. M. Friedlander, pp. 108, 109). Bibliography and Index have occupied pp. 131–134 and 135–137 respectively.

The price of this little beautifully printed book in cloth binding seems to be rather high.

Karachi
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The book under review is a scholarly contribution of Dr. Wilcox to Pakistan studies in U.S.A. Dr. Wilcox is a young promising scholar. He has been associated with the Center for Pakistan Studies at Columbia University as an Assistant Professor of Government and International Relations.

On the eve of the partition of the sub-continent the successor states of India and Pakistan were not only confronted with the problem of establishing a stable national government in the administrative provinces of the British India, but also they had to integrate a large number of native states which were, according to the author, "kept as antique showcases of medieval India" and at the same time their modernization and democratization was to be effected. The Indian part of the story has already been told by V. P. Menon in a book entitled: The Story of the Integration of the Indian States and partly in another work by the same author: The Transfer of Power in India. Dr. Wilcox has undertaken the difficult task of telling the story of the integration of the native states within the emerging political structure of Pakistan. He has filled in a serious gap in the literature on Pakistan studies. There does not exist any other work on this aspect of Pakistan, and as such his is a pioneering work. The theme of the book deserves further probing by Pakistani scholars as well.

The book contains the results of the author’s painstaking researches on the problem of the integration of the native states of Bahawalpur, Khairpur, Kalat, Makran, Las Bela, Chitral, Kharan, Amb, Dir and Swat in Pakistan. The book has been divided into three parts dealing with the three important phases of the involvement of the native states in the constitutional evolution of Pakistan.

In the first part of the book entitled: "The States in Contest" Dr. Wilcox analyses the role of the native states as an important political force in the tripartite negotiations with the British Government on the question of devolution of independence to Indian people before the partition of the sub-continent. In the pre-partition constitutional set-up of the Government of India, these native states had gradually evolved a special relationship with the British government. The native states had surrendered their rights of conducting foreign relations