

REVIEWS

detailed examination in a lengthy article which, it is hoped, will appear in the near future elsewhere. In the opinion of the present writer the examples of variant readings from Neofiti 1 given by the author do not in any way prove a pre-Masoretic origin of the text of that manuscript; but it may well be that an early dating can be claimed on other grounds. A final view on this very important problem cannot be reached until the whole text is made available to the scholarly world at large in the edition, so eagerly awaited, by A. D. Macho himself.

The volume under review has no indexes. There are a number of misprints; for example, some of the figures in the table of contents are wrong. There are some linguistic errors in the articles by A. D. Macho, S. Segert and I. Engnell.

P. WERNBERG-MØLLER

ABŪ BAKR MUḤAMMAD B. AL-WALĪD AL-ṬURṬŪSHĪ, *Kitāb al-Ḥawādith wa'l-Bida'*, ed. Muḥammad al-Ṭālibī. 1959. Pp. 227. (Al-Maṭba'a al-Rasmiyya li'l-Djumhūriyya al-Tūnisiyya.)

This scholarly edition of the work by the famous Spanish theologian al-Ṭurṭūshī (d. A.H. 520/A.D. 1126) is a contribution of considerable importance for the study of *bid'a* "innovation", one of the most important problems of Islam. The book reflects faithfully the struggle of the Orthodox '*ulamā*' against *bid'a*. Al-Ṭurṭūshī quotes the Qur'ān, brings evidence from the Ḥadīth for the refutation of innovations and cites for this purpose the opinions of scholars of Muslim law and jurisprudence. This collection of traditions about innovations which originated in Islam in the course of time is a valuable source for Muslim social life and the penetration of foreign influences.¹

Al-Ṭurṭūshī includes in his book innovations of past centuries and innovations introduced in his time as well; in this review only a few points of his comprehensive work can be discussed.

In the traditions about the adornment of mosques we can trace the opinions of early orthodox scholars. A characteristic tradition is told about Ibn Mas'ūd² one of the first companions of the Prophet.³ Ibn Mas'ūd held important administrative posts in the period of 'Umar, and was celebrated for his moral integrity; he fought corruption, and was a champion of the traditional way of life, conforming with the *sunna* of the Prophet.⁴ Passing by the adorned mosques of Kūfa Ibn Mas'ūd remarked "The person who built it spent the money of Allāh in His disobedience". This negative opinion about the adornment of mosques was accepted by Muslim scholars: Mālik b.

¹ See the passage by the editor, Introduction, p. 10 and cf. the statements of the translators of the *Vorlesungen* of Goldziher into Arabic about the *bid'a*, giving the view of contemporary Muslim scholars on this subject, p. 226.

² al-Ṭurṭūshī, p. 95.

³ Ibn Ḥadjar, *Tabdīb al-Tabdīb*, VI, 27-8.

⁴ See al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashraf*, ff. 915b-919a; al-Kalā'ī, *al-Iktifā*, I, 376; al-Tirmidhī, XIII, 213-16, *Manāqib Ibn Mas'ūd*; the article 'Ibn Mas'ūd' in the *E.J.*

Anas (d. A.H. 179) opposed the adornment of mosques; he based his view on the fact that adornments distracted the believer from concentration in prayer.¹ It is of interest to know that the pious 'Umar II (717-20) intended to remove the embellishments from the mosques of al-Madīna and Damascus.²

Other statements in connexion with the adornment of mosques are of interest: the adornment of mosques heralds the decline of the people and corruption.³ Ibn 'Abbās predicted that the Muslims would in course of time adorn their mosques like the Jews and Christians.⁴ In a later work, the *Tadbkirā* of al-Ḳurṭubī,⁵ the embellishment of mosques is mentioned as one of the symptoms of the period preceding the Day of Judgement (*al-sā'a*). The practice of the Jews in adorning their synagogues is illustrated by a tradition of Wahb b. Munabbih: God revealed to Isaiah: "Tell the Banī Isrā'īl, they are asking my favour through slaughter of sheep; but flesh will not reach me, nor its eater; they are requested to seek my favour through piety and abstaining from killing the souls which I forbade to kill; they raise buildings and adorn the temples (*masājid*), but what need is there to raise buildings in which I do not dwell and to adorn temples into which I do not come? I commanded only to build them in order to be remembered in them and praised."⁶

There were, however, different opinions in Muslim society about this subject. This is evident from the chapter dealing with this problem in the *Bustān al-'Arifīn* of al-Samarḳandī.⁷ A group of scholars was of the opinion that embellishment increased the honour of the mosque, and based their opinion on the Ḳur'ān (xxiv. 36). This group mentioned the beautiful mosques built by the Caliphs and recalled the building of the Temple by Solomon. One of the champions of this view was Abū Ḥanifa.

A remarkable tradition reports that the Prophet ordered his mosque to be built like the booth of Moses.⁸ This tradition seems to belong to an early layer of traditions omitted in later collections of Ḥadīth, and deserves special attention.

The opponents of the adornment of mosques quoted a tradition of the Prophet recommending the whitewashing of mosques (*bayyidū masājid Allāh*).⁹ Of interest as well is another tradition of the Prophet forbidding embellishment of mosques with dentils.¹⁰

To the same stratum of old traditions seem to belong the traditions about

¹ al-Ṭurṭūshī, *op. cit.* pp. 96, 97. ² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.* p. 95. ⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ As quoted in the *Mukhtaṣar* of al-Sha'rānī, p. 134.

⁶ al-Ṭurṭūshī, p. 98.

⁷ Died A.D. 983—this book printed on the margin of *Tanbīh al-Ghāfilīn* of the same author, p. 127.

⁸ al-Ṭurṭūshī, p. 94.

⁹ *Bustān al-'Arifīn*, p. 128; and cf. al-Ṭurṭūshī, p. 95.

¹⁰ *Bustān*, p. 128; about two houses built with dentils see: al-Mas'ūdi, *Murūdj*, II, 222, 223—the houses of Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and al-Mikdād b. al-Aswad. An explanation of the tradition is given in *al-Madjarāt al-Nabawiyya* of al-Sharīf al-Radiyy, p. 82, no. 66.

the *mībrāb*. Al-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Muzāhim (see *Tabdīb al-Tabdīb*, iv, 453) called the *mībrāb* "the first sign of polytheism [*shirk*] of the people of prayer".¹ Some of the pious men refrained from entering the *mībrāb* for prayer.² A peculiar detail which stresses the puritanical approach of Muslim scholars is their opposition to the decoration of the walls of mosques with inscriptions from the *Qur'ān*; that was the opinion of Mālik.³ It may be noted that he maintained his view in a period when the writing of sentences from the *Qur'ān* on the walls of mosques was already one of the main features in their decoration.

All these traditions about the embellishment of mosques seem to reflect faithfully the views of the early Muslim scholars. The retention of these views in a later period shows the conservatism of the orthodox '*ulamā'*'; they persisted in their opposition to adornment at a time when splendid mosques, with *mībrābs* and rich ornamentation, were already built in all the centres of the Muslim Empire.

Of importance are the few traditions quoted by al-Ṭurṭūshī about relations between scholars and rulers. Here the early attitude of Islam is evident: relations with rulers endanger the moral integrity and independence of the scholar.⁴

The fierce controversy with the Shu'ūbiyya is reflected in two traditions of Sufyān al-Thaurī and of Mālik b. Anas.⁵ Sufyān is reported to have said: "Knowledge was with Arabs and noble men; when knowledge passed from them to these people—i.e. Nabateans and men of lower classes—religion changed." His face changed when he saw Nabateans recording religious knowledge. Mālik considered it reprehensible to talk in foreign languages in the mosque.⁶

Of quite different origin was the innovation of fasting during Radjab and of the introduction of various prayers for the nights of Radjab. The tradition of Radjab is a pre-Islamic one and the chapter included in the book of al-Ṭurṭūshī stresses the fact that the fast during this month was observed in the Djāhiliyya. It is interesting to find that already in the first days of Islam Radjab created a problem: 'Umar used to flog the "radjabiiyyin", who fasted during this month. Abū Bakr in astonishment asks people who made preparations to fast during the month of Radjab: "Are you going to make Radjab like Ramaḍān?" 'Umar used to oblige people to take their meals in Radjab, stressing that Radjab was a sacred month of fasting in the Djāhiliyya.⁷ The sanctity of Radjab in the times of the Djāhiliyya is further

¹ al-Ṭurṭūshī, p. 94.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.* p. 97.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 72, 73; and cf. the article of S. D. Goitein "The attitude towards Government in Islam", *Tarbiḥ*, xix, 157 in Hebrew.

⁵ al-Ṭurṭūshī, pp. 72, 104; and see al-Djāhiz, *al-Bayān*, I, 284 about the explanation of the *Qur'ān* in Persian in the mosque; and cf. '*Uyūm al-Akbbār*', iv, 91; and 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn, *Nawādir al-Makhtūṭāt*, III, the introduction of the editor.

⁶ Cf. *Sira Ḥalabiyya*, I, 21. A man knowing Arabic is not allowed to speak Persian; this causes mischief.

⁷ al-Ṭurṭūshī, p. 129.

stressed in the words of Ibn 'Umar and explained in the commentary of the author.¹

Orthodoxy was apparently unsuccessful in combating this Djähiliyya custom. It was as late as A.H. 480 that a new prayer was introduced for the Radjab festivities.² A special treatise about the virtues of Radjab, MS. Bodley, Thurst. 9, is an additional proof of this trend; it contains, of course, many traditions attributed to the Prophet about the sanctity of Radjab. It is curious to find that Radjab was in the same way respected in Fātimid circles.³

A comprehensive chapter is devoted to innovations in prayers (pp. 43–60) and to the behaviour of the believers in mosques (pp. 103–14). Various activities in the mosque are discussed: eating, drinking, teaching, sleeping, commercial activities, begging, paring of nails, etc.⁴ In all the traditions the idea is stressed that the mosque is a place of worship and that the believer has to refrain from worldly activities there.

With the social life in the mosque the problem of the *ḥuṣṣās* is closely connected. They were accused of inventing traditions about the Prophet and corrupting religion.⁵ Al-Ṭurtūshī devotes a special chapter to the problem of the *ḥuṣṣās* (pp. 99–103). The first *ḥāṣṣ* is said to have been in the mosque of the Prophet; he was a *munāfiḳ*.⁶ The opinion of orthodox circles is reflected in the saying of Abū Idrīs al-Khaulānī: "I prefer to see in the corner of the mosque a blaze of fire than to see there a *ḥāṣṣ*."⁷ The information that the first *ḥuṣṣās* appeared in the time of the struggle between 'Alī and Mu'āwīya⁸ is of peculiar importance: it emphasizes the role of the *ḥuṣṣās* in the political struggle of the community. It was Ka'b who acted as *ḥāṣṣ* for Mu'āwīya,⁸ and it was 'Ubayd b. 'Umayr al-Lathī, the first *ḥāṣṣ* appointed by 'Umar,⁹ who was reproached by the Syrian troops during the campaign of al-Ḥuṣayn b. Numayr in the following manner: "Do not speak ill about the Caliph of the Prophet, because he is more respectable than the mosque in Mekka."¹⁰ The

¹ al-Ṭurtūshī, p. 130. About the sanctity of Radjab in the Djähiliyya see the article of M. Plessner in *E.I.* "Radjab"; Buhl, *Das Leben Muhammads*, p. 88; Wellhausen, *Reste*, p. 93; *al-Mufaḍḍaliyyāt* (Lyal), p. 229; *Nihāyat al-Arab*, xv, 68; al-Asyūṭī, *al-Kanḩ al-Madṣūn*, p. 74; Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, I [Lieder der Husailiten], p. 53.

² al-Ṭurtūshī, p. 122.

³ *al-Madṣūn al-Mustanṣiriyya*, ed. Muh. Kāmil Ḥusayn, p. 112.

⁴ Cf. the chapter: *Munkarāt al-Masāḍjid* in *Ihyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn*, II, 294.

⁵ Cf. Goldziher, *Mub. Studien*, II, 161, and Mez, *Die Renaissance*, Ar. transl., II, 87.

⁶ al-Ṭurtūshī, p. 100; cf. about the first *ḥāṣṣ* in Baṣra, al-Aswad b. Sarī, Ibn Sa'd's *Ṭabaḳāt*, VII, i, 28; and see *Ansāb al-Asbrāf*, MS. f. 1030b.

⁷ al-Ṭurtūshī, p. 99; it may however be remarked that this Abū Idrīs himself, one of the leading men of tradition, whose traditions were reported by authorities like al-Zuhri, Makḥūl, Shahr b. Ḥaushab and others, was appointed by 'Abd al-Malik as judge and was a *ḥāṣṣ* of the people of Syria (*al-Iṣāba*, v, 57; *Ṭabḍīb al-Ṭabḍīb*, v, 85). He died in A.H. 80.

⁸ al-Ṭurtūshī, p. 100 and *Djāmi' b. Wabb*, ed. J. David-Weill, p. 510.

⁹ Goldziher, *Mub. Studien*, II, 162.

¹⁰ al-Balādhuri, *Ansāb*, IVb, 52.

anecdote about al-A'mash, who attended a lecture of a *kāfiy* and was compelled to deny traditions told on his authority also recurs in our text.¹

Another important problem is the use of public baths by Muslim women in the company of women of the Ahl al-Dhimma; the problem discussed is whether it is lawful for them to enter without a waist-wrapper (*iḥār*).² This problem is discussed in a special treatise by Ibn al-'Imād: *Ādāb Dukhūl al-Ḥammām*³ and forms a part of the general problem of relations between Muslims and the Ahl al-Dhimma.⁴

The impact of Christian influence on the Muslim population in Spain is fairly attested: they observe the Christian New Year (*iḳāmat Yanār*), and the Christian Easter (*Khamīs Abrīl*).⁵

The details given by the author about the innovations introduced in his own times are of peculiar importance. In A.H. 448 a man from Ṭarābulus called Ibn Abi Ḥamrā prayed in the mosque of al-Aḳṣā the prayer of mid Sha'bān and was joined during his prayer by the people of the mosque. Since then this prayer spread among the masses and it was considered a prayer belonging to the *sunna*.⁶

The author himself attended the prayer of the Day of al-'Arafa in Jerusalem. People from Jerusalem and neighbouring villages stood in prayer facing Mekka, raising their voices in the *du'ā*, just as if they were attending the *wuḳūf* of al-'Arafa.⁷ The common opinion was that the standing of four *wuḳūfs* in Jerusalem was equivalent to the pilgrimage to Mekka.⁸ The prayer of Radjab, as already mentioned, was introduced in Jerusalem in A.H. 480. Raising of hands and loud prayer were peculiar features of this worship.⁹

The book of al-Ṭurṭūshī is comprehensive and contains a mass of information about burial, mourning, the attendance of women at prayers, the reading of the Qur'ān and various items of personal and communal life. It was a useful vademecum for the believer who wanted to refrain from harmful innovation. The book is based on the tradition of *Sunna* scholars and is well documented.

The editing of al-Ṭālibī is admirable. In his Introduction the editor discusses works on *bid'ā* (pp. 5-6), opinions of scholars about the author, the contents of the book and its importance (pp. 7-12). A short biography of the author is supplied (pp. 3-4). The editor's criticism of scholars too eager in their

¹ Cf. the stories in *Mub. Studien*, II, 160; al-Ṭurṭūshī, p. 102.

² *Ibid.* p. 142.

³ MS. owned by me, f. 24.

⁴ See E. Strauss, "The social isolation of Ahl al Dhimma", *Hirschler Mem. Book* (1949).

⁵ See the important notes of the editor about the observance of this feast in Muslim communities in contemporary times, p. 140; the problem of buying cheese from Christians seems to have disquieted the author and he devoted a special treatise to the problem: *Ṭaḥrīm djuḅn al-Rūm*, see p. 4 of the Introduction of the editor.

⁶ al-Ṭurṭūshī, p. 121.

⁷ About the standing in 'Arafa see v. Grunebaum, *Mub. Festivals*, p. 32.

⁸ al-Ṭurṭūshī, pp. 116-17.

⁹ Cf. al-Ṭurṭūshī, p. 100; and a tradition of Wahb b. Munabbih in MS. Bodley, Thurst. 9 about prayer with raising of the hands.

REVIEWS

pursuit of *bid'a* seems to be too severe (pp. 11-12). The different readings of the manuscripts are recorded and a very useful appendix on the traditionists mentioned in the book is added (pp. 170-214). Dr Ṭālībī deserves our gratitude for his excellent work.

Errors are few; some of them may be mentioned: p. 71, l. 12 read "fīmā"; p. 64, l. 5 read "ḥaddū"; p. 3, l. 18 read "istaṭṭana"; p. 108, l. 1 read "nuḍār".

M. J. KISTER

A. J. ARBERRY, *Oriental Essays: Portraits of Seven Scholars*. 1960. Pp. 261. (Allen and Unwin, London. Price: 28s.)

In this attractively written and presented book, Professor Arberry gives us a series of short biographical sketches of scholars who have been eminent principally in the Islamic field: Simon Ockley, Sir William Jones, E. W. Lane, E. H. Palmer, E. G. Browne, R. A. Nicholson and the author himself. Although nothing in the title or introduction hints at a principle of selection, it can be seen by a glance at this list that it has a heavy Cambridge bias; Jones is the only Oxford name included, and all the others (except for Lane, who owed allegiance to no university) are Cambridge alumni. An Oxonian may permit himself a tinge of regret that place in this gallery could not be found for men like Pococke, White and Nicoll.

The professional orientalist, already familiar with these names, will yet find much to interest and fascinate him in the details given of the careers of these men, and in the copious extracts from their writings. To readers who are not orientalists, these pages give a most revealing and valuable insight into the motives and outlooks of those who have devoted their lives to this too often materially unrewarding cause. And the book closes with an eloquent plea for oriental studies which deserves to be widely and attentively read.

A. F. L. BEESTON

Atlas of the Arab World and the Middle East, with Introduction by C. F. BECKINGHAM. 1960. Pp. iv+68, incl. 40 pp. of maps, 42 photographs, index, plan, and 2 end-papers. (Macmillan, London. Price: 35s.)

In this work the Middle East is divided into sub-regions, largely based on political frontiers, and in each instance there are maps to illustrate not only topography, but also climatology, natural vegetation, and industrial and rural economy. In addition, there are smaller-scale maps which deal with the ethnology and physical and historical geography of the area as a whole, and some special town plans on a much larger scale. The technical finish of the atlas is of high quality, and, except that the red trace of the railways sometimes clashes with that of the frontiers, the system of colouring is used effectively. The maps, however, are of uneven value. Sometimes, as with the end-paper map of medieval industries, they attempt too much and become confused. In other cases, the cartography fails to show what is really significant; on page 28, for instance, the overwhelming importance in Iraq of the date-groves of the Shatt-el-Arab is quite obscured, and on page 33 the pattern of the Arabian oases and their relation to the topography are nowhere evident. Close examination of the maps, moreover, reveals so many discrepancies and mistakes that faith in the value of the book as a work of reference is seriously weakened. To take a few examples, the railway to Tatvan is absent