

نخائر التراث العربية الإسلامية, مج. الأول, ١٩٨١/١٤٠١.

ISAM 95809.

361

[y.y : y.y.] ص.

الأوسبي *Omar b. Ibrahim el-Fasi ?*

عمر بن ابراهيم الاوسبي الانصاري (٨١١ هـ)

١ - تفريج الكروب في تدبير الحروب *

- تحقيق : جورج سكانلون George T. Scanlon

القاهرة ، الجامعة الامريكية ، ١٩٦١ م ، وترجمة الى الانكليزية بعنوان :

A Muslim manual of war

١٣٠ ص + ٩٨ ص *

AGUSTOS 2005

strong evidence that it was composed well before that date (cf. my *Origins*, 330), and, incidentally, I see no reason to doubt the information that the *Risāla*, i.e. this second version, was written at the request of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī who died in the same year. Professor Khadduri refers to §§ 1173 and 1184 (read: 427 and 429) of the text, but the first passage refers to a previous discussion of a certain tradition, obviously in *Kitāb al-Umm*, VI, 77, which is a composite work and does not provide a *terminus a quo*, and the second passage refers to the loss of some of Shāfi'i's books, which may have occurred at any stage of his extensive journeys.

A useful section of the Introduction explains the technical vocabulary of the *Risāla*, but surely *mursal* traditions are not "traditions without *isnād*" or "traditions lacking some or all the names of the transmitters" (p. 31), but traditions the *isnād* of which lacks the highest link, the name of a Companion of the Prophet. "Single-individual tradition" is perhaps as elegant a translation in two words of *khābar al-wāḥid* as can be found, but the Arabic term is as I have written it, and not *al-khābar al-wāḥid* (*ibid.*). And *qiyās*, in Shāfi'i's terminology, is not "a variety of *ijtihād* of which Shāfi'i approves" (*ibid.*), but "*qiyās* and *ijtihād* are two terms with the same meaning" (*Risāla*, § 490 f.).

Good, too, is the section on the Significance of the *Risāla*, but Professor Khadduri ought to have explained, for the benefit of the general reader, why the treatise fell out of fashion later, so that there are only two manuscripts in existence, and only five commentaries are known, none of which seems to have survived; this hardly justifies his enthusiastic remark that "the *Risāla* became a favorite subject for commentaries written by later jurists" (p. 42). It is also rather irrelevant to say that Ghazzālī "wrote a work on jurisprudence in which he elaborated the theme of the *Risāla*" (*ibid.*), because the same may be said of every treatise on *uṣūl*.

In a final section, on the Text of the *Risāla*, Professor Khadduri discusses the two manuscripts and the four printed editions. The printed editions call for no additional remarks, except that the edition of Cairo, 1310 ought not to have been dismissed quite so cavalierly as inferior in quality; it is based on the same manuscript as Shaykh Shākir's edition, and there is nothing much to choose between them as to scholarly method. As regards the two manuscripts, Professor Khadduri wisely refuses to endorse Shaykh Shākir's extravagant claim that the manuscript on which he based his edition is the original manuscript in the handwriting of Shāfi'i's own disciple, Rabi' al-Murādī. He leaves the question open (p. 51), but I think it can be definitely decided in the negative if we observe that the so-called manuscript of Rabi' contains a considerable number of mistakes which have been corrected not by the original or a contemporary, but a later hand (e.g. ed. Shākir, § 1085, cf. plate 8; 1279; 1659, etc.).

The Appendices of Professor Khadduri's work contain a full index of Transmitters of Traditions, which is an unprecedented and extremely useful feature, a Glossary of Arabic technical terms, a Select Bibliography, and an Index (in which, however, I do not find the Rabi' al-Murādī, just mentioned).

The *Risāla* is not an easy text, and Professor Khad-

duri's book is sure to find many readers; even the specialist will consult it with profit.

Columbia University, February 1963

J. SCHACHT

G. T. SCANLON, *A Muslim Manual of War, being Tafrīj al-Kurūb fī Tadbīr al-Hurūb*, by 'Umar ibn Ibrāhīm al-Awsī al-Ansarī. Cairo, The American University at Cairo Press, 1961 (8vo, VIII + 130 + 98 S., 4 Tafeln). Preis: \$ 4.50.

Ein Interesse an der Edition arabischer Werke über die Kunst der Kriegsführung war bisher unter den Facharabisten nicht sehr gross. Seit Prof. Ritter (vgl. *Der Islam* XVIII 1929 P.P. 116-154) seine bekannte Liste über die ritterlichen Künste veröffentlicht hat, wurde so gut wie gar nichts mehr veröffentlicht. Dr. Scanlon, der Herausgeber des Buches *Tafrīj al-Kurūb fī Tadbīr al-Hurūb* weist in seiner Einleitung darauf hin, dass man an historischen und fachlichen Stoff über europäisches Kriegswesen in Hülle und Fülle verfüge, während über das Islamische bisher wenig Material zusammengetragen wurde. Was westliche Historiker der Kriegsführung, wie Oman (vgl. Seite 3) über den islamischen Orient geschrieben haben, hält er wegen der Knappheit des ihnen verfügbaren Materials für wenig begründet, um nicht zu sagen falsch.

Angeregt von seiner militärischen Fachausbildung als ehemaliger Offizier in der US-Navy hat Dr. Scanlon (B. A. 1950 M. A. 56 Ph. D. 1959) der orientalischen Fachwelt und den Historikern der Kriegskunst ein spät-arabisches Buch über Kriegsführung neu herausgegeben und ins Englische übersetzt.

In einer 33-seitigen Einleitung gibt uns Dr. Scanlon eine gute Übersicht über *Source materials for the study of muslim warfare*. Seine Literaturangaben darüber gelten als die modernsten und vollständigsten. Ausserdem enthält die Einleitung eine Beschreibung der beiden Handschriften, die der Edition zugrunde liegen, nämlich Fatih 3483 aus Istanbul und Jehuda Collection 3954 aus Princeton, und eine Abhandlung über den noch nicht mit Sicherheit festgestellten Verfasser und sein Werk.

Der Verfasser des Buches, wie nur die Jehuda-Handschrift angibt, ist 'Umar b. Ibrāhīm wahrscheinlich 754/1353 oder 760/1359 geboren und ist 811/1408 gestorben. Als Kaḍī al-'askar hat er günstige Gelegenheit, sich mit der Kriegsführung vertraut zu machen. Seine Zeit als Gefangener bei Timur Lenk und seine Beziehungen zu dem Mamluken hat wieder seine Kenntnisse auf dem Gebiet erweitert. Teilnahme an Kriegsführung geht aus dem Buch nicht hervor. Deshalb sagt Scanlon „Its tone is that of the observer rather than of the participant“ S. 27. Das Buch besteht aus 20 Kapiteln. Das erste behandelt Vorsichtsmassnahmen und Nachrichtenwesen. Im weiteren schreibt er über: Geheimdienstwesen, Unterhändler, Betrug, Beratung, Führereigenschaften, die günstige Zeit des Angreifens, die Vorhutstruppen, Fahrt und Transport, Camping, Nachtangriffe, den günstigen Schlachtort, Stellung der verschiedenen Armeeeinheiten, Eroberung der Schlösser, Verteidigung der Schlösser usw. Das Buch gibt nicht reine Regeln über die Kriegsführung, wie man erwarten könnte, sondern trägt mehr

IEWS

of the *Nihāyat al-sūl* lies mostly in the interpretation of the technical terms in which it abounds; the sense of these is not easy to establish since the military arts which gave rise to them have been lost.

While Dr. Scanlon's translation renders the Arabic text fairly well, it is not free from errors of the kind that might have been avoided by more frequent reference to Lane, and the text is now and then not quite satisfactory, though the cause seems mainly to lie in faulty proof-reading, e.g. *Azdashir* for *Ardashir*; and p. 87, l. 5, *tawliyah* for *wa-tawliyah*; l. 6, properly *ilti'ām* for *iltiyām*. but in late texts such as this one may perhaps accept *iltiyām*; l. 11, *alwiyah* has a *yā'* without its dots. There are many misprints in the English and wrong vocalizations of Arabic words are not infrequent.

Dr. Scanlon's glossary taken in conjunction with that provided by Dr. Lutful-Huq should be of considerable assistance for elucidating other Mamluk texts. Here the following corrections should be made: *tabl-Khānah* for *tabli-Khānah*—a compound word (123); probably *ḍidbān* for *daydubān* (124) unless there is supporting evidence for this pronunciation in Mamluk Egypt; *qaws* for *qawsi* (128). On p. 68 the verse is not fully understood—*nāqis* means 'of low degree', and the sense is that one should take good advice even from an inferior. Can *ghulam* (p. 85) at this late period mean 'orderlies, royal pages', and not just 'soldier, trooper'? On p. 110 Dr. Scanlon has not found *ufrūtah*, but it is cited in Kindermann's *Das Schiff*, as of Spanish origin (*flotta*).

On p. 18 a work on artillery originally in Spanish seems closely to resemble a text described to me by Dr. Enan as having been found in a *zāwiyah* of southern Morocco and now at Rabat. For the story of al-Muqawqis such texts as the *Futūḥ Bahnasā* should be consulted rather than Ibn Highām. It may interest the reader to refer to W. Blackmann, *Fellahin of Egypt*, 195, with reference to p. 10 of Dr. Scanlon's introduction where fatally poisonous smokes are quoted as one of the weapons of war.

The presentation and especially the annotation of the materials is good, and this enterprising study is a distinct contribution to our knowledge of the Mamluk art of war, but cross-numbering of the text and translation for speedy reference, page citations in the glossary for at least the first appearance of words in the text, and some indexing are desiderata. It is a pity that a study upon which so much care and thought has been expended, should miss that final polish of precision required of orientalist tradition during the stage of publication.

R. B. SERJEANT

GEORGE T. SCANLON (ed. and tr.):
A Muslim manual of war; being Tafriḥ al-kurūb fī tadbīr al-hurūb, by 'Umar ibn Ibrāhīm al-Awsī al-Anṣārī.
viii, 130, 97 pp., 4 plates. Cairo: American University at Cairo Press, 1961. \$4.50. (Agents: Luzac. 32s. 6d.)

This volume is composed of the edition and translation of a manual on the art of war by a Mamluk author of the late fourteenth century, prefaced by an introduction in which the source materials for the study of Muslim warfare are set out and surveyed in concise critical fashion. Dr. Scanlon's strictures on Sir Charles Oman's sketchy treatment of the art of warfare as practised by the Muslim armies in his *History of the art of war* are to be endorsed, and with source material from Arabic sources now available it will be necessary to make a new approach to the history of the warfare of the Byzantines and Muslims. To the bibliography of this section might be added a further reference, Nu'mān Thābit, *al-Jundīyah fī'l-dawlat al-'Abbāsiyah*, printed at the Maṭba'at Baghdad in 1939, though it is prior to the age of the *Tafriḥ al-kurūb*. With regard to the edition of the *Nihāyat al-sūl*, while it is unfortunate that Lutful-Huq was unable to use more of the MSS known to exist, it is unlikely that a very much better edition will be produced for the quality of his editing is high, and notwithstanding what Dr. Scanlon says, a translation could be based on his text, though theoretically it has not exhausted the range of MSS which could be consulted. The problem

— Umar b. Ibrahim al-Awsī al-Ansari