Book Reviews

Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl Ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī, *Al-Faḍl al-Munīf fī al-Mawlid al-Sharīf wa-Yalīhi ʿIbrat al-Labīb bi-ʿAthrat al-Kaʾīb,* edited by Muḥammad ʿĀyish (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmīyah, 2007). Pp. 136.

Zayn al-Dīn Manṣūr ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥarīrī al-Dimashqī, *Lawʿat al-Shākī wa-Damʿat al-Bākī,* edited by Samīḥ Ibrāhīm Ṣāliḥ (Damascus: Dār al-Bashāʾir, 2005). Pp. 134.

Reviewed by Everett K. Rowson, New York University

The boom in publication of works by the prolific littérateur al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363), which I remarked upon in two previous reviews for this journal,[1] continues unabated, not least because of the ongoing productivity of Muḥammad ʿĀyish. The first of the two volumes under consideration here is particularly welcome, as in it ʿĀyish presents two texts by al-Ṣafadī that have never appeared before in print in any form; but he has been busy with others as well. According to his own count, these are in fact the ninth and tenth of al-Ṣafadī's works that he has edited, and in his introduction to this volume he duly includes the other eight in a full list of all of al-Ṣafadī's oeuvre that has been published to date.

While this list is of some help in keeping up with the flood of recent Ṣafadiana, however, it is not as useful as it might be, since ʿĀyish informs us of only *one* edition for each work, and in particular avoids any mention of alternative editions of the works he has edited himself. Thus, while al-Ṣafadī's critique of the celebrated lexicon *Al-Ṣiḥāḥ* by al-Jawharī (d. ca. 396/1006), the *Nufūdh al-Sahm fīmā Waqaʿa lil-Jawharī min al-Wahm* (ed. Muḥammad ʿĀyish, Beirut: Dār al-Bashāʾir, 2006) is an *editio princeps,* as is the thematic anthology *Rashf al-Zulāl fī Waṣf al-Hilāl* (ed. Muḥammad ʿĀyish, Dār al-Awāʾil, in press), the other six are all works that had in fact already appeared under other editorial hands. The parodic *Ikhtirāʿ al-Khurāʿ* (ed. Muḥammad ʿĀyish, Amman: Dār ʿAmmār, 2004) was edited by Fārūq Asalīm (Damascus: Ittiḥād al-Kuttāb al-ʿArab, 2000);[2] the rhetorical study *Faḍḍ al-Khitām ʿan al-Tawriyah wa-al-Istikhdām* (ed. Muḥammad ʿĀyish, Amman:

[1] Review of al-Ṣafadī, *Al-Kashf wa-al-Tanbīh ʿalá al-Waṣf wa-al-Tashbīh,* edited by Hilāl Nājī and Walīd ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Zubayrī (Leeds: Majallat al-Ḥikmah, 1420/1999), and of Nabīl Muḥammad Rashād, *Al-Ṣafadī wa-Sharḥuhu ʿalá Lāmīyat al-ʿAjam: Dirāsah Taḥlīlīyah* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Ādāb, 1421/2001), in *Mamlūk Studies Review* 8, no. 1 (2004): 315–23; and review of al-Ṣafadī (attributed), *Lawʿat al-Shākī wa-Damʿat al-Bākī,* edited by Muḥammad ʿĀyish (Damascus: Dār al-Awāʾil, 2003), in *Mamlūk Studies Review* 10, no. 1 (2006): 222–26.

[2] See the review by Vanessa De Gifis in *Mamlūk Studies Review* 10, no. 2 (2006): 204–8.

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

al-Dār al-ʿUthmānīyah, in press) was published (in very defective form, to be sure) by al-Muḥammadī ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥinnāwī (Cairo, 1979); the thematic anthology *Tashnīf al-Samʿ bi-Insikāb al-Damʿ* (ed. Muḥammad ʿĀyish, Damascus: Dār al-Awāʾil, 2004) was edited by Muḥammad ʿAlī Dāwūd (Alexandria: Dār al-Wafāʾ li-Dunyā al-Ṭibāʿah wa-al-Nashr, 2000);[3] the *maqāmah Lawʿat al-Shākī wa-Damʿat al-Bākī* (of questionable authorship, as discussed below) has been repeatedly published in uncritical editions since the late nineteenth century; yet another thematic anthology, *Kashf al-Ḥāl fī Waṣf al-Khāl* (ed. Muḥammad ʿĀyish, Damascus: Dār al-Awāʾil, 2006), has been previously edited twice, once by Sihām Ṣallān (Damascus: Dār Saʿd al-Dīn, 1999) and again by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar al-ʿAqīl (Beirut: al-Dār al-ʿArabīyah lil-Mawsūʿāt, 2005); and al-Ṣafadī's extraordinary collection of his lifetime correspondence, *Alḥān al-Sawājiʿ bayna al-Bādiʾ wa-al-Murājiʿ* (ed. Muḥammad ʿĀyish, Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmīyah, 2007), has also appeared in two previous editions, one by Ibrāhīm Ṣāliḥ (Beirut: Dār al-Bashāʾir, 2004) and the other by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Sālim (Cairo: al-Hayʾah al-ʿĀmmah al-Miṣrīyah lil-Kitāb, 2006). One detects more than a hint of competitiveness here.[4]

Be that as it may, ʿĀyish's lists—he also surveys unpublished works by al-Ṣafadī surviving in manuscript, lost works, and works falsely attributed to him—provide us with some new and useful details, particularly about the false attributions. His treatment of al-Ṣafadī's biography is, on the other hand, perfunctory, although one would hardly expect him to include a detailed account of it in every single one of this galaxy of publications. The important thing is, of course, the two texts offered here themselves—which seem to be combined in a single volume purely as a matter of convenience, since al-Ṣafadī's monograph composed on the occasion of the Prophet's birthday really has nothing, except authorship, in common with the *maqāmah* he composed in his youth on a homoerotic theme.

That al-Ṣafadī did compose a work for *mawlid al-nabī* with the title *Al-Faḍl al-Munīf fī al-Mawlid al-Sharīf* has been known from bibliographical notices in later authors, but that the work survives in a Princeton manuscript (Garrett Yahuda 3570) has not. To my knowledge, only Marion Holmes Katz, in her recent monograph on the *mawlid,* has shown any awareness of it,[5] and it is certainly good to have the

[3] It was first published in Cairo in 1321/1903. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Majīd Lāshīn announced in his major study *Al-Ṣafadī wa-Āthāruhu fī al-Adab wa-al-Naqd* (Cairo: Dār al-Āfāq al-ʿArabīyah, 2005), 154, that he has prepared his own edition, which is "in the course of publication," but to my knowledge has not yet appeared.

[4] ʿĀyish makes no mention of Lāshīn's major study of al-Ṣafadī (see note 3 above), which offers (pp. 93–161) the most detailed survey of al-Ṣafadī's works that has appeared to date.

[5] Marion Holmes Katz, *The Birth of the Prophet Muḥammad: Devotional Piety in Sunni Islam* (London and New York: Routledge, 2007). Katz has little to say about the work, but her fine study offers

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

text in print. ʿĀyish gives the essential information about the manuscript—which is an autograph, with a description of the occasion when it was read out publicly in the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus (Ṣafar 759/January–February 1358) and an *ijāzah* at the end—except for, frustratingly, any indication of what other works al-Ṣafadī included in this manuscript in his own hand. (The Princeton catalogues are not helpful in this respect, either; I did determine that the other works in the manuscript are not the author's own, but was unable to compile a full list.) The manuscript has suffered from some water damage, rendering some passages illegible—which, however, ʿĀyish has been able to restore (how accurately is debatable) from parallel passages in al-Nuwayrī's (d. 732/1332) *Nihāyat al-Arab*. In accordance with current scholarly norms, ʿĀyish provides facsimiles of the first and last pages, as well as one other random page, from the manuscript.

The content of the *Faḍl* is on the whole what one would expect, as is clear from Katz's investigation of the genre. The concentration is on the Prophet's birth and early life, with only cursory attention to later events. ʿĀyish has provided (in square brackets) headings that helpfully articulate the text. Primary topics are the Prophet's genealogy, predictions of his advent in the Old and New Testaments, miraculous events at the time of his birth, miracles associated with his mother's pregnancy and labor, his wet nurses, and his youthful journeys to Syria (and encounter with the monk Baḥīrā there, who recognized his prophetic status). Some attention is given to his marriage to Khadījah, the first revelation he received, his first public proclamation of the revelation, the first converts, his heavenly ascent *(isrāʾ* and *miʿrāj),* his letter to the Byzantine emperor Heraclius inviting him to convert to Islam, and the last verse of the Quran revealed to him. All of this is presented in fairly predictable style for al-Ṣafadī, heavily laden with *sajʿ* and interspersed with verses by both the author and others; the work ends with a 70-line poem by the author in praise of the Prophet, which is surprisingly jejune in style but also a bit startling in its explicit attacks on Shiʿis and Muʿtazilis, as well as its liberal use of wine imagery.

ʿĀyish can be presumed to have reproduced faithfully the text in the *unicum* on which he relies. The annotations he has supplied are, however, fairly minimal and occasionally embarrassing. When al-Ṣafadī quotes al-Kharāʾiṭī (d. 327/938) on the "trembling" of the Īwān Kisrā on the night of the Prophet's birth, ʿĀyish follows up appropriately with references to al-Kharāʾiṭī's *Hawātif al-Jinān* (albeit mispointing *al-jinān* as *al-jannān*). But he is completely at sea with the biblical prophecies, perhaps most distressingly when he misreads the place where Jesus grew up, al-Jalīl (Galilee), as al-Khalīl (Hebron), despite the fact that the text specifies the town there as Nazareth (al-Nāṣirah) and adds, in a touch of local

valuable contextualization for it.

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

color, that it is less than a day's journey distant from Ṣafad (al-Ṣafadī's birthplace). For "Kedar" (*Qāydhār,* Isaiah 42:11–13) ʿĀyish refers only to entries in the *Lisān al-ʿArab* and the *Tāj al-ʿArūs;* and for the Paraclete he footnotes a passage, again, in al-Nuwayrī.[6] While readers are thus left to do their own interpretive work, we can only be grateful that the text itself is now indeed available.

The *ʿIbrat al-Labīb* is quite a different kettle of fish. It is a scandal that this text, also known as *Al-Maqāmah al-Aybakīyah,* has not until now been made available to scholars, despite the fact that it seems to have put the young al-Ṣafadī on the literary map and is available in some half dozen manuscripts. ʿĀyish has no problems acknowledging the work's homoerotic theme ("*adab al-ghilmānīyāt*"), whose popularity in the Mamluk period he grants while pointing out that this *maqāmah* differs from most treatments of the subject by avoiding an explicitly libertine tone *(mujūn),* and stressing that the *ʿibrah* ("lesson") of the title is meant to warn men off from falling into this fatal trap (which by implication is homosexuality, although in fact al-Ṣafadī was probably thinking only of love passion *[ʿishq]* in general, regardless of the sex of the beloved).

In his introduction to the text, ʿĀyish reproduces al-Ṣafadī's own account of its genesis, according to which upon his arrival in Egypt in 727/1327 (at the age of thirty) he discovered that the literati there were enthralled by a *maqāmah* (or *risālah*—the two words are used interchangeably in our sources from this period) by the late ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ibn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir (d. 717/1317) entitled *Marātiʿ al-Ghizlān fī Waṣf al-Ḥisān min al-Ghilmān* ("Pastures for gazelles describing beautiful boys") and acceded to a request by a friend, or friends, to produce an emulative work on the same theme.[7] ʿĀyish adds some brief comments on ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn (who was the grandson of the famous chancery official, littérateur, and historian Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir (d. 692/1292)), noting that he was the author of *Al-Mufākharah bayna al-Sayf wa-al-Rumḥ*[8] and *Tashrīf al-Ayyām wa-al-ʿUṣūr fī Sīrat al-Malik al-*

[6]Al-Ṣafadī's treatment of both Old and New Testament passages in this context is absolutely standard, as can easily be established by consulting the indices in Hava Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), and Camilla Adang, *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible from Ibn Rabban to Ibn Ḥazm* (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

[7]Al-Ṣafadī, *Al-Wāfī bi-al-Wafayāt,* vol. 22, edited by Ramzī Baʿlabakkī (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1983), 54, and idem, *Aʿyān al-ʿAṣr,* edited by ʿAlī Abū Zayd et al. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Muʿāṣir and Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1998), 3:496.

[8]On this text see Adrian Gully, "The Sword and the Pen in the Pre-Modern Arabic Heritage: A Literary Representation of an Important Historical Relationship," in *Ideas, Images, and Methods of Portrayal: Insights into Classical Arabic Literature and Islam,* edited by Sebastian Günther (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 403–30. *Pace* Gully, I am not convinced that the attribution of a version of the text to al-Ṣafadī in al-Madanī's (d. 1066/1655) *Manhaj al-Tarjīḥ wa-al-Tajrīḥ* represents a *muʿāraḍah* rather than a simple misattribution (with a panoply of minor variants).

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

Manṣūr.[9] ʿĀyish points out that ʿAlāʾ al-Din's *Marātiʿ al-Ghizlān* is extant in a Cambridge manuscript, but it is not clear whether he (or anyone else) has actually looked at it; he in fact falls back on what he claims is an extract *(qiṭʿah)* from it in al-Nuwayrī's *Nihāyat al-Arab,* which he reproduces in full. This is an inference on ʿĀyish's part, and not necessarily a justified one.[10] Al-Nuwayrī presents, without title, what he simply calls a "*maqāmah ʿamilahā fī sanat 702,*" and the text (which runs to ten pages in the published *Nihāyah*) appears to be complete. Composed in a conventional mix of rhymed prose and poetry, it is put in the mouth of a "lover" who describes his quest for, and success at, finding a (male) beloved, identified (predictably) as a Turk, whose physical beauty is described at some length. The lover reveals his passion, which is initially welcomed by the beloved, until the "chaperone" *(raqīb)* discovers the affair and poisons the beloved's mind against his suitor, leading to separation. The disconsolate lover temporarily revives his hopes with the thought that the beloved's departure may have been coerced, but when his hopeful verses of "complaint" *(shakwá)* reach the latter they are rejected. Whether this is indeed the same *maqāmah* as the *Marātiʿ al-Ghizlān* can only be confirmed by examination of the Cambridge manuscript.[11]

Nor is it entirely clear whether the text in the *Nihāyah* can be considered an appropriate model for al-Ṣafadī's *ʿIbrah*. (ʿĀyish does not comment on this question, and in fact offers no discussion at all after reproducing the former.) Both texts are first-person narratives, in alternating rhymed prose and verse, by someone who has fallen in love with a beautiful Turk and been rejected, but beyond that they have relatively little in common. The *ʿIbrah,* which is much longer, is prefaced by an account of how it was inspired by the *Marātiʿ al-Ghizlān,*[12] followed—in only one of the two manuscripts utilized by ʿĀyish for his edition—by a dedication (and accompanying thirteen-line panegyric) to an obliquely-named patron.[13] The

[9]There has been some scholarly controversy about the authorship of this biography of the Mamluk sultan Qalāwūn, but the predominant opinion seems to be that it was authored by ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn's grandfather Muḥyī al-Dīn.

[10]Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila draws the same inference, although without apparently being aware of the Cambridge manuscript, in his *Maqama: A History of a Genre* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002), 386.

[11]And not necessarily then. The Cambridge catalogue assigns only the *Marātiʿ al-Ghizlān* to the 168-folio manuscript (of which the first folio is missing), which can hardly be the case for a single *maqāmah.*

[12]Al-Ṣafadī here calls the *Marātiʿ al-Ghizlān* a "*risālah*" and says he was asked to compose a "*risālah tumāthiluhā.*" In the *Wāfī* he refers to both works as *maqāmahs* and calls his own the "*naẓīr*" of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir's. In the *Aʿyān* he says that he composed his own *risālah* on the "topic" *(māddah)* of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir's *maqāmah.*

[13]"*Wa-qad khadamtu bi-hā khizānat al-maqarr al-ʿālī al-makhdūmī al-qaḍāʾī al-Shihābī.*" This is unquestionably Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyá Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī (d. 749/1349), author

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

narrator begins by expounding, with considerable elaboration, on his fascination with love stories and his resulting desire to fall in love himself.[14] For this purpose he seeks, and finds, an appropriate adviser, who one day tells him of having seen a particularly beautiful young man, describing him so vividly that the narrator falls in love with him, sight unseen, on the spot. Begged to arrange a viewing, the friend does so, but there is no indication of any interaction between lover and beloved before the latter "flees" like a gazelle. The friend then suggests that they go together to observe the beloved hunting with his Turkish friends, and they repair to a garden where they expect to find them. Seven young men *(ghilmān),* including the beloved, appear on horseback, pursuing a herd of gazelles; each is garbed in a different color and riding a horse of a different color, and these are described one by one. They ride off in pursuit of the gazelles and then return, each with his prey. Urged on by his friend, the narrator expresses his "complaint" to the beloved, who rebuffs him, and continues to do so as the narrator pleads ever more desperately for his attention. Finally, God leads the narrator aright: he recovers from his passion and resolves to put his efforts into preparing for the afterlife, turning away from all worldly passions.

Of course, the point of this composition is not the "plot" (such as it is), but rather the rhetoric, which is elaborate, variegated, and sustained. In his edition ʿĀyish is quite helpful in catching instances of *taḍmīn* (incorporation into the poetry of verses by earlier poets, or of Quran or hadith quotations or paraphrases) as well of *ḥall al-naẓm* (recasting well-known verses in prose). On the other hand, he seems to be quite oblivious to meter, and less than fully attentive to the demands of prose parallelism in rhyme (which al-Ṣafadī is in fact quite careful about, and which thus serves—or should serve—as a control on the text). The result is a distressingly high frequency of impossible readings, some but by no means all of which can be corrected by an attentive reader from the information presented.

But the larger problem with this edition of the *ʿIbrat al-Labīb* is a methodological one. ʿĀyish has relied on two manuscripts (for which he gives full descriptions), MS ʿĀrif Ḥikmat (Medina) *majmūʿ ʿāmm* 3065 (dated 1001, with the title "Al-Risālah al-Mawsūmah bi-Damʿat al-Labīb bi-ʿIbrat al-Kaʾīb"), and MS Bodleian Sale 34, fols. 103–13 (no date [eleventh/seventeenth century?], titled "ʿIbrat al-Labīb bi-ʿAthrat al-Kaʾīb"). He has taken the former, which he considers the better of the two, as his "*aṣl,*" supplementing it (in brackets) with phrases missing in

of the *Masālik al-Abṣār* and al-Ṣafadī's patron and friend, to whom he refers as "*al-makhdūm al-Shihābī*" in a letter to the poet Ibn Nubātah (al-Ṣafadī, *Alḥān al-Sawājiʿ* [ed. Ṣāliḥ], 2:219).

[14]One of the very few parallels in phraseology between Ibn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir's text as cited in the *Nihāyat al-Arab* and the *ʿIbrat al-Labīb* occurs here at the beginning, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir's "*ḥakā alīf al-gharām wa-khalīf al-saqām . . .*" being echoed by al-Ṣafadī's "*ḥakā ḥalīf al-ḍaná wa-al-ʿaná wa-alīf nayl al-manūn lā nayl al-munā.*"

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

it but present in the Bodleian text[15] and occasionally adopting a better reading from the latter, with a clearly presented apparatus in such cases. Having recently obtained a copy of the Bodleian manuscript (for which I thank the staff at the Bodleian library), I was able to check on ʿĀyish's use of it, and the results were not happy ones. To be sure, this is not an impressive manuscript—the scribe makes frequent egregious errors and clearly was often not understanding what he was copying. But in his devotion to his "*aṣl*" ʿĀyish has essentially *ignored* all variants from the Bodleian manuscript that are not either simple additions to the ʿĀrif Ḥikmat text or (to his eyes) clearly superior readings. Much valuable information is thereby lost, and no picture of what is actually in the Bodleian manuscript emerges. Some (in fact) superior readings from it are not recorded at all, and where (as frequently) the sequencing of phrases differs in the two manuscripts ʿĀyish's choices appear arbitrary and fail to make clear the actual reading in either manuscript.

Given these problems, it is difficult to say how good (or bad) the ʿĀrif Ḥikmat manuscript actually is, and in any case a truly critical edition of the text will have to take into consideration additional manuscripts (of which there are known to be two in Cairo, one in Istanbul, and one in Ṣanʿāʾ). In the meantime, the ʿ*Ibrat al-Labīb* is now available to scholars in a reasonably complete, readable text (although it gets rather messy—in both manuscripts—in the final pages). ʿĀyish appends to his editions of both *Al-Faḍl al-Munīf* and ʿ*Ibrat al-Labīb* (combined) indices of Quran quotations, hadith quotations, and poetry; these are useful, but also misleading since a single index refers to two very disparate works. (He also misses a few Quran quotations in the ʿ*Ibrat al-Labīb*.) The book concludes with a list of references.

ʿĀyish has nothing to say about the *Lawʿat al-Shākī wa-Damʿat al-Bākī,* of which he published an edition in 2003, in his introductory material on the ʿ*Ibrat al-Labīb,* despite the questions raised by any juxtaposition of the two. Both are highly rhetorical narratives of a love affair (of sorts) with a Turkish young man. The *Lawʿat al-Shākī* is attributed to al-Ṣafadī in a majority of the many surviving manuscripts of the work, but in others it is attributed to no less than five other authors. In his edition of it, ʿĀyish argued that it actually does come from al-Ṣafadī's pen (and in my review of his edition I was inclined to agree, although I found his arguments inadequate). Surely the publication of the ʿ*Ibrat al-Labīb* offers an occasion to reconsider this issue.

Meanwhile, however, Samīḥ Ibrāhīm Ṣāliḥ has produced yet another edition of the *Lawʿat al-Shākī,* attributing it without question—on his title page—to Zayn

[15]Including the dedication to "al-Shihābī," noted above.

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

Dīn Manṣūr ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥarīrī (d. 967/1560).[16] In fact, being well aware of ʿĀyish's edition of the text—which he calls "the best so far"—he justifies his own re-edition precisely on the grounds of his re-attribution, although why an argument about authorship should be grounds for re-editing the text itself remains obscure. (There may be a clue to this in Ṣāliḥ's refutation of ʿĀyish's arguments for attributing the work to al-Ṣafadī, which include what he perceived as its stylistic similarity to al-Ṣafadī's letters in his collected correspondence, the *Alḥān al-Sawājiʿ*, a similarity that Ṣāliḥ flatly denies. Ṣāliḥ questions how ʿĀyish could have compared the two anyway, since the *Alḥān al-Sawājiʿ* was at the time as yet unpublished—it appeared, in an edition by Ṣāliḥ's father, Ibrāhīm Ṣāliḥ, in 2004. But there is no reason to believe that ʿĀyish—who in fact published his own edition of the *Alḥān al-Sawājiʿ* in 2007 [not available to me]—did not at the time have manuscripts of the work at his disposal.)

In the introduction to his edition of the text, Ṣāliḥ presents a fairly persuasive case for al-Ḥarīrī's authorship of it. Observing that it has been known all along that the bio-bibliographers Najm al-Dīn al-Ghazzī (d. 1061/1651) and Ibn al-ʿImād (d. 1089/1678) attribute a work of this title to al-Ḥarīrī (and that none of the bio-bibliographical sources on al-Ṣafadī do so, nor does al-Ṣafadī ever mention it in his own works, despite his predilection for cross-referencing his own works), he has traced al-Ghazzī's and Ibn al-ʿImād's entries to their primary source, the *Durr al-Ḥabab fī Tārīkh Aʿyān Ḥalab* of Ibn al-Ḥanbalī (d. 971/1563). He reproduces Ibn al-Ḥanbalī's biography of al-Ḥarīrī, noting that he states clearly that al-Ḥarīrī "composed a nice romantic *(ghazalīyah) maqāmah* which he titled *Lawʿat al-Shākī wa-Damʿat al-Bākī,*" and observes dryly that as al-Ḥarīrī's contemporary Ibn al-Ḥanbalī should know what he is talking about.

Ṣāliḥ also lists all previous printings of the *Lawʿat al-Shākī*—a dozen of them between 1857 and 1929, then nothing until ʿAbd al-Malik Aḥmad al-Wādiʿī's 1991 edition (Beirut: Dār al-Manāhil)[17] and ʿĀyish's 2003 edition—noting that they all attribute it to al-Ṣafadī. Concerned as he is to refute that attribution and to confirm al-Ḥarīrī's authorship, he pays scant attention to the other manuscript attributions, noting only two of them—Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī and al-Māridīnī. This is inadequate, since the total number of manuscript attributions is in fact *six:*

1. al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363): so the majority of manuscripts and all printings prior to Ṣāliḥ's.

2. Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī (d. 750/1349): one Cairo manuscript, possibly no others. No one has ever taken this attribution seriously.

[16] ʿĀyish was more cautious: the title page of his 2003 edition of the work has "attributed to" *(al-mansūb li-)* Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī.

[17] I have not seen this edition, and was unaware of it when I composed my review of ʿĀyish's 2003 edition.

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

3. Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Sulaymān, known as Ibn Khaṭīb Dārayyā (d. 811/1408–9): one of the (Cairo?) manuscripts utilized by ʿĀyish for his edition; possibly also an Istanbul manuscript attributing the work to "Jalāl al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb" (but cf. no. 6 below).

4. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥusayn/al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Sharīf/al-Musharraf al-Māridīnī al-Ḥaskafī (d. 846/1442): one manuscript listed by Sarkīs, possibly identical with one of the manuscripts utilized by Ṣāliḥ for his edition.

5. Zayn al-Dīn Manṣūr ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥarīrī al-Dimashqī al-Shāfiʿī, known as Khaṭīb al-Saqīfah (d. 967/1560): authorship attested by Ibn al-Ḥanbalī and his successors, so attributed in manuscripts in the British Museum and Patna.

6. Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf al-Khaṭīb al-Madanī al-Ṣāliḥī: so attributed in a Copenhagen manuscript that cites the year 988/1580.

We will probably never know why this work ended up being attributed to so many different people. Ṣāliḥ's case for al-Ḥarīrī is quite strong—the *only* external (non-manuscript) evidence points to him—and although his case against al-Ṣafadī is not as strong, it is supported by the evidence from Bodleian MS Sale 34, which he does not consider. That manuscript includes both al-Ṣafadī's *ʿIbrat al-Labīb* (whose authenticity there is no reason to contest), attributed explicitly to him ("*risālah ʿajībah laṭīfah gharībah lil-shaykh Ṣalāh al-Dīn al-Ṣafadī*") and, immediately following it, the *Lawʿat al-Shākī,* unattributed ("*Damʿat al-Bākī wa-Lawʿat al-Shākī wa-hiya risālah ʿajībah gharībah*"). A comparison of the two, furthermore, makes it clear that they are not by the same author. The *ʿIbrat al-Labīb* is a rhetorically more sophisticated composition; the *Lawʿat al-Shākī* ties its prose and poetry together in a rather mechanistic fashion (prose passage usually followed by poetry expressing exactly the same thing with mostly identical vocabulary) that is foreign to the *ʿIbrat al-Labīb*. If the *Lawʿat al-Shākī* is not by al-Ṣafadī, surely al-Ḥarīrī is the most likely alternative candidate.

But comparing the two texts can also tell us more than this. As with the *Marātiʿ al-Ghizlān* (if that is what al-Nuwayrī is reproducing) and the *ʿIbrat al-Labīb,* we have with the *ʿIbrah* and the *Lawʿah* two first-person narratives of love passion for a young male Turk; but in this case the parallels are much closer. Like the *ʿIbrah,* the *Lawʿah* begins with the narrator expressing his general views on love before launching into his narrative. He then describes how one day he went out to a garden with a friend, and while they were enjoying the natural beauty there suddenly appeared seven Turkish young men, or, as the *Lawʿah* puts it (p. 35), "young men of the number of the planets" *(ghilmān ʿadad al-kawākib al-sayyārah);* the young men in the *ʿIbrah* (p. 106) are described as "*min al-ghilmah al-ḥisān ʿadad al-kawākib al-sayyārah.*" In the *Lawʿah* they "pushed aside the sun in (its) halo and shamed the moon in (its) halo" *(qad amālū al-shams fī al-hālah wa-akhjalū*

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

al-qamar fī al-dārah), while according to the *ʿIbrah* "among them was the source of my travail like the moon in (its) halo and the sun in (its) halo" *(wa-ṣāḥib balīyatī baynahum ka-al-qamar fī al-hālah wa-al-shams fī al-dārah)*. The following page in both texts offers several more such parallels in phraseology, and there are a number of others (I have found about half a dozen) scattered throughout the two works.

Once the Turks have put in their appearance and the narrator has fallen in love with one of them in particular, the plots of the two works do diverge. The *Lawʿah* has no hunt, nor any detailed description of the Turks' clothing and horses; and the beloved is far more accommodating than his counterpart in the *ʿIbrah*. On first meeting he takes the narrator aside, enthusiastically grants him kisses and embraces, and arranges an appointment for a longer and more private tryst. The friend, who plays a major role in the *Lawʿah,* is commissioned to prepare a room for this private party, with the necessary wine and other accoutrements. The beloved is delayed, but does finally show up, and after enjoying the wine lover and beloved retire to a night of embraces in bed (described in only vague, if highly rhetorical, terms; the friend sleeps outside the door). The next morning the beloved departs, apparently forever, and the narrator returns to the copious weeping in which he has indulged throughout the entire episode.

Despite the divergence in plot, it would appear to be fairly clear that the *Lawʿah* is in fact a direct emulation *(muʿāraḍah)* of the *ʿIbrah*—most likely one by al-Ḥarīrī. (Some misunderstanding of the relationship between the two works could perhaps lie behind the common attribution of the *Lawʿah* to al-Ṣafadī himself, although quite how that happened remains obscure.) What will require further research, however, is a fuller contextualization of these texts. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ibn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir, al-Ṣafadī, and al-Ḥarīrī (?) were certainly not the only authors during the Mamluk and Ottoman periods who cultivated what Thomas Bauer has called the "erotic *maqāmah,*"[18] and there is a history of this genre yet to be written. One wonders what to make of the fact that al-Ṣafadī mentions having studied with Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Faḍl Allāh (among other works) the latter's *Damʿat al-Bākī wa-Yaqẓat al-Sāhir,* no manuscripts of which appear to have turned up.[19] Bare titles can, of course, be deceptive, and in particular there is the difficulty of sorting out from "erotic *maqāmahs*" the quite distinct genre of anthologies of epigrams on beautiful boys (and sometimes girls), of which one well-known (but unpublished)

[18]Thomas Bauer, "Mamluk Literature: Misunderstandings and New Approaches," *Mamlūk Studies Review* 9, no. 2 (2005): 115.

[19]Al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfī,* ed. Muḥammad Yūsuf Najm, 8:255; idem, *Aʿyān al-ʿAṣr,* 1:420; and cf. al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-Wafayāt,* ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1973), 1:160. Josef van Ess, "Safaḍī-Splitter," *Der Islam* 53 (1976): 259, considers these two separate titles, which seems unlikely (albeit possible) to me.

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

example by al-Nawājī (d. 859/1455) bears the title *Marātiʿ al-Ghizlān fī al-Ḥisān min al-Jawārī wa-al-Ghilmān*. One wonders about the content of Ibn al-Ḥanbalī's *Martaʿ al-Ẓibá wa-Marbaʿ Dhawī al-Ṣibá,* preserved in manuscript, and whether it has any connection with the *Lawʿat al-Shākī* that he admired by his contemporary al-Ḥarīrī. On the other hand, one might also wonder about the *Bushrá al-Labīb bi-Dhikrá al-Ḥabīb* by Ibn Sayyid al-Nās (d. 734/1334), if it were not known that this (unpublished) work is in fact a collection of his own poems in praise of the Prophet. There remains much sorting out to be done.

As for the *Lawʿat al-Shākī,* while Ṣāliḥ's arguments for al-Ḥarīrī's authorship of it appear to be strong, his edition of the text itself is a disappointment. There were reasons enough to try to improve on ʿĀyish's 2003 edition—but that does not seem to have been Ṣāliḥ's primary motivation, and he has certainly not succeeded in doing so. In fact, his edition may be considered a step backward. He relies on four sources: the 1301 Istanbul printing of the text, ʿĀyish's 2003 edition, and two Damascus manuscripts, one without a named author and the other attributing the work to al-Māridīnī. Why editors should treat published editions as independent text testimonies—and both ʿĀyish and Ṣāliḥ are guilty of this—remains inexplicable to me; but Ṣāliḥ has compounded the problem by taking the Istanbul printing, *de facto,* as his *aṣl*. (He says nothing about an *aṣl,* but from his apparatus it becomes clear that the Istanbul printing is his "default.") It gets worse: Ṣāliḥ not only treats the Istanbul printing as an independent witness to the text, he treats *ʿĀyish's* edition as one. This becomes very messy indeed, because ʿĀyish's edition included readings from a manuscript with a great many obvious interpolations (the scribe clearly prided himself on catching various allusions and interpolated his explanations of them into the text). ʿĀyish (unwisely) included much of this material in his edited text, although he did (prudently) put it in brackets; but Ṣāliḥ ignores the brackets and treats whatever appears in ʿĀyish's text as if it were an independent witness to the textual tradition. The Istanbul printing is almost as bad about interpolations, and Ṣāliḥ takes those at face value as well. The result is quite chaotic.

Where Ṣāliḥ has in fact made a real contribution is in tracking down attributions of the poetry cited in the *Lawʿat al-Shākī*. (An important question that no one, so far as I know, has addressed is the conventions of poetry in *maqāmāt,* specifically in the Mamluk and Ottoman periods. When al-Ṣafadī wrote a *maqāmah*—the *ʿIbrat al-Labīb*—all the poetry seems to have been his own; in the *Lawʿat al-Shākī* the poetry seems to be all someone else's, without any explicit attribution. Was this a diachronic change?) ʿĀyish had managed to identify the authors of numerous previously-anonymous verses in the *Lawʿat al-Shākī,* and Ṣāliḥ has gone much further in this regard, relying in particular on a number of recently published

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

late-Mamluk poetic anthologies.[20] What should be especially interesting is verses cited in the work that can be identified as being by poets who post-date al-Ṣafadī. But in fact the only such cases are one set of verses attributed to Ibn Khaṭīb Dārayyā (of all people; see above) and another attributed to Ibn Ḥijjah al-Ḥamawī (d. 837/1434), and both come exclusively from manuscripts that are obviously larded with interpolations.

On the other hand, if in fact the *Lawʿat al-Shākī* can be assigned to a late tenth/sixteenth-century author, and yet quotes no poetry later than the early eighth/fourteenth century, that is in itself of great interest, in terms of tracking the history of canon in the "late medieval" and "early modern" periods. But obviously there is yet a great deal more work to be done before we can rely confidently on such evidence as this.

Ṣāliḥ's book provides conventional end matter: Quran quotations, hadith quotations, verse index, references. The last of these is very much up to date (although only Arabic-language sources are considered), and I found it valuable in that respect.

In sum, we should be happy to have available, from Muḥammad ʿĀyish, the texts of two works by al-Ṣafadī that have never been published before, even if those texts are presented in less than optimal form; and Samīḥ Ibrāhīm Ṣāliḥ has given us the latest, and fairly convincing, word on who wrote the *Lawʿat al-Shākī,* even though his edition of the text itself gets us no nearer the original words of its author (whoever he was) than we were before.

Anne F. Broadbridge, *Kingship and Ideology in the Islamic and Mongol Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). Pp. 232.

Reviewed by Thomas T. Allsen

The Mongolian invasions resulted in the destruction or incorporation of numerous Muslim polities from Turkestan to Syria. When the dust settled in the mid-thirteenth century, there were only two Muslim states left standing along the frontiers of this enormous empire, the Delhi sultanate and the Mamluk kingdom. Not surprisingly, the subsequent history of these two "frontline states" became closely entwined with that of their Chinggisid neighbors. Their relationships with the Il-khans, Chaghadai Khanate, and the Golden Horde were multifaceted involving war,

[20]Most significantly al-Nawājī's *Taʾhīl al-Gharīb* (ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad ʿAṭā, Cairo: Maktabat al-Ādāb, 2005).

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

diplomacy, trade, and considerable ideological posturing. Anne Broadbridge's fine volume examines the Mamluks' sustained but variable ideological response to the Mongolian challenge.

More specifically, she documents the concepts of political legitimacy advanced by both parties, and discusses their intended audience and the effects of ideology on the actions of ruling elites in the period from the Mongolian conquests to the death of Temür. This she does through a careful analysis of diplomatic messages and exchanges that reveal the subtle, and not so subtle, ideological competition between the Mamluks and their Chinggisid rivals and allies.

Properly, and most helpfully, she begins with the basics, the creation and delivery of ideological messages. Chancelleries, of course, crafted these diplomatic documents, but the messages conveyed were never limited to the written word: the quality and size of the paper, the kind and color of the ink, as well as the method of presentation made important statements about a ruler's legitimacy and majesty. So, too, did the method of dating documents, since calendars of every kind carry with them much political-ideological baggage. This is readily apparent in the long-time practice of Chinese courts, including the Mongolian Yuan Dynasty, who insisted that all subordinate states accept their calendrical system as a condition of their submission. Naturally, the language in which diplomatic documents were written was an equally crucial issue. The Mamluks, she finds, regularly sent their letters in Arabic, expecting that they would be understood or translated by foreign courts. The Mongols, in contrast, had in this respect an advantage, for their chancelleries contained many multi-lingual personnel and could produce documents in a variety of languages and scripts. However, because of the relatively high survival rate of the Mamluk documents and the comparative rarity of those produced in Chinggisid chancelleries, Broadbridge's study relies of necessity on the Arabic materials, and thus in many cases on the translation of originals from Persian, Mongolian, and Turkic. This situation points to the substantial influence wielded by translators and interpreters in such environments who could alter both the tone and substance of diplomatic messages either through error or by design.

The treatment accorded embassies was yet another opportunity for conveying important information about a ruler's intentions and mood. Receptions could be extremely denigrating, as when the Mongols, particularly in the early phases of the empire, required foreign envoys to be purified by fire and to bow before images of the founding father, Chinggis Khan, a singularly distasteful act for monotheists of any stripe. Or, receptions could be marked by acts of great generosity and shows of wealth involving extensive gifts of food, clothing, and exotic goods, and thus served as stages for Mongolian and Mamluk rulers to advertise their resources and reach to visiting embassies.

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

While offering a picture of the whole context of diplomatic exchanges, emphasis is placed on the more explicit ideological formulas found in the extant diplomatic documents. She begins with the fundamentals of Mongolian political doctrine, their claim of a divine mandate from heaven, *tenggeri,* to rule the face of the earth and the equally vital notion of a special good fortune, *suu* or *sutu,* which attached to the Chinggisid line and assured the success of their imperial venture. This package of ideas, Broadbridge rightly notes, arose in the years following Chinggis Khan's death in 1227. It should be stressed, however, that it was hardly unique to the Mongols. The notion of heavenly mandates resonated in China, where it was an age-old doctrine, while the bestowal of special good fortune was similar to the Turkic concept of *qut* and the Iranian *farr,* "royal glory."

For the Mamluks, the Mongols, more particularly the Il-khan state, were the most challenging of their neighbors, not only in terms of their military power but also in terms of their ideological pretensions. As Broadbridge shows, the Mamluk counter-package of political doctrines can be accommodated into the following periodization scheme.

1260–93: In the initial period, the Mongols simply asserted their mandate to rule and the superiority of Mongolian law, *yasa/jasa*γ, over the shariʿah, while the Mamluks emphasized their guardianship over Islamic society and holy places. In their relationship with the Golden Horde they emphasized religious kinship with their khan, Berke (r. 1257–66), a recent convert to Islam, and solidarity in the struggle against their common enemy, the Il-khans, and thus established a stable alliance which lasted for decades, even when dealing with Jochid rulers who were not Muslims.

1293–1316: The Il-khans' permanent conversion to Islam substantially altered the Mamluk ideological line, since Ghazan now used his adherence to Islam "to invite" Mamluk submission. He posed as a defender of Islam and at the same time invoked Chinggisid dynastic legitimacy and majesty, in pointed contrast to the lowly, slave origins of the Mamluks. His ideological pronouncements were directed at Mamluk subjects in Syria and senior commanders, which were countered by claiming religious "seniority" by reason of their earlier conversion or by disputing the sincerity of the Il-khan's embrace of his new faith.

1317–41: Following the rise of Özbek in the Golden Horde and Abū Saʿīd in the Il-khan realm, Muslim ideological formulas came to dominate in interstate exchanges. With peace established, Mamluks and Il-khans were now rival Muslim rulers and competed with each other over patronage of the holy places as well as in acts of piety and religious patronage. Still older tensions surfaced, the Mamluks stressing their religious seniority and the Il-Khans their dynastic-genealogical superiority.

1335–82: After the rapid disintegration of the Il-khan regime, the Mamluks,

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

largely by default, enjoyed a period of regional predominance and presented themselves to the contending Il-khan successors as senior sovereigns and guardians of the wider Islamic world. Starting in 1341, the Mamluks' own time of troubles, characterized by political in-fighting and decentralization, undercut their power and prestige but their principle rivals, the Chobanids and Jalayirids, were unable to take advantage.

1382–1404: The advent of Temür, however, posed a new and imposing military and ideological threat. He, like the Il-khans, fused Islamic and Chinggisid political notions and disparaged the Mamluks' slave origins. For their part, the Mamluks reverted to older formulas emphasizing their guardianship of Islam.

Broadbridge's portrayal of this century-and-a-half competition is extensively documented and her conclusions convincing: both the Mongols and the Mamluks took their ideological confrontation seriously; and, while there were frequent shifts in emphasis and novel elements introduced, there was continuous sparring about matters of legitimacy and supremacy; finally, these formulas, although flexible, did force rulers on many occasions to act out, or at least appear to conform to, their ideological pronouncements.

To my mind, the value of any scholarly endeavor can be usefully measured not only on its contribution to its principle theme and subject, but also for the light it casts on neighboring or related fields. Broadbridge, I believe, advances our knowledge on several significant fronts. Among other things, she provides the first full account in a Western language of the diplomatic relations between the Golden Horde and the Mamluks and in the process much improves upon the earlier work of Russian scholars such as Zakirov. She also adds to our understanding of the pivotal role of provincial governors and viceroys in Il-khan politics and diplomacy. As one primarily concerned with the history of the Mongolian Empire, her treatment of the Parvanah and of Choban help establish that these notable episodes in Il-khan history reverberated across the continent: the Parvanah's execution in 1277 is reported in the Chinese sources in some detail and it is now clear that Choban's "personal diplomacy," which led to his fall and death in 1327, extended from Cairo to Beijing. On a related issue, her examination of the more or less permanent place of political defections in Mamluk-Il-khan relations points up the need to study more closely similar movements elsewhere within the empire and along its borderlands, from western China to northwestern India and the Balkans. Further, her detailed descriptions of diplomatic receptions staged by the Mamluks and Mongols reveal that these were occasions on which cultural wares were put on eye-catching display for the benefit of foreign audiences. And, since lavish and competitive bestowals were a regular component of these encounters, such receptions constituted important mechanisms in the exchange of material culture among elites across Eurasia. Lastly, Broadbridge raises essential questions

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

concerning the purpose and audience for all the ideological jousting. To what extent was the message for external consumption and to what extent was it altered for internal politics? All this suggests a number of interesting comparative studies for which Broadbridge's monograph can serve as a point of departure.

To sum up, this is a high-quality work which, as the publisher's blurb maintains, will indeed "appeal to scholars of Middle Eastern and Central Asian history, Mongol history, and Islamic history, as well as historians of diplomacy and ideology." In other words, Broadbridge has successfully situated one facet of Mamluk history in a wider Eurasian context.

Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh al-Qadḥāt, *ʿĀʾilat al-Bāʿūnī wa-Dawruhā fī al-Ḥayāh al-ʿĀmmah fī al-Qarnayn al-Thāmin wa-al-Tāsiʿ al-Hijrīyayn* (Amman: Dār Ward al-Urdunīyah lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzīʿ, 2007). Pp. 125.

Reviewed by Th. Emil Homerin, University of Rochester

Over the past ten years, several books have been published in Arabic on the Mamluk Sufi poet and scholar ʿĀʾishah al-Bāʿūnīyah (see MSR 6 [2006]: 191–92; 7, no. 1 [2003]: 236–39; 13, no. 2 [2009]: 161–63). While they vary widely in terms of scholarship, these books are testimony to the renewed interest in this very erudite woman and author of the Mamluk period. In ʿĀʾilat al-Bāʿūnī, Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh al-Qadḥāt widens the scope to provide a general overview of the family and its contributions to Mamluk society and culture over four generations.

Al-Qadḥāt sets the political and cultural scene in his brief depiction of the Mamluk sultans, their often violent rule and succession, and the general mayhem that they caused among the populace. He then contrasts this political instability with the flourishing intellectual life of the period. Al-Qadḥāt notes that Cairo, in particular, was a safe haven for many scholars who fled the Mongols in the east and the Reconquista in the west. These émigrés, together with native scholars, found ample support among the Mamluk sultans and amirs, who established pious foundations (*waqf*s) for madrasahs, *khānqāh*s, and other institutions that supported learning. Such patronage would well serve the al-Bāʿūnī family (pp. 7–16). Al-Qadḥāt then turns, in chapter one (pp. 17–23), to a quick survey of sources that have mentioned the town of al-Bāʿūn, located today in Jordan, a few kilometers northwest of ʿAjlūn.

In chapter two (pp. 24–48), al-Qadḥāt traces family members from four generations, beginning with al-Nāṣir (fl. ninth/fourteenth century) and ending with ʿĀʾishah (d. 922/1516), though without mentioning her five brothers and

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

many other nephews, nieces, and cousins. Al-Qadḥāt reviews the education that various family members received and some of their teachers, their subsequent positions as preachers, teachers, scholars of law, and judges, their membership in the Qadarīyah Sufi order, and the place of honor and respect held by the family among their peers. In chapter three (pp. 51–82), al-Qadḥāt lists some of the books written by family members, occasionally citing samples of prose and, especially, poetry composed by them. In his footnotes, al-Qadḥāt often lists existing manuscripts of some of these works, their locations and index numbers, but it is quite apparent that he has not accessed most or all of these sources, and that he has drawn all of his quotations from previously published works. This is most apparent when al-Qadḥāt deals with the works of ʿĀʾishah, as he relies heavily on Ḥasan Rabābiʿah's 1997 study of her, often repeating the latter's mistakes while adding a few more of his own.

Chapter four (pp. 83–104) is the most interesting portion of this short book, as al-Qadḥāt cites several occasions when members of the al-Bāʿūnī family had interactions with a Mamluk sultan and members of his court. These include Aḥmad al-Bāʿūnī (d. 816/1413), who, as chief qadi, refused to allow Barqūq to appropriate *waqf* funds, which resulted in Aḥmad's brief imprisonment, and ʿĀʾishah al-Bāʿūnīyah, who had an audience with al-Ghawrī in Aleppo shortly before his death in battle with the Ottomans. Perhaps most interesting is al-Qadḥāt's re-telling of a protracted dispute between ʿĀʾishah's father Yūsuf and several al-Bāʿūnī relatives over legal positions in Syria. Here, al-Qadḥāt draws most of his information from al-Biqāʿī's *Iẓhār al-ʿAṣr,* but al-Qadḥāt never fully analyzes the incidents or several of the key players involved. This is typical for this book, for although al-Qadḥāt is to be commended for diligently citing his published sources, he never goes beyond them to form any opinions of his own. Moreover, as is apparent in his conclusion (pp. 105–10), al-Qadḥāt is often repetitive, some times repeating verbatim earlier statements and notes. In all, this book represents a wasted opportunity; al-Qadḥāt chose a family quite appropriate for a study of Mamluk intellectual and political history, yet, he failed to carry out the research and analysis required to make a significant contribution to Mamluk studies.

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

Hani Hamza, *The Northern Cemetery of Cairo*. Bibliotheca Iranica: Islamic Art & Architecture Series, no. 10 (Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda Publishers, Inc., 2001). Pp. viii + 58 + 26 figures (maps and plans) + 35 photographic plates.

Reviewed by John Rodenbeck

Its generalized title might seem to imply that this remarkable monograph follows the fortunes of Cairo's busy and much-frequented Northern Cemetery from some discernible beginning down to our own time; and that it might thus include a consideration not only of its celebrated Mamluk monuments, but also of a few belonging to later periods, such as the Qubbat Afandīnā, for example, which was recently reopened (6 May 2008) following extensive repair and restoration. Mamlukologists will be gratified, however, by the fact that the author's interests here are historical rather than purely architectural. His specific subject is the cemetery only during its Mamluk heyday, the period from 1250 to 1517, and though his concern is with monuments, it is much more with buildings erected in that period that have since disappeared than with the handful that are still standing.

A chemical engineer who runs his own business in Cairo, the author is a student of Islamic art and architecture by avocation; and it was the outstandingly rigorous M.A. program in Islamic art and architecture at the American University in Cairo that provided the scholarly training of which this book is a direct result. He has since achieved a Ph.D. in the subject at Cairo University.

The Northern Cemetery of Cairo was published as the tenth in a distinguished series of monographs in Islamic art and architecture, a pioneering effort overseen by an editorial board that includes Abbas Daneshvari, Bernard O'Kane (who was presumably one of Hamza's mentors at AUC), Robert Hillenbrand, and Ali Modarres. Mazda, the California-based publisher of the Bibliotheca Iranica and its Islamic Art and Architecture Series, is primarily interested in Iran and Persian culture, but occasionally ventures into other parts of the Muslim world, as is instanced by this book.

Hamza has inherited his investigative method from two classic works of scholarship, one of which is Doris Behrens-Abouseif's elegant article "The North-Eastern Extension of Cairo Under the Mamluks" (*Annales islamologiques* 17 [1981]). This article creates a general picture of Mamluk-era urban development northeast of al-Qāhirah from Bāb al-Naṣr in the direction of al-Maṭarīyah, an axis along which many Mamluk notables built palaces and pleasure domes. Because of its different character, however, Behrens-Abouseif quite carefully excluded from her purview the area south of the mausoleum of al-ʿĀdil. Hani Hamza's attention, on the other hand, is turned precisely upon that portion of the *ṣaḥrāʾ*

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

that Behrens-Abouseif chose to omit, which became what we call the Northern Cemetery. It is bounded on the north by the tomb of Qānṣūh Abū Saʿīd, on the northeast by Jabal al-Aḥmar and the site of Qubbat al-Naṣr, on the northwest by al-Husaynīyah (with its own significant graveyard, al-Bayraqdār, last resting place of Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, al-Maqrīzī, J. L. Burckhardt, and——presumptively——Badr al-Jamālī), on the southwest by the Barqīyah, on the east by the Muqaṭṭam, and on the south by Bāb al-Wazīr and the Citadel. A complete notion of the entire northeastern and eastern corner of Mamluk Cairo could be had by putting these two pieces of intensive research together.

Like Behrens-Abouseif, Hamza has combed through the sources, both Arab and non-Arab, with utmost industry. The Arab sources they use are of course in general the same, but Behrens-Abouseif cites twenty-five travelers' accounts and Hamza only five: al-Maṭarīyah, with its Christian sites, was on every European travel itinerary, the Northern Cemetery on virtually none, with the consequence that references to it by travelers are comparatively rare. (It might also be noted here that in the "Arabic Sources" section of Hamza's otherwise careful bibliography the entries have been transliterated, but have remained alphabetized according to the Arabic alphabet. Four of the entries are not properly "sources," but secondary studies; and the first two lines of the first entry have been printed twice.) The purpose of Hamza's impressive preliminary labor was to establish what exactly stood or was built in the Northern Cemetery in Mamluk times. For such historical purposes mere physical remains are deeply deficient; and it is the written record that must supply the evidence of what once was substantial and real.

Mamluk politics and Mamluk building activity being profoundly interlinked, Hamza's opening chapter offers an overview of construction in the *ṣaḥrāʾ* against the background of Mamluk political history. He is fully aware that any Muslim funerary structure in Cairo commonly housed and is still apt to house the remains of many people, some of them quite unrelated to the founder. The mere mention of someone in the sources as being buried in the Northern Cemetery he has therefore treated as insufficient evidence that a structure was actually founded by him or erected on his behalf. Despite the limitations imposed by such logical criteria, Hamza has nevertheless disclosed the existence of 106 structures, few of them still extant. Of 29 Bahri buildings, for example, all but one of them mausolea, only 4 now remain; of 77 Burgi buildings, a mere 28 are still standing. The Index of the Survey of Egypt identifies many of the buildings still extant, but whatever is standing at the present moment, quite obviously, is no guide to what was once the case. "It would be rash," Hamza writes,

> to claim that all the foundations in the *'sahara,'* whether surviving or not, have been listed, although it is probable that all the major

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

> examples are covered. But the corpus of monuments and the related information outlined so far [are] ample for analysis and drawing conclusions on the geographical, topographical and social aspects of development of the *sahara'* (p. 18).

The second chapter is a topographical analysis. It begins with a historical survey of the various names that have been applied to the *ṣaḥrāʾ,* ranging from Maydan al-Qabaq to Eastern Cemetery *(al-qarāfah al-sharqīyah)* to the Tombs of the Mamluks; and fixes an approximate site for the Qubbat al-Naṣr, a vital historical landmark that unfortunately no longer exists. Hamza then indicates the main arteries and street patterns, which are conveniently mapped. He traces four phases of urban growth under four different régimes or phases of government: (1) Bahri (648–784/1250–1382); (2) al-Ẓāhir Barqūq to the accession of al-Ashraf Barsbāy (784–825/1382–1422); (3) al-Ashraf Barsbāy to the accession of Qāytbāy (825–73/1422–68); (4) al-Ashraf Qāytbāy to the end of the Mamluk sultanate (873–922/1468–1517).

Hamza's phase-by-phase listings of foundations follow. Each building is identified, if possible, by either a number in the Survey of Egypt's Index, showing that it is still extant, or by a reference to a second classic work in the field: the late and much-lamented Michael Meinecke's heroic two-volume survey, *Die Mamlukischen Architektur in Ägypten und Syrien* (1992), his last published work, a survey that was intended in large part to supplement the Index by locating monuments that had disappeared. Meinecke thus found 33 new entries to add to the Index's 32 in the Northern Cemetery. In completing his own survey, however, Hamza found more than 40 additional foundations clearly attested.

An interim chapter follows on the patronage and typology of the buildings. The most numerous buildings were mausolea, of which 25 are still standing, many supplied with the remarkable carved stone domes that are one of the special boasts of Mamluk architecture. Several were also used as *khānqāh*s, which gave the area, as Hamza remarks, its "distinctive character." The only other important building type in the *ṣaḥrāʾ* appears to have been the *zāwiyah*.

These three building types reflect major activities in the *ṣaḥrāʾ,* the subject of Hamza's fourth chapter. Such activities certainly included visitations to the tombs of saints and Sufis, especially that of ʿAbd Allāh al-Manūfī, though the *ṣaḥrāʾ* otherwise had much less claim to sanctity than the *qarāfah*s to the south. Nine *khānqāh*s are still extant in the *ṣaḥrāʾ;* however, three or four more are known from the sources, and many other buildings served as *khānqāh*s even if not designated as such, so that by the end of the fifteenth century Sufi activity must have been quite evident. Residential quarters housed inhabitants of other kinds, including a large proportion of foreigners, but an experiment in economic

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.

development earlier in the century had failed and at the time of the Ottoman conquest the population was sparse. Hamza concludes by demonstrating that the period of greatest building activity was during the third quarter of the fifteenth century. An appendix examines in detail the ruined mausoleum of Mankalībughā al-Fakhrī, excluded from the Index because of its artistic mediocrity, but perhaps therefore all the more representative of architectural norms in an area presently known chiefly for its surviving handful of large-scale Mamluk masterworks.

This book may well be the definitive treatment of its subject. One could wish, though, that Mazda had taken much more editorial care. Apart from the bibliographic defects noted parenthetically above, there are frequent typographical errors and some sentences need straightening out, despite the author's excellent English. The graphic material is all informative, though here there are likewise a few mistakes that should have been corrected at an early stage. And why has the sketch map reproduced as Figure 2 not been formalized and thus made much more useful?

DOI: 10.6082/M1W0942V. (https://doi.org/10.6082/M1W0942V)

DOI of Vol. XIV: 10.6082/M1N877WP. See https://doi.org/10.6082/HBNW-HW25 to download the full volume or individual articles.