trabajos de investigación relacionados con la historia de la lengua española, en un libro de texto. El hecho concreto es que, en el momento presente, la obra de Lloyd es la más completa que tenemos, la más exhaustiva en cuanto a la investigación de la fonología histórica española. La publicación relativamente reciente de la *Morfología histórica del español*, de M. Alvar y B. Pottier (Madrid: Gredos, 1983), hace menos imprescindibles las secciones de morfología histórica del libro de Lloyd. No obstante, estas secciones no son menos valiosas que las de fonología, por haberse incorporado en ellas los resultados de las investigaciones más recientes.

MÁXIMO TORREBLANCA

University of California, Davis

The Arabic Role in Medieval Literary History. By María Rosa Menocal. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987. xvii+178 pages.

The influence of the Arabs in the development of troubadour lyric has been hotly debated since at least the end of the eighteenth century, and scholars have tended to adopt extreme positions (see R. Boase, *The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love* [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977], 62–75). The question of European debt to the Arabs seems to have excited the same kind of gut feelings as that concerning the extent to which Spanish culture has been determined by the Arabic presence in the Middle Ages.

It is to this polemic literature that Menocal's book belongs. Her thesis is that European scholars have refused to admit the debt that medieval literature owes to Arabic precursors, and that they have been influenced, not by scholarly arguments, but by ignorance, prejudice, and arrogance. This attitude of Europeans is characterised as a specific instance of the misunderstanding of the East by the West, so thoroughly exposed in Edward W. Said's *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon, 1978). Menocal's book therefore turns out to be more about the sociology of literary criticism than about the literary texts themselves.

Admittedly one would like to see more collaboration between Romanists and Orientalists—and indeed Islamic scholars working in Islamic countries, and one would like to see Andalusian poetry being fully accepted as part of Medieval European literature. The fact that Romanists have ignored the theory of an Arabic etymon for 'troubadour'—if this is true—is to be regretted. But what is needed is information rather than a rehearsal of prejudices. In recent years an impressive number of books and articles has appeared on Andalusian poetry, on the social interaction between Arabs, Berbers, and Christians, and on translations of Arabic scientific and

philosophical works. The most recent issue of the admirable periodical devoted specifically to al-Andalus—*Al-Qanṭara* 8 (1987)—includes articles on the Arabic *kharjas*, the possible influence of the Gallic (as opposed to Iberian vernacular) on the Romance *kharjas*, and the question of whether the *muwashshaḥs* were sung or not. The time is ripe for making the findings of specialised scholarship available to Romanists and other readers with a general interest. Some syntheses were attempted by Norman Daniel in *The Arabs and Mediaeval Europe* (London: Longman, 1975), Dorothee Metlitzki in *The Matter of Araby in Medieval England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), and Juan Vernet in *La cultura hispanoárabe en oriente y occidente* (Barcelona: Ariel, 1978). What is notable about these books is their authors' first-hand knowledge of the sources, their grasp of the secondary material, and the sobriety of their language.

Menocal claims not to present any new facts but relies on the discoveries of others (xiv). Unfortunately her reportage is not always reliable. To give some examples: (1) There is no evidence that Gerbert of Aurillac used Arabic numerals, far less that he saw 'the advantage of the numerical system of the Arabs (29), as a recent book by W. Bergmann has made clear (*Innovationen im Quadrivium des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts*, Sudhoffs Archiv, Beiheft 26 [Stuttgart, 1985]). (2) The *ṭaifa* kingdoms (not 'city-states'), which arose after the fall of the caliphate of Córdoba (for which we would like to have a date: 1031), were not called *mulūk* (29), since *mulūk* can only mean 'kings.' (3) Peter the Venerable never translated a word of Arabic (38–44) but commissioned translations from Robert of Ketton, Hermann of Carinthia, and Peter of Toledo. (4) It is misleading to talk about Michael Scot's "translation of Averroes' commentary on Aristotle" (57) as if this were a single work, and it is more likely that his translations of a few of the Middle Commentaries and one Greater Commentary on Aristotle by Averroes were written at the court of Frederick II rather than that "it" was sent there (ibidem). (5) The notorious letter accompanying and recommending translations of Aristotle (but not mentioning Averroes) was either sent by Frederick II to the students at Bologna, or sent about thirty years later by his son Manfred to the University of Paris, according to which manuscripts one follows (see 62). (6) Averroes' one commentary on Plato (*On the Republic*) was never translated into Latin, least of all were "commentaries on these philosophers [i.e. Plato and Aristotle] . . . disseminated throughout Europe" (56–57). The philosophical revolution of the twelfth to thirteenth century was an Aristotelian one, and Aristotle's works became best known through translations made directly from the Greek; the Arabs contributed the commentaries and summaries. Thus, while Menocal makes the good point that the influence of Arabic texts concerning grammar and logic on the rise of speculative grammar should be investigated (146–147; presumably she is thinking of

al-Ghazālī's *Maqāṣid*, the relevant portion of Avicenna's *Shifā'*, the *Introduction to the Logical Art* attributed to al-Kindī, and some fragments of al-Fārābī's commentaries on Aristotle's logical works, though she refers only to 'al-Ghazhali' [sic!], and Ibn Hazm), little concrete evidence has been adduced for the influence up to now. It is in the fields of cosmology, psychology, and philosophy of being that we can trace the specific role of texts translated from Arabic. For the gut feeling that Arabic poetry influenced the rise of European lyric, we would like more firm evidence. This Menocal does not provide.

Some of Menocal's ideas are stimulating—for example, that *kharjas* should not be studied in isolation from the *muwashshaḥs*, and that European literature of the Middle Ages should embrace the Arabic texts written in Spain. Moreover, her claim that the European Middle Ages were profoundly influenced by the Arabs is quite justified and would win wide assent. However, Menocal's arguments would he more likely to persuade the critical reader if they were backed up by an accurate and reflective rehearsal of the facts.

CHARLES S. F. BURNETT

Warburg Institute, University of London.

Medieval Catalan Literature: Prose and Drama. By David J. Viera. Boston: Twayne, 1988. 116 pages.

This volume surveys some major works of Catalan prose and religious theater of the Middle Ages. Poetry is not covered, as the bulk of poetry produced in Catalan-speaking areas before the fifteenth century was written in Provençal. Certain major prose authors whom we might expect to find here—Anselm Turmeda, Bernat Metge, Joannot Martorell—are not represented as they will reportedly be treated in another book, Patricia Boehne's *The Renaissance Novel.* This reduces the authors covered to Ramon Llull, Arnau de Vilanova, Francesc Eiximenis, and Saint Vincent Ferrer. Also treated are the four medieval chronicles: the *Libre dels Feyts* of Jaume I and the chronicles of Bernat Desclot, Ramon Muntaner, and Pere III. The final chapter surveys, not drama, but religious theater. The book also includes a minimal bibliography of primary and secondary sources.

In these brief pages Viera manages to supply a great deal of basic information on the authors and works included, most of it accurate, up-to-date, and clearly presented. I think Viera does a good job, within the