

853 Asylum Ave., Hartford,
Conn., U.S.A. 10/1/11.



My dear Goldyfish,

I thank you very heartily for your book — both for it and for all that I have learned from it. It is in a class by itself and I wish it could possibly be translated into English, for we have nothing at all like it. It gives not only a full outline of its subject but also there is a wealth of detail and references stored up in the notes which cannot be found anywhere else. No one but you could have written it and it only makes us wish the more for that full history of the institutions and ideas of Islam that you could write.

think this man. Did you ever meet him
and was your opinion of him intended?
I am very curious to know what you
think of him. Has Browne won over
enthusiasts? I have only one tiny point
of contact. When in Cairo I had an
one to talk to Sultan Esmat Muhammad
about Muhammad Abdin. He was
not enthusiastic. The next man, he
said, had been fanned out - him and
he went on to talk about him and
about the man whom he had impressed
He dictated a list of them to me; I
love it somewhere. Evidently toward
ad-Din was the biggest man. He had
known.

Another point I want to ask about
is have you returned to the spelling
Maturidi? I remember you credited
me upon it.

Your connecting the Mustajab
with the Zuhadi is full of suggestions.
Take a good rest and pick up
your Lewis for that great task.
Of him that pierce shall be required!
— that is the law of the world
of letters.
I am going to review your
book in the New York Nation and
I think you will be satisfied
with my review. So I shall
have coals of fire on your head!
But I have just finished the
review of another and a very
different book, Browne's Persian
Revolution. It is good and
shows great care of Persian
intercourse and — so it seems
to me — a certain lack of
appreciation of Persian theology
and the theory of the Shi'ite
State. He begins, as you probably
know, with a bit of Jamāl
ad-Din al-Afghan. Though you
mention Muhammad Abdin his
pupil, you don't mention, I

and light. I want to follow
it up when I can.

On p. 293, l. 9 from bottom, insert
"ein halbes Jahrhundert" a ship
of the pen?

In your characterization of
al-Ash'ari on pp. 120 ff. do you
reject the two stages in his
return which I speak of in
my Development, p. 180? I cannot
be quite sure

I wish you could have dealt
in more detail with the Abūnī
theory of the Mutakallimūn. It is
absurd, even absurd, to us, but
it made a tremendous deep
imprint on all the thought of
Islam. You never know when
some reference or other to it
will turn up. And that it
seems absurd to us is hardly
to the point. One of my old pupils
now a professor in Columbia, told

me that he had come upon a
man in Australia who had
worked out for himself of practically
the same system.

Here is another point on which
I am not sure if I understood
you. You speak ^(p. 79) of ash-Shāfi'ī's
laying down a rule that the
witness of a man should be
rejected who professed to have
seen the firm. Do you deduce
from that that ash-Sh. rejected
the firm? I always thought
it referred to the other position
that only prophets could see
them and that a man ~~who~~
said he had seen them must
either claim to be a prophet
or be a liar. And al-Shayḡālī,
a devoted Shāfi'ī, believed
he had seen firm in a shadowy
way.

And now I come to the

I can find no way of rendering "This is our interesting book" into classical Greek. I have a treasury of reports and they all give it up. But certainly the Greeks were simply made up of "disinterested curiosity" felt it as to me a very firm fact, and one that meets me all the time in reading that while there were certain Muslims who were "interested" in things the whole doctrine of Islam was against any such wasting of time.

With regard to your Note 6 on pp. 75 f. it is curious that some seem to have regarded the firm as of superior intelligence and others as stupid, almost in a different class from rational mankind. I suppose that the first idea was derived from the legend of their explicit origin and the second from the primitive barbarous association of them with the lower animals. The latter seems to be the point of the Arabian Nights-parage to which I have referred in my "utilitarianism".

I hope you do not reckon me in the same class with Tisdall, Zurewer et hoc genus omne and it was no railing accusation which I brought. If you will look again at my Valiqui Attitude pp. 119 f. you will see that the basis for my conclusion as to the utilitarianism of Islam is Ibn Khaldun's explicit doctrine and the explicit doctrine of practically all Muslim theologians. That there is no word in Arabic for "interest" is a curious comment and has significance as a comment. I do not by any means hold with "Bolesens" in the first sentence which I quoted and I am sorry now that I did not enter a caveat. For instance

Kalaf's Altitudo, p. 157. Similarly
in the Bilgis story Solomon is told
about her كيس كليس كيس كليس كيس كليس
meaning something wrong with her
kiss. I find too, in the Tubgat
al'arūs, p. 199, كيس = insanity كيس
كيس. But how exact to read
and translate كيس in the Arabic
Nights text I am not sure.

The only unfortunate thing that
I can point out about your
book is the index. I wish it
could have been a great deal
more complete. The book itself
is such a كيس or كيس!

Heartily congratulating on your
Göttingen and Berlin honours.
These Academies have honoured
themselves in honouring you.

Thank you too, for your
promise to review my book. I
will see that a copy is sent
to the Theol. Literary. Will
the review copy go to you or

355 would you like a copy for yourself?
I am sorry to say that the Macmillans
are very chary of copies to the
author. They are going to give
me much fewer than Scribner
or the Chicago Press.

This year I have three pupils.
One a Y.M.C.A. secretary on
leave from India does not take
Arabic but only reads in Islamica.
The second who has been some
years in Syria and talks Syrian
Arabic is trying to learn the
literary language. The third
is a C.M.S. missionary from
Cairo who knows Arabic well
but wants to read theology.
He went to Berlin but could
not get it there, so now he
has come to me. How much
theology he has read I do not
yet rightly know.
Please give the very best
regards of both of us to

Mr. Goldfiker. To you yourself
my wife joins me in greetings
and I am always

Yours faithfully,
Damon B. Macdonald

P.S. How is Ukkela now? I
wrote to him a long time ago
about my edition of Salland
and, for the first time, received
no answer. There nothing is
wrong.

Ukkela,

Again V.S.

The Seminary is going to give
from its research fund \$100
yearly to the Leyden Encyclopedia
of Islam. But I haven't got
another penny yet out of
America.

