

ARABICA

MOTZKI, H. — The Biography of Muḥammad. (Islamic History and Civilization, 32). E.J. Brill Publishers N.V., Leiden, 2000. (24 cm, XVI, 330). ISBN 90-04-11513-7; ISSN 0929-2403. Nlg. 110.19/Euro 50.00.

The ten articles in the present volume are revised versions of papers presented at a colloquium held in 1997 at the University of Nijmegen. They represent the various methods and approaches which scholars today are using in the study of the Prophet's biography, the *sīra*. Part I consists of five articles in which the focus is on the development of the *sīra* tradition. The other five articles in Part II address the question of the historical value of our sources.

In his introduction to the volume Harald Motzki, who is also one of the contributors, discusses the ongoing dispute among Islamicists about the value of the *sīra* sources. The dispute, he states, is blurred by factors such as the lack of systematic source-critical studies and of reflection on methods for assessing the reliability of biographical *ḥadīths*, the fact that conclusions about the relationship between the Qur'ān and exegetical and biographical traditions have often been based on study of a few cases, and the fact that modern biographies of the Prophet have until now relied on a limited range of sources. Motzki believes that if these shortcomings are tackled the question of reliability of the sources would become clearer. This volume is presented as a step in the right direction.

The first article is by Uri Rubin who analyses several versions of the episode of a council of war that Muḥammad is said to have held with his Companions. The argument is that the tensions and conflicts within the community in the first/seventh century, such as the rivalry between the Muhājirūn and the Anṣār and the demand that those in authority resort to consultation, and the emerging self-image of the Muslims of that period as the new chosen community influenced the manner in which Muḥammad's period was remembered.

Marco Schöller examines the account of Muḥammad al-Kalbī concerning the Prophet's conflict with Arabian Jews on the basis of traditions from *Tafsīr* al-Kalbī and other material transmitted on his authority. He argues that although Kalbī's *Tafsīr* was probably compiled in the late third/ninth century and contains later interpolations, it is still a valuable source for second/eighth century exegesis. He notes that Kalbī's legal material is similar to that found in other early *tafsīr* works and in *maghāzī* reports transmitted from Zuhri and Mūsā b. 'Uqba but different from material found in "orthodox" *sīra* accounts (e.g., Ibn Ishāq's and Wāqidī's) in which the earlier elements are absent and the influence of legal reasoning and disputes is more visible. From this Schöller concludes that the early exegetical material was not derived from or adapted to existing *sīra* and *maghāzī* reports but preceded them, which is contrary to the thesis put forward by Rubin in *The Eye of the Beholder* (Princeton, New Jersey 1995) where he argues that stories in the *sīra* acquired their exegetic function only at a secondary stage.

Adrien Leites examines two sets of *sīra* traditions which make use of the same imagery (the shooting stars and the banishing of demonic powers) and are concerned with the theme of Muḥammad as inaugurator of a "new order". He argues that the two sets of traditions reflected two different

conceptions of the Prophet, the "functional" and the "ontological": according to the first conception, the "new order" coincides with the beginning of the Prophetic mission (and the revelation of the Qur'ān), and according to the second, with the birth of the Prophet (which represents his emergence from a state of pre-existence). The evidence of Shī'ite and Sunnī sources and of reports which go back to Ja'far al-Šādiq and his disciple Ibn Kharrabūdh seems to suggest that the "ontological conception" originated in and remained the only one in the Shī'ite tradition, and that the "functional conception" existed from an early stage and remained the dominant one in the Sunnī tradition. On the other hand, it would seem that the "ontological conception" had also appeared among Sunnī scholars by the end of the second/eighth century (as might be inferred from a report cited by Ibn 'Asākir, and probably derived from *Akhbār al-madīna* of Ibn Bakkār (d. 256/870), where Ja'far al-Šādiq appears to have been removed from the *isnād*), but it disappeared soon afterwards and then reappeared in the tenth/sixteenth century. Increased Sunnī receptiveness to Šūfī doctrine is suggested as an explanation for this reappearance, while the reasons for the integration of the "ontological conception" by the end of the second/eighth century are said to remain undetermined.

Leites' interpretation of the earlier stages of development is problematic for two reasons. Firstly, there is no compelling reason to suppose that the traditions which associate the shooting stars with the birth of the Prophet and which appeared in some of the early Sunnī sources had already been identified as of Shī'ite origin or that they were deprived of ascription to Ja'far al-Šādiq by the early Sunnī compilers. After all, al-Šādiq was recognized as an authority by a number of Sunnī scholars, and the possibility that Ibn 'Asākir himself omitted him from the *isnād* cannot be ruled out. Secondly, there is no solid evidence that the birth of the Prophet had already acquired an ontological significance or been associated with ideas about his pre-existence (as one finds, for example, in Kulīnī, *al-Kaḥfī*, ed. Ghaffārī, I, pp. 439ff). In fact, Leites' data would fit in better with a later dating for the elaboration of Shī'ite esoteric doctrine where the birth of the Prophet (and of the imāms) came to have a metaphysical significance. A later dating could explain why the traditions which associate the shooting stars with the "birth" appear in some early Sunnī sources and why they tend to disappear after the middle of the third/ninth century: it was only when they became associated with Shī'ite esotericism that Sunnī scholars would have stopped citing them as a sign of Muḥammad's prophethood.

Gregor Schoeler's article is in German with an English summary at the end. It is meant as a refutation of the conclusions reached by Schacht in his study of Mūsā b. 'Uqba's *Maghāzī*. Schacht had argued that Mūsā's reporting from Zuhri was fictitious and due to a "growth" or "spread" of the *isnāds* and concluded that false ascriptions were also rife in the historical tradition. Schoeler, however, comes to the conclusion that Mūsā's indication of Zuhri as his source is authentic and, on the basis of similar arguments, that the earlier link in the chain, namely, 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr, is also authentic. The question of whether the reports correspond to historical fact is left open. An assessment of Schoeler's method and arguments will be given below together with that of Motzki's and Görke's.

Maher Jarrar presents his article as an attempt to pave the way for more study of the early Imāmī *sīra-maghāzī* tradi-

tion. A number of Imāmīs are reported to have written works of this genre, but none is extant. Jarrar concentrates his examination on a body of material that the Imāmī tradition ascribes to a certain Abān b. 'Uthmān who is said to have been a disciple of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and his son Mūsā al-Kāzīm and is credited with a work on *sīra* and *maghazī*. The material examined is found in a variety of sources and exhibits Imāmī concerns and interpretations of events in the life of the Prophet and in pre-Islamic sacred history. Jarrar is acutely aware of the need to be cautious when reconstructing earlier works from later sources (p. 99f), but he seems to argue in favour of the authenticity of ascription of the material to Abān on the basis that it is narrated by a wide range of transmitters and that in many ways it resembles that of his contemporary al-Wāqidī and of Yūnus b. Bukayr (p. 107).

Michael Lecker examines three reports about the alliance that Muḥammad is said to have made with the Anṣār at 'Aqaba and the reaction of the Quraysh to that alliance, which are at variance with the standard accounts. The reports are found in 10th/16th century *sīra* compilations but appear to have been derived from much earlier works. They refer to a treaty between the Quraysh and the Anṣār, according to which there would be a truce between them for several months and after that the Prophet and his Companions would be allowed to leave to Medina. According to the standard accounts, however, the reason for the postponement of Muḥammad's Hijra is not made clear. Lecker suggests that the rare reports may have been suppressed in the standard *sīra* literature because they do not fit in with the image of a persecuted prophet. As regards the question of reliability of the reports, he seems to be saying that although they may be early and the account of events following 'Aqaba would make better sense if it included the treaty, they are not necessarily historical (p. 166).

The articles by Motzki and Görke, like the one by Schoeler, aim to trace the transmission history of *sīra* traditions by comparing their variants. Motzki and Görke believe that their reconstructions also enable them to recover the "historical kernel". This kernel is thought to be in the common elements of the variants and where there are no apparent motives for their fabrication. The argument in each of these three articles is methodical and clearly presented. As many of the variant reports as possible are analysed together with their *isnāds* and the common links in the *isnāds* are identified. Where the variants going back to a common link display agreement on broad outline and structural and textual similarities, this is taken as evidence that the common link must also be the common source. Differences in detail and wording are said to exclude the possibility that one line of transmission was dependent on another or that the common link was artificially created by one of the transmitters copying or imitating the text of another transmitter and providing it with a false *isnād*. Where two or more of the variants have in common details not found in the other variants going back to the same common link, this is explained on the basis that the common source must have told the story in different ways (Motzki, pp. 188, 195). Conclusions are then reached as to when and by whom the tradition was first put into circulation, what the earliest texts looked like, and how they changed at various stages of the process of transmission. These conclusions, if accepted, would support the traditional picture of how the life story of the Prophet was handed down.

However, the sorts of arguments used in these articles are

not likely to convince those Islamicists who take the view that, since legal, theological and exegetical concerns pervade much of the *sīra*, *isnāds* are as likely to have been fabricated here as in the legal literature. A main objection is likely to be that none of the features identified in the analysis of those variant traditions excludes the possibility that common links were artificially created by the spread of *isnāds*. Also likely to be rejected is the reasoning which says that if a spread of *isnād* did take place we should expect the variants to be much closer to one another and to exhibit fewer differences in detail than they actually do. One argument against this reasoning would be that a transmitter or compiler who was reluctant to name his real source and contributed to the spread of an *isnād* might have been motivated by his desire to narrate the story in a different way or to include additional material. Or, he might have introduced changes in order to conceal the real origin of his report because his source happened to be unacceptable as an authority in certain circles. In other words, it could be argued that where a spread of *isnād* did take place we would expect to find these sorts of variations and perhaps more, not less, of them than in cases of real transmission.

Robert Hoyland reexamines some of the non-Muslim material used by Crone and Cook in *Hagarism*, namely, the earliest Christian portrayals of Muḥammad. Some of the critics of *Hagarism* had argued that the non-Muslim sources of the first/seventh and second/eighth centuries cannot tell us anything of value about Islam in its formative phase. Hoyland accepts that these sources contain bias and distortions and that their accounts may be influenced by biblical notions about the Arabs and Arabia, but he notes that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that much of their information was either based on personal observation or derived from the Muslims themselves.

The last article is by Andrew Rippin who argues against the conventional view of the Qur'ān as a primary source and as evidence for the veracity of the *sīra*. Rippin examines the question of the addressee of the Qur'ān and shows that the picture is much less cohesive than commonly assumed: the addressee is often the community, where the singular "you" is used this may be read as an address to the reciter, and there are unexpected disruptions and switches from plural to singular. In the *sīra* and *tafsīr* traditions some of these difficulties with the addressee were resolved, for example, by taking a plural "you" as a reference to the singular Muḥammad, but other difficulties could only be ignored. Rippin suggests that these facts support the thesis that it was the Muslim tradition which provided a consistent picture of Muḥammad as a background to the text.

April 2001

Tamima BAYHOM-DAOU

* *
*

BAR-ASHER, Meir M. — Scripture and Exegesis in Early Imāmī Shi'ism. (Islamic Philosophy Theology and Science, Vol. XXXVII). E.J. Brill Publishers N.V. Leiden, 1999. (24 cm, XV, 274). ISBN 90-04-11495-5; ISSN 0169-8729. Nlg. 159,-/\$ 94.00.

Depuis deux ou trois décennies, les études shiites en général ou imāmītes en particulier sont principalement consacrées — la révolution iranienne oblige — aux aspects politiques,

sociologiques ou économiques de l'imāmisme moderne et contemporain. D'autres, minoritaires mais en nombre respectable, fondées essentiellement sur des méthodes philologique et historique, examinent le shi'isme classique dans ses dimensions religieuses et doctrinales, théologiques, juridiques, mystiques, philosophiques, etc.¹⁾ Parmi ces ouvrages, bon nombre touchent bien sûr directement ou indirectement les données exégétiques, mais il faut bien rappeler que depuis *Die Richtungen der islamischen Koranauslegung*, l'ouvrage pionnier mais déjà très ancien d'I.Goldziher,²⁾ aucune monographie critique d'envergure n'a été consacrée à l'exégèse imāmite ancienne.³⁾ Le livre de M.M.Bar-Asher, savant connu par ailleurs pour ses remarquables travaux, en collaboration avec Ariyeh Kofsky, sur la Nuṣayriyya, vient ainsi combler, et de manière excellente, cette lacune.⁴⁾

Version complétée et mise à jour d'une thèse de doctorat, soutenue en 1991 à l'Université Hébraïque de Jérusalem, l'ouvrage est essentiellement consacré à ce que l'auteur appelle «l'École pré-bouyide de l'exégèse imāmite». L'introduction (pp. 1-25), aussi dense que documentée et instructive, présente le contexte historique et religieux, l'importance de l'exégèse en milieu imāmite, le plan de l'ouvrage ainsi que les principales sources exploitées.

Le chapitre 1 (pp. 27-70) est consacré aux quatre grands compilateurs⁵⁾ de commentaires coraniques pré-bouyides, tous morts au 4^e/10^e siècle, ainsi qu'à leurs œuvres: Furāt b. Furāt b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī, 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, Muḥammad b. Mas'ūd al-'Ayyāshī et Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Nu'mānī. Les manuscrits, les anciennes et les nouvelles éditions ainsi que les principales caractéristiques de ces plus anciens *tafsīr*-s imāmites qui nous soient parvenus, sont présentés avec méticulosité. On soulignera en particulier l'importance des sous-chapitres 1-4 sur la censure du matériau anti-«sunnite» du *Tafsīr* d'al-Qummī dans sa nouvelle édition, et 1-5, sur la présence d'importantes strates zaydites jārudites dans ce même ouvrage.

Dans le second chapitre (pp. 71-86), certaines caractéristiques de «l'École pré-bouyide de l'exégèse» sont analysées: le commentaire par le ḥadīth, le procédé sélectif appliqué aux versets coraniques, la rareté de spéculations proprement théologiques (l'auteur entend surtout par là la théologie spéculative dialectique du type du *kalām*) et l'importance de l'institution de l'imāmāt, l'attitude violemment hostile envers les Compagnons et les tendances anti-sunnites.

Le chapitre 3 (pp. 87-124) constitue, à mon sens, la partie la plus importante et la plus originale du livre; il est consacré aux méthodes d'exégèse et consiste en un examen précis et

érudit aussi bien des fondements doctrinaux de «la science de l'exégèse» en tant que discipline nécessaire, que des méthodes exégétiques proprement dites. Les deux premiers sous-chapitres sur la nécessité de l'interprétation du Coran et l'autorité de l'interprète touchent de près l'imāmologie et éclaire excellentement les bases épistémologiques du *tafsīr* imāmite et même shi'ite en général. Dans le troisième sous-chapitre, consacré aux méthodes exégétiques, quelques problèmes de première importance sont analysés, entre autres les interprétations fondées sur les altérations du texte coranique, les interprétations allégoriques et typologiques ou encore l'usage du langage codé.

Le chapitre 4 (pp. 125-203), le plus long du livre, est consacré, comme il se doit, à l'imāmāt et aux doctrines s'y référant. Paradoxalement, il apporte peu de nouveautés par rapport aux études antérieures, par exemple celles de H. Corbin, W. Madelung, E. Kohlberg, U. Rubin ou du signataire de ces lignes. Cependant les sous-chapitres 2.4 et 2.5, respectivement sur l'infailibilité (*'isma*) et sur l'intercession (*shafā'a*) des prophètes et des imāms, fréquemment fondés sur des sources jusqu'ici non exploitées sous cet angle, comportent des développements aussi intéressants que pertinents.

Le chapitre 5 (pp. 204-223) est centré sur l'attitude des imāmites à l'égard des Umayyades et des Abbassides, mais à travers cette problématique d'autres questions, comme la notion de *badā'*, l'utilisation de la valeur numérique des lettres ou encore les croyances eschatologiques, sont examinées.

Enfin, le sixième chapitre (pp. 224-243) consiste en l'examen de deux ḥadīth-s imāmites que l'auteur considère comme «insolites» (unusual)⁶⁾. Un appendice sur les occurrences de la *riwāyat Abī l-Jārūd* dans le commentaire d'al-Qummī, une riche bibliographie et d'excellents indices ajoutent à l'utilité de l'ouvrage.

Les critiques que l'on pourrait formuler à l'égard de cet excellent livre ne concernent donc que quelques points de détail. D'abord, le plan est quelque peu troublant, peut-être parce qu'encore trop proche du plan initial de la thèse. On y relève des répétitions ou bien des discussions éparses sur des mêmes sujets pouvant être réunies ensemble (par exemple l'hostilité envers les adversaires «historiques» du shi'isme ou envers les Compagnons: parties I-4.1 à I-4.3, II-1.4, III-3.2.2 à 3.2.4 et enfin tout le chapitre 5) ou encore des répartitions en chapitres et sous-chapitres dont la logique peut échapper au lecteur (les chapitres 2 et 3 auraient pu constituer logiquement une même et unique entité, d'autant plus que le second chapitre contient un sous-chapitre 1 alors qu'il n'y en a pas un deuxième; il aurait été plus logique de faire un appendice du chapitre 6 sur les deux traditions «insolites», puisqu'il s'agit plutôt d'un ex-cursus).

Un grand nombre de fautes typographiques et de coquilles est à déplorer, surtout dans les noms propres et les transcriptions. Contentons-nous de quelques exemples: p. xiv, ligne 19: H.Diaber et P.Pingree au lieu de H.Daiber et D.Pingree. P.16, l.4: Hsaan > Hasan. P.34, note 26: *fihī* > *fihī*. P.68, l.1: Aummi > Qummī. P.80, note 33: Dhhabī > Dhahabī. P.89, l.16: *baytihi* > *baytihi* et note 2, l.6: *nafā'ishuā* >

¹⁾ Sur ces études voir maintenant M.A. Amir-Moezzi et S. Schmidtke, «Twelver-Shi'ite Resources in Europe», *Journal Asiatique* 285/1 (1997), pp. 73-122, en particulier pp. 75-80.

²⁾ Première édition: Leipzig, 1920.

³⁾ A cet égard, l'article de M. Ayoub, «The Speaking Qur'ān and the Silent Qur'ān: a Study of the Principles and Development of Imāmī-Shi'ite Tafsīr» dans A. Rippin (éd.), *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'ān*, Oxford, 1988, pp. 177-98, posait les problèmes de base de façon fine et érudite.

⁴⁾ Les articles de Bar-Asher-Kofsky sur la Nuṣayriyya: *Le Muséon* 108/1-2 (1995), pp. 169-80; *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 58 (1995), pp. 243-50; M.A. Amir-Moezzi (éd.), *Le Voyage initiatique en terre d'Islam. Ascensions célestes et itinéraires spirituels*, Paris-Louvain, 1997, pp. 133-48; *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 71/1-4 (1997), pp. 55-81.

⁵⁾ Chez ces auteurs, les gloses exégétiques sont en fait des ḥadīth-s remontant aux imāms; c'est ce qu'on appelle *al-tafsīr bi l-ma'thūr*.

⁶⁾ Une version française de ce chapitre de la thèse a déjà été publiée: «Deux traditions hétérodoxes dans les anciens commentaires imāmites du Coran», *Arabica* 37 (1990), pp. 291-314; là-dessus M.A. Amir-Moezzi, «Notes sur deux traditions 'hétérodoxes' imāmites», *ibid.*, 41(1994), pp. 127-33.

naḥā'isuhā... P.196, note 311: *arakān* > *arkān*. P.234, note 34, l.3: al-Ḥāsan > al-Ḥasan; l.5: après *al-rajul minhum* il faut ajouter *fi l-Kūfa*, etc.

Quelques remarques et réflexions ponctuelles: pp. 22-23, note 67: il est vrai que dans ses *Rawḍāt al-jannāt*, al-Khwān-sārī, suivant certainement l'avis de quelques savants d'époque ṣafawide, rattache la *nisba* Ṭabrisī à la province de Ṭabaristān;⁷⁾ mais en fait cette *nisba* — lue également Ṭabarsī — se rapporte à la petite ville de Tafresh (nom arabisé sous la forme de Ṭabris, fautivelement lu et prononcé Ṭabars), située non pas au Ṭabaristān mais dans l'ancienne Médie, appelée à l'époque islamique Jibāl ou 'Irāq 'Ajam.⁸⁾

P.24, note 69: l'appartenance (secrète?) de Shahrastānī au shī'isme ismaélien semble maintenant établie, après l'édition de son commentaire coranique *Mafātīḥ al-asrār*⁹⁾ et grâce aux travaux de G. Monnot et plus récemment de D. Steigerwald.¹⁰⁾

Aux pp. 82, note 42, p. 91, note 11 et pp. 102-4, concernant «le Coran shī'ite», l'auteur ne cite point ma longue étude consacrée à ce sujet,¹¹⁾ étude qui va en plus dans le même sens que celle d'E. Kohlberg et ses propres recherches.¹²⁾ Par contre, il ne cesse de se référer à l'article de H. Modarressi, paru dans *Studia Islamica*, qui est fondamentalement en désaccord avec les analyses et les conclusions des trois chercheurs sus mentionnés.¹³⁾

P.89, note 3: Abū Baṣīr était la *kunya* portée par trois disciples de l'imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq.¹⁴⁾

P.123: 'Abd Sāliḥ est une des nombreuses appellations du septième imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm (m.203/818). Le rapporteur du ḥadīth peut donc être un des Muḥammad b. Maṣṣūr qui sont dits avoir connu l'enseignement des 7^e et/ou 8^e imāms.¹⁵⁾

P.118 (dernière ligne) et 220 (première ligne): il faut préciser que le mot *sibā'* (de *banū l-sibā'*), anagramme de *'abbās* (de *banū l-'abbās*) signifie «bêtes sauvages» et que *zufār* (p. 118, nom ironique donné à 'Umar) a ici le sens de «bête qui porte de lourds fardeaux», en l'occurrence l'âne.

Enfin, quelques contradictions auxquelles l'auteur fait allusion à de très nombreuses reprises (pp. 72, 79, 81, 135-37, 152, 241-3), auraient pu trouver une explication si elles avaient été mises en perspective à l'aide de la division que

⁷⁾ Voir par exemple H. Karīmān, *Ṭabrisī wa Majma' al-bayān*, Téhéran, 1340 solaire/1962, I:166sq. et 313sq.

⁸⁾ Voir notes de F. Bahmanyār à son édition de *Tārīkh-e Bayhaq* d'al-Bayhaqī, Téhéran, s.d. (vers 1945), pp. 347-53.

⁹⁾ Ed. fac-similé de l'*unicum* de Majlis de Téhéran, première édition, Téhéran, 1989; maintenant al-Shahrastānī, *Mafātīḥ al-asrār wa maṣābiḥ al-abrār*, vol. 1, éd. M. 'A. Ādharshab, Téhéran, 1997 (l'édition de la suite est en cours). Sur l'ismaélisme de l'auteur, voir l'introduction de l'éditeur.

¹⁰⁾ G. Monnot dans ses nombreux articles dans l'*Annuaire de la Section des Sciences Religieuses de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes*, années 1981sq.; id. «al-Shahrastānī», *EI2*, s.n.; D. Steigerwald, *La pensée philosophique et théologique de Shahrastānī*, université de Laval, 1997 et *Majlis. Discours sur l'ordre et la création*, Université de Laval, 1998.

¹¹⁾ M.A. Amir-Moezzi, *Le guide divin dans le shī'isme originel*, Paris-Lagrasse, 1992, pp. 200-227.

¹²⁾ E. Kohlberg, dans S.M. Stern et al. (eds.), *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition. Essays presented to Richard Walzer*, Oxford, 1972, pp. 209-224; M.M. Bar-Asher, *Israel Oriental Studies* 13 (1993), pp. 39-74.

¹³⁾ H. Modarressi, *Studia Islamica* 77 (1993), pp. 5-39; voir le compte-rendu critique de C. Gilliot dans *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 67 (1993), pp. 470-72. Sur le sujet voir aussi maintenant P. Sander, «Koran oder Imām? Die Auffassung von Koran im Rahmen der imāmītischen Glaubenslehren», *Arabica* 47/3-4 (2000), pp. 420-40; R. Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, Mainz, 2001.

¹⁴⁾ *Mon Guide divin*, p. 87, note 182.

¹⁵⁾ Voir par exemple al-Ardabilī, *Jāmi' al-ruwāt*, Qumm, 1331 solaire/1953, II:203-4.

j'ai pu établir, dans plusieurs publications, entre une tradition imāmīte «primitive ésotérique et non-rationnelle» (justement principalement pré-bouyide) et une tradition plus tardive «rationnelle et théologico-juridique» d'époque bouyide.¹⁶⁾

Ces remarques ponctuelles ne diminuent évidemment en rien l'importance du livre de M.M.Bar-Asher. Cette étude enrichit considérablement notre connaissance de la genèse et du développement de l'exégèse coranique imāmīte ancienne. L'érudition, la rigueur et la clarté qui la caractérisent font incontestablement d'elle une référence désormais incontournable pour les études shī'ites à venir.

Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Paris, mai 2001
Mohammad Ali AMIR-MOEZZI

* *
*

AL-MAWARDĪ — The Ordinances of Government. A Translation of *Al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyya w' al-wilāyāt al-dīniyya*. Translated by Wafaa H. Wahba, Ithaca Press / Garnet Publishing, Berkshire, 1996. (25 cm, xvii, 301 incl. glossary and index). ISBN 1-873938-17-9.

The book under review is a much welcomed publication in a series supported by the Qatar based *Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization*. The major goals of the series are “to acquaint non-Muslims with the contributions of Islam ... to human civilization as a whole” and to make “available ... a wide selection of works” that represent the civilization of Islam “in all its diversity” (p. viii). Accordingly, it presents English translations of books that are both faithful and comprehensive reflections of intellectual activities, conducted by medieval Muslim scholars in various branches of literature and scholarly writing. Since the books published in this series aim to address “the common reader,” footnotes and other technical means of scholarly publication are kept to a minimum.

For the translations presented by this series, it is stated that, in general, two scholars have been working each on translation: a native user of English and a native user of Arabic. This has been done “in order to ensure accuracy and fluency” (p. ix). The translator of this particular book, W.H. Wahba, adds that efforts were made “to remain as faithful to the original as possible without sounding archaic or unidiomatic” (p. xvii). These statements reflect an intention that will be appreciated by most readers, including specialists in the fields of Arabic and Islamic studies.

The book begins with a *Foreword* by Mohammed bin Hamad Al-Thani, Chairman of the Board of Trustees (pp. vii-viii), followed by a note *About this Series*, (pp. ix-x), a list of the *Board of Trustees* of the Center (pp. xi-xii), and the *Translator's Introduction* (pp. xiii-xvii). The English translation of al-Māwardī's primer constitutes the main part of the book (pp. 1-280). The publication is rounded off by a *Glossary* of Arabic technical terms, some of which receive a concise definition (pp. 281-285), and by an *Index* of proper names (pp. 286-301).

¹⁶⁾ M.A. Amir-Moezzi, *Guide divin*, pp. 15-48; id., «Al-Saffār al-Qummī (m.290/902-3) et son *Kitāb Baṣā'ir al-darajāt*», *Journal Asiatique* 280/3-4 (1992), pp. 221-50; id., «Aspects de l'imamologie duodécimaine I: remarques sur la divinité de l'Imām», *Studia Iranica* 25/2 (1996), pp. 193-216.

In the foreword, M. Al-Thani places Wahba's translation within the Great Books of Islamic Civilization Project. He outlines the vision, general foci, and methodology of this collection. The note *About this Series* again makes similar statements. The translator's introduction briefly reviews al-Māwardī's life and work in the wider context of the historical development and the history of ideas of Islam. Consideration is also given to Islam's general views on politico-religious leadership and government. In this introduction, the translator relies in particular on the publications of H.A.R. Gibb and F. Rosenthal, to whom the translator refers explicitly at the end of the preface.

The decision to translate this book of al-Māwardī's has been made carefully. Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb al-Māwardī (d. 1058 AD in Baghdad) is an important medieval Muslim jurist, known especially for his contribution in formulating orthodox political theory regarding the nature of the authority of the caliph. In fact, his book *The Ordinances of Government* became an influential statement of Islamic political theory.

In general terms, the English translation is a good one. It represents accurately the meaning of the Arabic original, and it is written in clear and understandable English (though the translation still alludes to the fact that the Arabic original is not an easy text to read). A cursory comparison of the translation with the Arabic original, however, shows that in a number of sections the translation tends to follow the wording of the Arabic text rather loosely (unless the translator had access to an Arabic text different from those consulted for this review).¹⁾ This general observation is noteworthy for two reasons: al-Māwardī's book is considered authoritative in Islam, and it is a book on law that heavily depends on the precise use of specific (legal) expressions, along with a certain way of reasoning. In effect, anyone who needs to consult al-Māwardī's book as 'a legal source' may still wish to cross-check the translation with the Arabic original.

"The non-specialist with an interest in Islam and its cultural heritage" (p. vii), however, will very much appreciate having al-Māwardī's book now available in English. The translation provides easy access to the manifold contents of al-Māwardī's book. It displays the diversity of its sources and it shows the particular scholarly method and literary form used by this medieval author. The latter includes al-Māwardī's sophisticated and vigorous way of presenting matters of crucial political or legal importance in Islam. Examples of this are the meticulous organization of precedents into categories and sub-categories, and the author's references to the different legal traditions. Even though al-Māwardī is concerned in the first place with legal and state matters, he makes — in addition to the frequent references to the Qurʾān and the Sunnah — extensive use of poetry, anecdotes, and traditions from the life of the early Muslim community. All this contributes to an appreciation of al-Māwardī's book as an important literary and historical source that provides colourful and lively insights into medieval Islamic society, culture, and politics. This ultimately makes reading the book a fascinating and pleasurable experience for all interested readers,

¹⁾ Ed. Muṣṭafā al-Bānī al-Ḥalabī, [Cairo]: 1380H/1960 AD; this edition seems to rely on only one manuscript. The Edition by Aḥmad Mubārak al-Baghdādī, Kuwait: Maktabat Dār Ibn Qutaybah, 1409/1989 is a good one; it is based on what would seem to be several manuscripts. It also contains a helpful technical apparatus.

including experts in medieval history, culture, literature, religion, sociology, political sciences, etc.

Unfortunately, there are some incorrect details in the title page of this publication: the accurate transliteration of the author's name is al-Māwardī²⁾ (instead of al-Mawardī); also read *wa-l-Wilāyāt* or *wa-'l-Wilāyāt* (instead of *w' al-Wilāyāt*). Furthermore, it must be noted that the publication does not indicate which edition of the Arabic text was used for translation. This is a *lacuna*, even if this publication targets a "potentially large readership."

Along the same line, the lack of footnotes must also be mentioned. Even in publications like the one discussed here, the complete omission of footnotes is not always a blessing. For example, one does not have to read much of the initial chapters of al-Māwardī's book in translation before coming across names of individuals, many of whom may mean little to non-specialist readers with a rather general interest in Islam. Most of these names would have merited short explanations. In addition, there are passages on rather complex subject matters that would have benefited from brief comments, given the fact that al-Māwardī's *The Ordinances of Government* is regarded as a text of principal significance in Islam.

University of Toronto,
December, 2000

Sebastian GÜNTHER

* *
*

SMET, D. De — Empedocles Arabus. Koninklijke Academie, Brussel, 1999. (26 cm, 257). ISBN 90-6569-684-9.

Neoplatonism has deeply influenced Arabic philosophy. It was just that form of thinking in late Greek Antiquity, especially at Alexandria, as reflected in the *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, nowadays translated and commented, published by R. Sorabji in the series *The ancient Commentators on Aristotle* with which Islam got acquainted.

It was part of the tradition, even of the Christian tradition, to use philosophers both for basements of their doctrine and the material to accuse their opponents of heresy, as e.g. Hippolytus did in his *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. And especially the Presocratics were appropriate for this aim because of their lack of clarity, and even more Empedocles with all his strange theories of first causes like Love and Hate!

After a short rejection of the theories of M. Asín Palacios about Empedocles and Ibn Masarra, De Smet first tries to find which corpus of texts of Anbaduqlīs existed in the Arab world and what the difference was between Empedocles in the Greek world, the real Empedocles, and this Neoplatonistic one. The Greek fragments are collected by H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 3 vol. Zürich 1996-1998 (1951-1952), but here the collection of fragments should also be mentioned, edited by M.R. Wright, *Empedocles. The extant fragments*, London, Indianapolis/Cambridge 1995 (1981), with translation and commentary.

In the Arab world this real Empedocles was known by the translation of the *Placita Philosophorum* of Aetius by Quṣṭā

²⁾ All major medieval bio-bibliographical dictionaries available to me have al-Māwardī. See also *EI* (2) VI, 869 (C. Brockelmann).

ibn Lūqā, edited by H. Daiber, *Aetius Arabus*, Wiesbaden 1980. In addition to this, many fragments of Empedocles were known through citations in the books of Aristotle. On p. 25 and in note 57 it should be added that an edition of the *Problemata Physica* has been published after a manuscript from the library at Manisa (Turkey) by the reviewer, *The Problemata Physica attributed to Aristotle. The Arabic Version of Hunain ibn Ishāq and the Hebrew Version of Moses ibn Tibbon*, Leiden, Boston, Köln 1999, including only 15 books of the 38 Greek ones, without any citation under the name of Empedocles.

The author concentrates on Anbaduqlīs, the Neoplatonic-Islamic philosopher. De Smet wrote many a study about Neoplatonism within the Islam, and consequently this book about Empedocles must also be interesting because of his knowledge of late classical philosophy and its Islamic traditions.

The most important source of his study (pp. 28ff.) appears to be the *Kitāb Amūniyūs fī Ārā' al-falāsifa*, now edited by U. Rudolph, *Die Doxographie des Pseudo-Ammonios. Ein Beitrag zur neuplatonischer Überlieferung im Islam*, Stuttgart 1989, with many of the existing fragments of Empedocles in a typical Neoplatonic-Islamic colouring, completed by Abū 'l-Hasan al-'Āmirī's *Kitāb al-Amad 'alā 'l-abad*, the source of *Kitāb Šiwān al-Ḥikma* and *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-Umam* by Šā'id al-Andalusī, then *Ġāyat al-Ḥakīm*, attributed to al-Mağrībī. Akin to the last mentioned text is probably a Hebrew text *Yesōd 'Olām*, a cabbalistic treatise by an Elḥanan ibn Abraham (XIV sc.), containing a quite free adaptation of texts of Empedocles, chosen from his *Book of the five substances*. "Mais ce groupe se compose avant tout des fragments hébraïques d'un soi-disant "Livre sur les cinq substances" ... and somewhat later: "Ils devraient donc occuper une place centrale dans notre étude, la tradition arabe, certes plus ancienne, étant beaucoup plus éparse", but the Jewish adaptation which can not have been arisen within the muslim world, prevents to estimate these texts at their true value (pp. 34-35); these texts require more research. The third part forms the *Turba philosophorum*. Most of the texts to which is referred, are included in the book after the text, preceded by a French translation, unfortunately without any reference in the text or in the notes of the book.

In chapter II life and works of Anbaduqlīs is discussed. Especially authors like 'Āmirī described him as a real monotheist, to persuade the 'ulamā' that philosophy has its roots in prophecy and is therefore not contrary to Islam. He has had a close connection with Luqmān, but later philosophers were polluted and introduced erroneous innovations. This is a conception which he derived probably indirectly from the early Christian literature (p. 40f.). Interesting are the facts about his life, according to the Arabs as a contemporary of David, but it is clear that his contact with Luqmān and David made him a man with many intellectual and moral qualities. He wrote many books, but the titles are different from those mentioned in Greek literature.

In chapter III (*La pensée d'Anbaduqlīs: Essai de reconstitution*) De Smet carefully investigates the fragments of texts which have been transmitted, and compares them with the parallel texts to reconstruct Anbaduqlīs' system and to find an interpretation of the terms used by Anbaduqlīs and the meaning of them for his Arab readers.

A. *Anbaduqlīs monothéiste: le Principe Ultime et ses attributs*: The *tawḥīd* is the most important dogma of the

Islam, but in his teachings this dogma is more Neoplatonic than Islamic, more the negative doctrine of non-existence of any other Form than the *ipseitas* of God (*huwīya*), which is *azalī* and not belonging to the *dahr*, in this manner that the *azaliya* belongs to God, the *dahr* to the intelligible world, the *zamān* to the sublunar world. This doctrine is very similar to the one, described in the *Plotiniana Arabica*, but also to Ismailitic writers like as-Siğistānī.

Of course, the doctrine of the divine attributes (pp. 72ff.), already known to the Greek Neoplatonism, is a topic in the doctrine of Anbaduqlīs. Because of his Neoplatonism it was difficult for him to accept that some attributes like knowledge, truth, goodness and power, did belong to God, for to ascribe attributes to God could mean to annul the *tawḥīd*. Therefore Anbaduqlīs defended the doctrine that the multiple of attributes ascribed to God in the Qur'ān, did not mean a multiplication in the divine Essence; these are absorbed in the divine Essence in such a way that He is one. A relation between Anbaduqlīs, Abū 'l-Hudail and the Mu'tazila seems obvious (pp. 77ff.).

B. *La genèse du monde intelligible* (pp. 85ff.):

The creation *ex nihilo*, denied by Empedocles (DK fr. B12), is one of the other unusual issues of his doctrine. God is the first Mover, *the mutaḥarrrik bi-naw' as-sukūn*, He moves on the manner of rest, the Aristotelian $\delta \kappa \iota \nu \eta \tau \eta \varsigma \delta \acute{\alpha} \kappa \iota \nu \eta \tau \circ \varsigma$, but via Proclus it arrived in Neoplatonism, not as an action of the Intellect ('*aql*) or of the Matter ('*unṣur*'), but as an action of the will of God (pp. 91ff.), which is possible because this is the *irāda maḥḍa*, the pure will He is, one of the attributes of the Qur'ān He absorbed. Therefore He did create *bi-annihī faqaṭ*, "solely by His essence". Owing to this *ibdā' al-'unṣur al-awwal* (the First Matter) comes into being. This is a sort of spiritual matter, which is composed of Love and Victory ($\tau \delta \nu \iota \kappa \circ \varsigma$ by iotacism instead of $\delta \nu \epsilon \iota \kappa \circ \varsigma$), a reminiscence of the Greek Empedocles, but in a neoplatonic sense situated between God and the Intellect and different from the Second Matter, the matter of the sensible world. Perhaps this is also a connection with the real Empedocles, because his $\Sigma \phi \alpha \iota \rho \circ \varsigma$ has been explained by later commentators of Aristotle as a matter and receptacle which has in it all germs of later beings, the substratum on which Love and Victory (Hate) will have their effect.

From this First Matter originated the Intellect, the Soul, Nature and the Second Matter, together the five substances belonging to the cosmic order (pp. 111ff.). Like Neoplatonism the procession of the emanation is a sort of degeneration, but — and this is new in Anbaduqlīs — each entity is like a *qišr* (skin) or *ṣanam* (image) for the preceding one and like a *lubb* (heart) for the inferior one (p. 115ff.). That makes possible the $\pi \rho \acute{\omicron} \delta \omicron \varsigma$ and the $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho \omicron \phi \eta$, the way down and up. The way up Anbaduqlīs denotes the verb Neoplatonic and Coranic *taḍarra'a* to pray humbly to God to be illuminated by the superior entity as a sort of soteriology. This soteriology is incited by the $\delta \nu \acute{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ or *quwāt maḥabba* (Love) and *ḡalaba* (Victory) (pp. 121ff.), which go down in all inferior entities, because *al-maḥabba* is the unifying power, directed to the celestial sphere and *al-ḡalaba* the separating power, directed to the inferior multiplication of the sublunar world. This seems to be in accordance to the explanation of Hippolytos of the doctrine of Empedocles, rendered by Aristotle.

The Nature and the Second Matter (pp. 128ff.) are the last hypostases of the intelligible world, whereas the Second Mat-

ter is the substratum of the four elements, and then we enter the sensible world.

C. *La chute des âmes et leur remontée* (pp. 133ff.), an explanation of the soteriology which is important in Anbaduqlīs' doctrine. The Soul is directed through the *mahabba* at the Intellect, whereas the *galaba* directs the Soul at the sensible world with all its temptations — a sort of Neoplatonistic explanation of DK fr. B115 — and this procession brings about the fall of the souls and their incarceration in the bodies. The soul enters the body as a *σπίλαιον* with the remarkable correction of *صدى* of Badawī (*Aflūṭīn 'inda 'l-'Arab*, Cairo 1955, p. 24, notes 9 and 10) in *صدف*. Through the illumination of the soul (pp. 141 ff.) the purification begins and the soul is liberated. This chapter ends with the doctrine of the prophet, who purifies the *insān maḡnūn bi-'l-lisān* or *bi-'s-saif*, in the same way as the Greek Empedocles also wanted to be a prophet, and the Second Creation at the day of Resurrection, although the doctrine of Resurrection is not the orthodox Muslim interpretation, but a Neoplatonistic one: the purification of the souls and the return of the souls in a cyclic procession.

The book ends with a conclusion (pp. 151ff.), the appendices, the French translation (pp. 157ff) of the Arabic texts (pp. 176 ff.) and Hebrew fragments of the Book of the five substances in French translation (pp. 208ff.). After the bibliography (pp. 233ff) and the indices (pp. 245) still follows a summary in Dutch.

It is a very interesting study of this obscure philosopher and prophet, but it is especially an important study, because De Smet shows carefully the influence of Neoplatonism in the Islamic philosophy and theology. Some inaccuracies like *'ala* instead of *'alā* (pp. 31 and 38, but see p. 31) or *fī* instead of *fī* (p. 26, note 61) or *bi-ḡumlatihi* (p. 27, n. 66) instead of *bi-ḡumlatihī* are quickly forgotten after reading this excellent study.

Culemborg NL, February 2001

Lou FILIUS

* *
*

GELDER, Geert Jan van — Of Dishes and Discourse. Classical Arabic Literary Representations of Food. Curzon, Surrey, 1999. (22 cm, VII, 178). ISBN 0-7007-1174-0. £ 40.00.

Food is perhaps not as omnipresent in Arabic literature as wine is, yet there is no dearth of descriptions of banquets, metaphors taken from culinary arts and small vignettes on the topic of food.

Van Gelder's monograph, which is simultaneously published in the USA under a different title (*God's Banquet*), discusses culinary topics in Arabic literature. As always, van Gelder manages to be both entertaining and informative, a rare quality among scholars who usually do not combine fluency with philological accuracy. In four chapters after the Introduction (pp. 1-6), van Gelder discusses food in early poetry (pp. 7-21), Umayyad and early Abbasid literature (pp. 22-38), Classical *adab* (pp. 39-79: this is the main chapter, as indicated by the author himself, see p. 6: the core of this chapter is the sub-chapter 2 where the juxtaposition and interchangeability of words and dishes is developed), and later *adab* (pp. 80-108). He retains the last chapter (pp. 109-125)

for discussing food and sex, food and oneiromantic texts and, finally, food metaphors in the metalanguage of the Mediaeval literary critics. Van Gelder's presentation is not as straightforwardly chronological as the above might imply, but he takes up similar subjects from different chronological layers.

The theme of food & literature is naturally vast, and there are always areas which could have been covered. However, the selections made by van Gelder are easily defensible and the texts he discusses (the *maqāmāt* of al-Hamadhānī; *Hikāyat Abī'l-Qāsim*; Ibn Sūdūn's *Nuzha*; Ibn al-Ḥajjār's *Delectable War*; ash-Shirbīnī's *Hazz al-quḥūf*, as well as many other texts, including several poems and short anecdotes) are well-chosen and central to the theme. Nevertheless, the theme of feeding the wolf (see Manfred Ullmann, *Das Gespräch mit dem Wolf. Beiträge zur Lexikographie des Klassischen Arabisch* 2, 1981) would at least have merited a mention in the chapter on early poetry, although one has to admit that the feeding itself is rather subordinate in the scene, the conversation between the poet and the wolf, or the poet's monologue, taking most of the space.

Also the romantic meal, so common in *Alf Layla wa-Layla* and frequently found in Mediaeval *adab*, too, is studied only in passing (pp. 109-110).

Van Gelder has not included medical works and cookery books¹) into the discussion (see p. 39), although the latter do pop up now and then, especially Ibn Sayyār al-Warrāq's *Kitāb at-ṭabīkh*. This is easily understandable as their nature is not literary.

The aim of the book is not to reconstruct the diet of Mediaeval people but to study the use of food in literature. Thus, it is understandable that the more humble aspects of eating get little attention, as do peasants and their dishes: as van Gelder himself states (p. 103), "peasants are almost wholly invisible in Arabic literature, with one prominent exception", viz. ash-Shirbīnī's *Hazz al-quḥūf*, which is subsequently studied in detail.

Although van Gelder is clearly right, one might draw attention to Ibn Waḡshīyya's *al-Filāḡa an-Nabaṭīyya* (Toufīq Fahd, éd., *L'agriculture nabaṭéenne. Traduction en arabe attribuée à Abū Bakr Aḡmad b. 'Alī al-Kasdānī connu sous le nom d'IBN WAḤṢIYYA (IV/X^e siècle)*. I-III. Damas: Institut Français de Damas 1993-1998), a book of controversial date but probably describing the situation in Iraq around 900, which is full of peasant recipes not found elsewhere in Arabic literature. The work naturally falls outside the limits set by van Gelder (it has no literary pretensions) but it gives us some glimpses of peasant life and eating almost unparalleled in Mediaeval Arabic literature. Thus, there is an interesting and rare mention of the tasty flesh of pork which the author deems the best and most nutritious kind of meat (p. 647; cf. van Gelder, p. 83).

Van Gelder's book is an excellent survey of the theme of food in literature. It is based on the impeccable use of a wide variety of sources with which the author is very familiar. This also means that he is free of the over-interpretations that bedevil many similar studies. Van Gelder himself often warns

¹) See van Gelder, pp. 63-64; a few additions to the list of early cookery books can be found in my review (in *Studia Orientalia* 73, 1994, p. 293) of Manuela Marín — David Waines (eds.), *Kanz al-fawā'id fī tanwī' al-mawā'id. Medieval Arab/Islamic Culinary Art*. Bibliotheca Islamica 40, 1993

against reading 20th-century theories into Mediaeval texts or forcing a single interpretation on heterophonic (cf. p. 105) material (see, e.g., pp. 92, 94-95, 108, 117, 121). The sober attitude of the author can only be applauded: he never lapses into fanciful interpretations, although some do tempt him. Yet, “being tempted, however, does not mean being convinced” (p. 92). As a result of his soberness and vast reading, van Gelder’s book is a remarkable contribution to the field of literary studies.

The following few remarks on some details should be taken as a desperate attempt by the reviewer to find in this excellent monograph at least something to correct or add to.

p. 45: I can see no reason not to accept the explanation (*rajrāj = fāūdhaj*) given by the editor of az-Zamakhsharī’s *maqāmas* (p. 122; copied from the older edition, *Sharḥ Maqāmāt az-Zamakhsharī*, s.a.&s.l., p. 89). Cf. also E.W. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon* (I-VIII. [London 1863-1893], repr. Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society 1984), s.v. *rajrāja = fālūdh*.

p. 51: Al-Maʿarrī must have been thinking about the famous episode of the poisoned roasted lamb addressing and warning the prophet, cf., e.g., A. Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad (A Translation of Ibn Ishaq’s Sirat Rasul Allah)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1955), p. 516. As al-Maʿarrī was quite ready to laugh at religion (cf. also van Gelder, pp. 87-88), this adds another possible level of interpretation.

pp. 56-57: “But Abū Zayd is wrong” (p. 57) — is he? The end of the *maqāma* of al-Ḥarīrī actually shows how he is able after all to trade his words for some valuables. The passage will be analysed in my forthcoming monograph on the *maqāmas*.

p. 72: When Abū Zayd explains, at the end of *as-Sinjāriyya*, that his story has been a substitute for the lost sweets, he actually provides a key for the interpretation of al-Hamadhānī’s *al-Maḍīriyya*, too. In both *maqāmas*, the story within the story is served as a substitute for the dish taken away.

p. 75: For *jarmāzaj* one should probably read *jazmāzaj*, cf. Persian *kizmāzaj* (F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. Sixth impression 1977, s.v.). Cf. also p. 151, note 6, in (ps.)-at-Tawhīdī, *ar-Risāla al-baghdādiyya* (Ed. ʿAbbūd ash-Shālījī. Bayrūt: Maṭbaʿat Dār al-kutub 1400/1980), a title selected by the editor: actually the text is a re-edition of al-Azdī’s *Ḥikāyat Abīʿl-Qāsim*.

p. 77: Al-Azdī is probably not quoting from al-Hamadhānī, see my article *Al-Hamadānī and the Early History of the Maqāma*. in: U. Vermeulen — D. de Smet (eds.), *Philosophy and Arts in the Islamic World*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 87 (1998): 83-96.

p. 82: For the edible god of Banū Hanīfa, see also Gerald R. Hawting, *The Idea of Idolatry and the Emergence of Islam. From Polemic to History*. Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999: 107.

p. 85: For Ibn Shuhayd’s *Risālat al-ḥalwāʾ*, see also my article Ibn Shuhayd and his *Risālat at-Tawābiʿ waʾz-zawābiʿ*, published in the on-line *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* 1 (1996-1997 [recte 1998]: 65-80), available from <http://www.UIB.NO/JAIS>, to be published later in printed form.

pp. 88-89: It should be obvious that Musaylima is quite innocent of the passages attributed to him by later, and clearly malicious, Muslim authors.

p. 90: The re-edition of Ibn Sūdūn’s *Nuzha* by Arnoud Vrolijk (see p. 146, note 63) has now appeared as *Bringing a Laugh to a Scowling Face: a critical edition and study of ʿAli Ibn Sudun’s “Nuzhat al-nufus wa-mudhik al-ʿabus”*. Research School CNWS, Publications vol. 70. Leiden: Research School CNWS 1998.

p. 136, note 46: *at-Tadhkira al-Ḥamdūniyya* has been edited (I-IX+Index. Ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās — Bakr ʿAbbās, Bayrūt: Dār Ṣādir 1996).

p. 151, note 1: For *Kashshāf*, read *Asās*.

University of Helsinki,
January 2001

Jaakko HÄMEEN-ANTTILA

* *
*

PAUL, Joachim — *Menschliche Destruktivität und politische Gewalt*. (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen, Band 223). Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin, 1999. (24 cm, 106). ISBN 3-87997-275-3; ISSN 0939-1940.

The mere existence of this book is a positive sign, since it is a short monography on a single novel by a contemporary Arabic author. Not many of such works exist in German as yet, if at all, which could make Joachim Paul’s study a beacon lighting the way to the shores of interest in contemporary Arabic literature. For what is an everyday procedure in the study of other literatures must eventually become the same for Arabic and other West Asian literatures as well. That this is not yet the case can be seen from the series in which the author saw fit or found necessary to publish his study. It is called “Islamwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen”, a series of great merits but also serious limits as it predefines the content of studies that may then completely contradict this definition. To publish in such a series a study about an author like Muʿnis ar-Razzâz, who has nothing to say, and does not say anything about Islam, is worse than just deplorable and only explicable by the history of, and the attitude still predominant in the (philological) study of West Asia and North Africa in Germany. To continue to force any interest in contemporary Arabic literature into the strait-jacket of Islamic studies does not do justice at all to this literature.

Still, the mere existence of studies like this one shows a development that may eventually, and against many odds, result in the separation of literary from Islamic studies and lead to a normalization in treating Arabic literature.

Joachim Paul’s book deals with *Iʿtirâfât kâtim ṣawt* (Confessions of a Silencer) one novel by Muʿnis ar-Razzâz, dividing his just over one hundred pages long study, rather conventionally, into half a dozen chapters: “Der Autor und sein Werk” (The author and his work, pp. 14-21); “Zur Bedeutung von *Iʿtirâfât kâtim ṣawt* in der arabischen Literatur” (The place of *I.k.s.* in Arabic literature, pp. 22-25); *Iʿtirâfât kâtim ṣawt* (About the plot and the structure of the book, pp. 26-30); “Die intertextuellen Strategien: Erich Fromm, Dostojewskij und Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ” (Intertextual strategies: E.F., D. and b. al-M., pp. 31-59); and “Der autobiographische Gehalt von *Iʿtirâfât kâtim ṣawt*” (The autobiographical content of *I.k.s.*, pp. 60-96).

Muʿnis ar-Razzâz is, together with Ibrâhīm Nasrallâh, Ilyâs Farkûh and a few others, probably the best known prose writer in Jordan today. His writing is anything but easy to read. The author likes to use a great variety of perspectives,

different levels of time and consciousness, and sometimes a complete integration of awareness, dreams, wakefulness and nightmares. His characters symbolize the deep frustration about the end of the great visions, particularly that of nationalism, in the Arab world. They thus become strangers or even completely split personalities.

J. Paul selected for close reading ar-Razzâz's novel *I'tirâfât kâtim şawt* (Confessions of a Silencer), silencer here being not only someone who prevents someone else from speaking or speaking up but also a euphemism for a killer.

This silencer, Yûsuf, is a professional killer in the service of politicians of different affiliations who when he was in prison met a fellow-prisoner, Dr. Murâd, a politician of high renown, from whom he hopes to gain a position of power, which Dr. Murâd is not willing to grant to him. When, after some political change, Dr. Murâd is put under house arrest so he will be "silenced", Yûsuf flees to Lebanon and decides to take revenge on his former cell-mate by killing his son Aḥmad, who lives in Beirut.

In the novel — which M. ar-Razzâz considers a genre to create a world different from the real one, but not in the sense of a positive counter-world but of one ruled by a deeply depressing atmosphere — the author, in fact, combines several themes: Yûsuf's character; his relationship with Dr. Murâd and his family; the political situation that determines Dr. Murâd's destiny, and his family's situation during the house-arrest. Needless to say, the novel is replete with psychology, and it is here that J. Paul is at his best. He gives much information about the "sources" used, the psychological interpretations employed, particularly those of Erich Fromm and Dostoyevski about human destructiveness. In another chapter (pp. 60-96) he deals at length with the autobiographical content of the novel, offering details gleaned from interviews with the author, particularly about the relationship to his father, Munîf ar-Razzâz (whose *Rasâ'il ilâ awlâdî — awrâq ghayr manshûra* the son published in 1995). Useful as all this information may seem, it sometimes tends to distract from the novel and reduce the literary production of the son to his feeling of guilt towards his father. It is a kind of psychologization comparable to the one practiced some years ago by Brigitta Ryberg on Y. Idrîs (*Yûsuf Idrîs [1927-1991] — Identitätskrise und gesellschaftlicher Umbruch* [Beirut, 1992]). In both cases, one admires and appreciates the information presented, while having at the same time the impression that there is at least one chapter missing in the book — in this case that on the novel as a piece of literary art.

But all this must not blind us to the fact that J. Paul's book is a step in a promising direction.

Bern and Zürich, January 2001

Hartmut FÄHNDRICH

* *
*

GILADI, Avner — *Infants, Parents and Wet Nurses. Medieval Islamic Views on Breastfeeding and Their Social Implications.* (Islamic History and Civilization, Vol. 25). E.J. Brill Publishers N.V., Leiden, 1999. (24 cm, XII, 191). ISBN 90 04 11223 5; ISSN 0929-2403. Nlg. 143,24/Euro 65.00.

The methods, mores and meanings of infant feeding in past and present societies are increasingly receiving attention from

historians and anthropologists. They depart from the premise that breastfeeding should not be considered merely as a biological fact but as a specific historic and cultural practice, analysis of which may shed light on vital aspects of family life, such as the status of women, the value of children, the kind of bonding between mother and child, the power structures within the family, and the family's role in the wider society. Historians of premodern Europe have uncovered valuable historical documents on wet nursing in France and Italy, such as the archives of foundling hospitals, which enabled them to go beyond a study of theories and opinions about infant feeding and to focus on daily practices instead. For premodern Muslim societies however there is a near total lack of such archival documentation. It is therefore all the more courageous that Giladi has accepted the challenge to write this study of the Medieval views on infants, parents and wet nurses in the Muslim world.

The sources available to Giladi were in general of a normative-theoretical character, all written and compiled by men of upper-urban social strata. The reader should therefore not expect much information on the daily practices of breastfeeding in the past. But Giladi made the best use of his sources as he could. Religious, legal and medical texts formed the basis to deal with three main aspects of the history of breastfeeding in Muslim societies: Firstly, the Islamic 'ethics' of breastfeeding as laid down in the Qur'ân and later further developed in the Traditions, compilations of positive law, court records and fatwa's. They all inform us of the norms and values concerning breastfeeding, and the latter two sources give a few glimpses of local attitudes to and practices of breastfeeding. Secondly, how medical theories of breastfeeding developed as a reformulation of Greek Hippocratic and Galenic medicine, the ways in which they were popularized and woven into religious and legal discussions, and in which instances medical doctors disagreed with religious and legal scholars. The third aspect dealt with are the social implications of the medieval Islamic theories of breastfeeding, in particular their influence on parent-child relationships and the definitions of kinship.

The early religious sources express a remarkable attention for the value of maternal breastfeeding and the right of the nursing to maternal care and the protection of its health. At the same time, the Qur'ân approved of non-maternal nursing, whether voluntary or mercenary, as a solution to practical problems due to illness, death, or pregnancy of the mother, or divorce of the parents. It seems that at certain times among the urban elite mercenary wet nursing was quite common. In this context, the author extensively discusses the impediments to marriage this non-maternal suckling creates according to the Qur'ân 4/23. This verse prohibits marriage to "those who are your mothers by having suckled you, those who are your sisters by suckling" (p. 21). It is implicitly based on the idea that the milk of a nursing woman is formed from the blood of her womb, and that therefore ties created by suckling are ties of kinship. By recognizing milk ties analogous to blood ties, the incest taboo is extended to a larger group than only blood relatives and affines. Many *aḥâdîth* and/or legal treatises further elaborate on the question of who should be considered as milk relative. When the man is seen as the owner of the milk because it is the man's semen which causes the flow of breast milk, as some jurists do, the circle of people who can be considered kin is further enlarged. Another main issue is how and under what conditions milk kinship and its

impediments to marriage are established. In this context, jurists have argued about the number of sucks, the ways of transmittance, or the age of the suckling as relevant criteria.

This unique extension of kinship in Islam, at least compared to Judaism and Christianity, has had a remarkable social impact and significance. It has been practiced to broaden the network of relatives on whom one could rely for assistance and cooperation and with whom women could have free and open social contact, while it also encouraged exogamous ties beyond the boundaries of the own patrilineal and patrilocal extended families. The author could also have referred here to the scattered notes in the anthropological literature on the political and economic use of breastmilk, for instance some Berber tribes in Morocco have used it to establish pacts, while elsewhere it was used to establish trade relations. Of particular interest is Giladi's analysis of the discussion on milk banks, which illustrates how Medieval Islamic views on breastfeeding continue to play a role in present times. In milk banks as set up in some Western countries since the 1940's, human milk is pooled to make its nutritional and immunogenic properties of full use to babies who are premature, have low birth-weight or suffer from malabsorption or feeding intolerance. Although milk banks play only a very marginal role in Western countries and do not exist in Islamic countries, the idea behind them is passionately discussed by Muslims because such sharing of human milk from unknown origins is particularly problematic from an Islamic point of view. Giladi includes the full texts in Arabic of an article by 'Abdallāh Mabruk al-Najjār, a teacher of Islamic law at al-Azhar University in Cairo, and a book-chapter by two Sa'udi doctors, Zuhayr Ahmad al-Sibā'i and Muḥammad 'Alī al-Bār on this issue. Both the physicians and the scholar of law reject the milk bank because it threatens the legitimacy of future marital relationships between nurslings fed through milk banks. I would like to add here that knowledge about the Islamic notion of milk kinship and the resulting objection against milk banks is of relevance for medical personnel working with milk banks in multi-cultural and multi-religious hospital settings.

Medieval medical views on breastfeeding were largely in agreement with religious views in their recommendation of maternal breastfeeding up to two years and their recognition that maternal milk had nutritive and immunogenic value (stated by Ibn Sīnā in terms of "repelling harms" p. 51) and was important for the well-being and health of both the infant and its mother. Wet nursing was seen as an acceptable alternative, animal milk was not. Less unanimously shared notions were that pregnancy could harm a woman's milk and that the nurse's milk influenced the nursling's character traits. There was but one medical advice which was detrimental to the infant in terms of present day medical knowledge: that a newborn baby should not be breastfed the first two or three days. Such a practice deprived the nursling of the highly nutritional and protective colostrum.

Galen's idea that women who are nursing babies should abstain from sexual intercourse because this could spoil or diminish the milk was taken over by Muslim physicians. Religious scholars were more ambivalent towards this issue, and neither group seems to have been successful in convincing couples to practice abstinence for as long as the mother was lactating. It conflicted with what males considered as their basic marital right, especially for men from the lower strata who could not afford polygamy or female slaves. A similar

post-partum taboo on sexual intercourse had supported the widespread European practice of mercenary wet nursing. That mercenary wet nursing never became so widespread in the Islamic world as in Europe, is attributed by Giladi to the ambivalent religious stance on abstinence and to the sexual outlets provided to young fathers by polygamy and slavery (p. 119). But because second wives and slaves were only available to a very limited elite group of men, I would rather argue that the "cult of the mother" (p. 96) and especially the kinship effects of wet nursing were the more important explanations for this difference. Current anthropological research not only shows a general awareness and occasional strategic use of milk kinship relations, but also a recurrent hesitation or even aversion to use strange wet nurses, as also the discussion on milk banks confirms. The fear of losing track of one's kin ties and the possibility of unwittingly committing incest looms large. By taking account of this deeply felt fear for incest we can also better understand why jurists have such hair-splitting discussions on whether suckling from a dead woman, a virgin, or an animal, leads to prohibitions of marriage, or why local people can spend hours in discussing who is allowed to marry whom. Another reason for the aversion to wet nursing lies in the distrust of women, because men fear that women may use it for their own purposes against the interests of the husband or his patrilineage, for instance to prevent a patrilateral parallel-cousin marriage, to enlarge their network beyond the circle of in-laws, or to socialize with strange men.

This is a truly fascinating book, especially for specialists in Islamic family law or scholars researching Islamic childhood or family relations. It is also important for historians, anthropologists and other readers who want to know more about the various meanings and social consequences of breastfeeding or about the intricacies of kinship in non-European cultures. It is a fine piece of research, well written, and an excellent sequel to the author's *Children of Islam: Concepts of Childhood in Medieval Muslim Society* (1992). The specialists will appreciate the inclusion of transcribed Arabic terms and citations in the text, and the glossary of Arabic terms designating child feeding based on Ibn Sīdā's *Al-kitāb al-mukhaṣṣaṣ* in Arabic and English. Unfortunately, the non-Arabic speaking reader is at times left puzzling because some Arabic terms and citations have remained untranslated, and it is not systematically indicated when they have been paraphrased or summarized elsewhere in the text. The high price set by Brill Publishers may be an impediment to buying this book, which is very much worth reading.

University of Nijmegen,
January 2001

Willy JANSEN

* *
*

AVISHUR, Yitzhak — *The Oldest Translation of the Former Prophets into Judaeo-Arabic: The Text of Bodleian Manuscript Poc. 349 with an Introd. and Notes.* (Publications of the Hebrew University Language Trad. Proj., 19). The Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1995. (24 cm, VI, 342, IV). ISSN 965-350-019-8.

This book is devoted to a manuscript containing the Arabic translation of the Former Prophets, that is, the biblical books Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. In the preface by

Shlomo Morag, the scholar says that his series will now be enriched by a manuscript with an Arabic translation which dates from 1354 CE made by Mordechay ha-Dayyan bar 'Uzziel in Mardin in Northern Iraq (now in southern Turkey or western Kurdistan). The manuscript contains a long foreword and some parallels with Saadya Gaon (d. 942).

Avishur first describes the manuscript and discusses the Judaeo-Arabic translations of the Former Prophets in general. For example, he compares the translation which he calls the Mardin Translation of the Former Prophets with Saadya's translations by asking himself whether Saadya translated the Former Prophets, and by discussing a) the translation of Judges 5 attributed to Saadya and the Mardin translation of the Former Prophets; b) a translation of two *haftarot* from the Book of Kings (I Kings 1: 1-31 and II Kings 4: 1-37) and the Mardin translation of the Former Prophets; c) Saadya's translation of Isaiah 36-39 and the Mardin translation of II Kings; and d) Saadya's translation of Psalms 18 and the Mardin translation of II Samuel 22. However, it seems that none of the known Arabic fragments or citations from the Former Prophets attributed to Saadya have anything in common with the present Mardin translation.

In introductory Chapter 4, Avishur discusses the characteristics of the translation of the Former Prophets by a) establishing the possible link with Jonathan's translation into Aramaic; b) establishing the link with alternative translations; c) investigating whether the translation contains interpretation; d) looking at the original features of the translation; and e) looking at inconsistencies.

In the fifth introductory chapter, Avishur discusses the language of the translation and deals with the nature of the medieval Judaeo-Arabic language; he also discusses the possible influence of Saadya's translations on the Mardin translation, based on a scrutiny of the translations of specific terms, of the translation of Hebrew words by words of similar roots, and of Persian, Hebrew and Aramaic words in the translation. But the influence of Saadya Gaon on the Mardin translation is difficult to trace, and the Mardin translation shows many original characteristics of its own such as the rendering of one Hebrew word with different Arabic words and his interpretative expansions introduced by the expression *ya'ni* ("that is to say").

Then follows the translation of the text (Joshua: pp. 53-88; Judges: pp. 89-124; Samuel: pp. 125-210; Kings: 211-298; and notes to the foregoing books: pp. 299-334), and finally the list with the biographical abbreviations (pp. 335-342).

One wonders why in a time of increasing interest in the Qaraite linguistic literature and Qaraite translations of the Hebrew Bible into Arabic and Qaraite grammatical comments — which led to important publications by Haggai Ben-Shammai, Meirah Polliack and Geoffry Khan — no attempt is made by Avishur to compare the translations of the Mardin manuscript with similar translations made by the Qaraites, of which Yefet ibn 'Eli (d. 1005) is the most important representant. Finally, I should like to mention that the language of the translation — Arabic written in Hebrew letters, and therefore called Judaeo-Arabic — is very close to or identical with literary or Classical Arabic.

Amsterdam, December 2000

Arie SCHIPPERS

* *
*

AVISHUR, Yitzhak — A Medieval Translation of the Latter Prophets into Iraqi and Syrian Judaeo-Arabic, Book 1: Isaiah and Jeremiah, the Text of the Bodleian Huntington 206 manuscript with Hebrew Introduction and Notes, Hebrew University, Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1998.

In the preface, Avishur states that this partial manuscript edition of the translation of the Latter Prophets into Arabic (Huntington 206; Bodleiana) is a part of the nearly complete translation made in Baghdad and copied there in 1196. It is a kind of follow-up to Avishur's publication of the Mardin manuscript (Pocock 349; Bodleiana) containing the translation into Arabic of the Former Prophets.

The Huntington 206 manuscript has 298 leaflets, comprising Isaiah from 1a-83a, Jeremiah from 83a-172a, Ezechiel from 173a-238b, and the twelve Minor Prophets (in Aramaic, *tere 'asar*) from 238b-298b. Nineteen leaflets are written in a different hand, completed by a much later copyist. As we know, this edition covers only Isaiah and Jeremiah.

Here and there in the manuscript are dates, such as at the beginning: 'I start to write the *sharḥ* of the Latter Prophets etc. in the year 5340' (i.e. 1580). It seems, as Avishur implies, that the date at the beginning of the manuscript (1580) refers only to the date when the copying took place by the copyist of the last failing passages. After the translation of Jeremiah is written: 'the completion of this blessed text coincides with 16 Ab of the year 4957 (1197)'. A date very near to that is found at the end of the translation of Ezechiel, namely: 'The completion of it was the night [before] Wednesday, namely the night of Hoshana Rabba, 21 Tishri, 7th day Sukkoth'.¹⁾

In his introduction Avishur goes into the background of the Judaeo-Arabic translations of the Latter Prophets, describes the manuscript and concludes that it is not an original but a copy. This opinion is based on the fact that there are many mistakes in the manuscript, and that the translation of complete verses fails and apparently are omitted by oversight. Also the fact that the copyist uses the word *nuskha* ('copy') leads to this conviction. The other copyist involved in this codex has 19 leaflets: his handwriting is very unclear, while the other copyist was very readable. His language is more outspokenly dialectal and is reminiscent of the dialects of Syria and Baghdad. Avishur considers all the translations to be by the same hand, and lists grammatical and lexical particularities under one heading.

Avishur asks himself whether or not Saadya Gaon (d. 942) translated the Latter Prophets and individuates terms used by Saadya in the present translation, referring to Saadya's commentaries and their relation to the Latter Prophets, and the identification of place names.

According to the editor, the influence of Saadya can be seen in the translation of Hebrew roots by Arabic words of similar roots; by the Persian words in the translation, by the Hebrew and Aramaic words in the translation, and by the use of rare words in Saadya's translation and the present

¹⁾ Schlossberg (Pe'amim 83, pp. 154 ff.) asks why Avishur did not spot the discrepancy between the dates indicating 1196. Jeremiah was completed in Ab, and Ezechiel was completed in Tishri 1196, while Tishri is normally the first month of the year. The reason may be that the beginning of the year at the time was Nisan, so that until Nisan everything is still 1196, not yet 1197. (To me, the meaning of 'minyan ha-shetaroth' is unclear. Does it mean different counting of the seasons? A.S.)

translation, the interchange of letters and the vocabulary. He discusses some of the characteristic features in the translation of the Latter Prophets such as interpretation and grammar, alternative translations, and people and periods in the translation. Moreover, he tries to determine the translation's relationship to Targum Yonathan. In the introduction, Avishur talks at length about the identity of the author of the translation and his whereabouts. Having failed to see a possibility to identify the person, he goes on to individuate the place. The way the author translated the names of the towns of Iraq shows that he was an Iraqi from Baghdad or Basra, the use of Persian words is also frequent in Iraqi dialects. These features added to the Syrian dialecticisms leads him to believe that the translator was from an Iraqi family residing in Syria.

After the text of the translations of Isaiah (pp. 45-114) and Jeremiah (pp. 115-190) into Arabic, with notes added to Isaiah (pp. 191-222) and Jeremiah (pp. 223-236), the editor ends with a list of bibliographical abbreviations (pp. 237-241). According to Schlossberg (see *Pe'amim* 83), Avishur did not take into consideration that the translations are a reworking of the Qaraite translator Yefet ibn 'Ali ('Eli), the greatest interpreter of the Bible of the Qaraite in the Middle Ages. The Huntington manuscript on which the work is based has been known in academic circles for more than 300 years, but scholars have been more interested in the twelve Minor Prophets than in the other parts. However, those scholars did not identify the author: some thought it was Saadya Gaon, while others thought it was not written by him, but influenced by or based on him.

Paltiel Birnebaum was the first to attribute the twelve Minor Prophets to Yefet ibn 'Ali. He edited the long commentary by Yefet on Hosea. In his foreword he analyses the likeness between the commentary in question and our present Huntington 206 manuscript and concludes that it must be by Yefet.²⁾

It can now also be explained that the first three translations of the Huntington manuscript (Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezechiel) are the fruit of the pen of Yefet. Perhaps the translator also used non-Qaraite translations.

The bibliographer of the writings of Yefet, Giuliano Tamani, unhesitatingly classifies the translation of the Latter Prophets between the translations of Yefet. Comparisons with the Huntington Isaiah and other Yefet Isaiah manuscripts reveal that what we have here is a reworking of the Isaiah by Yefet.³⁾ There seems to be no doubt that the Huntington manuscript belongs to Yefet. However, the text is far from the original, because the copyist made a reworking on his own and changed the text in a number of places.⁴⁾ Schlossberg

²⁾ Schlossberg agrees with Birnebaum because comparisons of our manuscript with the recently edited Nahum and Habaquq (by Livneh-Kari) prove that they are clearly those of Yefet, with all the changes due to time.

³⁾ This supposition can be based upon the edition of Isaiah 47 which Haggai ben-Shammai made for a study on differences of translation in the work of Yefet ibn 'Ali. Ben-Shammai compares the text of manuscript Huntington 60b with the text of three other manuscripts namely British Library Or. 2548 (112a-118a), and London Or. 2502 (37b-45b) and Petersbourg Yevr. I: 569 (165a-172a).

⁴⁾ Compare e.g. Jeremiah 2 Huntington with BM Or. 2549 (11th Century) written in Arabic letters which is the oldest remaining comment by Yefet on Jeremiah. Sometimes in Huntington Ms there is a concession made for the vernacular, where it says 'esh al-hajah bik' instead of the classical 'ma lak'. In other verses of the Huntington manuscript parts of the commentary are added, comprising identifications of places and rivers, etc.

concludes that Huntington must be one of the early reworkings of the translations of the Prophets by Yefet. Avishur individuated the author of the translations as someone from Iraq residing in Syria, but did not want to conclude that the author could be identified with the important Qaraite translator Abu 'Ali al-Hasan ibn 'Ali al-Basri alias Yefet ibn 'Eli (Hasan=Yefet, "beautiful") who came from Iraq and lived in Jerusalem, where he died ca. 1000. However, comparisons between the twelve Prophets as represented in Huntington 206, reveal that there are in the British Library manuscripts of Qaraite translations ascribed to Yefet, which are textually almost identical to the ones in Huntington 206.⁵⁾

A final remark about the so-called Judaeo-Arabic language of the published text: it is very close to literary Arabic and hardly dialectal. This is a feature the text shares with Saadya Gaon's translations. It is certainly not Middle Arabic, which should be a mixture of the vernaculars and the Classical language. The situation in this manuscript is quite the opposite of the later *shurūh* genres in Morocco, which are totally in vernacular and exhibit no knowledge at all of written Arabic. Concluding, I should like to thank Avishur for making all this material accessible and hope that he will publish the remaining texts, in order to provide us with more insight into the nature of the Arabic of the Jews which was a tool for them to make the Hebrew Bible comprehensible.

Amsterdam, December 2000

Arie SCHIPPERS

* *
*

GALMÉS DE FUENTES, Álvaro — Los manuscritos aljamiado-moriscos, de la Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia (Legado Pascual de Gayangos). Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia 1998 (Fuentes catalográficos de los fondos manuscritos de la Real Academia de la Historia). 235 pp. 16 láminas. ISBN 84-89512-07-8.

Álvaro Galmés de Fuentes, professor emeritus of the Universidad Complutense of Madrid, has been for years the most important founder of this field of study, namely the Spanish-Arabic literature in Arabic script written by the Moriscos — the Muslims who remained in Spain after the Reconquista. This Spanish literature in Arabic is, as we know, called "Aljamiado" literature. A few of these Aljamiado manuscripts are to be found in the collection of 58 manuscripts, some of them fragmentary, made by Pascual de Gayangos (1809-1897) and endowed to the Spanish Royal Academy of History.

The manuscripts described in this collection concern topics ranging from poems to history, legends, novellas and religious literature. The author decided to catalogue the manuscripts because the index by Eduardo Saavedra is merely a list which did not merit the title of catalogue. The thematic classification of the manuscripts, however, is difficult, since there are many codices which are miscellaneous or comprise various materials. But the author has made a uniform system for describing the codices, following a sequence in which he gives the name of the author or declares the work anonymous

⁵⁾ Kees de Vreugd (Faculty of Mathematics, University of Amsterdam) is working on one of these texts of the twelve Minor Prophets.

(I); the name of the copyist (II); the title and contents of the work (III); an indication of the place where the work was written (IV); the date of the work and of the manuscript (V); the first and last words of the work (VI); an external description of the manuscript, type of paper, Latin or Arabic letter type, number of leaflets, size, number of lines per leaflet, marginal notes, vignettes, state of conservation, and origin (VII); an internal description and analysis of the contents (VIII); a brief biography of the author and the sources (IX); the relation of the codex to other manuscripts and texts, in Aljamiado, Arabic or Romance (X); a bibliography (XI); and quotations of important passages from the manuscript (XII). Before the description, the new and old signature of the manuscripts are mentioned.

From what I can judge, there is a vague kind of order to the listing of the manuscripts: those in Latin letters come first (the first five items), followed by the manuscripts in Aljamiado and Arabic, sometimes also mixed with Latin. The first five manuscripts are also among the most important ones. Number I — about religious festival days and the love of God, consisting of folia 64-238 — also contains a poem on the punishment of the son of Edam, of which Galmes gives a specimen on pages 14-16. Number II is called “The repentance of the unfortunate” (El arrepentimiento del desdichado) and apparently was written by a Morisco expelled from Tunis (255 folia). It comprises also a scene of a man who escaped from his wife who had incited him to sin. What makes it interesting is that among the authors and sources quoted are many Castilian literary authors such as Lope de Vega and Garcilaso. Number III is one of the manuscripts of the *Breviario Çunni* about religious duties by the well-known Yça Gidelli, on which G. Wieggers, “el gran estudioso de la figura del autor del *Breviario Çunni*” (p. 28), has written a monograph entitled *Islamic Literature in Spanish and Aljamiado. Yça of Segovia (fl. 1450): His antecedents and successors*, Leiden 1994 (not 1944, as listed by Galmes on p. 29).

Grouped at the beginning of the catalogue are the most substantial works, while at the end there are many items of a limited number of leaflets, sometimes only one or two. As to be expected, many of the items are concerned with religious subjects such as the destruction of schisms and heresies, Muslim duties, marriages (V), the 99 names of God, Mohammed’s prayer when ascending to heaven (VIII), etc. But the following list shows how disparate the items really are:

- XXIII *Book of the Lights* by al-Bakri about the Prophet Muhammad’s early life and celestial travel (184 leaflets in Aljamiado) with many significant passages mentioned.
- XXIV Legends and traditions of the Prophet (198 folia, Alj.).
- XXV Religious duties (230 folia, Alj.).
- XXVI The story of the love between Paris and Viana (18 folia).
- XXVII Tradition by Muhammad (one page).
- XXVIII A fragment of the story of al-Hajjaj b. Yuçuf, the well-known general and conqueror of early Islam, with a lad (one page).
- XXIX The Story of the doncella Arcayona (one page).
- XXX El poema de Yuçuf (one page).
- XXXI Debate between Christians and Muslims (8 leaflets).
- XXXII Debate between Muslims and Jews (11 leaflets).

As well as religious debates, there are more belletristic genres such as the love story about Paris and Viana, the story about al-Hajjaj b. Yuçuf with a lad, the story of the doncella Arcayona, and *El poema de Yuçuf*. Galmes provides all the items with the necessary information, but nevertheless for the English reader, I should like to refer to the introductory work by Anwar G. Chejne, *Islam and the West: the Moriscos. A Cultural and Social History* (Albany NY 1983). This work is not referred to by Galmes, although it contains special chapters dealing with secular literature, poetry, history and legends.

At the end of the book, Galmes provides many useful indices, such as an index of authors and quoted personal names, and indices of place names, titles of works referred to, modern authors, and a glossary of Arabic words and phrases. There are also 16 plates with reproductions from various manuscripts from this collection. All in all, the catalogue is a useful tool for those researchers who want to pay a visit to the Pascual de Gayangos collection, or to keep themselves informed about it.

Amsterdam, December 2000

Arie SCHIPPERS

* *
*

PAGNINI, Anna — Matal e verso a confronto. Una questione di poetica araba classica alla luce di un’analisi paremiologica. (Quaderni di Semitistica 20). Dipartimento di Linguistica, Università di Firenze, Firenze 1998. (24 cm, VII, 329). ISBN? L. 70.000.

This book deals with the comparison of early Arabic *mathal* (Arabic for ‘proverb’ and ‘proverbial expressions’) and early Arabic verse. The first part is devoted to definitions. The Arabic *mathal* may differ from our proverb. The characteristics of proverbs are investigated, as is why they are so representative to be included in verses. Opinions on proverbs by Ancient Arab critics are quoted in order to individuate the principal elements of the definition of *mathal* (Part I, 2.1). For instance, there is a classical definition by al-Nazzam (d. 845) who defines the *mathal* as containing brevity of formulation, concision, to-the-pointness and well-chosen comparison; other theoreticians claim that there are also incorrect *amthal*, i.e. when a verb is omitted or a word changed or expression modified. The wordings of the *mathal* may very well have aesthetic values, because of the relation between the idea and the efficiency of its expression. She quotes many other medieval definitions, such as those mentioned by Ibn Rashiq (d. 1063), for example, “They said: it was called *mathal* because it is always a sign (*māthil*) for the mind of somebody who is consoled by it and counselled, admonished and commanded, and the sign is in front of somebody because they say: ‘Ruins that stand before him (*ṭalal māthil*)’, i.e. towering up before him.”

Then, proverb-like verses are mentioned from classical sources, especially in view of the closure of the verse line. The closure of the verse is seen as one of the characteristics of Arabic poetry. There has also been a debate among orientalists on the possible coherence of a whole *qaṣīda* and the molecular structure of the lines. The problem of the closure of the verse should perhaps be placed in the context of oral production as exemplified in *The Oral Tradition of Classical*

Arabic Poetry by Zwettler (1978). Closure is also dealt with by the Ancient Arab literary critics, who sometimes consider *enjambement* as a stylistic effect. According to Blachère, Zwettler and Bencheikh, enjambement developed more in later poetry than in pre-Islamic.

Subsequently, Part I Chapter 3 presents some medieval testimonies [that critics considered *mathal* and verse in the same perspective. The verse is quoted for one of the following reasons: obscure and rare words (*gharīb*); the same concept; the same image; the verse contains the *mathal* itself. One of the examples of classical authors who combine proverbs and verses is al-Jahiz (d. 868) in his *Kitab al-Ḥayawān* and al-Askari in his *Dīwān al-Maʿānī* (d. 1005). There is also an author who brings back all the *amthal* in *Kalila wa-Dimna* (translated into Arabic in the 8th century) to Arabic origin borrowed from poetry. The *mathal* when quoted confers elegance to prose and gives solidity to poetry, according to Zamakhshari (d. 1144). After confronting *mathal* and verse one can conclude that the well-known description of the Arabic verse as single unity and the autonomy of the verse has been reconfirmed. This study also discloses that the closure of the verse belongs to the essential characteristics of Ancient Arabic poetry, which you have to know in order to grasp its particular aesthetics. *Amthāl* found in poetry are, for instance, famous lines by Imruʿul-Qays (d. 540; “God made successful the one who asked him, and doing good is the best luggage for a man”) and by al-Nabighah (d. 604; “There is no way for a man besides God”). Famous is the anonymous proverbial verse-ending that goes *Ayyu l-rijāli al-mudhahhab?* (see p. 44, note 116, 117: “Which man is pure, i.e. without sin?”), which can be inserted after several verse beginnings. Critics such as Thaʿlab (d. 904) are interested in perfect half-verses, which can be quoted independently. Other poetry verses such as by al-Mutanabbi (d. 965) and Abuʿl-ʿAtāhiyah (d. 825) were proverbial already in medieval times.

The second introductive part is devoted to the direct analysis of the material. Pagnini goes into the question which corpus she is going to use for her research. Her choice falls on the famous *Amthal* by al-Maydani. Although Maydani died in 1124, his material is nevertheless representative of pre-Islamic times. Maydani used more than 50 reliable collections to make his collection representative (it comprises nearly 5,000 proverbs). Maydani’s alphabetical rendering has the advantage that you can find all the proverbs starting with ‘man’ (“who”) of the type “who is X=Y” under the letter *mim*; and under *lam* you can find the type of proverbs with the prefix ‘la-’ followed by the energetic verbal forms.

In the next passage the focus is on the formal description of the *mathal* (Part 2, Chapter 3.) by means of the distinction of the different structures such as *tajnis* (paronomasia), rhyme, alliteration and *izdiwaj* (‘repetition of certain morphological schemes’), and structures of proverbs earlier identified by Dundes such as equational proverbs (“Time is money”), coordinate proverbs (“Laugh and grow fat”) and oppositional proverbs (“One swallow does not make a summer”).

Pagnini then comes up with her own Arabic examples of basic structures of proverbs and expressions: e.g. “War is deceit” (X=Y); “Advice makes him fall into suspicion” (X makes Y); “Do what is just from this moment on” (do X); “A lousy thirst” (X); “The vanity of a singer and the resourcefulness of an heretic” (X and Y); “Few water from a rich source” (X preposition Y); “A wolf, when alone, is a lion (X=Y, when Z). The last mentioned example belongs to

a series of cases, in which a condition (Z) is added. She gives an ample list of additional conditions A-I (such as condition, negation, time, ‘who’, ‘like’, doubling, etc.). In Chapter 4, she gives an ample set of examples, with an analysis of proverbs in the light of the interaction of the different structures. On pages 115-116, there are schemes showing the possibilities of XYZ in conjunction with A-I and the frequency of them. She also gives examples of binary structures in certain *amthāl*, such as “The good is habit and the bad is obstinacy”, “Many times the wise is rejected and the stupid listened to” (p. 127).

A special chapter is devoted to the interaction of the single structures, such as *Al-naḥs* ‘*azufun alufun*’ (“The soul is disinclined and passionate”), where there is an alliteration of the letter *f* enriched by the presence of the two fricative sibilants *s* and *z*; or the sentence *Bāla fādirun fa-bāla jafru-hu* (“The wild goat pisses and his young pisses”), where there are several phonetic echoes, the repetition of the verb, and the opposition superior/inferior.

After the analysis of the *amthāl* comes the analysis of the verses (Chapter 5), and *amthāl* and verses are contrasted with each other. The corpus of verses is formed by 270 verses from the *Diwan al-Ḥamāsa*, a collection of early and pre-Islamic poetry by the poet Abu Tammam (d. 843). From this work, 234 verses are quoted from a single chapter, namely *Bab al-adab* (“Chapter of Good Manners”), while the other 37 belong to the first chapter on *Ḥamāsa* (“Bravery”). Both collections, the *Amthal* and the *Ḥamāsa*, refer to pre-Islamic and early Islamic periods and were very popular but were compiled afterwards. Pagnini’s way of analysing the verses is similar to her earlier analysis of the *amthal*. E.g. as an example of binary verse structure and repetition, she gives the following verse (my translation): “When they eat my flesh, I spare their flesh, and when they try to destroy my glory, I will build for them a glory.”⁶⁾ The two hemistichs have a perfect binary structure: within each hemistich we have the opposition of a pair and the repetition of another, while the relation between the two hemistichs is synonymy. In another example we find the first hemistich with a verbal conjugated form in combination with a verbal accusative, the relation between the first and the second hemistich being confirmed by the repetition of the word *layth* (“lion”, not “wolf” as Pagnini translates it) in the expression “We walked like a lion who comes in the morning, but the lion was ferocious”.⁷⁾ And to give a third example listed “X preposition Y when Z”: “In evil is salvation when doing good does not save you”.⁸⁾ In this example, we find a pair of opposed words and a verbal substantive plus verbal conjugated form. In initial and final position we find the two opposites (evil/good) and in the central position the two appearances of the verb (name and verbal conjugated form). From this results a chiasmus. Pagnini also gives examples of binary verses in which the intention of the first hemistich is repeated in the second, e.g. “If I am small in the eyes of the vicious, I am great in the eyes of the good ones”.⁹⁾ Sometimes the two segments of the

⁶⁾ Fa-in yaʿkulu laḥmi, wafartu luḥūma-hum/ wa-in hadamu majdi, banaytu la-hum majda//.

⁷⁾ Mashayna mishyata l-laythi/ għada, wa-l-laythu għadbānu//. Pagnini translates: ‘Avanziamo come il lupo di mattina, il lupo affamato’ = “The hungry wolf”.

⁸⁾ Wa-fi-l-sharri najātun hi/na la yunji-ka iḥsānu//.

⁹⁾ Fa-in aku fi shirāri-kum qalīlan/fa-innī fi kḥiyāri-kumu kathīru//.

binary phrase have a relation based on a particular remark being subsequently linked to a general remark, which is almost a proverb, e.g. "Recognize to your client his right: it is the noble man who recognizes the right of others".¹⁰⁾ Some verses can be described in the same manner as the *amthāl* ("Do not do X, doubled") such as "Do not mix yourself in the affairs from which you are exempted/ and do not give advice except only to someone who will accept that advice".¹¹⁾

As earlier, the types of verses are listed in a scheme (p. 154). The main text is followed by the corpus of *amthāl* and their translation (Appendix I); the corpus of verses and their translation (Appendix II); a survey of *amthāl* and verses in which the same proverbial expressions occur (Appendix III); and frequent word couples, sometimes two opposites, which are word groups that also crop up elsewhere (Appendix IV). The book ends with a bibliography and a summary in English.

On the whole, the book is an interesting contribution to the study of early Arabic literature and language: no-one has ever made such a detailed analysis of Ancient Arabic *amthāl* as proverbs. The formal characteristics which can be distinguished in the *mathal* indicate a general principle, namely that of repetition, especially in its binary function. This has a mechanism comparable with Greima's *question-réponse*, and Scheindlin's *anticipation-resolution* whose main tension is to give a completeness to the sentence and a sense of definite closure. We live in a time in which there is more and more interest in throwing light on the nature of the very formalistic characteristics of Semitic languages, such as Biblical Hebrew and Classical Arabic, which were more artificial constructions than living languages. Studying early Arabic verse and early Arabic *amthāl* may give us more insight into the archaic linguistic construction that literary Arabic was. Therefore, this study by Anna Pagnini should be welcomed amidst the other recent books on proverbs by Kassis¹²⁾ and Sagiv/Landau¹³⁾ and the book on Classical Arabic verse and metre by Frolov.¹⁴⁾

Amsterdam, December 2000

Arie SCHIPPERS

* *
*

CORRIENTE, F. — A dictionary of Andalusian Arabic (Handbuch der Orientalistik. 1. Abt., Der Nahe und der Mittlere Osten, ISSN 0169-9423; Bd. 29)- Brill, Leiden, 1997. — XXI, 623 p.; 25 cm. — ISBN 90-04-09846-1.

This is the first ever comprehensive dictionary of Andalusian Arabic. It is rather surprising that until recently very little was known about Andalusian Arabic. The dictionaries and grammatical sketch of the Andalusian Arabic language and other literary documents of this vernacular, published earlier by Corriente, already showed us the richness of Andalusian

Arabic, about which we have more data than any other medieval Arabic vernacular (cf. e.g. F. Corriente, *El lexico arabe andalusi segun P. de Alcalá, ordenado por raices, corregido, anotado y fonemicamente interpretado*, Madrid, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras (Departamento de Estudios Arabes e Islámicas, Universidad Complutense de Madrid) 1988. — X, 259 pp; F. Corriente, *El lexico arabe estandar y andalusi del "glosario de Leiden"*, Madrid, Departamento de Estudios Arabes e Islámicos, 3, Universidad Complutense, 1991. — 184 pp. ; F. Corriente, *Lexico estandar y andalusi del Diwan de Ibn Quzman*, Zaragoza, Universidad de Zaragoza (Area de estudios arabes e islámicos; 1), 1993. — 164 pp.)

The sources of the present dictionary are manifold: testimonies of the vernacular in Arabic script as well as Latin script, from dialectal poetry as well as from scientific treatises. Books about the 'errors of the people' (the so-called *lahn al-'amma* literature) and Andalusian Judaeo-Arabic sources in Hebrew script have not generally been included, except occasionally from the Granadine Jewish author Saadya ibn Danan (15th century). And rightly so, I think, because many Judaeo-Arabic texts from Andalusia are not in vernacular, but in Classical Arabic since the Arabic writings by important Jewish authors such as Moses ibn Ezra (1055-1138) and Yehudah ha-Levi (1065-1140) do not contain Andalusian Arabic at all. But as far as Judaeo-Arabic is concerned, Corriente leaves the final decision to Blau in view of the comprehensive Judaeo-Arabic dictionary the latter is undertaking.

In his dictionary, Corriente is right to use a single, standardized Latin transliteration system, except for Arabic materials that were already in Latin script, as in the case of Alcalá's work. It is of course impossible to get an impression of the Andalusian Arabic vernacular by reading a dictionary. If we want to get to know the grammar of the vernacular and its affiliations with other Arabic dialects and tribal vernaculars, we need to look at Corriente's earlier publication *A grammatical sketch of the Spanish Arabic dialect bundle* (Madrid, Instituto Hispano-Arabe de Cultura, 1977).

Nevertheless, it is interesting to have an overview of the lexical possibilities of the dialect. The dictionary is arranged by Arabic roots represented by Latin symbols. In case of verbs, some data of the verbal scheme are given. Many loci refer to Ibn Quzman's *Diwan* (referred to by IQ).

I hope this compilation of words and expressions of the Andalusian Arabic dialect will attract the attention it deserves. It will be of great use to all those who specialize in Andalusian Arabic, or even Spanish Hebrew or medieval Castilian literature.

Amsterdam, December 2000

Arie SCHIPPERS

¹⁰⁾ Wa-'rif li-jāri-ka ḥaqqā-hu/ wa-l-ḥaqqu ya'rifu-hu 'l-karīmu//.

¹¹⁾ lā ta'tariḍ fi-l-amri tukfa shu'una-hu/ wa-la tansahna illa li-man huwa qābilu-h//.

¹²⁾ Riad Aziz Kassis, *The book of Proverbs and Arabic proverbial works*, Leiden: Brill, 1999.

¹³⁾ David Sagiv & Jacob M. Landau, *Hebrew-Arabic Proverbs*, Tel-Aviv: Schocken Publishing House, 1998.

¹⁴⁾ Dmitry Frolov, *Classical Arabic verse: history and theory of Arud*, Leiden: Brill, 2000.