

the text in the tradition of Arabic erotology, even as she places its author within the world of double exile: exile in Spain from his Islamic culture which was stripped from him progressively by the Inquisition, then exile in Tunisia from Spain and the Spanish literary world which he loved.

As López-Baralt states, much of the material in her article will need a new generation of scholarship to explore fully. This would apply to the articles of Jayyusi, Monroe, and Menocal as well. What these essays demonstrate is the capacity of Andalusian literature—and questions of its origins, distinctiveness, and influence—to touch our deeper sensibility and inflame our scholarly passions.

These five essays comprise only a small portion of this valuable volume, which belongs in the library of any institution with a graduate or undergraduate program in Islamic, Mediterranean, or medieval studies.

MICHAEL SELLS

Haverford College

Reorientations: Arabic and Persian Poetry. Edited by SUZANNE PINCKNEY STETKEYVICH. Bloomington: INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1994. pp. x + 269. \$16.95 (paper).

Members of the A.O.S. or M.E.S.A. who attend the annual meetings will be familiar with the panels of the self-styled "Chicago school," panels consisting of Suzanne and Jaroslav Stetkevych (hereafter SPS and JS) and usually their current and former students from the University of Chicago. It is not only their presence that has earned the name "Stetkevych panel," but also the sense that they dominate the enterprise. This domination is evident in *Reorientations*. Of the 262 pages of articles, 129 are by SPS and JS; of its 510 footnotes, 261 are by them. They account, therefore, for half the volume.

Quantity is admittedly not an arbiter of quality, but as the contributions are of a more or less even standard, the statistics are significant. But SPS's belief that the articles (called studies) represent a wide spectrum is curious. Of the eight articles, six treat Arabic poetry, two Persian poetry; of the former, five concentrate on the *nasīb* section of the classical *qaṣīda*. Indeed, Homerin's article on mystical verse, Lewis's on the *radīf*, and Losensky's on a Bābā Fighānī lyric, seem to be here less for the "broad spectrum of literary critical issues addressed" (p. vii) than for the need to include other members of the "Chicago school." Substituting those with other articles on the *nasīb* might have turned this book into a coherent volume.

Although the "school" does not have "a distinct theoretical or methodological approach"—surely nuancing the applicability of the term—SPS explains in the preface that its members

do share certain literary critical assumptions, primarily that the classical literary traditions of the Islamic Middle East are

fully literatures in the same sense of the term as we apply it to Western literary traditions. In whatever ways they differ from Western literatures, they are nevertheless not to be relegated to mere fodder for philological, sociological, or anthropological pursuits. And however impenetrable they may seem from a Western stance, Arabic and Persian poems are works of art and are regarded as such by the cultures that produced them. (p. vii)

I am unclear who the implied "relegators" are—perhaps those who "perpetually follo[w] the latest critical trends of New York or Paris . . . fashionable but never original" (p. vii). Moreover, it seems to me that the last sentence of the "manifesto" quoted above replicates the position it indicts. Prefatory editorial remarks notwithstanding, the contributors are obviously comfortable with contemporary theory.

The articles also include "original translations . . . that strive to capture the power and poeiticity"—do not all translations so strive?—of the originals. This inclusion is useful as it provides the reader with the texts in question. The Arabic is provided for the texts discussed by SPS but, inexplicably, not for those of other contributors, though transliterations are provided throughout.

The volume opens with "Pre-Islamic Panegyric and the Poetics of Redemption: *Mufaddaliyyah 119* of 'Alqamah and *Bānat Su'ād* of Ka'b ibn Zuhayr" (pp. 1–57). Drawing on Mauss' theory of gift exchange, SPS argues that the poems function as commodities in a ritual exchange, i.e., as ransom payments (p. 2); and, using Gaster's seasonal pattern paradigm, she further identifies the poems as pledges of fealty. She also suggests that it was the Mantle Ode (*Bānat Su'ād*) that generated the story of the Prophet Muḥammad's donation of the mantle to Ka'b and not vice-versa, thus revealing the poem's mythogenic and mythopoetic aspects. Indeed, her choice of poems rests on the fact that both "have been handed down in a context of anecdotal materials that testify to their redemptive transaction" (p. 2). The commentator al-Anbārī explains in his gloss of the last line of *M 119* that it was composed to have the poet's captive nephew released. SPS sees al-Ḥārith's decision to do so (and to release others besides) as a way to avoid exhibiting a "failure to make return gifts, mean[ing] a loss of dignity" (p. 5).

These positions are used to challenge assertions that the *nasīb* (amatory prelude) and *raḥīl* (desert journey) "perform only a preambular rhetorical function" (p. 1). But the agenda is more far-reaching. SPS proposes not only a new "estimation" of the *qaṣīdah's* structure, but also a new understanding of the ritual function of poetry in premodern societies, a role she considers "fundamentally at odds with our Romantic and post-Romantic notions of poetry, poetics, and aesthetics" and

"return" to "poetic language" the better to interpret the tangled words of mystical verse. Before this (unexplained) strategy can be put into practice, Homerin says that the question "what makes a poem mystical?" must be answered. He shows first how difficult it is to distinguish sufi poetry from non-sufi poetry by recourse to themes alone, citing "the two references on the subject I have found in literary works," exceptions, as it turns out, that prove the rule, quoting al-Tha^calibi's complaint about al-Mutannabi's use of "kalimātihim al-mu^caqqadah" (their [Sufis'] tangled words) (p. 194). Homerin concludes, with al-Tha^calibi and Ibn Jinnī, that the use of multiple prepositions, antithesis, and paradox are "characteristic of mystical verse" (p. 196). The article is extremely short (only eight and a half pages) and samples very little verse. Perhaps this will be remedied in the analysis of Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj's *Kitāb al-Luma^c fi al-taṣawwuf*, which Homerin mentions he is undertaking in note 7. I am also surprised that he makes no reference to the admittedly idiosyncratic attempt on the part of Martin Lings to survey and characterize "Mystical Poetry" in *Abbāsid Belles-Lettres* (Cambridge, 1990), 235–64.

I am on unfamiliar territory with the contributions of Franklin D. Lewis and Paul E. Losensky, but both are clearly comprehensive discussions of two aspects of Persian poetry. Lewis's "The Rise and Fall of a Persian Refrain: The *Radīf* 'Ātash ū Āb'" (pp. 199–226) is a study of the "fire and water" *radīf* (a word, or phrase which recurs in every line after the *qāfiyah*) in an attempt to evaluate the way it has been deployed and re-deployed by succeeding generations of poets. Lewis then draws conclusions about literary influence and intertextuality by evaluating instances of *istiqbāl* ("honoring or vying with an earlier poem and its creator by imitating, alluding to, or pastiching it"), *taẓmīn* (quotation), and *sariqah* (plagiarism). Influence, in its manifestations as *istiqbāl* and *javāb-gūi* (speaking-in-reply) are also the subject of Losensky's "The Allusive Field of Drunkenness: Three Safavid-Moghul Responses to a Lyric by Bābā Fighānī" (pp. 226–62). He systematically shows, with the wit to which he has accustomed his readers and audiences, that *imitatio* and *creatio* can often be one and the same thing. He concludes with the programmatic observation that *istiqbāl* is an important locus for the study of the nature and development of poetic device and talent. The analyses in Lewis and Losensky are the result of a great deal of familiarity with their material. This may be true of all the contributors to the volume, but Lewis and Losensky write with a fluency and cogency that the others lack in varying degrees.

In what sense are these articles *reorientations*? The only explicit statement about the taking of a new direction is to be found in SPS's preface:

[T]hrough reorienting our critical approach to classical Middle Eastern literatures we will gain a *new vantage point on our own tradition* that will lead us to a more

profound and multidimensional new poetics." (p. x; emphasis added)

I must confess to seeing no relationship between this prefatory hope and the articles, Peter Monaghan's report notwithstanding.²

SHAWKAT M. TOORAWA

UNIVERSITY OF MAURITIUS

² Peter Monaghan, "Two Scholars Bring New Energy to Study of Ancient Arabic Poetry," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 21, 1996), p. A6.

Popular Culture in Medieval Cairo. By BOAZ SHOSHAN. Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization. Cambridge: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1994. Pp. xv + 148. \$49.95.

Shoshan's book is brief (seventy-eight pages of text) but ambitious, crowding together a variety of intriguing sources ranging from sermons and hagiography to accounts of public processions and economic and political history. What emerges is an attempt to understand the Islamic tradition as it was experienced by the non-elite population of Mamluk Cairo.

Borrowing from methods developed by scholars of European popular culture, Shoshan in his introduction discusses ways of gaining access to non-elite understandings of classical traditions. Basing his approach in part on the work of Roger Chartier, a historian of early modern France, Shoshan asserts that elite and popular cultures are to be distinguished from each other not by identifying compartmentalized texts and labeling them either aristocratic or vulgar (whether these "texts" are to be understood as books or as religious processions), but rather by identifying the differing uses that elites and non-elites made of the commonly acknowledged sources of the tradition. With regard to Islamic society, this would mean analyzing the range of responses to texts such as the Qur^ʿan and hadith. Shoshan does not develop fully this important point; but it is worth further articulation. To take one example: whereas the medieval ulama drew on Qur^ʿanic scripture to develop a framework of legal guidelines for the structuring of Islamic society, professional storytellers (of the type described by Ibn al-Jawzī in his *Kitāb al-quṣṣās*) combined Qur^ʿanic narratives with geographers' accounts and travelers' wonder-tales to produce pious entertainment for the masses.

Shoshan's first two chapters deal with Sufi sermons and hagiography. He analyzes the writings of the celebrated mystic

the text in the tradition of Arabic erotology, even as she places its author within the world of double exile: exile in Spain from his Islamic culture which was stripped from him progressively by the Inquisition, then exile in Tunisia from Spain and the Spanish literary world which he loved.

As López-Baralt states, much of the material in her article will need a new generation of scholarship to explore fully. This would apply to the articles of Jayyusi, Monroe, and Menocal as well. What these essays demonstrate is the capacity of Andalusian literature—and questions of its origins, distinctiveness, and influence—to touch our deeper sensibility and inflame our scholarly passions.

These five essays comprise only a small portion of this valuable volume, which belongs in the library of any institution with a graduate or undergraduate program in Islamic, Mediterranean, or medieval studies.

MICHAEL SELLS

HVERFORD COLLEGE

Reorientations: Arabic and Persian Poetry. Edited by SUZANNE PINCKNEY STETKEVYCH. Bloomington: INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1994. pp. x + 269. \$16.95 (paper).

Members of the A.O.S. or M.E.S.A. who attend the annual meetings will be familiar with the panels of the self-styled "Chicago school," panels consisting of Suzanne and Jaroslav Stetkevych (hereafter SPS and JS) and usually their current and former students from the University of Chicago. It is not only their presence that has earned the name "Stetkevych panel," but also the sense that they dominate the enterprise. This domination is evident in *Reorientations*. Of the 262 pages of articles, 129 are by SPS and JS; of its 510 footnotes, 261 are by them. They account, therefore, for half the volume.

Quantity is admittedly not an arbiter of quality, but as the contributions are of a more or less even standard, the statistics are significant. But SPS's belief that the articles (called studies) represent a wide spectrum is curious. Of the eight articles, six treat Arabic poetry, two Persian poetry; of the former, five concentrate on the *nasib* section of the classical *qaṣīda*. Indeed, Homerin's article on mystical verse, Lewis's on the *radīf*, and Losensky's on a Bābā Fighānī lyric, seem to be here less for the "broad spectrum of literary critical issues addressed" (p. vii) than for the need to include other members of the "Chicago school." Substituting those with other articles on the *nasib* might have turned this book into a coherent volume.

Although the "school" does not have "a distinct theoretical or methodological approach"—surely nuancing the applicability of the term—SPS explains in the preface that its members

do share certain literary critical assumptions, primarily that the classical literary traditions of the Islamic Middle East are

fully literatures in the same sense of the term as we apply it to Western literary traditions. In whatever ways they differ from Western literatures, they are nevertheless not to be relegated to mere fodder for philological, sociological, or anthropological pursuits. And however impenetrable they may seem from a Western stance, Arabic and Persian poems are works of art and are regarded as such by the cultures that produced them. (p. vii)

I am unclear who the implied "relegators" are—perhaps those who "perpetually follo[w] the latest critical trends of New York or Paris . . . fashionable but never original" (p. vii). Moreover, it seems to me that the last sentence of the "manifesto" quoted above replicates the position it indicts. Prefatory editorial remarks notwithstanding, the contributors are obviously comfortable with contemporary theory.

The articles also include "original translations . . . that strive to capture the power and poeiticity"—do not all translations so strive?—of the originals. This inclusion is useful as it provides the reader with the texts in question. The Arabic is provided for the texts discussed by SPS but, inexplicably, not for those of other contributors, though transliterations are provided throughout.

The volume opens with "Pre-Islamic Panegyric and the Poetics of Redemption: *Mufaddaliyyah* 119 of 'Alqamah and *Bānat Su'ād* of Ka'b ibn Zuhayr" (pp. 1–57). Drawing on Mauss' theory of gift exchange, SPS argues that the poems function as commodities in a ritual exchange, i.e., as ransom payments (p. 2); and, using Gaster's seasonal pattern paradigm, she further identifies the poems as pledges of fealty. She also suggests that it was the Mantle Ode (*Bānat Su'ād*) that generated the story of the Prophet Muḥammad's donation of the mantle to Ka'b and not vice-versa, thus revealing the poem's mythogenic and mythopoetic aspects. Indeed, her choice of poems rests on the fact that both "have been handed down in a context of anecdotal materials that testify to their redemptive transaction" (p. 2). The commentator al-Anbārī explains in his gloss of the last line of *M* 119 that it was composed to have the poet's captive nephew released. SPS sees al-Ḥārith's decision to do so (and to release others besides) as a way to avoid exhibiting a "failure to make return gifts, mean[ing] a loss of dignity" (p. 5).

These positions are used to challenge assertions that the *nasib* (amatory prelude) and *raḥīl* (desert journey) "perform only a preambular rhetorical function" (p. 1). But the agenda is more far-reaching. SPS proposes not only a new "estimation" of the *qaṣīdah's* structure, but also a new understanding of the ritual function of poetry in premodern societies, a role she considers "fundamentally at odds with our Romantic and post-Romantic notions of poetry, poetics, and aesthetics" and

"return" to "poetic language" the better to interpret the tangled words of mystical verse. Before this (unexplained) strategy can be put into practice, Homerin says that the question "what makes a poem mystical?" must be answered. He shows first how difficult it is to distinguish sufi poetry from non-sufi poetry by recourse to themes alone, citing "the two references on the subject I have found in literary works," exceptions, as it turns out, that prove the rule, quoting al-Tha'ālibī's complaint about al-Mutannabī's use of "kalimātihim al-mu'āqqadah" (their [Sufis'] tangled words) (p. 194). Homerin concludes, with al-Tha'ālibī and Ibn Jinnī, that the use of multiple prepositions, antithesis, and paradox are "characteristic of mystical verse" (p. 196). The article is extremely short (only eight and a half pages) and samples very little verse. Perhaps this will be remedied in the analysis of Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj's *Kitāb al-Luma' fi al-taṣawwuf*, which Homerin mentions he is undertaking in note 7. I am also surprised that he makes no reference to the admittedly idiosyncratic attempt on the part of Martin Lings to survey and characterize "Mystical Poetry" in *Abbāsīd Belles-Lettres* (Cambridge, 1990), 235–64.

I am on unfamiliar territory with the contributions of Franklin D. Lewis and Paul E. Losensky, but both are clearly comprehensive discussions of two aspects of Persian poetry. Lewis's "The Rise and Fall of a Persian Refrain: The *Radīf 'Ātash ū Āb'*" (pp. 199–226) is a study of the "fire and water" *radīf* (a word, or phrase which recurs in every line after the *qāfiyah*) in an attempt to evaluate the way it has been deployed and re-deployed by succeeding generations of poets. Lewis then draws conclusions about literary influence and intertextuality by evaluating instances of *istiqbāl* ("honoring or vying with an earlier poem and its creator by imitating, alluding to, or pastiching it"), *taẓmīn* (quotation), and *sariqah* (plagiarism). Influence, in its manifestations as *istiqbāl* and *javāb-gūi* (speaking-in-reply) are also the subject of Losensky's "The Allusive Field of Drunkenness: Three Safavid-Moghul Responses to a Lyric by Bābā Fighānī" (pp. 226–62). He systematically shows, with the wit to which he has accustomed his readers and audiences, that *imitatio* and *creatio* can often be one and the same thing. He concludes with the programmatic observation that *istiqbāl* is an important locus for the study of the nature and development of poetic device and talent. The analyses in Lewis and Losensky are the result of a great deal of familiarity with their material. This may be true of all the contributors to the volume, but Lewis and Losensky write with a fluency and cogency that the others lack in varying degrees.

In what sense are these articles *reorientations*? The only explicit statement about the taking of a new direction is to be found in SPS's preface:

[T]hrough reorienting our critical approach to classical Middle Eastern literatures we will gain a new vantage point on our own tradition that will lead us to a more

profound and multidimensional new poetics." (p. x; emphasis added)

I must confess to seeing no relationship between this prefatory hope and the articles, Peter Monaghan's report notwithstanding.²

SHAWKAT M. TOORAWA

UNIVERSITY OF MAURITIUS

² Peter Monaghan, "Two Scholars Bring New Energy to Study of Ancient Arabic Poetry," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 21, 1996), p. A6.

Popular Culture in Medieval Cairo. By BOAZ SHOSHAN. Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization. Cambridge: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1994. Pp. xv + 148. \$49.95.

Shoshan's book is brief (seventy-eight pages of text) but ambitious, crowding together a variety of intriguing sources ranging from sermons and hagiography to accounts of public processions and economic and political history. What emerges is an attempt to understand the Islamic tradition as it was experienced by the non-elite population of Mamluk Cairo.

Borrowing from methods developed by scholars of European popular culture, Shoshan in his introduction discusses ways of gaining access to non-elite understandings of classical traditions. Basing his approach in part on the work of Roger Chartier, a historian of early modern France, Shoshan asserts that elite and popular cultures are to be distinguished from each other not by identifying compartmentalized texts and labeling them either aristocratic or vulgar (whether these "texts" are to be understood as books or as religious processions), but rather by identifying the differing uses that elites and non-elites made of the commonly acknowledged sources of the tradition. With regard to Islamic society, this would mean analyzing the range of responses to texts such as the Qur'an and hadith. Shoshan does not develop fully this important point; but it is worth further articulation. To take one example: whereas the medieval ulama drew on Qur'anic scripture to develop a framework of legal guidelines for the structuring of Islamic society, professional storytellers (of the type described by Ibn al-Jawzī in his *Kitāb al-quṣṣāy*) combined Qur'anic narratives with geographers' accounts and travelers' wonder-tales to produce pious entertainment for the masses.

Shoshan's first two chapters deal with Sufi sermons and hagiography. He analyzes the writings of the celebrated mystic