the strategic results of the defeat of Venice, had on foreign policies to such an extent that the fine detail and diligent marshalling of facts tend to lose force. The extreme conciseness of treatment results, unfortunately, in an appearance of lack of insight into what one might call the tenor of the times as it relates to his thesis. For example, although the *ghazi* and *ulema* influences and tensions in Turkey are discussed, how vital these tendencies were in the recurrent Balkan campaigns and in the struggle for power within the Ottoman government is not made sufficiently clear. Nor is the very significant difference between "Turk" and "Ottoman" adequately brought out. In the discussion of Safavi–Ottoman affairs there is no illuminating statement which makes a sharp distinction between Sunni and Shia Muslim beliefs and why these as well as Anatolian heterodoxy influenced the course of these relations.

A number of errors and inconsistencies in the text and notes might have been corrected by more careful editing. A good many technical terms like *akinji,* "ruling institution", or *sanjak,* and proper names like Masto, Albistan, and Ravenstein are not properly identified or located when they are first mentioned. A glossary giving alternative spellings of names and terms, and an accurate map would have been valuable aids in this connection.

Such a study is particularly welcome when so few scholars in the United States are concerned with early Ottoman history. It gains in stature from the thorough use of several fine contemporary Venetian sources and by Dr. Fisher's analysis of a few good Turkish histories. However, recent worthwhile publications by specialists like Babinger and Hinz, and especially the fine Turkish edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* and the excellent work of Ismail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı do not appear in the bibliography. This useful book gives a detailed, chronological statement of the negotiations conducted under Bayezid with other powers. It does not, however, clearly interpret these international contacts in the light of the constant trends in Ottoman history although some of them, like the *ghazi* tendency, are frequently alluded to. Yet the author has condensed a wealth of material into a work which students of both European and Ottoman history will find a helpful addition to the relatively limited literature dealing with the reign of Bayezid II.

Howard A. Reed

Princeton University

The Arab of the Desert: A Glimpse into Badawin Life in Kuwait and Sau'di Arabia. By H. R. P. Dickson. London, George Allen and Unwin; New York, Macmillan, 1949. Pp. 648, with over 100 illustrations, nine in color, and ten maps. 63 shillings net. $10.00.

Colonel Dickson brings unusual qualifications to an intimate study of the Badawin. Born in Syria, where his father was British Consul, he spoke Arabic from babyhood. As an infant he had the good fortune to be foster-mothered by a Badawin woman of the desert, and thus automatically by Islamic law became a blood-brother of her tribe, the important and aristocratic 'Anizah.

After government service in Northern India and twenty-four

years' experience in Iraq, Hasaa and the Kuwait hinterland, he was for seven and a half years H. M. Political Agent in Kuwait. He began "to collect material for this book in 1929 until the midsummer of 1936 when my notes were finally typed out." The result (with the help of Mrs. Dickson, who as artist and collector shared this life under the black tents) is an encyclopedic work on one corner of Arabia.

The book is true to its title, except that the "glimpse" includes all that could be minutely observed, classified and recorded by two enthusiastic lovers of the desert Arab and his ways! The style is easier than that of Doughty, his stories and anecdotes equal those of Burton, while the accuracy of his minute anthropological material is amazing.

The book has two parts, not clearly distinguished. The first tells in eleven chapters of Nomad Life, The Tent and its Furnishings, Tent Treasures, the Badawin Social System, Arab Honour, Marriage and Divorce, Women's Secrets, Children, and closes with a chapter on Faith and Prayer. Part Two treats consecutively of Food and Hospitality, Morality, Death, Burial and the Hereafter, Smoking, Festivals, Arab Greetings, the Pilgrimage, Seasons and Winds, Sandstorms, 'Ajman Talks and Tales, Story Telling (p. 263-301), Dreams, Proverbs, Badawin Warfare, Hawking, Greyhounds, Horses, Sheep and Goats, The Camel, Locusts, Wild Birds, Boat Building, Pearl Diving, Slavery, Sickness and Disease, Crime, The Supernatural, Curious Customs and Stories, with a concluding chapter on the Muntafiq Shepherd Tribes.

This list of most of the chapters is an index to their orderly disorder. But that only urges the reader on from one glimpse after another of "the proudest and most loveable of all peoples, the Desert Arab." Every chapter oozes with information in text and footnotes, and evokes admiration for such brave adventures, in summer heat and winter cold that are indescribable. Yet they *are* described with artistic skill—the hot sandstorm, the frozen waterskins in winter, the death and funeral of a child in the desert, thirst and loneliness, slavery at its best and at its worst, all these are described in unforgettable words. For example, Colonel Dickson's sketch of the Arab character. Such is their inborn delight in raiding other tribes that

> "when the strong hand is weakened or withdrawn, then merry hell is let loose, and every tribe is at its neighbour's throat. Such a period is what every tribe and every individual Badawin long to see. It means raiding and fun for everyone and wealth for him who is bold and strong. Not much killing or loss of life follows from this state of anarchy, but camels change hands frequently, and there is loot for all and exchange of worldly possessions. Since women are always safe under such conditions the Badawin considers this state of affairs as nearly ideal as possible, and is for ever talking about the good times when anarchy prevailed" (p. 49).

It is poverty that drives them to fight for loot and living:

> "The average Badawin has a hard and difficult existence, and may be said to be always hungry and ill-clad. The main hardship he is at all times faced with is lack of money and inability to make any, by what the world would call honest methods. Hence if he cannot live on somebody's largesse he must steal or raid. He cannot spin, to work he is ashamed. If he is forbidden to raid (as

NOTES ON DICKSON'S *THE ARAB OF THE DESERT*

Colonel H. R. P. Dickson's *The Arab of the Desert*[1] is probably the most important work on Arabia to appear since the masterpieces of Philby's earlier period, culminating in *Sheba's Daughters* (London 1939). The book, it is gratifying to learn, has sold unusually well for one of this type, and the numerous reviews of it have on the whole been very favorable. Its merits are for the most part readily apparent, and its value as a first-hand source for the recent history of Arabia and the life of the Arabian people is unquestioned. At the same time, the book is marred by flaws that should be brought to the notice of its readers as well as of its author, with the hope, in the latter case, that some of them may be eliminated in the second edition, which is understood to be in the process of preparation.

It is my sincere wish that concentration on the shortcomings of Dickson's book in this paper will not give a false impression regarding my opinion of it. I entertain high esteem for the author and his book, which I have read with genuine pleasure and from which I have learned a great deal. Dickson speaks Arabic with fluency, he has enjoyed intimate association with the Arabs over the span of many years and has won their confidence and affection, and in many ways he has portrayed their life with great fidelity and charm. Were his book of less account it would not call for the devotion of much time and space to a painstaking analysis of it. Dickson himself, aware of his inadequacies, has asked critics to be gentle, and he may rest assured that what is said here is said only out of a desire to have his good book made even better.

General Remarks. Various reviewers have commented on Dickson's omissions and his failure to discuss such subjects as the problems confronting the Arabs at the present day, the impact of the new oil industry on Kuwait and Eastern Arabia, and the rapid penetration of Western inventions and ideas into regions where for centuries the surface of life had remained almost unruffled by disturbing things of this kind. These omissions may be traced in part to the fact that Dickson still holds an official position in the State of Kuwait and so can hardly be expected to speak with complete freedom on all matters, though his candor in expressing himself in numerous passages is surprising and deserving of praise. There is hope that before long Dickson will give us another volume, and in this his sights may be set on the present and future as well as on the past.

---

[1] The Arab of the Desert: a Glimpse into Badawin Life in Kuwait and Sau'di (sic) Arabia. London, George Allen & Unwin, 1949, pp. 648.

In a number of places Dickson's information and judgments have clearly been rendered out-of-date by the march of events. The reader of his book should remember, however, that virtually the whole of it was prepared for publication ten years or more ago, a fact to which Dickson makes only indirect reference in his acknowledgments.

One of the weaknesses of the book is its poor organization, which resembles that of an author's notebook in which data are jotted down to be worked over later and fitted together before publication. Frequently the same statement or item of information is set forth two or three times in different parts of the book. Had the repetitious passages been excised, space would have been available for other data that the publishers were forced to lay aside. Some of the author's often delightful—but occasionally exasperating—spontaneity might have been lost by squeezing the book into a more polished and formal mold.

As the title and subtitle indicate, the book deals primarily with Arabs who, since their home is the desert, are known as Bedouins (I am sorry that Dickson has given added currency to the bastard form Badawin, which is neither Arabic nor good old English). At the same time, substantial portions are devoted to town-dwelling Arabs of Kuwait. In more than a few instances the words or customs of town-bred Arabs are given or described without being identified as such, and the uninformed reader desiring to know the true Bedouins may be misled.

The present paper is concerned not so much with what has been omitted from the book or with the imperfections of its organization as it is with the validity of what it does contain. The author—despite his great gifts, remarkable opportunities, and powers of keen observation—has been handicapped by inadequate acquaintance with such matters as classical Arabic, the general principles of linguistic science, the history of the Arabs and of Arabia, and the tenets of Islam, a fact for which he cannot be blamed, as a full life as a government official and a man of business has left him little time to train himself as a scholar in these fields. Since he freely confesses inadequacies of this sort on his part, it is to be regretted that he did not associate himself with a collaborator who could have raised the level of accuracy without altering the imprint of the author's character on the book.

Dickson has on occasion accepted and recorded the testimony of his Arab friends in an uncritical manner. The fact that So-and-so said such-and-such may be worth putting down, even though it is untrue, but the author does not discharge his full duty to his readers when he fails to check the statement against reliable sources and then evaluate and report on its accuracy. In our own work with the Bedouins we

have frequently found it necessary to check what one man has told us against what half a dozen others have to say, and it is often useful and edifying to compare what one man says the first time with what the same man says on the same subject six months or two years later. The Bedouin has an amazing grasp of the particular and a perhaps equally amazing lack of concern for the general; consequently, some of the generalizations suggested by Bedouins are wrong. In other cases Dickson misses the mark because his close knowledge of the desert Arab is confined to a relatively small portion of the Arabian Peninsula, and what holds good here does not always apply elsewhere.

The Bedouin Tribes. Although there is a fairly extensive literature on the Bedouins inhabiting the deserts that lie within the sweep of the Fertile Crescent, there is little in either Arabic or the Western languages on the tribes of the area Dickson writes about, the territory of Kuwait and Eastern Arabia. One of Dickson's finest accomplishments has been to bring these people within the ken of Western readers; it is my firm conviction that the men and women of these tribes are inferior to none as representatives of the true Arab type of the homeland. Dickson spreads before his audience a sumptuous wealth of detail that merits the most careful scrutiny by anyone seeking to know the Arabs well. Although much of the information of this kind is accurate and much has the distinction of never having been published before, there remains a residue of statements that are incorrect or apt to give the wrong impression. Examples of these will be found in the following comments, which are restricted to a consideration of the two great Eastern tribes of Muṭair and the 'Ujmān.

The Tribe of Muṭair. The main divisions of Muṭair with their principal sections are:[2]

I. 'Ilwā: (1) The Muwahah; (2) Dhawī 'Aun; (3) The Jiblān.
II. Buraih: (1) Wāṣil; (2) The Ṣu'rān; (3) Maimūn.

This list, compiled independently from information given by Bedouins well acquainted with the tribe, agrees with the one recorded by the Amir 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān, brother of the King of Saudi Arabia, and printed in Fu'ād Ḥamzah's *Qalb jazīrat al-'arab* (Cairo 1933) pp. 193-194 (the Amir 'Abd Allāh brackets the Ṣa'abah together with the Ṣu'rān and Maimūn under the collective name of Wassāmat al-Hilāl, but this is a descriptive term referring to their use of the crescent camel-brand rather than the name of a division or section).

[2] In transliterating proper names throughout this paper I follow the modern forms in written Arabic; in transliterating words and phrases from Bedouin speech I follow the prevailing spoken forms.

When Dickson's list, given on pp. 563-566, is compared with this one, a number of discrepancies will be noted. The Dūshān, instead of being a separate division of the tribe, are only a clan (*ḥamūlah*) of the Muwahah of 'Ilwā. Dickson's Aulad 'Ali is not a common appellation for any of the principal sections of Buraih, and the usual name for the group of which Ibn Buṣayyiṣ (not Musaiyis) is the Amir is the Ṣu'rān. Banī 'Abdillah (in Arabia 'Abdillah or 'Ibdillah is a separate name, to be distinguished from 'Abd Allāh), sometimes known simply as 'Abdillah, form a section of Dhawī 'Aun of 'Ilwā and do not belong to Buraih, though, as pointed out by the Amir 'Abd Allāh, they have special ties with Maimūn and the Ṣa'abah of Buraih.

The chief of Dhawī 'Aun is named Sa'ūd ibn Hāyif al-Fughm, not Al Fuqm; his residence is the *hijrah* of Qaryah al-Suflā (pronounced *garyat assiflā*), also known as Qurayyah, as it is smaller than the companion settlement of Qaryah al-'Ulyā (pronounced *garyat al'ilyā*).

The first major section of Buraih is Wāṣil, not Aulad Wasil. Some even say that Wāṣil, instead of being the ancestor of the section, was a lance used as a symbol of unity by the component subsections (*Wāṣil rumḥ mutawāṣilīn fīh*); this version may be compared with a story current among some of the 'Ujmān to the effect that Madhkar, usually given as the ancestor of at least some of the sections of their tribe, was actually a piece of iron grasped at the time of sealing an intratribal alliance.

The need for subscript dots in some cases is apparent when one comes to the name al-Faṭḥī (given by Dickson simply as Al Fathi) borne by the chief of the 'Ifisah or 'Ifasah (not Al 'Afsah), a subsection of Wāṣil—without the dots one would naturally assume the name to be al-Fatḥī.

The subsection belonging to Wāṣil that is under the chieftainship of al-Haftā is the Maḥālisah (singular Muḥailisī), not Al Maharisa.

The Ḥamādīn (singular Ḥumaidānī) belong to Wāṣil, not to Aulad 'Ali. Dhawī Sa'dūn (pronounced *si'dūn*), not Al Sa'adun, belong to the Ṣu'rān, not to Aulad 'Ali; their chief is named al-Muqahwī, not Al Umjahwi.

Ibn Isqaiyan is listed by Dickson as the Shaikh of Al Thi'aun (apparently another version of Dhawī 'Aun); in reality Faiṣal Ibn Suqayyān, who resides in the *hijrah* of Mulaiḥ in the district of Sudair in Najd, is the chief of 'Abdillah, one of the three principal subsections of the section of Dhawī 'Aun, which is headed by his superior al-Fughm.

As pointed out by Dickson, the *dīrah* or habitat of the tribe encompasses Ṭiwāl Muṭair (not Tuwál al Mutair), but the word *ṭiwāl* (pronounced *ṭwāl*) as used here and in other instances (Ṭiwāl al-Ẓafīr and Ṭiwāl Āl Murrah) means "deep wells," not "long places"

(the ordinary word for "deep" among the Bedouins with reference both to wells and the sea is *ṭwīl,* plural *ṭwāl,* not *'amīq*). Dickson falls into the common error of rendering the names of two sets of the deep wells of Muṭair, al-Lihābah (pronounced *allhābah*) and al-Liṣāfah (pronounced *allṣāfah*), as Haba and Safa (two other names that have often been victims of this type of amputation at the hands of Westerners are al-Lidām and al-Liḥā, more familiar in their truncated forms Dam and Ha).

Dickson supplies very interesting details on the black camels once owned by Muṭair, but his information needs to be corrected on a number of points. These camels are called *shurf* (singular *sharfā*), not Shuruf. While it is true that they are highly esteemed, it is definitely misleading to describe them as "almost sacred" or "a sort of 'sacred emblem.' " The following passage (p. 585) is of doubtful accuracy:

> "In the attack . . . the *Shuruf* have the place of honour always and lead the van. No Mutairi ever rides them, and they just move forward in a compact well-trained black mass ahead of the fighting men as if perfectly understanding the game. The latter will follow straight on to victory or death in their wake. The *Shuruf* seem also to know that they afford a sort of moving wall of protection for the footmen in their rear, and never scatter."

Bedouins who ought to know have assured me that the tribe of Muṭair has never employed such tactics, and it seems obvious that placing camels in such a position would only lead to the fruitless slaughter of highly prized stock.

The *shurf* sometimes graze alone and sometimes with other camels. Hostility towards strange camels is not peculiar to the *shurf;* it is characteristic of all herds of camels.

The Bedouins I have talked with have been surprised to hear it said that Muṭair make a special effort to avoid having the *shurf* seen by persons not belonging to the tribe; laying eyes on the *shurf* is held to be no more unusual or noteworthy than catching sight of any other fine beasts.

The tribe of Muṭair is not the only one to have had camels known as *shurf,* for Abū Khushaim of Banī Hājir still has some, though the consensus of Bedouin opinion appears to be that the *shurf* of Muṭair are superior in quality to his. The 'Ujmān also own a number of *shurf,* stock captured long ago from Muṭair.

The implication that Muṭair are alone in owning the breed of horses called *kurūsh* is also incorrect, for horses of this breed have in the past belonged to many different tribes. The most famous horses of Muṭair are the Ḥamdānīyah belonging to the Jiblān.

The Tribe of the 'Ujmān. The members of this tribe pronounce their name as spelled in this heading, but the spelling 'Ajmān has

gained such currency in English that Dickson cannot be criticized for using it. A member of the tribe is called an 'Ajmī. Bedouins familiar with the tribe, as well as the tribesmen themselves, seem without exception to associate the name of the tribe with *'ajam* (colloquial for *a'jam,* just as *ḥamar* and *ḥawal* are the colloquial forms for *aḥmar* and *aḥwal,* and so forth); *'ajam* means "speaking brokenly or incoherently", and the name appears in the warcry (*'izwah,* not *'iswah*) of the tribe: *"Mifrāṣ alhadīd anā ibn l'ajam"* (inaccurately recorded by Dickson in the footnote on p. 48 as *"Garás al hadid wa ana ibn al 'Ajám"*). The diminutive of *'ajam* is found in 'Ujaim, the name of a remote ancestor of some sections of the tribe.

There is no basis, either in the traditions of the tribe or in other evidence, for attributing to the 'Ujmān any blood relationship with the Persians (al-'Ajam). This mistake, arising from the accidental similarity of the names, is met with now and then, but Dickson goes too far in describing it as "commonly believed"—at least it is not commonly believed among the Bedouins. All the data we have on the tribe and its history bear out the descent of the 'Ujmān, as reported by Dickson, from Yām. There is no reason, however, for calling Yām "mysterious": he is given in the classical genealogies as a descendant of Qaḥṭān, and the presence of his descendants in Najrān since ancient times is attested to by numerous authentic sources. Both the 'Ujmān and Āl Murrah, who trace their descent back to the man Yām, recognize their kinship with the tribesmen known as Yām (not Banī Yām) living at the present time in and near Najrān, and are recognized in turn by the men of Yām as being of their stock. On the other hand, the identification by one of Dickson's informants of Yām as ancestor of the Manāṣīr, the Manāhīl (not the Manahir), the 'Awāmir, Āl Rāshid, the Ṣai'ar, and the Karab, is supported neither by the testimony of the genealogists nor the traditions of the tribes themselves.

The main divisions of the 'Ujmān with their principal sections are:

I. Āl Ḥadjah:	(1) Āl Mu'īḍ;	(2) Āl Maḥfūẓ;
	(3) Āl Sulaimān;	(4) Āl Hitlān;
	(5) Āl Ḥubaish;	(6) Āl Khuwaiṭir.
II. Āl Ẓā'in:	(1) Āl Shilwān;	(2) Āl Duwaish;
	(3) Āl Sakbān;	(4) Āl Khuḍair.
III. Āl al-Miṣrā.		
IV. Āl Shāmir:	(1) Āl Shāyiqah;	(2) Āl Ḥusain;
	(3) Āl 'Āyiḍah;	(4) Āl Qubaiḍān;
	(5) Āl Maṭarah;	(6) Āl Khuḍair.
V. 'Iyāl Wu'ail:	(1) Āl al-'Arjā;	(2) Āl Rashīd;
	(3) Āl Futaiḥ;	(4) Āl Fahhād.

VI. Madhkar: (1) Āl Mufliḥ; (2) Āl Ḥayyān; (3) Āl Rizq; (4) Āl Salūm.

The first four divisions given above regard 'Ujaim ibn Marzūq as their common ancestor, while the relationship of these divisions to the other two is more remote. Division V ('Iyāl Wu'ail) is said to join the first four divisions in Hishām, while division VI (Madhkar) apparently does not join the rest until one reaches Madhkar, who according to the classical genealogists was a son of Yām himself and brother of Jusham, presumably the ancestor of Āl Murrah, who are thus, as they themselves say, remote cousins of the 'Ujmān. It must be confessed that the identity of 'Ujaim, Marzūq, and Hishām—none of whom has been found in the old genealogies—is still uncertain, and the notions regarding them that are entertained by members of the 'Ujmān at the present day are often sadly mixed up. There is no question, however, of the fact that the sections listed under these last two divisions are believed to be somewhat distant in their relationship to the main stock of the 'Ujmān; the majority of the members of these sections still live in the south, in the stretches east of the mountains of 'Asīr between Wādī al-Dawāsir and Najrān. In their homeland the inclination is to regard these sections as belonging to Yām rather than to the 'Ujmān, but on the other hand the 'Ujmān have no hesitation about recognizing men of these sections as full-fledged members of their own community.

Dickson's list of the sections of the 'Ujmān (pp. 568-569) is even less satisfactory than his list of the divisions and sections of Muṭair. It is, for example, impossible to list Al Arjah (properly Āl al-'Arjā) as a section with Arjah as one of its subsections, or Adh Dha'in (properly Āl Zā'in) as a section with Dha'in as one of its subsections, or Al Hadi as a section with Al Hadi as one of its subsections.

Āl Rizq (not Risq) and Āl al-'Arjā are both sections of Madhkar; Dickson is wrong in giving the first as a subsection of the second. The name of the section of Madhkar pronounced Āl Ḥayyān is just as given here, and is not Āl Ḥajjān.

The weakest part of Dickson's list is the one dealing with Āl Mu'īḍ, the section to which Ibn Ḥithlain, paramount chief of the whole tribe, belongs, which is given on p. 569 as follows:

Al Ma'idh

Subsections:

Hubaish	Najiah
Karah	Silbah
Mughatti	Zaiz
Muaig	

Āl Ḥubaish is a separate section of Āl Ḥadjah and does not belong to Āl Mu'īḍ. Karah and Muaig are names that none of the 'Ajmīs I have questioned can recognize; in any event, they are not names of subsections of Āl Mu'īḍ. Mughaṭṭī is the name of a *hijrah* belonging to the 'Ujmān in Wādī al-Miyāh; it is not the name of a tribal subsection. Najiah, the name of the shaikhly house of the whole tribe, stands for Āl Nāji'ah, and Zaiz is a truncated form of Āl Luzaiz. Āl Hādī, Āl Sifrān, and Āl Rīmah, all of which are subsections of Āl Mu'īḍ, are shown by Dickson as separate sections of the tribe, while Āl Ṣāliḥ, the seventh subsection, is not listed by him at all. The roster of Āl Mu'īḍ should therefore read as follows:

Āl Mu'īḍ

Subsections:

Āl Nāji'ah	Āl Luzaiz
Āl Sifrān	Āl Rīmah
Āl Hādī	Āl Silbah
Āl Ṣāliḥ	

Dickson's remarks about the chieftainship of the tribe are at the least out-of-date, even if not misleading with regard to the situation at the time they were recorded. Rākān ibn Ḍīdān (not Dhaidan) Ibn Ḥithlain is recognized by the Saudi Government as well as by the whole tribe as the paramount chief. Khālid ibn Ḥizām Ibn Ḥithlain, nicknamed Zibb Siḥmān (not Zib Sahman) but preferring to be called Siḥmān, his father's nickname, is well liked by both the King and members of the tribe and might have become the paramount chief on the death of Ḍīdān had he so desired, but he deferred to Rākān since Rākān's father had been chief before him.

With regard to the habitat of the tribe, Niṭā' (not 'Nta) and other centers in Wādī al-Miyāh are *hijrahs* or villages of some size with permanent populations rather than headquarters camps for the summer, though it is true that the population of each is considerably increased when nomads camp in the vicinity during the summer months. The following statement is misleading: "In winter the tribe ranges whole Province of Hasa from the Kuwait border as far south as Hufuf". The southern boundaries of the Province of al-Ḥasā have not been officially established, but the territory under the jurisdiction of the Amir Sa'ūd ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Jalwī, the Governor of the Province, extends far to the south of the capital at al-Hufūf (the Bedouin form of which is al-Hufhūf). It might also be pointed out that Wādī al-Miyāh is not a true *wādī* (a water-course in which a *sēl* or flash flood sometimes runs) but derives its name (the Valley of the Waters) from the fact that it contains a large number of watering

places, around many of which permanent settlements have grown up.

The 'Ujmān do not look upon the Ẓafīr as perhaps their principal enemies; in fact, they have been at war with this tribe only once during the last half century or so—and then for only a few months. Most of their fighting during this period has been with Muṭair, primarily because of their proximity to this tribe, and with Banī Hājir and the 'Awāzim, who as allies of Ibn Sa'ūd have often been arrayed against the 'Ujmān. There is no traditional hostility between the 'Ujmān and Shammar or between them and Subai' and the Suhūl; the 'Ujmān have fought against elements of the latter two tribes only when such have been found in the ranks of Ibn Sa'ūd.

Although at one time the 'Ujmān might have been described as being "sullenly hostile" to Ibn Sa'ūd, this is no longer true of them. The loyalty of this tribe, which fought so long and bitterly in the old days against the man who is now their King, is a remarkable thing. Dickson's statement that "were authority to collapse in Najd, the 'Ajman would be the first to desert" has no validity at the present time.

In a footnote on p. 48 Dickson mentions the peculiar custom of the 'Ujmān—not found among any of the other tribes in this part of Arabia—of tying up their hair as a means of identification on the battlefield. However, it is only the hair on the top of the head, not the side locks or *gurūn*, that is tied into a knot, called a *gunzu'ah* (not *ganaza*). A piece of rope or bit of cloth of any color, not necessarily a red cloth, may be used in tying the *gunzu'ah*. Freya Stark in *Seen in the Hadhramaut* gives photographs of boys wearing a strip of hair on top of the head with the sides of the head shaved, reminding one of the American Indian scalp lock; this is called *gamzuz* in Hadramaut, the similarity of which name to *gunzu'ah* will not escape notice.

Readers with some knowledge of Arabia or Arab history are likely to be confused by Dickson's use of Sharif with a capital S in describing the descent of the 'Ujmān and other tribesmen who maintain that they are of pure Arab stock (*aṣīlīn*). The term Sharīf is usually restricted to its technical meaning of "a descendant of the Prophet"; King 'Abd Allāh of Jordan, for example, is known to the Bedouins of Arabia as al-Sharīf. The Bedouin tribes who are true Sharīfs (Ashrāf) in this sense are all found in the western part of the peninsula, though elements of a few other tribes—such as the House of Sa'dūn, the shaikhly clan of the Muntafiq—are also recognized as being Ashrāf. There is no sound basis for attributing Sharifial ancestry to the 'Ujmān, though it is true that an occasional member of the tribe will say that one of his forefathers was a Sharīf (I suggest that such statements are due to confusion between Hishām, who is known in a hazy way as a remote ancestor of the 'Ujmān, and Hāshim,

the founder of the House of Hāshim which provided the ruling Sharīfs of Mecca for many centuries).

Dickson's account of the sending of messengers by the 'Ujmān to Āl Murrah and vice versa to solicit help in time of war errs on the side of picturesqueness. Sometimes a single messenger was sent, and at other times a party, which might number as many as fifty men. The camels they rode had black cloths tied about their necks, rather than "a red scarf or scarlet rope." The name 'Iyāl Marzūq embraces only some sections of the 'Ujmān, not all the descendants of Yām ('Iyāl Yām), and there is nothing sacred about the name.

The Reproduction of Bedouin Speech. On p. 23 Dickson has set forth the principle that guided him in reproducing the spoken language of the desert: "In representing Arabic as spoken by the Badawin I have striven to write what I heard, however far removed from literary forms. To simplify typesetting I have not attempted to distinguish the Arabic sounds of *'ain* and *hamzah* but represent both by an apostrophe. Similarly I have not sought to differentiate the Arabic varieties of *s, t, h,* etc., nor systematically to insert the final silent *h.* I lay no claim to a profound knowledge of classical or literary Arabic, and I therefore crave the indulgence of those learned in these matters."

The basic principle here enunciated—the faithful recording of spoken Bedouin Arabic without regard to the classical norm—is a sound one, and that it is feasible to put this principle into practice has been demonstrated by Landberg, J. J. Hess, Montagne, and others. However, Dickson's confessed lack of training in linguistic matters makes his material much less satisfactory for the student than that of some of his predecessors.

Dickson's major fault is perhaps inconsistency, which apparently derives from a failure to bear in mind at all times the principle he laid down for himself. In the chapter on proverbs, which purports to present "very ordinary everyday sayings," a number of the specimens are mediocre renderings of classical lines, complete with nominal and verbal endings that current speech preserves only in quotations from classical literature. Other specimens are unhappy blends of classical and colloquial, such as "Aish laka fi shajaratiu wa hayatiha." *Aish* is of course colloquial, and in the mouth of the Bedouins of Eastern Arabia it usually becomes *wēsh.* The classical *laka* is *lak* in colloquial, and *ḥayātihā* is *ḥayāthā. Shajaratiu* is obviously a misprint for *shajaratin* (pronounced *shijiratin*), where the ending *-in* is the sole survival among the Bedouins of the classical *tanwīn* (it should also be pointed out that *shijirah* among the Bedouins means a bush, even a tiny bush, as well as a tree, and the nature of Arabian vegetation is such that over 99% of the *shijir* are bushes, not trees).

Despite Dickson's fluency in Bedouin speech, which has been developed to an extent unusual for a foreigner and which commands the admiration of the Bedouins themselves, who listen to his talk with pleasure and hang on every word of his inimitable stories, the recording of names shows that his ear is none too keen. The name of his 'Ajmī friend Zunaifir ibn Ḥuwailah is incorrectly given throughout as Junaifir. The family name of Sālim, the keeper of Dickson's tent, invariably appears as al Muzaiyin, when it should be al-Muzayyan (the difference in the last vowel between *i* and *a* is not such a slight matter, for it marks the difference between the active and the passive participle).

I should lodge a strong protest against the practice of representing both *'ain* and *hamzah* with an apostrophe. In spoken Arabic the two are clearly distinct from each other, and the use of one symbol to represent both in transliteration is bound to cause confusion, as may readily be seen from many instances drawn from Dickson's own book. In the glossary the words *'udh* and *'udhkul* are given side by side. The uninformed might assume that the first of these two words is the same as the first syllable of the second, but, apart from the fact that the order of the consonants *-dhk-* in the second word should be *-dkh-*, the first word begins with the letters *'ain* and *wāw* while the second begins with the letters *hamzah* and *dāl*. Nor is Dickson consistent in representing both *'ain* and *hamzah* with an apostrophe. His form *asfúr* for "a yellow wagtail or sparrow" begins in Arabic with an *'ain*. The peculiar form *a'a'tifa* might suggest that this word contains both an *'ain* and a *hamzah* or a brace of either one of the two letters, when the word is actually *'āṭifah*, beginning with an *'ain* followed by the *alif* of prolongation. The word *abū* begins with a *hamzah* just as does the word *abraq*, but all the compound names in which the former occurs are written in the glossary with *abu*, while the latter appears as *'abraq* (though the pronunciation is recorded as *abrag* without the apostrophe).

Apostrophes are used in words and names that in Arabic contain neither an *'ain* nor a *hamzah*. The form *'abd mu'allid* should of course be *'abd muwallad*, and *l'Illah* should be *lillāh*, which in Arabic is both pronounced and written without a *hamzah*.

The Arabic for "fingernails" appears in one place in the glossary as *'adhấfir* (properly *aẓāfīr*) with an apostrophe, and three pages later as *athấfir* without an apostrophe.

The three forms *bayir*, *bayír*, and *baiyir*—all apostropheless—are given for *ba'īr*, though the *'ain* that exists in the Arabic word does crop up in the plural *ba'arin* (properly *ba'ārīn*).

In the genealogical tree of Āl Ḥithlain, the shaikhly clan of the

'Ujmān, the name Faurān is written in one place as Fauran and in another place as Fa'aran.

Ru'us is given as the plural of *ras* in conflict with the principle of ignoring literary forms, for among the Bedouins the plural of *rās* is *rūs,* a form which, by the way, also occurs in classical Arabic, though not as commonly as *ru'ūs.*

I also consider ill advised the omission of the final *h,* which Dickson incorrectly describes as silent (it only seems to be silent to the Western ear unaccustomed to the light aspirate at the end of words). Inconsistency again marks Dickson's practice: *birkah, badawiyah, dhabihah, manihah,* and others are written with the final *h,* while *bakúra* (properly *bākūrah*), *batúla* (properly *baṭṭūlah*), *dhimma, qahwa,* and others are written without it. In a few cases a final *h* or *t* has been added to words that do not have it in the Arabic: *hamáh* (properly *ḥimā*), *rahat* (properly *raḥā*), and *siflah* (properly *suflā,* pronounced by the Bedouins *siflā*).

A few words that in Arabic end with *'ain* have been written in such a way that their endings cannot be distinguished from the endings of words like *dhimma: burqa* (properly *burgu'*), *sana* (properly *ṣāni'*) with its plural *sanna* (properly *ṣunnā'*), and *qata* (properly *gāṭi'*).

Dickson's decision not to differentiate between the Arabic varieties of *s, t, h,* etc., is understandable in view of the difficulties in typesetting that would be involved in making such a differentiation. However, it might have been possible to use subscript dots only in the glossary, which would have been a great help for students. In writing *jidda* as the name of the wooden drinking-bowl used in Arabia, Dickson has overlooked the final *h,* which in this word is the strong aspirate, as well as the fact that the usual Bedouin pronunciation in Eastern Arabia is *gidaḥ* or *dzidaḥ* (from the classical *qadaḥ*).

Another shortcoming in Dickson's system of transliteration is to be found in his treatment of double consonants. In English double consonants are usually pronounced as if they were single, though their presence may have an effect on the pronunciation of the accompanying vowels. In Arabic, however, every double consonant is clearly pronounced as such, and this fact should be taken into account in transliterating Arabic into English. Dickson sometimes gives a double consonant in the English version when there is only one in the Arabic:

'assa	= *'aṣā*	*dibbash*	= *dibash*
bakkarah	= *bakrah*	*dibdibba*	= *dibdibah*
dallal	= *dlāl* / "coffee-pots"	*gatta*	= *gaṭā*
dibba	= *dibā*	*ghazzu*	= *ghazū*

guffa	= *gufā*	*jeddi*	= *jadī*
hallal	= *ḥalāl*	*khalla*	= *khalā*
hammam	= *ḥamām* / "Pigeons"[3]	*mattrah*	= *maṭrah*
hanniyan	= *hanīyan*	*muttar*	= *maṭar*
hurrum	= *harm*	Qassim	= al-Qaṣīm

In other cases he provides only one consonant for the English version when the Arabic has two, particularly if the double consonant in Arabic is at the end of the word:

'am	= *'āmm*	*haq*	= *ḥaqq*
bat	= *baṭṭ*	*jau*	= *jaww*
dhub	= *ḍabb*	*muta'awah & mutawa'a*	= *muṭawwa'*
gash	= *gashsh*	*ruz*	= *ruzz*
hadh	= *ḥaẓẓ*	*sam*	= *samm* / "say *bismillāh*"
haj	= *ḥajj*	*sim*	= *simm* / "poison"
haji	= *ḥājj* (though the double *j* shows up when *ḥujjāj* is given for the plural)	*zib*	= *zubb*

The letter *qāf* has also given Dickson trouble. The prevailing sound for it used by the tribes frequenting the region that Dickson deals with is *g*, with Banī Hājir and others sometimes pronouncing it as *dz*. Dickson could have rendered it consistently as *g* in accordance with his principle of adhering to verbal usage, or he could have bowed to the accepted practice of Arabists and rendered it consistently as *q*. He has instead written it now as *g* and again as *q*, shifting for no apparent reason from one to the other at random. In many cases in the glossary he gives the same word twice, once with *g* and the other time with *q*, but in other cases he does not do this. For example, the word for "a young male camel" appears in the glossary only as *ga'ud*, while the word for "tribe" appears only as *qabilah*, though the pronunciation of the initial letter is exactly the same for both words. Again, the word for "grave" is written *gabr*, but the *g* of the root is transformed into *q* in the word for "cemetery," *maqbarah*.

The pronunciation of *qāf* as *j* is not at all characteristic of the Bedouins of the region Dickson is describing, though it is found among some of the tribes of the Far East of Arabia, such as the Manāṣīr and Āl Wahībah. It is also common among the seafaring Arabs of the Persian Gulf as well as among the townspeople on or near the water, so that it is easy to see how Dickson picked it up in Kuwait, though it is misleading for him to record it without clarification of the usage. Such a combination as *"garab,* sing. *jirba (qirba)"* is a bit bewildering. The statements that *"qalíb"* is "always pronounced

[3] Many Westerners fail to make a distinction between this word and *ḥammām*/ "bath."

jalib," "qáfilah" is "pronounced *jáfila* as a rule," and *"qarib"* is "pronounced *jarib"* are simply not true as far as the great majority of the Bedouins of Dickson's part of Arabia are concerned.

In a few instances the letter *qāf* is rendered as *k: dushak* is written for *dōshag* and *maksar* for *magṣar*. The proper name Marzūq occurs as Marzuk. The word *nabaq,* which by the way is not familiar to the Bedouins of Eastern Arabia, appears as *nabuk*. For at least one word—*zernīkh*—Dickson also uses *k* in place of *kh*.

From the standpoint of students of Arabic it is unfortunate that Dickson does not tackle the problem of how to distinguish in transliteration between the letters *dhāl, ḍād,* and *ẓā',* all three of which he usually represents with the combination *dh*. The confusion becomes worse when *th* is sometimes used for *ḍād,* as in *thaif* for *ḍēf* and *muthaiafchi* for *muḍāyifī* (though *ḍiyāfah* from the same root is written *dhiáfa*). The word *muthif* (properly *maḍīf),* also derived from the root common to all the words just cited, is not used in the desert, where the alighting-place for guests in front of the tent is called *manākh aḍḍēf*. The proper name Mūḍī appears as Muthi, and the verbal form *ygēyiẓūn* as *igaiyathun* (in other instances the prefix of the imperfect is set off by itself as if it were the separate word *i*). In at least one case, Ibn Hathal (properly Ibn Hadhdhāl), *th* is made to stand for *dhāl*. The same combination is pressed into service to represent *t* in *thafadhalu* (*tafadhalu* is also given). The letter *ḍād* becomes *z* in Zana Muslim, though the first word of this pair (properly *ḍanā*) is given elsewhere as *thina*.

Dickson's lack of familiarity with written Arabic may be detected in such incorrect forms as *al amir al muminin* (for *amīr al-mu'minīn*), *al masta'ariba* (for *al-musta'ribah*), *musulman* (for *muslim*), *shi'ah* (as the name for an adherent of the Shī'ah, instead of *shī'ī,* the classical form, or *baḥrānī* or *rāfiḍī,* the colloquial forms current in Eastern Arabia), and *Zam Zam* (for *Zamzam*). For *qaryah* he gives three plurals—*qaryat, qiryat,* and *quryat*—none of which is correct. In preference to the classical plural *qurā* the Bedouins use *garāyā;* the plural of the diminutive is *gurayyāt,* which occurs in the proper name Qurayyat al-Milḥ (a group of villages in Wādī al-Sirḥān in northern Saudi Arabia).

The tendency to use words that do not enjoy great currency in this part of the desert is illustrated on the page of drawings of the main articles of clothing worn by a Bedouin man. The word *kaffīyah* for the headcloth belongs to the Syrian dialect and is almost unknown among the Bedouins of Eastern Arabia; Muṭair, the 'Ujmān, Āl Murrah, Banī Hājir, the 'Awāzim, and most of the other tribes call the headcloth *ghuṭrah,* the Manāṣīr and other tribes in the Far East of Arabia call it *sifrah,* members of 'Utaibah sometimes use

'imāmah (the classical name for a turban and the 'Ajmī name for headropes), and other names are not wanting. *Bisht* is almost universal among the Bedouins of Eastern Arabia for the outer cloak; Dickson's *'abbah* (properly *'abāh* or *'abāyah*) is Syrian rather than Arabian, though it is used in Eastern Arabia for a heavy black cloak worn especially by women, while *mishlaḥ* for *bisht* is encountered as one goes farther west in Arabia.

The Maps. This thick book is made even thicker by a number of folding maps and genealogical tables pocketed inside the back cover. The ordinary reader may spend little time with these sheets, but the student of Arabia will do well to pore over them. The maps are cartographically of poor quality; some are only sketches made by the author as much as thirty years ago and are obviously in need of revision. Nevertheless, they contain so much good material that the failure to make them genuinely first-class by working them over before publication must be regretted.

One of the most interesting, and at the same time one of the least successful, of the maps is that entitled "Rough Tribal Map of Arabia." It may be questioned whether it is physically possible to draw a map showing tribal ranges in a satisfactory manner. As soon as lines are traced on the map, it looks as if each tribe has its own compartment into which it fits to the exclusion of other tribes, and the force of this impression is not sufficiently diminished by a note stating that the tribal boundaries are approximate only. For nearly every tribe in Arabia there is a geographical area, known as *dīrah* (or *dār* or *diyār*), in which the tribe enjoys a sort of local supremacy, marked particularly by the ownership of wells and sometimes of date palms. The tribe is almost always at home in its *dīrah* in the summer time, when the heat and the scarcity of water make it necessary to keep the livestock fairly close to a guaranteed supply of water at fixed points. In the fall, winter, and spring, however, members of the tribe may roam far afield—often through the *dīrahs* of other tribes or through country that may be called no-man's-land—depending on the vegetation that is then more abundant or following the rains wherever they may fall. The shifting pattern of these movements poses a nice problem in the delineation of tribal ranges on a map. The boundaries of the *dīrahs* proper where private ownership accords special rights to the members of a tribe may be uncertain, not generally recognized, or in active dispute, and the assignment to one tribe or another of grazing grounds or completely barren land where private ownership does not exist appears to defy even the wisdom of Solomon. In the preparation of a map use might be made of different colors blending into each other, but even this would leave much to be desired. We have found that the safest procedure is simply to write

the name of each tribe a number of times across the area that is indisputably its *dīrah,* thus making no attempt to define boundaries or divide up intervening areas of doubtful appurtenance.

Reference may be made to some of the data on Dickson's tribal map that should be changed. At least half of the territory of the 'Ujmān is shown lying south of al-Hufūf, though the tribe claims nothing south of that oasis as belonging to its *dīrah* and members of the tribe seldom go in that direction even in search of forage. The territory of Banī Hājir is outlined with a peculiar shape for which there is no justification in fact, while the territory of Āl Murrah is shown as extending much farther to the east than members of the tribe are accustomed to go. The town of Abu Dhabi (properly Abū Ẓabī) appears far to the west of its true position; were it properly placed it would fall within the range of Banī Yās instead of that of the Manāṣīr, which is as it should be. The 'Awāmir do not have and do not claim a *dīrah* of their own just to the south of the *dīrah* of Banī Yās, even though a number of members of the 'Awāmir live and roam there in territory they recognize as falling within the *dīrah* of Āl Bū Shāmis (one of the two main divisions of the great tribe of Nu'aim, shown by Dickson as found only in Qaṭar, whereas its main strength is actually in the region of al-Buraimī). The fact that the 'Awāmir do not have a *dīrah* here means that the *dīrah* of Āl Bū Shāmis abuts on the *dīrah* of Banī Yās and is not separated from it as shown on the map. The names Ghāfirī and Hināwī, though tribal in origin (from Banī Ghāfir and Banī Hinā), have been used in Oman since the early eighteenth century as the names for the two principal political factions, which keep alive the age-old animosity between the Northern Arabs and the Southern Arabs. Ja'lân is the name of a geographical district in Eastern Oman and is not borne by any tribe. Yalwahiba is properly Āl Wahībah (the members of the tribe call themselves Hal Wahībah, *hal* being a dialectal variant of *ahl* or *āl*).

In the southwestern corner of the Peninsula a fairly large space has been left devoid of tribal names. Parts of this space might have been given to 'Abīdah, a large branch of Qaḥṭān centered at Mārib (classical Ma'rib), to the Karab, and to Bakīl, the companion tribe of Ḥāshid. The *dīrah* of the Dawāsir is shown as being to the north and west of the *dīrah* of Qaḥṭān, when in reality the positions of these two tribes are exactly the reverse.

GEORGE RENTZ

New York City