

Book Reviews

SATO TSUGITAKA, *State and Rural Society in Medieval Islam: Sultans, Muqta's, and Fallahun* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997). Pp. 337.

REVIEWED BY AMALIA LEVANONI, University of Haifa

This is a study of the *iqṭā'* system in Iraq, Syria, and Egypt from its inception in Iraq in the mid-tenth century to the mid-fourteenth century. The author argues that the *iqṭā'*, despite seemingly common features, differed in each region because of both historical and regional peculiarities.

Sato develops his argument in nine chapters (the first and the ninth being the introduction and conclusion). The introductory chapter, through a wide-ranging survey of the research to date, reveals the origins of the *iqṭā'* and its development up to the Ayyubid system in Syria and Egypt. Chapter 2 examines the *iqṭā'* system in Iraq and its influence on the evolution of Iraqi society. The Buwayhids were the first to introduce a hierarchical military *iqṭā'* into the Islamic world, specifically the Sawād region of Iraq (334/946). In the course of time, the position of fief holder (*muqta'*) strengthened to such an extent that it encroached on the provincial governors' (*wālī*) administrative authority, such as the right to collect protection fees from both *muqta'*s and peasants. The Seljuqs inherited the Buwayhid *iqṭā'* and, with slight changes, continued to assign land revenues to military forces of a lower standing. With the consolidation of Seljuq rule, however, the allocation of the administrative *iqṭā'* to amirs, limited under the Buwayhids, became common practice in both Iraq and Iran.

Chapters 3 to 7 trace in detail the history of the *iqṭā'* system in Egypt and Syria under the Ayyubids (564-649/1169-1250) and the Mamluks. Imitating the system of the Seljuqs, Salāḥ al-Dīn, the founder of the Ayyubid dynasty, introduced the *iqṭā'* into Egypt and Syria. During the Ayyubid period, the fief holders had to perform certain duties in exchange for the *iqṭā'*s allocated to them; for example, to render military service in accordance with *iqṭā'* revenues and to maintain the irrigation system in their fiefs.

During al-Zāhir Baybars's reign (658-76/1260-77), *iqṭā'*s were allocated not only to prominent Mamluk amirs and the sultan's *mamlūks*, but also to non-*mamlūk* soldiers serving as auxiliary forces for the Mamluk Sultanate, such as members of the *ḥalqah*, Bedouins (*'urbān*) and the Mongol *wāfiḍīyah* warriors. Because of his political talents, Baybars, the author concludes, attributed more importance to the assignment of *iqṭā'*s to the *'urbān* and the *wāfiḍīyah* warriors than to the *mamlūks*.



Behind this policy lay Baybars's aim of attracting these two forces to his army for use against the Mongol threat from the East.

Sato uses the set of instructions that Sultan al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn (678-89/1279-90) gave to Amir Kitbughā al-Manṣūrī, then Vice-Sultan (*nā'ib al-salṭānah*), delegating to the amir the management of the Sultanate in the Sultan's absence while on an expedition in al-Marqab (Dhū al-Ḥijjah 679/March 1281), as a basis for studying the *iqṭā'* system during Qalāwūn's reign. The author finds that during this period there was a classification of *muqṭa'*s according to income, which was complicated because this revenue was closely related to the local taxation system. The author, however, does not explain the complexity of either this revenue or local taxation.

The need to improve the position of the sultan's *mamlūks* later led to the carrying out of two cadastral surveys (*rawk*). The first, *al-rawk al-ḥusāmī*, was conducted by Sultan Ḥusām al-Dīn Lājīn (698/1298). The second, *al-rawk al-nāṣirī*, which had more far-reaching ramifications for the structure and economy of the Mamluk Sultanate, was carried out by Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn (713-25/1313-25). *Al-rawk al-nāṣirī* brought about uniformity in the *iqṭā'* system by transferring the right to levy taxes (i.e., land tax [*kharāj*], poll tax [*jawālī*] and tribute goods [*diyāfah*]), from state authorities to the private hands of the *muqṭa'*s. This provided the opportunity to abolish miscellaneous taxes (*mukūs*); the introduction of fair administration further improved the conditions of the villagers.

In the wake of the "privatization" of the *iqṭā'*, a withdrawal of the officials previously occupied as tax collectors was also inevitable. The transfer of the right to levy taxes in the *iqṭā'* to the *muqṭa'*s, however, did not encroach on the authority and centralized power of the state because the right to appoint or dismiss amirs and soldiers and to allocate *iqṭā'*s remained at the absolute discretion of the sultan.

Chapter 8 describes the life of the peasantry in Syria and Egypt under the *iqṭā'* system. The author concludes that the sources tell little about the actual conditions of the peasantry in Syria during the Mamluk period. As for Egyptian rural society, the sources are clearer. Relations between the *iqṭā'* proprietors and the peasants (*fallāḥūn* or *muzārī'ūn*) were arranged through *qabālah* contracts. According to this arrangement, the former allocated land and lent seed (*taqāwī*) to the latter; the proprietors employed private agents (*mubāshirūn*) to collect taxes and distribute the seed. Later, when the *muqṭa'*s stepped into the government's shoes and their position vis-à-vis the peasantry strengthened, they thrust responsibility for the maintenance of the irrigation system in the *iqṭā'*s upon the peasants by levying corvée (*sukhrāh*) on them every winter. Under such conditions, the author maintains, village-based peasants (*fallāḥū qarrār*) were treated as "serfs" (*'abd qinn*) by their *muqṭa'*s.

Moreover, after al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's death (741/1341), when the government's control over the *muqṭa*'s loosened, the latter increased taxes without regard to the changing conditions of cultivation. A further deterioration in the management of the *iqṭā'* system occurred following the Black Death (749/1348), when common people (*al-‘āmmah*) were assigned fiefs in the *ḥalqah*. Political disorder, maladministration, and the repeated outbreak of plagues during the period of the Circassian rule brought about a general decline in Egypt and Syria. One of the major victims of the Circassians' misrule was the peasantry. Officials and fief holders, whose appointments were gained through bribery, exploited the peasants while neglecting their share in maintaining the irrigation system and in promoting the cultivation of land in their *iqṭā'āt*. The failure of the Circassian government to secure public order left the peasants subject to the constant threat of the Bedouins. Unable to bear up under this neglect, the peasants abandoned cultivation.

The author rejects al-Maqrīzī's contention that "political corruption was the cause of economic decline during the Circassian rule." Instead he regards the economic decline as the catalyst for the Circassians' misrule. It was the decline in the *iqṭā'* revenues, in this view, that led the Mamluks to increase taxes, which brought about a stagnation in economic activity in both rural and urban society.

Sato's study is a welcome contribution to the research on medieval Muslim history. It is the first inclusive and comprehensive survey of the history of the *iqṭā'*s, which until now has been fragmentary, based on restricted studies of a specific period and region. The author has also laid out remarkably detailed chronological information on the *iqṭā'* system in the Middle Ages. The contribution of the study could have been more significant if new insights, interpretations, and general conclusions had been provided as well.

A few slips may briefly be noted. The transliteration of the feminine suffix, *al-tā' al-marbūṭah*, is occasionally wrong. There are several cases in which it is silent, whereas it should be pronounced (such as when it is the suffix of a determined noun in an annexation). On p. 193, "Hiba Allāh al-Qibṭī" should read "Hibat Allāh al-Qibṭī"; on p. 212 "qilla al-mā'" should read "qillat al-mā'". In other cases, however, the suffix should be silent: thus, on p. 76, "al-Madrasat al-Fakhrīyah" should be "al-Madrasah al-Fakhrīyah"; on pp. 263 and 264, "al-Nuzhat al-Sanīyah . . ." and "al-Tuhfat al-Mulukīyah . . ." should be, respectively, "al-Nuzhah al-Sanīyah . . ." and "al-Tuhfah al-Mulukīyah . . ." The definitions of *muqṭa' aṣlī* and *muqṭa' al-jihah* (pp. 113, 235) do not appear in the glossary. Finally, the process whereby the peasant in Egypt was treated as a slave for life (*'abd qinn*) (p. 236) is not clear.

This study is based on a wide-ranging survey of both primary sources—including both major and less well-known printed books and manuscripts—and modern studies of Abbasid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk history and institutions. These sources

are fully listed in the bibliography, which provides a precious mine for scholars who work in these fields.

‘ABD ALLĀH IBN RASHĪD IBN MUḤAMMAD AL-ḤAWSHĀNĪ, *Minhāj Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymīyah fī al-Da‘wah ilā Allāh Ta‘ālā* (Riyadh: Markaz al-Dirāsāt wa-al-I‘lām, Dār al-Ishbīlīyā, 1996). Two volumes.

ṢĀ’IB ‘ABD AL-ḤAMĪD, *Ibn Taymīyah: Ḥayātuhu wa-‘Aqā’ iduhu* (Beirut: al-Ghadīr lil-Dirāsāt wa-al-Nashr, [1994?]). Pp. 465.

REVIEWED BY DAVID C. REISMAN, Yale University

Studies devoted to various aspects of Ibn Taymīyah’s life and thought have proliferated in recent years. In one respect, such a growing interest is to be expected and perhaps even applauded; the importance of this independently minded thinker for the history of medieval Islamic thought cannot be overestimated. In another respect, the sheer number of works on Ibn Taymīyah requires a principle of classification (both of a given work’s content and the author’s intention in studying and writing about Ibn Taymīyah) that has yet to be articulated or even discussed in a scholarly manner; hence, the present review.

There are essentially two categories of works written about Ibn Taymīyah these days: one is a historical study that employs a critical methodology to elucidate some aspect of Ibn Taymīyah’s life or thought within the context of medieval Arabic-Islamic intellectual history; the other studies Ibn Taymīyah as an important contributing voice to modern Muslim debates on religion, society, and politics. There have been no comprehensive critical studies of Ibn Taymīyah since Henri Laoust published his *Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Taki-d-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Taimīya* in 1939. Works of the first category can be critically assessed in a modern scholarly publication. If works of the second category are to be critically analyzed, such analysis should occur only within the context of a study on modern Islamic movements and thought, but relevant responses properly speaking should come from participants in those modern Muslim debates.

The two publications reviewed here fall under the second category. As such, this review should be correctly viewed as an anomaly to a publication such as *Mamlūk Studies Review*, concerned as it is with *medieval* history and thought. While both works contain a great quantity of raw data on a number of issues of central concern to Ibn Taymīyah (in the form of extensive quotations from a

number of his treatises and monographs) and so might conceivably be *described* for their potential use as source books of collected passages, *critical review* of the authors' overall aims, methodology, and opinions should properly be reserved for publications concerned with modern Muslim thought (and Ibn Taymīyah's place therein).

Al-Ḥawshānī, Director of the Institute for Imams and Preachers at the Jāmi'at al-Imām Muḥammad ibn Sa'ūd al-Islāmīyah in Saudi Arabia, has written a rather wide-ranging, if entirely descriptive, two-volume study of the major aspects of Ibn Taymīyah's thought and socio-religious activity, entitled "Ibn Taymīyah's Missionary Program." The author understands the wide breadth of Ibn Taymīyah's interests to be part of a larger missionary activity and the work is designed as a blueprint for modern missionary activity that takes as its model the career of Ibn Taymīyah. It opens with a brief, laudatory biography of Ibn Taymīyah (the main source of which is the hagiographical *al-'Uqūd al-Durrīyah* by Ibn Taymīyah's erstwhile disciple Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī) and then passes to the substantive areas of study. Part 1 (pp. 49-358) treats particular characteristics of Ibn Taymīyah's "mission," including his views on language and technical terminology, his attempts at reconciling religious knowledge with the dictates of rational demonstration (a collection of passages, pp. 131-35, in which Ibn Taymīyah addresses the *ḥaqīqah-majāz* issue is of particular interest for studies of this Ḥanbalī's treatment of anthropomorphic Quranic passages), the comprehensiveness of his mission in addressing all groups of his society (a section which overlaps considerably with a later section on "objectivity in Ibn Taymīyah's method"), the clarity of his various styles of composition, tailored as they were to specific audiences (for Ibn Taymīyah's views on women, see pp. 210-20), and concludes with a group of passages highlighting Ibn Taymīyah's knowledge of the culture of his age. Part 2 (pp. 361-529) deals with the "basic principles of Ibn Taymīyah's mission" which the modern missionary may use as templates with which to organize and assess particular situations and ideas; it is divided into sections on general beliefs (pp. 365-89), religious practices (393-417), and ethics (421-529, spaced across the two volumes). Part 3 (pp. 535-737) is entitled "al-Asālīb wa-al-Wasā'il"; the author explains that these terms are to be understood as referring to the methods and means of missionary activity respectively (defined p. 544). Missionary methods include the construction of a model believer based upon Ibn Taymīyah's life-style, the use of debating techniques for defending the religion, and the use of the *fatwā* genre for guiding individual believers. The means of missionary activity are exemplified by Ibn Taymīyah's use of different genres of writing (it is not clear why the *fatwā* was not included here), his style of preaching, the importance of travel, and Ibn Taymīyah as the moral champion of soldiers engaged in war against unbelievers. Two final discussions of the arenas of preaching—mosques and schools—conclude the section.

Al-Ḥawshānī concludes the work as a whole with a descriptive list of the parts of his work and recommendations for future study of Ibn Taymīyah's missionary activity that will emphasize the influence of the "pious forefathers" of the religion and involve religious students of modern Saudi Arabia.

'Abd al-Ḥamīd's *Ibn Taymīyah: His Life and Beliefs* is a highly personal and often very emotional critique of Ibn Taymīyah's views on Shi'ism. The author claims that Ibn Taymīyah's thought has been willfully misrepresented in the past and that it is as a remedy of that distortion that he has written the present work (pp. 10-11). The first part of the work is a largely undocumented and highly anecdotal biography of Ibn Taymīyah (pp. 15-89) that includes rough sketches of the political, social, cultural, and religious dimensions of his age. The second part (pp. 97-184) addresses major areas of belief, including Ibn Taymīyah's views on *ijtihād* and *taqlīd*, the ever present debate on God's attributes, and his understanding of Sufism. The third part (pp. 189-271) focuses on Ibn Taymīyah's discussions of Shi'ism, especially those in his monumental work *Minhāj al-Sunnah* to which Ibn Taymīyah's contemporary Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī responded with *Minhāj al-Karāmah fī Ma'rīfat al-Imāmah* (the biography of al-Ḥillī, pp. 197-212, is to be contrasted with that of Ibn Taymīyah). The final section (pp. 277-428) discusses Ibn Taymīyah's views on the Prophet's family, with detailed sections on 'Alī and Ḥusayn. Throughout, Ibn Taymīyah is engaged less as a subject of historical enquiry than as a formidable and unrepentant opponent. Ibn Taymīyah's understanding of and response to Shi'ism is an important subject and the debate between Ibn Taymīyah and al-Ḥillī represents a critical moment in medieval Islamic intellectual history. Henri Laoust's "Les Fondements de l'imamat dans le Minhāj d'al-Ḥillī" has yet to be surpassed as an introductory essay.¹

A serious and comprehensive revision of Henri Laoust's fundamental *Essai* on Ibn Taymīyah has yet to appear despite the continued growth of interest in this major figure of medieval Islamic intellectual history. Arabic-Islamic studies is no more plagued by a lack of continuity in scholarship than any other field, but the absence of very basic research on Ibn Taymīyah should nonetheless be perceived as a serious shortcoming to a proper understanding of the man and his work and not simply as a typical, if woeful, characteristic of the field as a whole. Basic spadework, such as a critical biography, a list and chronology of works, a study of extant manuscripts, and an informed assessment of work to date, seems to be viewed as an unfortunate mechanical aspect of Arabic-Islamic studies best done by someone else, but without such work any study of a discrete aspect of Ibn Taymīyah's life and thought cannot but be tentative.

¹*Revue des études islamiques* 46, no. 1 (1978): 3-55.

In many ways the study of Ibn Taymīyah is blessed with an enormous amount of primary material, perhaps more so than for any other comparably significant medieval figure. The wealth of primary biographical sources, much of it contemporary, is vast. The very topical nature of Ibn Taymīyah's writings has insured that much of the corpus is internally dated (many of his works are introduced with very specific dates of composition). The diligence of his disciples in preserving their master's program of thought has provided modern scholars with two major lists of his works (Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzīyah, Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī), in addition to the many partial lists found in the *ṭabaqāt* entries. The continued interest in Ibn Taymīyah on the part of modern Muslim intellectuals as well as the increasing sophistication in the cataloguing of medieval Arabic manuscripts has made the study of the manuscript remains of Ibn Taymīyah's work more viable than ever before.² At this critical juncture in Ibn Taymīyah studies, what is most needed is a diligent researcher to undertake such a primary and comprehensive introduction to Ibn Taymīyah. Until such a study is undertaken, we might profitably, if modestly, begin the process of organizing Ibn Taymīyah studies with the simple classification of modern studies on Ibn Taymīyah introduced here.

IBN AL-'ADĪM, *Zubdat al-Ḥalab min Ta' rīkh Ḥalab*, edited by Khalīl al-Manṣūr (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmīyah, 1417/1996). Pp. 528

REVIEWED BY MICHAEL CHAMBERLAIN, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Historians of medieval Aleppo have long benefited from Sami Dahan's admirable edition of the *Zubdat al-Ḥalab* (Damascus, 1951-68). While it may be premature to believe that this edition is getting long in the tooth, so much has been published since that a new edition would seem to be justified. Unfortunately, it is difficult to recall an edition so remarkably inferior to the one it intends to supersede. It appears that the same manuscript was consulted, so there is nothing new - or more accurate for that matter - here. The project could have been justified if the editor

²A fine beginning in this regard has been made by Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Shaybānī in two manuscript catalogues published in the same year: *Majmū'at Mu'allafāt Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymīyah: Al-Makḥṭūṭah (al-Aṣliyah wa-al-Muṣawwarah) al-Maḥfūzah fī Markaz al-Makḥṭūṭāt wa-al-Turāth wa-al-Wathā'iq* [Jordan], Qism Ibn Taymīyah, 1 (Kuwait: Manshūrāt Markaz al-Makḥṭūṭāt wa-al-Turāth wa-al-Wathā'iq, 1993); and *Majmū'at Mu'allafāt Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymīyah: Al-Makḥṭūṭah al-Maḥfūzah fī al-Maktabah al-Sulaymānīyah bi-Istānbūl*, Qism Ibn Taymīyah, 3 (Kuwait: Manshūrāt Markaz al-Makḥṭūṭāt wa-al-Turāth wa-al-Wathā'iq, 1993).

had taken into account recently discovered or published works (the complete *Bughyat al-Ṭalab* published by S. Zakkār in 1988-89 comes to mind). However, this opportunity was not only not taken up, the notes fail to include many of Dahan's references. Bizarrely, it appears that al-Manṣūr declined to consult Dahan's notes even as he adopted his corrections of scribal errors, and all too often Manṣūr claims that names and toponyms that Dahan managed to track down are unmentioned in other sources (compare Dahan, ii: 293n with al-Manṣūr, p. 331n for a particularly egregious example). In short, where this new edition is generally accurate, and possesses the virtue of availability, it induces a *fasād al-zamān* mood in the reader, and a sense of puzzlement that it was published at all.

MAJD AL-AFANDĪ, *al-Ghazal fī al-'Aṣr al-Mamlūkī al-Awwal* (Damascus: Dār al-Ma'add, 1994). Pp. 318.

REVIEWED BY THOMAS BAUER, Universität Erlangen

That poetry of the Mamluk period has a flavor different from that of previous periods is due to a shift of importance given to the various genres of Arabic poetry rather than to a specific stylistic change. Of particular importance was the fact that the number of political leaders capable of appreciating the subtleties of sophisticated panegyric odes had decreased conspicuously. One of the few remaining court poets was Ibn Nubātah, who had managed to win one of the last Ayyubid princes in Ḥamāh as patron. Consequently, the laudatory ode addressed to a ruler, in which the basic values of society were to be reformulated in a ceremonial game between prince and poet, was no longer considered to be the most noble and important genre. Instead, those genres gained ground that immediately reflected the ideas and interests of the civilian elite, a group of which the poets themselves were a part. In this context, the panegyric ode survived, but was now mostly directed to scholars (and often composed by scholars) and other members of the *a'yān*. In its function as a means of communication between members of the civilian elite, *madīḥ* poems were supplemented by consolation, invitation, and congratulation poems and other kinds of occasional poetry with a more informal character. Even a superficial glance into chronicles and biographical dictionaries of scholars reveals the high importance these and other genres of poetry must have played for the shaping of social identity in Mamluk society. Since the *a'yān* of this period "constructed their most intimate and socially critical social bonds

through the cultivation of ‘ilm,¹ as Michael Chamberlain has shown in his seminal study, and since poetry was clearly one of the major fields of ‘ilm,² one can only be amazed by the general neglect of poetry by modern scholars.

It is not sufficiently clear what role love poetry played in all this, but there can be no doubt that the *ghazal* was a genre that profited greatly from developments in this period. Again, the *ghazal* poems of the Mamluk period are not very different from those of the ninth and tenth centuries (which, from a Mamluk point of view, must be seen as its “formative period”).³ Nearly all features that the author of the study in review considers to be new in the Mamluk period were already present two or three centuries earlier (a glance in al-Tha‘alibī’s *Yatīmat al-Dahr* would have been helpful). However, love poetry starts to turn up in a great variety of writings as, for example, in all sorts of anthologies and biographical dictionaries. I would even dare to assert that, by the tenth or eleventh century, love poetry had taken the place of the most important poetic genre next to *madīh*. Nevertheless, the question of its social function has not even been touched upon yet. Majd al-Afandī does not make an exception even if she devotes an entire chapter to the role of women in Mamluk society, stating that this period can be considered the “golden age of the woman” in the history of Islam (p. 12). But since more than half of the love poems composed during this period are homoerotic, this chapter answers less than half of the questions. More interesting would have been a discussion about possible parallels between teacher-pupil relations on one side and lover-beloved relations on the other, or a more general enquiry about the function of different kinds of emotional bonds between men in this society and their literary representation (and construction), which would help to allocate love poetry’s proper place. Al-Afandī cannot see in homoerotic poetry anything other than a sad sign of moral decadence, and has not realized that today the great importance of male-male love relations in pre-modern Islam from the ninth century onwards can no longer be considered a problem of morals, but must be treated as a subject of gender studies, an approach unknown to the author. This is very regrettable since poetry as a simultaneously rather informal as well as generally acknowledged and widely practiced means of communication is one of our most important sources for social history and the history of mentalities of the Mamluk period.

¹Michael Chamberlain, *Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190-1350* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 108.

²A fact not unnoticed by Chamberlain, *ibid.*, 85f.

³Cf. my study, *Liebe und Liebesdichtung in der arabischen Welt des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts: Eine literatur- und mentalitätsgeschichtliche Studie des arabischen Ġazal* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1998).

Majd al-Afandī confines herself to the study of six major poets from the seventh/thirteenth and the first half of the eighth/fourteenth century: (1) Sharaf al-Dīn al-Anṣārī (586-662/1190-1263), who belongs rather to the Ayyubid than to the Mamluk period (as he is not mentioned in the authoritative Western handbooks, al-Afandī has to be thanked for having rescued this interesting poet from oblivion); (2) Shihāb al-Dīn al-Talla‘farī (593-675/1197-1277); (3) Ibn al-‘Afīf al-Tilimsānī, known as al-Shābb al-Zarīf (661-688/1263-1289); (4) Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī (677-759/1278-1348); (5) Ibn Nubātah (686-768/1287-1366); and (6) Ibn al-Wardī (689-749/1290-1349). Each of these poets is treated twice; first in a chapter entitled “The Traditional *Ghazal*” (pp. 44-97) and again in a chapter entitled “The Most Important *Ghazal* Poets of the Time” (pp. 170-258), in which al-Afandī discusses the achievements of these poets in a field she calls the “innovative *ghazal*.” Western Arabists might be more familiar with the distinction between *nasīb* and *ghazal*. In fact, nothing else is meant by the differentiation between “traditional” and “innovative” *ghazal*. Al-Afandī simply follows the terminology of traditional Arabic literary theory which does not assign different meanings to the terms *nasīb* and *ghazal*. The author is right in dealing with both types of love poetry in two separate chapters, because the differences between “traditional *ghazal*” on the one hand, and the “innovative *ghazal*” on the other, are still relevant in Mamluk times. “Traditional *ghazal*” (that is, *nasīb*) is love poetry continuing an intertextual line going back to the *jāhilī* prelude of the *qaṣīdah* and featuring themes like the deserted campsite. “Innovative *ghazal*” (what Western Arabists are used to calling simply *ghazal*) continues the tradition of independent love poems in the vein of Abū Nuwās, Abū Tammām, and others (therefore not being really “innovative” in the Mamluk era). One must, however, be aware of the fact that love poetry in the “innovative” style, even in its homoerotic variety, can be found very often now as prelude in the panegyric ode, a place mostly reserved for traditional-style *nasīb* in earlier centuries. Due to this rather complicated situation, one misses a discussion of terminology in al-Afandī’s book. Her own classification of the “innovative” *ghazal* in three categories, “sensual,” “obscene,” and “spiritual” (pp. 98ff.), reflects modern ideas of morality but was rather irrelevant for Mamluk authors, many of whose poems combine lines of more than one type.

In principle, there are two different ways of approaching literature. One can either listen to literature as a recipient, asking if the work appeals to one’s taste and wondering what the author has to say to “us.” Or one can look at works of literature from a more scholarly angle, trying to elucidate the aesthetic principles of the author’s period and the role of literature in his cultural environment and asking about the relation between the particular work of art and the communicative field of which it formed part. Al-Afandī’s book belongs to the first category. It is mainly dedicated to an evaluation of the six poets mentioned. The criteria according

to which they are judged are not those of the Mamluk period (or those of any other period of pre-modern Islamic culture), but those of Western literature of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. For al-Afandī, the main criterion is to what extent a love-poem “expresses the true feelings” of the poet. Of course, no Arab poet prior to the nineteenth century ever cared about this. Even the expression *al-shu‘ūr al-ṣādiqah*, “true feelings,” used by al-Afandī *ad nauseam*, would have been completely incomprehensible to the authors of these poems, *shu‘ūr* designating nothing but sensory impressions. In fact, there is no way to translate the expression “true feelings” into Classical Arabic since pre-modern Islam (as well as pre-modern Europe, China, etc.) lacked any such concept. In their eyes, emotions either were there or they were not. Emotions could not be true or false; they could, however, be concealed or expressed in a more or less sincere way. Further, and most important, pre-modern Arab poets (and perhaps poets of any pre-modern culture) were not supposed to express feelings, but rather to evoke emotions. A poem—any poem—was not judged by its potential of “expressing” something but by its potential to arouse the interest of the hearer (if, e.g., it was *muṭrib*, evoking *ṭarab*, or not). To evoke emotions, the poet was not supposed to possess the feeling as “truly” as possible, but to possess a poetic gift and the technical command of composing poems. Part of this ability was mastery of the rhetorical devices. These devices were seen as one of several means of arousing emotion (*ṭarab*) in the hearer/reader. To arouse *ṭarab* in this way was considered a legitimate and admirable achievement. Not for al-Afandī, who is startled as soon as she comes across a *jinās* or any similar device. For her, Ibn Nubātah, generally considered by his contemporaries to be the most gifted poet of the period, limited himself to pure formalism which makes no impression whatsoever in the heart of the reader, appealing to the brain but not to the soul (see pp. 244f.). Even worse is the case of Ibn al-Wardī, whose poetry is “devoid of affection and feelings and inconsistent with the poetical spirit” (p. 247). It is frustrating to see Arab scholars imitating Western conceptions of aesthetics that never existed in the pre-modern Islamic world and that have become fairly outdated today in the West. At the turn of the century, Western culture displayed a considerable contempt for great segments of its own aesthetic tradition, denouncing everything that hinted of pure *ṭarab* (to use the Arabic term) which did not serve any ideological purpose as false and trivial. As this was the time of colonialism, these concepts were immediately exported to the colonized parts of the world. In the West, however, these concepts have been overcome or, at least, modified in the last decades. Ornament is no longer seen indiscriminately as a “crime” (as the architect Adolf Loos put it at the beginning of the century), and coloratura in music is no longer considered to be merely empty formulas that detract from its “real” essence, as is demonstrated with sufficient clearness by the Rossini revival in Europe and the United States. It was this new appreciation of

form and rhetoric that has enabled Western scholars to hold a less prejudiced view of classical Arabic poetry, whereas many colleagues from Arab countries still persist in a negative view of their own aesthetic tradition. Al-Afandī's book gives several examples of applying the standards of the age of colonialism, as can be seen not only from her negative attitude towards pre-modern Arabic aesthetic principles, but also from her moralistic approach to the homoerotic content of the bulk of Arabic Mamluk *ghazal*, and, finally, even from the book's cover illustration imitating the style of some bad "orientalist" extravagances of Ingres.

This approach prevents the author from noticing some of the most original achievements of the Mamluk *ghazal*. To mention only one example, the Mamluk period represents the apogee in the history of the Arabic epigram. This history starts in the ninth century with poets like Ibn al-Rūmī, and the popularity of epigrams rose from century to century. Never, however, were there composed so many and such original epigrams as during the age of the Mamluks. The most important collection of *ghazal* epigrams was assembled in the Mamluk period by Shams al-Dīn al-Nawājī (d. 859/1455). His book is entitled *Marāṭi' al-Ghizlān*,⁴ and is still in manuscript. It contains hundreds of epigrams, mostly from the Mamluk period, many of them from the six poets treated by al-Afandī. Al-Afandī, limiting herself to printed publications, does not know it. Had she known it, she would have disliked it anyway, since epigrams, which were supposed to be witty and pointed, are certainly not the right medium to express "true feelings." Blinded by her normative approach, al-Afandī does not even notice the existence of the epigram as a distinct formal model in Mamluk poetry. So, for example, Ibn al-Wardī, al-Afandī's most hated poet, was first and foremost a composer of epigrams, dozens of which were included in al-Nawājī's collection. Al-Afandī, however, does not recognize Ibn al-Wardī as a poet of epigrams, but, bewildered by the fact that most of his poems comprise only two lines (as epigrams usually do), ascribes this "defect" to "the weakness of Ibn al-Wardī's poetical spirit" (p. 248).

To do justice to al-Afandī's book, one should mention that it contains a lot of interesting and useful observations. The best chapter deals with the *ghazal* in "popular" forms, where al-Afandī talks about *mawāliyyā*, *qūbā*, *kān wa-kān* and *zajal* (pp. 151-69). Al-Afandī likes folk poetry (since she finds true feelings expressed in it) and pleads convincingly for a proper appreciation of its elegance and freshness. If only she would have been able to emancipate herself from aesthetic normativism as readily as she does from the linguistic normativism of disparaging poetry that uses dialect forms!

⁴Cf. Brockelmann, *GAL* 2:56

Al-Afandī's study is, as far as I can see, the first monographic study of love poetry in the Mamluk period. Unfortunately, the author is not able to free herself from the prejudices associated with the Mamluk period since the *nahḍah* period (most of them of Western origin). For her, the Mamluk period is a period of decadence, of economic decline, and of deplorable moral standards. Some gifted poets did their best to compose good poetry despite this sorry state of affairs. In her eyes, they did better the more their poetry complied with literary norms created in the modern West and borrowed by the Arab literati a century ago. Needless to say, this approach does not do justice to the rich and exciting tradition of love poetry in the Mamluk period which has to be measured by its own yardstick and which in turn has to be set in relation to its historical and cultural environment. In reviewing several contributions to the history of Mamluk poetry, Th. Emil Homerin came to the conclusion that "most Arab negative opinions [towards Mamluk poetry] appear to be the product of a pervasive reading of this poetry in terms of romantic notions of creativity that embrace the simple and emotional as indicative of personal experience, sincerity, and truth. Therefore, condemnation of Mamluk Arabic verse as decadent and superficial says more about modern tastes than it does about this poetry and its roles within Mamluk society."⁵ This is also the quintessence of what can be said about al-Afandī's book.

ŞALĀḤ AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD NAWWĀR, *al-Ṭawā'if al-Mughūliyah fī Mişr wa-Ta' thīrātuhā al-'Askarīyah wa-al-Siyāsīyah wa-al-Ijtimā'īyah wa-al-Lughawīyah wa-al-'Umrānīyah fī 'Aşr Dawlat al-Mamālīk al-Baḥrīyah* (658-783 H./1260-1382 M.) (Alexandria: Munsha'at al-Ma'ārif bi-al-Iskandarīyah, [1996?]). Pp. 160.

REVIEWED BY REUVEN AMITAI, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

From the title I expected this small volume to deal in a comprehensive way with the history and influence of the successive groups of Mongol immigrants—the so-called *wāfidīyah*, *musta'minah*, or *musta'minūnah*—who found refuge in the Mamluk Sultanate in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Although the subject has been studied in the short but seminal article by David Ayalon

⁵*Mamlūk Studies Review* 1 (1997): 71

almost fifty years ago,¹ and further discussed by him and other scholars within larger studies, there is certainly room for a monograph which presents the evidence in a systematic and detailed way, analyzing it in light of recent advances in Mamluk studies. From the outset, however, I must say that this book is a great disappointment. The actual events themselves are treated in a most cursory manner, and the author's thesis—that the influence of these Mongol refugees along with the large number of Mamluks of supposedly Mongol origin was a fundamental if not decisive one on the Mamluk Sultanate—is basically wrong.

This erroneous thesis is due to three major problems:

1) The author completely misunderstands the ethnic composition of the early Mamluk army and officer class. He is, of course, correct in asserting that the majority of the early Mamluks and certainly the Baḥrīyah regiment hailed from the Qipchaq Turkish tribes who lived in the steppes of southern Russian. His mistake is to assume that since the Mongols conquered the Qipchaq steppes around 1240, the Qipchaqs and Mongols should be equated. Thus, whenever the sources mention the importance and prominence of both individual Qipchaqī Turks or these Turks as a group within the Mamluk Sultanate, the author takes it for granted that these were Mongols. The equating of Mongols and Qipchaqs, almost invariably unjustified, is found on virtually every page of the book. To the author's mind, then, the importance of Qipchaq Turks in the early Sultanate means only the predominant position of Mongols, and thus the extensive Mongol influence on the Mamluk state. This, however, is an untenable position. There is no denying that among the continuous batches of young Mamluks from the Golden Horde there were some of Mongol origin, or Mongolized Turks, or even Turkified Mongols, but this is still a far cry from all Qipchaqs—the dominant ethnic group in the early Sultanate—being Mongols or bearers of Mongol influence.²

2) The importance of the Mongol *wāfidīyah* has been greatly exaggerated by the author. Without negating the military qualities of these *wāfidīs*, Ayalon has already shown in his article published in 1951 their inferior position in the Mamluk military society, albeit with some notable exceptions in the early fourteenth century. (These, by the way, are barely mentioned by the author). For Baybars's reign, the decisive period when the supposedly Mongol influence was at its height, Ayalon's suggestion can be easily strengthened by examining some evidence from Ibn Shaddād al-Ḥalabī, who writes that among some 3,000 Mongol *wāfidīyah* who arrived during the time of Baybars, "he made some of them *ṭablkhānah* amirs (i.e.,

¹"The Wafidiya in the Mamluk Kingdom," *Islamic Culture* 25 (1951): 89-104 (reprinted in David Ayalon, *Studies on the Mamluks of Egypt (1250-1517)* (London, 1977).

²This whole matter is dealt in some detail by David Ayalon in "The Great *Yāsa* of Chingiz Khān: A Re-Examination," *Studia Islamica* 36 (1972): 126-28.

amirs of 40), and others amirs of 10 to 20.³ There is no reason to assume that anything higher than the middling rank of amir of forty was granted even to Geremün, who led the second group of some 1,300 *wāfidīyah*, which arrived in the Sultanate in 661/1263, and whom one contemporary writer called a commander of a *tümen*, i.e., a unit of 10,000 men.⁴ As Ayalon pointed out, there is no evidence that any *wāfidī* leader received the rank of amir of one hundred in these first decades of Mamluk rule. There is certainly no textual basis for the author's conclusion (p. 31) that Baybars gave the senior Mongol *wāfidīs* commissions of amir of one hundred. Another indication of the secondary status of even the senior *wāfidīyah* is seen in the allocations of private land granted by Baybars in 663/1265, after the conquest of Arsūf and Caesarea. Only two of the sixty-one officers named were of Mongol *wāfidī* origin (one of them the above-mentioned Geremün).⁵ The Mongol refugees—as a group or as individuals—do not appear to have had a particularly prominent position in the early Sultanate, and it is unlikely that they were a source of overwhelming influence on it.

3) The author virtually ignores all that has been written by modern scholars on the *wāfidīyah* and Mongol influence on the Sultanate. Granted, David Ayalon, tastelessly referred to as "the Jewish historian," is mentioned in passing in a note in the author's introduction (p. 2), as is his famous 1951 article, but there is nothing in the book to indicate that it was consulted.⁶ Even in that preliminary overview, Ayalon had discerned the limited role and influence of the *wāfidīyah*, Mongol and otherwise, in the Mamluk military society. No mention whatsoever is made of Ayalon's later study of Mongol influence on the Sultanate, "The Great *Yāsa* of Chingiz Khān: A Re-Examination," which appeared in four parts in *Studia Islamica* in the early 1970s,⁷ and was later reprinted in his third *Variorum* volume, *Outsiders in the Lands of Islam* (London, 1988). Ayalon there dealt in a most cogent way with the contention that there was a decisive Mongol influence,

³Ibn Shaddād al-Ḥalabī, *Ta'rikh al-Malik al-Zāhir*, ed. Aḥmad Ḥuṭayṭ (Wiesbaden, 1983), 337. This passage is cited with some changes by Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah fī Mulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhirah* (Cairo, 1930-56), 7:190. Later, Nawwār cites this latter passage (p. 59), but only to give the total number of Mongol *wāfidīyah*, and conveniently leaves out the information regarding the low ranks granted to their chiefs.

⁴Shāfi' ibn 'Alī, *al-Faḍl al-Ma'thūr min Sīrat al-Sulṭān al-Malik al-Manṣūr*, MS Bodleian Marsh 424, fol. 4a.

⁵Reuven Amitai-Preiss, "The Mamluk Officer Class during the Reign of Sultan Baybars," in *War and Society in the Eastern Mediterranean, 7th-15th Centuries*, ed. Yaacov Lev (Leiden, 1997), 284, 295, 296.

⁶L. A. Mayer, Ayalon's teacher and professor of Islamic archeology at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, is misleadingly described (p. 80), as "the German historian."

⁷See vol. 33 (1991): 99-140; 34 (1971): 151-80; 36 (1972): 113-58; 38 (1973), 107-56.

particularly of the *Yasa* (the body of Mongol law attributed to Chinggis Khan), on the Mamluk military society in Egypt and Syria, and showed that this influence was much more limited than had been previously thought. His most decisive proof was the demonstration that the famous evidence by al-Maqrīzī in his *Khiṭaṭ* on the adoption of the *Yasa* by the Mamluks was a deliberate falsification. In addition, Ayalon showed that Ibn Taghrībirdī's well-known passage on Baybars's adoption of Mongol institutions also deserved little credence. Ayalon, it should be emphasized, did not deny any Mongol influence, but showed that it was restricted in scope. It is, of course, Nawwār's right to adopt a different position towards the credibility of these passages (and thus draw dissimilar conclusions on Mongol influence), but the normal approach would be to discuss Ayalon's work, try to disprove it, and demonstrate the veracity of this evidence, not just to assume so in the face of what has become the accepted position among historians of the early Sultanate. It is worth mentioning that Nawwār only fleetingly cites A. N. Poliak, and then only through the work of another modern Arab historian (p. 80 in the note), in spite of the fact that Poliak's work (preceding that of Ayalon) attempted to show the important role of Mongol influence on the early Sultanate.⁸

Throughout the book I was struck by the frequency of unsupported statements, let alone those which were wrong. I will mention just a few. First, it is stated that Baybars himself was raised according to the *Yasa* (p. 61). This, however, was unlikely: Baybars was born in the 1220s in the steppe area north of the Black Sea. Around 1241-42, his tribe fled to Anatolia, where he was taken into slavery. Since the Mongols only gained control over this area in 1238, one wonders how formative the *Yasa* was on this young Qipchaqi Turk. Second, Quṭuz is called a Mongol Qipchaq (p. 23).⁹ This is one of countless examples of the arbitrary, and unjustified, juxtaposition of these two ethnic terms. It is interesting to note that some sources report that Quṭuz himself claimed he was descended from the Khwārazm-Shāhs;¹⁰ any Mongolness that Quṭuz was supposed to have had does not seem to have left much of an imprint on his own sense of identity. Third, the author states that the Mamluks did not forget the important role played by the group of Mongols which Berke Khan sent *before* the battle of 'Ayn Jālūt at that battle (p. 24). I do not have a clue as to the possible basis for such an assumption. Finally, it is suggested that the letter sent by the Īlkhān Tegüder Aḥmad was sent in Mongolian, and only upon reaching the Sultanate was it translated into Arabic (pp. 137, 139). This, it is

⁸On p. 117, the author claims that the Mamluk state was a sort of branch of the Golden Horde, an assertion eerily reminiscent of the argument found in A. N. Poliak, "Le caractère colonial de l'État mameluk dans ses rapports avec la Horde d'or," *Revue des études islamiques* 9 (1935): 213-48.

⁹On p. 95, Quṭuz is mistakenly called the *khushdāsh* of Baybars.

¹⁰Robert Irwin, *The Middle East in the Middle Ages: The Early Mamluk Sultanate 1250-1382* (London, 1986), 23.

suggested, shows how widespread was the knowledge of the Mongolian language in the Mamluk Sultanate. In fact there is nothing to indicate that this letter was sent in anything but Arabic. When the Mongols did dispatch a letter in Mongolian to the Mamluk court, this was noted by the sources.¹¹ Further proof of this letter originally being written in Arabic is that identical texts of its contents are found in both Mamluk sources and the pro-Mongol Persian Waṣṣāf. It seems likely that the latter saw a copy of the Arabic letter from before it was sent, rather than a hypothetical Mamluk translation into Arabic from a supposed Mongolian original that found its way back to the Ilkhanate.

To be fair, the book has some value. For example, there is a thoughtful discussion of some of the reasons behind the large-scale trade in *mamlūks* from the Golden Horde to the Sultanate (pp. 20-21), and the section on the influence of Mongol sartorial practices on the Mamluks is interesting (pp. 71-79). But there is no getting around the unconvincing way in which the book's main thesis is presented. If one ignores previous scholarship, exaggerates in a most excessive way the role of the *wāfiḍīyah* in the Sultanate, and equates Mongols and Qipchaq Turks, let alone everything Mongol and Turkish, then one is surely bound to find decisive Mongol influence on the Mamluk state in the military, political, cultural, and even linguistic realms. I, for one, was not convinced.

MUḤAMMAD AL-ḤABĪB AL-HĪLAH, *al-Tārīkh wa-al-Mu'arrikhūn bi-Makkah min al-Qarn al-Thālith al-Hijrī ilá al-Qarn al-Thālithah 'Asharah: Jam' wa-'Arḍ wa-Ta'rīf* (London: Al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation, 1994). Pp. 518.

REVIEWED BY FRÉDÉRIC BAUDEN, Université de Liège

The work at hand belongs to the type of study that flourished mainly after the publication of the first volumes of the *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* by Carl Brockelmann—that is, the bio-bibliographical analysis of the historiography of a certain area in the Muslim world at a particular time. Similar works were published for Andalusia by Francisco Pons Boigues,¹ for Morocco by Évariste

¹¹Waṣṣāf, *Ta'rīkh-i Waṣṣāf (Tajziyat al-Amṣār wa-Tazjiyat al-A'ṣār)* (Bombay, 1269 H./1852-53; repr. Tehran, 1338/1959-60), 113-18.

¹Francisco Pons Boigues, *Ensayo bio-bibliográfico sobre los historiadores y geógrafos arábigo-españoles* (Madrid, 1898).

Levi-Provençal,² for Tunisia by Ahmed Abdesselem,³ for Yemen by Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid⁴ and, finally, for al-Shām by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid.⁵ The first aim of these works has always been to give new impetus to historical research by offering researchers compendiums listing the available sources in published or manuscript form for the defined area.

As far as the Hijaz is concerned, and more particularly Mecca, one can only agree with the author's statement (p. 10) that no wide-ranging study on the historiographical school of Mecca has been completed until now.⁶ One may even go further, stressing the fact that scholars specializing in this field have had to wait until recent years for the appearance of a surge of text editions dealing with the history of Mecca.

Indeed, if we glance at the record, we notice that, with the exception of some worthless attempts, the first scholar whose attention was drawn to this field was Heinrich Ferdinand Wüstenfeld, who devoted several volumes to the edition of extracts of basic texts such as *Akhhbār Makkah* by al-Azraqī (d. 244/858), *Ta'rikh Makkah* by al-Fākihī (ca. 272/885), and *Shifā' al-Gharām* by al-Fāsī (d. 832/1429).⁷ This first attempt failed to generate any interest among Orientalists.

In the Middle East, we have had to await the second half of this century to witness the appearance of the first editions of historical texts dealing with the history of the Holy City: for the complete edition of *Shifā' al-Gharām* by al-Fāsī in 1956 and for the issue of the first volume of *al-'Iqd al-Thamīn* by the same author in 1959 (the last volume was issued in 1969). These editions may be considered the first of a stream of editions of historical texts about Mecca, several of which were edited as dissertations and, unfortunately, remain unpublished.⁸

²Évariste Lévi-Provençal, *Les historiens des Chorfa: Essai sur la littérature historique et biographique au Maroc du XVIe au XXe siècle* (Paris, 1922).

³Ahmed Abdesselem, *Les historiens tunisiens des XVII^e, XVIII^e et XIX^e siècles: Essai d'histoire culturelle* (Paris, 1973).

⁴Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid, *Sources pour l'histoire du Yémen à l'époque musulmane* (Cairo, 1974).

⁵Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid, *Mu'jam al-Mu'arrikhīn al-Dimashqīyīn* (Beirut, 1398/1978).

⁶We should emphasize that another book rather close to this subject, although the approach is less scientific, was published in the same year as al-Hīlah's: 'Ātiq ibn Ghayth al-Bilādī, *Nashr al-Rayyāḥīn fī Tārikh al-Balad al-Amīn: Tarājim Mu'arrikhī Makkah wa-Jughrāfiyihā 'alā Marr al-'Uṣūr* (Mecca, 1415/1994).

⁷Heinrich Ferdinand Wüstenfeld, *Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka* (Leipzig, 1858-61).

⁸'Abd al-Qādir al-Ṭabarī's "Nash'at al-Sulāfah" (d. 1033/1624), ed. Ḥamad al-'Uraynān (University of St. Andrews, 1973); 'Alī al-Ṭabarī's "al-Araj al-Miskī" (d. 1070/1660), ed. Muḥammad ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Ṭāsān (University of Edinburgh, 1979); Muḥammad al-Ṭabarī's "Ithāf Fuḍalā' al-Zamān" (d. 1173/1760), ed. Nāṣir al-Barakātī (University of St. Andrews, 1972).

The last to be published was probably *Ithāf al-Warā* by al-Najm Ibn Fahd (d. 885/1480), edited between 1983 and 1989.

Anyone wishing to publish an Arabic text knows that the inevitable starting point must be Brockelmann's *GAL* and its partial supplement, that is, Sezgin's *GAS*. Nevertheless, since their issue, several catalogues of manuscripts have appeared, supplementing these two essential works. In order to avoid neglecting any manuscript, a thorough survey of the sources requires the investigation of catalogues. Al-Hīlah's work happily completes both these sources for Mecca.

By offering researchers a study that includes most of the historians who were born or resided in Mecca, al-Hīlah facilitates forthcoming research in this area and, in particular, serves as a general survey which may help to define a Meccan historical school.

The period in question (from the third to the tenth century A.H.) might appear too broad for the study to be complete. However, the author does not pretend to be exhaustive (see p. 11, note 1) by invoking the fact that numerous texts which may include supplementary information remain unpublished. He invites readers to inform him of missing information; this may appear to some as a weakness.

The reader will perhaps wonder why no explanation is given in the introduction justifying the choice of the period in question. Why did he not take into account the authors preceding the third century?⁹ Perhaps because most of the works dating to this time have not been preserved?

In his survey, al-Hīlah has been able to identify 187 Meccan historians whom he orders chronologically according to their death dates. To perform this selection, he considers as Meccan all those who were born in the Holy City, or who went there in order to live permanently, so that they have been described by historians as "Makkī." For this, he mainly relies on *al-'Iqd al-Thamīn* by al-Fāsī, *Ithāf al-Warā* by al-Najm Ibn Fahd and *al-Mukhtaṣar min Kitāb Nashr al-Nūr wa-al-Zahr fī Tarājim Afādil Makkah min al-Qarn al-Āshir ilá al-Qarn al-Rābi'ah* 'Asharah by 'Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad Mirdād (d. 1343/1954). However, this method produces some inconsistencies. One will be astonished to find a record of 'Umar ibn Aḥmad al-Shammā' (d. 936/1529) from Aleppo, who resided in Mecca in 916 and in 927, but nothing about Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, who resided at Mecca from 727 to 730 and whose travel account is an excellent source for the history of the Holy City at that time. Such instances are common, notably for Egyptian historians (e.g., al-Maqrīzī).

The total number of works for which the author has found any trace amounts to 846. Yet al-Hīlah notes that only ninety-eight titles are available in printed editions, which is not a reasonable sample for such a large number of works. As

⁹It seems that *Faḍā'il Makkah* by al-Ḥumaydī (d. 219/834) has escaped the author's attention.

for the remaining titles, only 245, according to al-Hīlah, are still extant in manuscript form. The terrible conclusion is that 505 titles have not survived.

Al-Hīlah follows a scheme that he repeats for each author: he starts by giving a short biography of the author, mentioning also his most important non-historical works. This biography is followed by the chief bibliographical references. Then he lists the author's historical works alphabetically. Al-Hīlah takes into account not only those works ordinarily considered historical, but also texts from which historical information may be gleaned. These include law texts by *fuqahā'* (*fatwās* and works dealing with pilgrimage ritual) which remain, in al-Hīlah's eyes, the best sources on culture.

For each work, al-Hīlah gives, insofar as manuscripts have been preserved, the contents and sometimes even the table of contents. Al-Hīlah quotes those manuscripts for which he has found a reference in the many catalogues he has consulted, by adding the name of the library, the shelf mark and, if possible, the date of copying. An important place is also reserved for quotations of the works by later authors, and most of the time he manages to give the pages where these are to be found. If the work has been published, he mentions the various editions, and expresses an opinion on the scientific value of these and their historical importance. All of this will surely delight researchers.

Because some Meccan families have been rendered illustrious by several famous representatives, the author strives to devote to them several lines and to establish chronologically a list of the representatives of a given family (Banū Fahd, pp. 99-108; Banū 'Allān, pp. 311-12; Banū al-'Ujaymī, pp. 367-70; Banū Dahhān, p. 397). But al-Hīlah does not explain his criteria for doing so, and some families deserving of similar treatment are ignored. We particularly note the Banū al-Ṭabarī¹⁰ (of whom seven representatives are mentioned in al-Hīlah's book, however), the Banū Ḥahīrah, the Banū Nuwayrī, and the Banū al-Qaṣṭallānī.

The author begins his work (p. 15) with the famous al-Azraqī (d. 244/858) and ends it (p. 423) with Abū Bakr al-Zur'ah al-Makkī (fl. 13th/19th c.). The book also includes a bibliography, divided into two parts, listing manuscript (p. 427) and printed sources (p. 440), as well as valuable indexes of authors' names

¹⁰For a genealogical tree of this family, from the end of the 12th c. up to the end of the 15th c., see Frédéric Bauden, *Les Ṭabariyya: Histoire d'une importante famille de la Mecque (fin XII^e-fin XV^e s.)*, in *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk Eras*, Proceedings of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd International Colloquiums organized at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven in May 1992, 1993, and 1994, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, vol. 73, ed. Urbain Vermeulen and Daniel De Smet (Leuven, 1995), 253-66. The author of this review is currently preparing a study of the whole Ṭabarī family in Mecca from the end of the 12th c. up to the end of the 18th c., which will contain a complete genealogical tree and will study the family's relationships with other Meccan families.

(p. 460) and titles of quoted works (p. 473). However, no reference is made in the bibliography to the manuscript catalogues consulted by the author. The table of contents is at the end. A few pictures are scattered within the text of samples of historians' writings mentioned by al-Hīlah.

The main value of this work is, no doubt, the mention made by al-Hīlah of the manuscripts held in Mecca that represent a significant percentage of those that have been preserved. As a matter of fact, he was able to study these manuscripts because he is Professor of History at the Jāmi'at Umm al-Qurá in Mecca and is the author of a catalogue of historical manuscripts kept in one of the libraries of the Ḥaram.¹¹ As for the manuscripts preserved in other parts of the world, one must be more cautious. There are just a few quotations of Brockelmann's *GAL* and Sezgin's *GAS*, although the author had at his disposal the Arabic versions of both. Indeed, the author does not seem to have a fluent knowledge of European languages, except perhaps English. This is unfortunately apparent in the European names and titles: Wustenfeld instead of Wüstenfeld (p. 17, and *passim*), Ahlward instead of Ahlwardt (p. 25), Tubengen instead of Tübingen (p. 34), Hands Chriften (read Handschriften) by Edwald Warner (read Ewald Wagner) (p. 63), Mignana instead of Mingana (p. 69), and so on. These mistakes are minor compared to other more serious ones. He constantly refers to the Berlin catalogue of Arabic manuscripts, compiled by Ahlwardt, but most of these references are false, and this is due to his misunderstanding of the German language. He does not seem to have understood that Ahlwardt was citing, at the end of each section, a list of titles belonging to the same subject, relying on the information in Ḥājji Khalīfah's *Kashf al-Zunūn*. Al-Hīlah mistakenly understood these titles to be preserved in Berlin. Thus the following references are erroneous and must be corrected: p. 17 (MS Berlin 9751 does not contain *Akhbār Makkah* by al-Azraqī, but rather *Zubdat al-A'māl* by al-Isfarā'inī [see p. 75]), pp. 41, 48, 94, 327 (Berlin 6073 is not a MS), pp. 55, 58 (Berlin 5536/10 is not a MS), p. 118 (MS Berlin 9873 is not dated 1850, but ca. 900/1494), p. 146 (Berlin 9633 is not a MS), p. 165 (Berlin 9877 refers to two copies, and not just one).

In the same way, the author devotes, in reference to no. 141, a record to a certain Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad al-Makkī, about whom he says that he was alive in 1117/1705. According to al-Hīlah, this individual is the author of *Majallat al-Ḥunafā'* for which he refers to MS Berlin 9658. He acknowledges that he has found no information relating to the life of this author, and he mentions also that he relies only on Ahlwardt. If we go back to Ahlwardt's work (vol. 9, p. 202), however, we ascertain that this is not the case. Ahlwardt simply says that the

¹¹*Handlist of Manuscripts in the Library of Makkah al-Mukarramah: History Section* (London, 1994).

author's name is missing in the manuscript and adds: "Auf der Innenseite des Vorderdeckels steht als solcher (nebst Angabe des Titels) in ganz neuer Schrift Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad al-Makkī. Diese Angabe geht aber auf den Abschreiber: der ungenannte Verfasser ist jüngerer Zeitgenosse des Majd al-dīn Abū al-Ṭāhir al-Fīrūzābādī, [. . .], lebt also um 850/1446." Thus, al-Hīlah has gone astray and regarded this copyist, who is unknown, as the author. It may be added that there is another copy of this work in Paris (MS Ar. 1571).

Because this reviewer has been working on a Meccan *faqīh*, al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī,¹² who is mentioned by al-Hīlah (no. 24), an assessment of the accuracy of information gathered by al-Hīlah can readily be made. Al-Hīlah mentions (p. 54) that an *ijāzah* of al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī, dated 640 A.H., is preserved in MS Leiden Or. 2544. This is absolutely not true: a *samā'*, dated 604 A.H. (note that al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī was born in 615 A.H.), is found on fol. 55b, but nothing else is indicated. However, an *ijāzah* of al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī is held in the Maktabat al-Asad in Damascus, MS 3857 (on fol. 71a), and is dated 685 A.H. Al-Hīlah specifies that *Istiḳṣā' al-Bayān* is MS Berlin 5536, being thus a *unicum*, although Ahlwardt just mentions the title, as noted earlier in this review. If al-Hīlah sticks to the rule he has defined in his introduction, and since he mentions two works by al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī consisting of *fatwās*, we wonder why there is no mention of his *Sharḥ al-Tanbīh*, which has not been preserved but which seems to have contained important historical information about Mecca since al-Fāsī quoted it on numerous occasions in his *Shifā' al-Gharām*, as did al-Samhūdī in his *Wafā' al-Wafā'*. On the other hand, we do not understand why he mentions his *Kitāb al-Ghinā' wa-Taḥrīmuhu* (?) for which he says that a *unicum* exists in Berlin (no. 5536/11). Once again, this is erroneous. Comparing our census of the manuscripts preserved for each of al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī's works with al-Hīlah's, we are struck by the difference. For *Khulāṣat Sīrat Sayyid al-Bashar* (al-Hīlah's no. 4, p. 55), four manuscripts are listed as opposed to the twenty-nine we have found. *Khayr al-Qirā fī Ziyārat Umm al-Qurā* (no. 5, p. 56) is identical with no. 9 (p. 57), while the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyah manuscript is not dated to 781 A.H., but was copied before 881 A.H. (three editions were published, all of which are unknown to al-Hīlah). For *Dhakhā'ir al-'Uqbā fī Manāqib Dhawī al-Qurbā* (no. 6, p. 56), four manuscripts are listed as opposed to twenty-seven that we have found; for *al-Riyāḍ al-Naḍrah*

¹²Frédéric Bauden, *Les trésors de la postérité ou les fastes des proches parents du Prophète (Kitāb Daḥā'ir al-'Uqbā fī Manāqib Dawī al-Qurbā) de Muḥibb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭabarī al-Makkī (ob. 694/1295): Édition critique accompagnée d'une traduction annotée et d'une étude sur la vie et l'œuvre de l'auteur* (Université de Liège, 1996). The Arabic text and the French translation will probably be published by the IFEAD in Damascus. See also on this author, Frédéric Bauden, "al-Ṭabarī, Aḥmad ibn 'Abd Allāh," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 10.

fī Faḍā'il al-'Asharah (no. 7, p. 56), eleven manuscripts are listed as opposed to forty; for *al-Simṭ al-Thamīn* (no. 8, p. 57), two manuscripts are listed as opposed to fourteen; al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī's *'Awāṭif al-Nuṣrah* (no. 11, p. 57), is preserved in a *unicum* (Princeton, 2275, dated 785 A. H.) that al-Hīlah does not mention. Finally, we do not understand what al-Hīlah's aim is when he limits himself to mentioning just a few manuscripts, as these are not even the most important ones, especially in terms of date of copying. Because a comparison of this material with ours produced this result, we actually fear that this might be only the tip of the iceberg. And our fear also seems to be confirmed by the following corrections and additions which may be added to the preceding remarks:

p. 20: *Kitāb Mizāj al-Nabī* (read *Mizāḥ*, cf. *GAS* I, p. 318).

p. 20: *al-Muwaffaqiyāt* consisting of nineteen parts, but only parts fifteen to nineteen are preserved in two manuscripts: the one quoted by al-Hīlah and another one in Gotha (Ar. 76, cf. *GAS* I, p. 318). The following edition of this text, based on both manuscripts, seems to have escaped al-Hīlah's attention: *al-Akhhbār al-Muwaffaqiyāt*, ed. S. Makkī al-'Ānī, *Dirāsāt Dīwān al-Awqāf, Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-Islāmī*, no. 7 (Baghdad: Maktabat al-'Ānī, [1392/1972]), 719 pp.; reprint (Qom: Manshūrāt al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, 1996).

p. 25: There is another copy of al-'Uqaylī's *Kitāb al-Du'afā' al-Kabīr*, which is preserved in the Chester Beatty Library, no. 3783 (mentioned in *GAS*).

p. 57: There are three editions of al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī's *Ṣafwat al-Qirā'*.¹³

p. 57 : al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī's *'Awāṭif al-Nuṣrah* is preserved in a *unicum* (Princeton University Library, MS 2275).

p. 59: al-Jamāl al-Ṭabarī's *al-Tashwīq ilā al-Bayt al-'Atīq* has been edited.¹⁴

p. 153: Richard Mortel¹⁵ refers to another manuscript of al-Najm Ibn Fahd's *al-Durr al-Kamīn* (King Saud University Libraries, Riyadh, MS *fā'* 113/2).

p. 188: al-Hīlah mentions no manuscript for al-Shammā's *al-Durar al-Multaqaṭah* although we found a copy of it in the Chester Beatty Library (MS 3400), where it is entitled *al-Durrah al-Nayyirah min al-Riyāḍ al-'Asharah*.

¹³Ed. Riḍwān Muḥammad Riḍwān (Cairo, 1354/1935), under the title *Ḥijjat al-Muṣṭafā'*. The second was also published under the title, *Ḥijjat al-Muṣṭafā'* (Cairo, [1981?]). The third was published by Dār al-Ḥadīth in Cairo in 1988, under the same title as the first two (pp. 37-107), together with Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī's *Quwwat al-Ḥajjāj li-'Umūm Maghfirat al-Ḥujjāj* (pp. 7-36), and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzīyah's *Awhām al-'Ulamā' fī Ḥijjat al-Nabī* (pp. 109-121).

¹⁴Ed. 'Abd al-Sattār Abū Ghuddah, under the title *al-Tashwīq ilā Ḥajj al-Bayt al-'Atīq* (Cairo, 1413/1993).

¹⁵"Madrasas in Mecca during the Medieval Period: A Descriptive Study Based on Literary Sources," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 60 (1997): 246, note 95.

p. 201: Jār Allāh Ibn Fahd's *Taḥqīq al-Ṣafā' fī Tarājim Banī al-Wafā'* is preserved in a *unicum* in the Chester Beatty Library (MS 4868) and it was transcribed from the author's autograph.

p. 233: Al-Hīlah quotes Sylvestre de Sacy's edition and French translation of al-Jazīrī's *Umdat al-Ṣafwah fī Hill al-Qahwah*, but not Antoine Galland's nonliteral translation.¹⁶

p. 257: There are two other copies (Princeton University Library, MSS 2883 and 4713) of *Tuḥfat al-Ṭālib bi-Ma'rīfat man Yantasibu ilā 'Abd Allāh wa-Abī Ṭālib*.

p. 260: another copy of *al-Risālah al-Maqāmīyah fī Faḍl al-Maqām wa-al-Bayt al-Ḥarām* is to be found in the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyah, MS 8304 ḥā'.¹⁷

p. 299: The number of pages (352) given for the 1316 A.H. edition of *'Uyūn al-Masā'il min A'yān al-Rasā'il* should read 252.

p. 300: The information given for 'Abd al-Qādir al-Ṭabarī's *Kashf al-Niqāb 'an Ansāb al-Arba'ah al-Aqtāb* must be supplemented by the following: This work was indeed published in 1309 A.H., but within *Majmū' Jalīl wa-Mu'allaf 'Adīm: al-Mathīl Mushtamil 'alā Khams Rasā'il 'Āliyat al-Isnād 'Aẓīmat al-Imdād* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-'Āmirah al-Sharafīyah, 1309), 119 pp.

p. 314: It is said that Muḥammad 'Alī ibn Muḥammad 'Allān used to copy manuscripts to earn his living. Evidence of this information may be found in the Maktabat al-Asad, Damascus, MS 4808, which is a copy of al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī's *Dhakhā'ir al-'Uqbā'*, where it is to be found on fol. 1: *min kutub al-faqīr ilā Allāh subḥānahu wa-ta'ālā Muḥammad 'Alī ibn Muḥammad 'Allān al-Ṣiddīqī al-Shāfi'ī khādīm al-ḥadīth al-sharīf bi-al-ḥaram al-makkī*.

p. 385: there are two more copies in the Leiden University Library of al-Sinjārī's *Manā'ih al-Karam* (MSS 7018-19).¹⁸

It must be clear that these additions and corrections are those detected upon the first reading of this book. There is no doubt that further readings might reveal additional shortcomings.

To conclude, al-Hīlah's book remains a good, first step towards the history and the historiography of Mecca that will be useful to students and scholars specializing in this field, especially as a compilation of the manuscripts kept in Mecca and Medina and the contents of published editions. Be that as it may, it must be kept in mind that nobody should rely only on this book in light of the inconsistencies and deficiencies revealed in this review.

¹⁶*De l'origine et du progrès du café, sur un manuscrit arabe de la Bibliothèque du Roy* (Caen and Paris, 1699; reprint, Paris, 1992).

¹⁷See Fu'ād Sayyid, *Fihrist al-Makḥṭūṭāt: Nashrah bi-al-Makḥṭūṭāt allatī Iqtanathā al-Dār min sanah 1936-1955*, 2:186.

¹⁸See P. Voorhoeve, *Handlist of Arabic Manuscripts in the Library of the University of Leiden and Other Collections in the Netherlands*, 182.

AḤMAD IBN ‘ALĪ AL-MAQRĪZĪ, *Durar al-‘Uqūd al-Farīdah fī Tarājim al-A‘yān al-Mufīdah: Qiṭ‘ah minhu*. Edited by ‘Adnān Darwīsh and Muḥammad al-Miṣrī. (Damascus: Wizārat al-Thaqāfah, 1995). Two volumes.

REVIEWED BY DONALD P. LITTLE, McGill University

As Claude Cahen, Li Guo, and I have had occasion to note before, publication of Mamluk texts and historiographical studies has been erratic, with preference often shown to derivative over contemporary sources and with instances of plagiarism and incompetence. The work here under review provides still another example of scholarly caprice.

As is well known, al-Maqrīzī supplemented his famous annalistic and topographical works on Islamic Egypt with biographical dictionaries; indeed, he undertook to do so with at least two such projects. His *Kitāb al-Muqaffā al-Kabīr* was to consist of biographies of famous men from many professions who had flourished in Egypt since the Muslim conquest. According to Ibn Taghrībirdī, these would have filled more than eighty volumes, or sixteen according to al-Sakhāwī.¹ Surviving portions have been edited and published recently in Beirut.² A more specialized work, *Durar al-‘Uqūd*, prepared in the tradition of al-Ṣafadī’s *A‘yān al-‘Aṣr*, was devoted to biographies of al-Maqrīzī’s eminent contemporaries. The rationale for such a book the author set forth rhetorically in the preface:

When I was still close to the age of fifty I had lost most of my friends and intimates. My grief was intense at their loss, and my life went sour thereafter. So I consoled myself with meeting them in remembrance and compensated for not seeing them by listening to reports about them, dictating my information about them in this book, taking pleasure from commemorating them. . . . Then I saw fit to compile the reports about those whom I had encountered, whether in absence or in person, Egyptian or foreign, recording news of kings, amirs, notable scribes and viziers, transmitters of tradition and legists, scholars and poets, both famous or renowned,

¹Ayman Fu’ād Sayyid, ed., *Le manuscrit autographe d’al-Mawā’ iz wa-al-I’tibār fī Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār* (London, 1995), 50.

²Edited by Muḥammad al-Ya‘lāwī, 8 vols. (Beirut, 1991).

whether men of worldly affairs or seekers of the next world, beginning with the year 760.³

According to Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid, *Durar al-'Uqūd* contained about 666 biographies,⁴ of which the present edition, a fragment, contains 382, all of which cover a person whose name begins either with *alif* or *'ayn*. Oddly enough, although most of the biographees qualify as al-Maqrīzī's contemporaries, a few do not. Perhaps these were intended for *al-Muqaffā'*?

Be that as it may, this edition by Darwīsh and al-Miṣrī is based on a *musawwadah*, a rough draft, in the author's hand, with notes and additions from others. Accordingly, many of the biographies are brief and incomplete, with blanks to have been filled in later. But some are fairly long, complete with quotations of poetry. But what is unique about this edition is the fact that the editors do not reveal the identity of the manuscript they used and refer to it only as "the manuscript which we have relied upon in 177 folios."⁵ With a truly bizarre twist, they present a cropped facsimile of the title page which eliminates the bottom of the page containing the identifying seal of ownership. This despite the fact that there are known to be only two surviving copies, one in the Gotha collection in Germany, and the second, an apparently complete, privately owned copy in Mosul, which its owner has so far declined to publish or share.⁶ Darwīsh and al-Miṣrī were obviously unaware of the latter copy since they express the hope of finding a complete copy some day.⁷ Stranger still, three hundred selected biographies were edited and published in Beirut in 1992 with the title *al-Maqrīzī wa-Kitābuhu Durar al-'Uqūd al-Farīdah fī Tarājim al-A'yān al-Mufīdah*, edited by Muḥammad Kamāl al-Dīn 'Izz al-Dīn 'Alī. It is not for me to speculate as to why Darwīsh and al-Miṣrī saw fit to suppress identification of the Gotha manuscript and neglected to cite the Beirut edition; nor do I know the basis of 'Alī's selection of the biographies he included or omitted since he does not himself state this criterion. Suffice it to say that we now have two independent editions of a surviving autograph fragment of *Durar al-'Uqūd*, one apparently complete, the other obviously not. Of the two, the Damascus edition is clearly the more valuable, especially since the editors have provided copious vowels to the text as well as detailed footnotes. On the other hand, 'Alī has written a valuable introduction describing al-Maqrīzī's methodology as a biographer, whereas the Syrian editors were satisfied for the most part with

³Darwīsh and al-Miṣrī, ed., *Durar al-'Uqūd*, 1:50-51.

⁴Sayyid, ed., *Le manuscrit*, 52.

⁵Darwīsh and al-Miṣrī, ed., *Durar al-'Uqūd*, 1:36.

⁶Sayyid, ed., *Le manuscrit*, 52.

⁷Darwīsh and al-Miṣrī, ed., *Durar al-'Uqūd*, 1:37.

repeating banalities about Arabic biographical literature in general. Neither edition contains a bibliography. As to the value of the source itself for historians, it would seem from the footnotes in both editions that biographies of practically all the subjects are available in other sources, some of which show signs of borrowing from *Durar al-'Uqūd*, so that with the exception of unique biographies, if such there be, the main value of *Durar al-'Uqūd* may turn out to be historiographical.

Strange are the ways of Mamlukologists.

DORIS BEHRENS-ABOUSEIF, *Mamluk and Post-Mamluk Metal Lamps* (Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1995). Pp. 107.

REVIEWED BY NUHA N. N. KHOURY, University of California at Santa Barbara

Objects of illumination, lighting devices, or, simply, lamps perform the same function today as they always have: to "magically" transform a patch of darkness into light. Beyond their basic, necessary function, all lamps—from the most humble portable earthenware oil-and-wick holders to the translucent "cloth" and paper lanterns such as appear in Timurid miniatures, to the plain and enameled glass, glazed ceramic and more labor intensive metal ones—are compound devices in which a light-giving substance is combined with a "holder" and/or body that is capable of becoming a decorative object. Lamps are eminently useful objects for the archeologist and the cultural historian; they provide information on architectural and urban activities, on technologies, materials, and decorative techniques, and, in the case of Islamic ones especially, often also elicit discussions of religious and philosophical views pertaining to light and its metaphorical or allegorical applications.

The Mamluks—or, at least, a particular sector of Mamluk society—favored two general types of suspended lamps: the well-known enameled glass ones that are occasionally inscribed with the Verse of Light, and the punched, incised, inlaid, and otherwise decorated metal lamps often designed to hold a number of "lights," usually small glass oil containers that are sometimes placed in special compartments within or around the metal body. Although some recent studies have expanded our knowledge of these often beautiful objects, there is still much information to be extracted from them, and, in fact, some collections are still incompletely known. A case in point is the important collection of lamps that forms the core of the study under review, at the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (formerly the Museum of Arab Art), which has remained virtually untouched

since Gaston Wiet catalogued some samples in his *Objets en cuivre* over sixty years ago. Now, Doris Behrens-Abouseif revisits this collection to study the formal rather than the purely epigraphic aspects of metal lamps produced in Mamluk, Ottoman, and later times (covering the span from the thirteenth through the nineteenth centuries, and including the so-called Mamluk Revival lamps). In the process, she adds a number of unknown or previously unpublished examples, many of which post-date the "classical" moment that has dominated studies of the arts of Syria and Egypt. Her text at once communicates the excitement of discovery, rehabilitates the often ignored later examples, and positions lamps within a general functional framework on the basis of a variety of historical and descriptive accounts.

The book is divided into an introduction discussing lamps and their uses, followed by five succinct but richly illustrated chapters, and a short conclusion on "stylistic evolution." Of the five chapters that form the body of the book, four are devoted to specific Mamluk types: the *tannūr* ("a monumental type of bronze polycandelon"), "vase-shaped lamps" (considered the classic Islamic type in as much as they have counterparts at other times, elsewhere, and in different media, primarily glass), the *thurayyā* ("polycandelons with spherical shade"), and "pyramid lamps." The author analyzes these lamps from the point of view of design, manufacture, and decoration, in order to create a catalogue and provide a typology of Mamluk metal lamps. Although some of the attributions of anonymous lamps will no doubt be refined in future, the additional samples offered here, ranging from a lamp at the Mu'allāqah church in Old Cairo to ones at the Egyptian Ethnographic Museum, are valuable additions to the available repertoire of Mamluk objects.

The stylistic analysis that appears in these chapters is carried forward into the fifth one, which combines different formal types from post-Mamluk times. The arrangement allows the author to view the objects within a larger comparative and chronological framework that aids in the dating and attribution of the anonymous examples on the one hand, and leads to a discussion of the changes in decorative techniques, tastes, and market demands on the other. Thus Behrens-Abouseif is able to point to a continuity—even renewed creativity—in the production and design of metal lamps after Cairo became a provincial capital under the Ottomans; proof of the persistence of local "styles" based on a Mamluk paradigm. The durability of local traditions in the manufacture and decoration of metal lamps apparently justifies the "post-Mamluk" designation, though it remains unclear why this was the case with lamps and not with other sorts of metal objects, which were more open to developments in Istanbul, or why the "vase-shaped" type disappeared from Cairene markets but not in Istanbul. The extent to which still later post-Mamluk metal (as opposed to glass) lamps satisfied primarily antiquarian demands that transformed them into "*objets d'art*," whether for local consumption or for an

export market, is also problematic. As Behrens-Abouseif's inclusion of these later objects in her catalogue demonstrates, it may be time to reevaluate the evidence arising from the nineteenth and early twentieth century, whose scholars and collectors may have been more captivated by Mamluk products than by their later counterparts.

If the later lamps raise general questions of fashion, manufacture, and market demand, the earlier ones are also implicated in similar problems. The break-down into four formal types, for example, has yet to inform us whether any (and, if so, which) of these types was reserved for domestic uses as opposed to use in mosques or the various religious complexes patronized by the Mamluk elites. The correlation (or lack thereof) between formal types and their functions is of particular interest in regard to Mamluk visual culture, which concentrated on an increasingly limited repertoire of decorative designs. Although this repertoire leads to an immediate identification of Mamluk objects, it does not immediately distinguish functions, leaving such differentiation to larger formal categories or to epigraphy.

Similarly, we are still ill-informed about the material constitution of these objects (even though some are defined by both form and metal, such as the bronze *tannūr* type) and the degree to which they reflect shortages in raw materials (studies that require extensive and expensive technical analyses). However, this raises the issue of possible correspondences between medium, terminology, form, and specific functions and uses as sources of information, as is the case, for instance, with the gold and silver lamps that were donated to shrines and/or used on special occasions, or the *fānūs*, a special functional type discussed by the author and associated with Ramadan celebrations. Although there are rare instances in which an inscription provides its carrier object with a name (for example, the *thurayyā* discussed on p. 43), the vocabulary associated with the lamps remains ambiguous, and there is little attempt here to use terminology as an informative category that may correlate to specific metals, formal types, or uses. This lacuna is particularly striking in regard to Mamluk times, for which we possess copious amounts of historical sources, dictionaries, and *waqf* deeds that have been used in other analyses of material remains and some of which are also used by the author in discussions of certain lamps. Despite this wealth of information, it is, of course, often difficult to connect textual data with actual objects. Still, it would have been interesting to know if, for instance, lamps—or certain types of lamps—were among the objects included in bridal dowries among other essential household furnishings, information that is likely available in some of the same sources that are used to set the scene in the introduction and that do not always correspond to the temporal frameworks of the objects under discussion. Ferreting out such information would add immeasurably to our understanding of Mamluk lamps as objects of daily life, as opposed to their persistent association with mosques and shrines, and would

enhance our knowledge of the typological, functional, and terminological varieties in which they exist. Similarly, the author's incidental reference to olive oil also raises the question of lamp fuels, which are likely to have been less costly vegetable and mineral by-products. These incidentals are yet another part of the reason why lamps are such valuable indicators of the economies and means as well as the tastes and activities of their societies and users. Raising such questions, however, goes beyond the stated aims of the book, whose focus is the formal typology of the lamps and their decorations.

In the end, it is decoration, more than any other aspect, that frames this study of Mamluk and post-Mamluk metal lamps. The lamps are decorated in a variety of designs and techniques, with floral and geometric patterns produced through incising, inlay, *repoussé*, *à-jour* perforation, and various other, less delicate open-work techniques. Many of the lamps carry inscriptions that are either inlaid or "silhouetted" through open-work. As is usual for Mamluk objects, the inscriptions on the more expensive commissions often include the patron's name or titles along with Quranic quotations, with the Verse of Light associated with Mamluk glass lamps noted by the author for its conspicuous absence from the metal ones.

The open-work technique is particularly fitting for objects that play with light and shade, and in which decoration—and the objects themselves—take on one aspect when the lamps are not in use and another when they are lit. The complexity of these effects increases when other materials, such as pieces of colored glass, are incorporated into the lamps. In this respect, these metal lamps most clearly illustrate the additional layer of visual complexity that is a hallmark of Islamic decorative arts. Behrens-Abouseif's sensitivity to this quality is indicated by her inclusion of illustrations of lit lamps, a rare and welcome occurrence that underscores the use of light itself as a medium of decoration. It is in this use, which effects the dematerialization of the surface itself through light, that the objects take on their most striking appearance. These qualities lead to comparisons with Quranic imagery, thereby once again reflecting the tension that exists between the practical need for light and the urge to interpret its carriers and their decorations. The "magical" properties of lamps are thus reasserted, but how far these properties can lead us toward a better understanding of the technical and social aspects of these objects, of their various contextual uses, and of contemporaneous interpretations of light and its metaphoric representations remains a topic for further investigation.

Behrens-Abouseif's book is then a valuable contribution not only because it adds to the repertoire of Mamluk and post-Mamluk metal lamps, providing several previously unknown examples and placing them within a considered formal typology, but also because it continues to reflect questions that need to be raised and, eventually, answered.

YĀSĪN AL-AYYŪBĪ, *Āfāq al-Shi‘r al-‘Arabī fī al-‘Aṣr al-Mamlūkī* (Tripoli, Lebanon: Jarrūs Priss, 1995). Pp. 560.

REVIEWED BY TH. EMIL HOMERIN, University of Rochester

This introduction to Mamluk poetry is largely descriptive and somewhat disorganized. Al-Ayyūbī quotes over two thousand verses, but usually in an anecdotal fashion, and so his overall literary analysis is superficial. Further, he draws the vast majority of this verse from published biographical and historical works from the period. Though he occasionally cites several published collections of Mamluk poetry, he never refers to manuscripts, nor to any of the essential studies of the Mamluk period published during the last twenty years, whether by Western or Arab scholars. This is a glaring weakness in the book's first section (pp. 15-98), where the author attempts to frame this verse within its historical, political, and cultural contexts. When listing the great Circassian sultans, for example, he omits reference to Qāyṭbāy, while his comparison of the Baḥrī and Burjī Mamluk periods is based largely on a long quote from al-Maqrīzī. This Mamluk historian lauded the Baḥrī reign as a golden age in contrast to the later period in which he lived. Yet, al-Ayyūbī never questions al-Maqrīzī's personal stake in the matter and, similarly, he accepts other Mamluk historical and biographical sources as unbiased objective accounts.

The situation improves little when al-Ayyūbī turns from politics to culture, as he adduces evidence of an intellectual life from lists of scholars migrating to Cairo. Then, following an uncritical discussion of important religious and cultural institutions, including the *madrasah* and the mosque, al-Ayyūbī cites the titles and authors of over eighty-five works composed during the Mamluk period on subjects ranging from Quranic commentary, biography, and history, to rhetoric and the belles lettres. Conspicuous by its absence here is any review of collections of poetry, whether by a single author or compiled by anthologists.

The second and longest section of the book is loosely organized around poetic genres and themes, beginning with *madīḥ*, or panegyric (pp. 101-37). Al-Ayyūbī cites examples of verse lauding individuals' good qualities, especially those of the poets' Mamluk patrons. At one point, he draws attention to Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī's (d. 749/1349) conscious comparison of the poet's praising his patron to the latter's bestowal of honors on his poet (p. 111). Yet this intriguing reference to the intertwined issues of aesthetics, honor, and ritual exchange is left behind. Instead, al-Ayyūbī quickly outlines recurring themes and elements in panegyrics

of Muḥammad by describing one of al-Būṣīrī's (d. 694/1295) odes to the Prophet. Al-Ayyūbī regards these panegyrics as a subset of poetry in praise of God, and due to its overtly religious themes, he accepts this verse as more sincere than poetry composed for sultans and amirs. Even if true, it is quite clear that these poets, too, offered their praise in hopes of reward, albeit of a more heavenly coin.

Next, al-Ayyūbī reviews the Mamluk *ghazal*, or love poem (pp. 138-61), which he divides into two broad categories. First is the chaste and virtuous 'Udhri style verse, which was a favorite among the Mamluk Sufi poets. Nevertheless, some of them occasionally referred to the beloved's physical features, if only symbolically, and this leads al-Ayyūbī to a brief review of his second type of love poem, that of sensuality. Whether the subject be male or female, al-Ayyūbī notes, most of this love verse followed earlier models, though with the rhetorical flare characteristic of the Mamluk period. Al-Ayyūbī reaches a similar stylistic conclusion regarding Mamluk *rithā'*, or elegy (pp. 162-80). He divides elegies between those referring unambiguously to historical persons or events, and more general elegies that could be offered for any number of deceased persons. This division, however, is of little critical use as it ignores the importance of standardized themes and their repetition, which are crucial to successful elegies as poets attempt to place their personal sorrow within more universal contexts. Al-Ayyūbī does draw attention to the elegy's broader social and cultural dimensions in his comments on elegies for lost lands and cities, particularly on the traumatic fall of Baghdad.

Al-Ayyūbī's next chapter on *hijā'*, or invective verse, is surprisingly brief given the prominence of this genre in the earlier periods of Arabic literature (pp. 181-191). Yet, al-Ayyūbī argues that this was not a favored form during the Mamluk period, perhaps due to the decline in tribal rivalries. As a result, he claims, Mamluk invective verse tended more toward wit and charm than to scathing insults and personal attacks. Most of al-Ayyūbī's examples resonate with light-hearted or comic tones, as when a wife berates her miserly husband, or when a poet deplores the sorry state of his vermin-infested house. Still, in a later section on social criticism (pp. 238-58), al-Ayyūbī cites many other verses that underscore invective's persistent power to demonize one's enemies, as well as to serve as a form of social protest.

Wasf, or descriptive poetry, is the subject of the next chapter (pp. 192-222), which quickly becomes tedious as al-Ayyūbī quotes numerous verses cataloging an assortment of human features, animals, plants, and "inanimate objects," including descriptions of cities, and references to the Black Death of 1348-50. Several quatrains on the plague suggest the destructive and demoralizing impact of this pandemic on Muslim life, society, and religion, although al-Ayyūbī seems unaware of such implications or its possible effects on poetry.

Turning to verse of self-praise and personal bravery, *fakhr* and *ḥamāsah* (pp. 227-37), al-Ayyūbī notes the scarcity of boasting matches among Mamluk poets and suggests that this may be due to their homogeneity in terms of social rank and class, and the lack of religious rivalries among them. His one exception is Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī, who devoted a section of his *Dīwān* to such poems inspired by the murder of his uncle and tribal chief, for whom the poet demands revenge in the defiant tone of many pre-Islamic odes. The obvious similarities between the genres of *fakhr* and *ḥamāsah*, *hijā'*, and *madīḥ* raise the question as to why al-Ayyūbī did not treat them in a more coherent fashion, particularly in light of his following sections which take up the larger thematic issues of poetry and social criticism (pp. 238-58) and the poets' relationship to their patrons and power (pp. 259-84). Al-Ayyūbī quotes verses from poets calling for control of marauding bedouins, tax-collectors, and exorbitant prices, and then devotes considerable space to Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī's (d. 771/1370) critiques of unqualified religious officials, and al-Būṣīrī's harangues against corrupt amirs and their civil servants. Al-Ayyūbī then reprints an earlier article on relations between poets and their Mamluk patrons, noting the participation of poets in Mamluk ceremonies and their roles within the civil service as secretaries and press men, who were assigned to record favorably Mamluk military campaigns and public policies.

The final seven chapters of the book's second section take up a number of prominent cultural themes and issues mentioned earlier in discussions of the genres. On wisdom and manners (pp. 285-305), al-Ayyūbī cites verses on the brevity of life, the importance of friendship, and the golden mean, while his chapter on complaint and longing (pp. 306-39) revolves around laments for lost beloveds, one's home far away, or for the holy lands of Mecca and Medina. His chapter on wine poetry also contains a few verses on hashish but not on mystical wine (pp. 340-50), though Sufi elements are evident in the chapter on ascetic poetry (pp. 351-60). Verse on the strange and the marvelous (pp. 361-78) and examples of verse riddles and puzzles (pp. 394-404) conclude this second section.

In the book's third and final section, al-Ayyūbī briefly describes common stylistic and structural elements of Mamluk poetry, including *tawriyah* (double-entendre), *jinās* (paronomasia), and the use of grammatical, rhetorical, and other technical terms in verse (pp. 409-34). He also gives examples of narrative poems, especially on the life of Muḥammad, and Mamluk military campaigns, and some colloquial verse (*zajal*) on political events and crises (pp. 435-66). He then ends the work with a short chapter on didactic poetry, including that on morals, Arabic grammar, and poetics (pp. 467-85).

Al-Ayyūbī could have improved his book significantly had he been more informed and analytical regarding this poetry's social, political, and religious contexts. Rather than following the standard introduction by genre, he might have

integrated his chapter on poet-patron relations into his introduction, to be followed by his thematic studies on poetry in Mamluk life and culture. Genres should be discussed, but the overall emphasis would be on the life and world views of the cultural elite which, in turn, would give more credence to al-Ayyūbī's dependence on historical and biographical sources. Granted, the focus of the book would be different, but by so doing al-Ayyūbī could have made a far more substantial and original contribution to the study of Arabic literature in the Mamluk period.

MAḤMŪD AL-SAYYID, *Tārīkh 'Arab al-Shām fī al-'Aṣr al-Mamlūkī* (Alexandria: Mu'assasat Shabāb al-Jāmi'ah, 1997). Pp. 255.

REVIEWED BY STEFAN H. WINTER, The University of Chicago

The relative paucity of specialized studies on Syrian Mamluk history makes Maḥmūd al-Sayyid's short book on the Arab tribes of al-Shām a particularly welcome contribution to the field. In it, the author takes exception to the conventional image of the refractory bedouin in perennial conflict with the central state authority, and argues instead for the Syrian tribes' loyalty to the Mamluk regime and their contribution to Islamicate culture in that period. While not entirely successful in proving this, the case he presents is happily long on scholarly references and short on (viz. devoid of) nationalist or religious jingoism.

The book's four chapters comprise an overview of Syrian society under the Mamluks, Arab tribal *'aṣabīyah* in Syria, and the tribes' political and "civilizational" roles in the Mamluk age. These chapters are preceded by a section somewhat inaccurately titled "source criticism," in which the author discusses the wide range of documentary, narrative, and archeological sources available to the historian. While he freely cites western scholarly literature throughout, he uses nothing more recent than 1975, and the text consequently lacks any reference to actual problems or debates within the discipline. Nor indeed does al-Sayyid engage in any critical reflection on his primary sources, a fact compounded by the book's fatal dependence on al-Maqrīzī, al-Qalqashandī and Ibn Iyās.

The first chapter is meant to provide a geographical, administrative, social, and religious sketch of Syria under the Mamluks. To this monumental task it can do little justice, and the reader is left with only some ahistoric generalities on Syria's ethnic and societal composition that appear either mundane or ill-informed. In particular, the assertions that Hanbalism was the principal *madhhab* and the Protestants an important Christian minority in Mamluk Syria do not inspire

confidence. Al-Sayyid's mention of some select Arab tribes does little more than anticipate the discussion of later chapters. The references to Kurds, Turkmen, Druze, and their contribution to certain military campaigns, frame the author's ideological concept of a multicultural Syrian nation united in its support for the Mamluk regime against its foreign enemies. The final chapter suffers from a similar lack of focus, encompassing aspects of Mamluk-era culture at large on the one hand and reaching back to describe great Syrian literateurs from previous centuries on the other. Among the more pertinent and interesting passages is perhaps the discussion of the bedouins' dress and the gifts received from al-Nāṣir Muḥammad in return for horses (pp. 194-97).

The second chapter concentrates more specifically on the bedouin tribes, and in particular how politics in Syria have been played out historically against a backdrop of tribal rivalries when these could not be subsumed into a single ideology (such as Islam) directed against an external foe. However, the author makes no attempt to come to any sociological, Khaldunian understanding of *'aṣabīyah* and is content simply to reduce the dynamics and complexity of tribalism throughout Syrian history to the timeless and overarching Qays vs. Yemen rivalry. Thus the genius of the Syrian tribes is defeated by the Abbasids, re-emerges with the Hamdanids to struggle against Persian, Turkish, and Byzantine encroachment, and attains its full flowering with the coming of the Mamluks. The third chapter, covering the political and military role of the Syrian tribes, serves the author's central thesis that the Arabs of Syria pursued a conscious policy in supporting the Mamluk regime, in war and in peace, throughout its 250-year existence. The argument rarely transcends an *histoire événementielle* of battles and rebellions, from 'Ayn Jālūt to Marj Ḍābiq, in which certain tribal groups (thence "the Arabs of Syria") fought on the side of the Mamluks, receiving fiefs (*iqṭā'*) or even political office in return. The heroes of the story are unquestionably the Āl Faḍl and, in particular, 'Īsā ibn Muḥannā and his progeny, who were confirmed as official tribal *zu'amā'* by successive sultans and even enjoyed a measure of political influence in Cairo. The Arabs, we are told finally, would even have held out against the Ottoman Turks had Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī sent reinforcements to chief Ibn Ḥanash in time.

In sum, the reader interested in the Syrian tribes might do better to refer back to the relevant parts in Gaudefroy-Demombynes's *La Syrie à l'époque des mamelouks*. The complex issues of urban center vs. nomadic province and of foreign elite and domestic legitimization raised by al-Sayyid serve foremost to recall that the sub-field of Syrian Mamluk history still desperately awaits the sort of narrative study Thierry Bianquis has devoted to the Fatimid era. While this particular work suffers from some critical shortcomings, al-Sayyid deserves credit for his care and evenhandedness in addressing the question of Arab tribal support

for the sultans. His differentiation between the purported Syrian collaboration with, and Egyptian disdain for, the Mamluks, although not entirely original and here not exploited sufficiently, is noteworthy, as is his readiness also to cite evidence contrary to his central arguments. Finally, though the book cannot pretend to have made exhaustive use of the available literature, the author's meticulous footnoting and well-organized bibliography (but unfortunately no index) make it a potentially useful tool for the specialist wishing to locate particular items connected with the bedouin tribes of Mamluk Syria.

BAYYŪMĪ ISMĀ'ĪL AL-SHIRBĪNĪ, *Muṣādarat al-Amlāk fī al-Dawlah al-Islāmīyah (Aṣr Salāṭīn al-Mamālīk)* (Cairo: al-Ḥay'ah al-Miṣrīyah al-‘Āmmah lil-Kitāb, 1997). Two volumes.

REVIEWED BY MARLIS SALEH, The University of Chicago

The term "*muṣādarah*," as used in medieval Islamic administration, refers firstly to "an agreement with someone over the payment of taxation due." Its most frequent and characteristic meaning, however, is "the mulcting of an official of his (usually) ill-gotten gains or spoils of office."¹ Readers of Mamluk chronicles cannot fail to be struck by the pervasiveness of *muṣādarah* (or confiscation, as we may loosely translate the term); virtually no individual of any prominence seems to have escaped unscathed by it. It therefore appears to be a topic well worth isolation and focused study. Little attention, however, seems to have been paid to the phenomenon per se; I have come across only a slim volume, approximately half of whose 120 pages are devoted to the Mamluk period.² The present substantial two-volume work, originally the author's doctoral dissertation at the University of al-Manṣūrah, thus promised to be a welcome addition to the list of studies devoted to specific aspects of Mamluk history and economic life.

Following a preface discussing the difficulties encountered in doing the research for the book and then outlining it in considerable detail, Shirbīnī begins with a brief introduction defining *muṣādarah* and overviewing its use prior to the Mamluk period. He starts out with the Muslim world in general through the Umayyad age, and then narrows his focus to Egypt.

¹C. E. Bosworth, "Muṣādarah," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., 7:652-53.

²Muḥammad Bahjat Mukhtār 'Uṣfūr, *al-Muṣādarah fī Miṣr al-Islāmīyah min al-Fatḥ al-Islāmī ḥattā Nihāyat 'Aṣr al-Mamālīk (20-923 H./641-1517 M.)* (Cairo, 1990).

Chapter 1, "The Nature of and Reasons for Confiscation in the Mamluk Age," establishes the pattern which is followed throughout the succeeding three chapters. The author divides the reasons for confiscation into the general categories of political, economic, social, and unknown, subdividing each category and providing examples. He next discusses the types of confiscation, which are really more reasons looked at from a different angle: confiscation was used to punish, for reasons of fiscal administration, and to provide compensation.

Shirbīnī proceeds to discuss the personnel and the specific procedures involved in actually carrying out a confiscation. This is one of the more interesting sections of the book, and highlights the potential value of an intensive study of a narrowly defined topic, describing as it does in detail the sort of information which would normally not be dealt with in a more general work. He then goes on to discuss the amounts and types of items which could be seized in a confiscation, the various localities where they could be deposited and the procedures for recording them, and the final fates which befell people whose property was confiscated.

A number of problems with the book become apparent in this first chapter. First of all, the author quotes the specific figure 3306 as the number of confiscations carried out in the Mamluk period, without ever explaining how he arrived at it. Judging by the footnotes and the appended chart, he went through the standard chronicles, but nowhere does he discuss his methodology. He then uses this figure to come up with specific percentages of this or that type of confiscation under one sultan as compared to another, lending a scientific aura to the data which it may not deserve.

An even more important flaw, undermining what could have been the primary value of the book, is that the author does not stick to his chosen topic. Instead, he widens his scope to consider virtually any action involving the state whereby anyone suffered a loss of wealth or property as a "form of" *muṣādarah*. This includes everything from any sort of non-canonical taxation, to debasement of coinage, to the sultan's visiting an *iqtā'* holder who was then obliged to give his royal guest gifts. The book thus becomes much too diffuse, offering superficial discussions of practically every aspect of economic life.

Chapter 2, "Confiscations and Men of State," and Chapter 3, "Confiscations and the Rest of the People," follow the paradigm established in Chapter 1 for discussing confiscations: reasons, types, procedures, types of property, localities of deposit, and final fate of the victim(s), each time applied specifically to men of state and to the general populace respectively. This naturally makes for a great deal of repetition, and any differences there may have been between the groups that would benefit from this presentation are obscured rather than highlighted.

In Chapter 4, "Confiscations and Family Resources," the author shows that despite the fact that one of the major motives for putting property into pious

endowments (*waqf*) was to attempt to protect it from government rapacity, *waqfs* were in fact regularly plundered under various pretexts. Once again, he puts the material through its assigned paces as set down in Chapter 1. Oddly, he feels compelled to adduce some positive aspects of state despoilment of *waqfed* resources, which include the return of capital to the active economy as well as forcing idle sufis from their parasitic existence back into the labor market.

Chapter 5, "The Effects of Confiscations on the Nature of the Mamluk State," contains a hodgepodge of observations on everything from the decline of Egyptian agriculture due to the *iqtā'* system, to the European discovery of the Cape of Good Hope sea route around Africa. Once again, the book's lack of focus proves detrimental.

The Conclusion rehashes a number of mostly obvious points that have been made repeatedly before (e.g., men of state suffered confiscation more frequently than the general public). Most of the author's major conclusions—for example, that confiscations were one of the principal sources of state income, and that their implementation was a symptom of the political and economic decline of the state due to the atrophy of agricultural production—are reduced to banalities by his lumping virtually every source of revenue exploited by the state under the umbrella of "*muṣādarah*."

The work concludes with several appendices. First comes a *fatwá* from al-Azhar, requested by the author, on whether or not the practice of *muṣādarah* is permissible. Though throughout the book the author has made it clear that the practice, at least as implemented by the Mamluks, is shocking to his personal religious sentiments, disappointingly, the *fatwá* supports its use under circumstances "approved by Islam."

Next come two charts, which are not labelled. The first presents the name of the sultan, the name of the *shādd al-dawāwīn* [the official usually responsible for execution of confiscations ordered by the sultan], the year, comments [on the fate of the *shādd al-dawāwīn*], and sources.

The second chart is potentially more useful. It lists the name of the person or group whose goods were confiscated/his office/year/name of the sultan/executor of the confiscation/type of confiscation/amount/place of deposit/final fate of the victim. In other words, it is basically a schematic distillation of Chapters 1 through 4 of the preceding book, in chronological order. However, as noted, the author has stated that 3306 confiscations occurred during the Mamluk period; this chart contains only 1222 entries. On what basis were these 1222 extracted from the total? The author gives us no clue.

Despite its considerable length, *Muṣādarat al-Amlāk* feels more like an outline for a book than an actual finished work. There is virtually no sustained prose, with each point developing and leading into the next point. Rather, the book is formatted

as a series of discrete lists. An opening paragraph will state, for example, that there were various economic motives for confiscation, then the author will proceed to recount them in list form. Individual items range in length from an incomplete phrase to several pages. The lists are often nested within each other down to several levels, and are enumerated in various ways, such as by numbers, letters, bullets, and flowers, which do not follow a standardized nesting order. This makes it very confusing for the reader suddenly coming upon a *jīm* or a 7 or a bullet in the middle of a page, who is then forced to flip back to discover whether this is a new item in the overarching list, or in a sub-list at the second or third level down. To make matters even more confusing, the author occasionally slips up in the numbering.

Notes, though copious, are extremely difficult to use, due mainly to the author's resorting to "op. cit." and its Arabic equivalent (*al-marjī' al-sābiq*). To cite only one example, if the reader is interested in tracking down the reference to a work by Ḍūmaṭ in note 3 on page 290, he must page back through hundreds of notes on hundreds of pages until finally arriving at a full citation (buried within a footnote containing dozens of citations) in note 1 on page 18. In addition, the text of the footnotes is riddled with errors; the references to Western works in particular are virtually certain to contain typos and are often garbled to the point of unintelligibility. Bizarrely, a bibliography promised and described in detail in the introduction (divided into documents, manuscripts, printed texts, and modern sources [Arabic and foreign]), is nowhere to be found.

Despite its promising title, *Muṣādarat al-Amlāk* is a disappointment. If the author had confined himself to the topic (narrowly defined) and had made use of a good editor, this could have been a much more useful work.

‘ĀṢIM MUḤAMMAD RIZQ, *Khānqāwāt al-Ṣūfīyah fī Miṣr*. Vol. 1: *Fī al-‘Aṣrayn al-Ayyūbī wa-al-Mamlūkī*. Vol. 2: *Fī ‘Aṣr Dawlat al-Mamālīk al-Burjīyah* (Cairo: Maktabat Madbūlī, 1997). Pp. 875.

REVIEWED BY TH. EMIL HOMERIN, University of Rochester

During the Mamluk period, nearly fifty *khānqāhs* were founded in or around Cairo alone, suggesting the prominence and importance of this religious institution to medieval Muslims. Nearly two dozen of these *khānqāhs* are profiled and extensively described by ‘Āṣim Muḥammad Rizq in this two-volume work, prefaced by three short introductions which outline, in very general terms: 1) the earlier

history of the *khānqāh* and the related institutions of the *ribāṭ* and *zāwiyah* (vol. 1, pp. 21-35); 2) the development of Sufism (vol. 1, pp. 39-63); and 3) architectural features of the *khānqāh* in Mamluk Egypt (vol. 1, pp. 67-123). These chapters offer nothing new, as Rizq reiterates the traditional interpretation of the *khānqāh* as an educational institution meant to spread Sunni Islam among the masses in opposition to Shi'ism. Rizq goes on to claim that, despite this noble origin, the *khānqāh* in the twilight years of the Mamluk period was often the site of outlandish un-Islamic practices encouraged by the ruling elite, and hidden from the larger public under the guise of Sufism (vol. 1, p. 57).

By this point in the book, it is painfully apparent that Rizq has accepted medieval criticism of the *khānqāhs* at face value, and that he is largely unaware of the extensive scholarship devoted to Sufism and its institutions over the last thirty years. Most telling in this regard is Rizq's failure to refer to even one of the many in-depth studies of the *khānqāh* by either Leonor Fernandes or Doris Behrens-Abouseif; also missing are references to similarly important work by Donald P. Little, J. Chabbi, Muḥammad Muḥammad Amīn, and others. Further, although Rizq knows of the many *waqf* documents detailing *khānqāh* endowments and lists them in his bibliography, he rarely cites them directly, choosing to rely instead on secondary sources, particularly Ibn al-Jī'ān and 'Alī Mubārak.

Clearly, *Khānqāwāt al-Ṣūfiyah fī Miṣr* is a disappointment, especially given its size and, moreover, the importance of its topic. But the work may still be of some use to the careful reader, for Rizq has expended great effort to detail the physical remains and reconstruct the floor plans of a number of *khānqāhs*, and each *khānqāh* reviewed is recorded by diagram and several photographs. Further, Rizq has combed published Arabic sources from the Mamluk period to record the names and occupations of those who studied or worked in these *khānqāhs*, and he usually cites verbatim or slightly abridges the sources. Nevertheless, Rizq draws few conclusions from this mass of evidence, other than such well-established facts as, for example, that Sufis in the *khānqāhs* also assumed non-mystical functions there, such as serving as an *imām* (vol. 2, p. 663), or that Sufis performed their duties at other religious establishments in addition to the *khānqāhs* (vol. 2, p. 587). Sadly, Rizq never tells his reader what these "Sufi duties" were, nor why they were important to religion and society in the Mamluk domains. Indeed, the daily performance of the *ḥuḍūr* with its Quran recitations and prayers, and not teaching, was the primary mission of the *khānqāh* Sufis, and though many *waqf* deeds assign funds for teaching law, *ḥadīth*, and other religious subjects, references in medieval sources to the teaching of Sufism in the *khānqāhs* are conspicuous by their absence. But readers will not find discussion of this or similarly important issues in Rizq's largely descriptive and superficial work.