Volume 116 / Number 2 / April–June 1996
ISSN 0003-0279

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

quences. Where other historians of the age tended on the whole to ascribe to the ruler most of the credit or blame for the course of events, Ibn Khaldūn was aware of larger and more impersonal forces shaping the historical process" (p. 225). He cites Ibn Khaldūn's treatment of the murder of ʿUthmān, which he "projects . . . onto a far larger tableau where the nature and appeal of power and religion to differently ordained segments of a given society must be taken into account in any attempt to understand the significance of events" (p. 227); but with the exception of his initial observation (that "when the conquests had reached their limit and the Muslim religion had acquired a fully fledged state" the tribal Arabs grew restless—"the veins of the *jahiliyya* began to throb once more" [pp. 226–27]), which situates the reign of ʿUthmān in the age theory of states that his history is concerned to demonstrate (however forcedly), Ibn Khaldūn's account presents nothing new, and certainly nothing analytical. His approach to the history of the past, informed both by hindsight and by political conditions in his native Maghreb, is essentially reductive; cf. his comment on the caliph al-Nāṣir (Khalidi does not mention the specific context, the death notice for that caliph), read as suggesting that "a caliph found to be spending his time breeding pigeons or cavorting in the uniform of *futuwwa* 'indicates' a senescent state" (p. 229; what Ibn Khaldūn actually says—after having praised al-Nāṣir's learning—is that it was a sign of the senescence of the Abbasid *dawla*). Once a state is in decline, nothing can reverse the inevitable course of events. Neither example supports in an unqualified way the view of Ibn Khaldūn as a historian who "sought to pass beyond the particular and the individual and to survey history as it unfolded over generations" (p. 231).

Concluding, Khalidi recapitulates his arguments: "that the effect of Islamic revelation on historical thought was preponderant, that the Arabs acquired, with Islam, a new historiography as well as a new religion"; that the early conquests provided the chief impetus to historical writing; and that Islamic historiography underwent a particular process of evolution characterized by the four main epistemic "canopies" described (p. 232). These remarks point to some of the book's major problems. That Arabic-Islamic historical thought was formed only by the Koran, in isolation from the surrounding cultural milieu, and that historical writing appeared fully fledged, as it were, in the early decades of Islam cannot be supported either by the texts at our disposal or by common sense. There is too much overlapping between the epistemic "canopies" (especially between *adab/ḥikma/siyāsa*) to make them viable as categories, although the observation that all these tendencies (to which others might be added) inform historical writing to varying degrees is a sound one. What is needed now is a study of the way they may be combined in the work of particular historians. Generally speaking, Khalidi's approach tends to be overly theoretical; although there is a laudable effort to place historical writing in its larger political and cultural context, this is often done in an oversimplified manner. Questions of style are largely ignored, as are the links between historiography and rhetoric which mark the ethical historiography of the middle period; but Khalidi must nonetheless be commended for the emphasis placed on that period and for his discussions of often neglected writers. Most crucially, there is little sense of the larger context in which historical writing took place, of contacts with non-Arab (Persian, Ottoman) or non-Muslim (Jewish, Christian) historiography, or of any comparative framework within which Arabic historical thought might profitably be considered (e.g., through comparisons with classical or medieval Western historiography); it is as if "Arabic-Islamic historical thought" were hermetically sealed off from the rest of the world. There is a tendency to take statements literally and uncritically, to ignore the fact that historical discourse is, like any other, a literary construct subject to a variety of generic and stylistic (not to mention political) constraints. Current scholarship in the field is largely relegated to footnotes and never really engaged, unless to be dismissed. Documentation is often sketchy; diacritics are lacking (certainly an inconvenience to the student); the bibliography lists only the Arabic texts cited; the index is inadequate for serious reference.

Nonetheless, this is a pioneering effort, since few scholars have even attempted to consider Islamic historical thought as an intellectual phenomenon, rather than viewing Islamic histories as repositories of data; and Khalidi deserves credit for his attempt to consider this complex subject from a broad perspective and over an extensive period. There is a great deal of value in this book, and if I have called attention to some of its weaknesses this is not to disparage its overall importance. It is hoped that, now some of the spadework has been done, others will be inspired to pursue in more detailed fashion the issues to which Khalidi has called attention.

JULIE SCOTT MEISAMI

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Shards of Love: Exile and the Origins of the Lyric. By MARÍA ROSA MENOCAL. Durham: DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1994. Pp. xiii + 295. $19.95 (paper).

While *Shards of Love* deals mainly with European literary history, the issues it raises—of how narratives of literary history have been, and might be, written—concern all of us who study literature (and not least the literatures of the Middle East). The "master narrative" of European literature begins, as does the book (part I, "The Horse Latitudes"), on that fateful

day of 2nd August 1492 when the Jews of Spain began their second Diaspora and Columbus launched the voyage which "would be remembered as that perfect marker of a rip in the fabric of world history" (p. 4). From this point on, "the literature and culture of the Jews and the Muslims . . . are fully exiled from the narrative of 'European literary history'" (p. 23), which will jettison everything that does not fit—beginning with the Middle (now, the Dark) Ages, as "modernity" defines itself as everything that is not medieval, going on to efface pluralities of language and culture that threaten fragmentation and chaos—as it proceeds "towards pristine Castilian, or pure Italian, or perfect French" (p. 13), the languages of nations and of states.

How can we resist the temptations of this smooth, false narrative? We might begin by substituting for the "objectivizing" stance by which we distance ourselves from the past the "synchronic" medieval historiographic mode "that intimately molds the relationship between self and text, self and history," in an effort both to "reconceive our own relationships to earlier texts and culture as part of our fundamental personal and present histories" and to restore "the radical presentness of the medieval past just beneath our consciousness" (pp. 17–18), to acknowledge the pluralism lost to our communal memory, purged from the master narrative just as its representatives were expelled from their European homelands.

There is no better example of "the havoc wreaked on our communal memory" than the *muwashshahāt*, those songs that "invent new Romance and Arabic and Hebrĕw poetics in one swoop," in which "we hear a calliope of languages and voices," of registers and genders, playing out "the paradoxes of love" (pp. 24–25). Carved up by specialist philologies, dismissed as not very "good" poetry (ungrammatical, mongrel, popular), their very existence violates the assumptions of the master narrative. The *muwashshahāt* share important affinities with other marginalized, hybrid literary phenomena: the Baroque poetry of a Spanish Góngora, the modern poems of a Cuban Nicolás Guillén; this hybridity prompts Menocal to argue "that medieval culture is postmodern" (p. 37), in ways mapped out here and in the ensuing chapters.

Menocal distinguishes, correctly I think, between the early Middle Ages (tenth–thirteenth centuries), marked by a general tolerance of pluralism, and the later (fourteenth–fifteenth centuries) whose social devastation and religio-political repression have given the Middle Ages a bad name. She sees the polymorphous lyric as the link between medieval and postmodern, and asks if it is possible "to tell History in the lyrical mode" rather than the narrative (p. 50). In part II ("Scandal") she attempts to do so, beginning (ch. 1, "Love and Mercy") with the two great metaphysical lyricists of Spain, Ibn ᶜArabi and Ramon Llull, whose lives spanned the period from the twelfth to the early fourteenth century, and who migrated across that rapidly changing world singing their visions of love.

It is no accident that both "believed that a reconciliation between their religions was possible and . . . wrote poetic works which suggest that sacred and profane love are reconcilable" (p. 62); nor is it accidental that the two, mutually exclusive, literary narratives that rise on the ruins of al-Andalus render whichever of the two they include "orthodox" through an exegesis that posits an unbridgeable divide between "profane" and "mystical" love. The kinship between Ibn ᶜArabi and Llull cannot be explained by the " 'origins' and 'borrowings' methods of medievalism that end up atomizing and mutilating texts" (p. 76); it is "far more unsettling . . . they are both children of the same storm." That storm put an end to multicultural Spain and brought "the madness of civil hatreds that would be used to carve out the modern states and their exclusive languages, their strong 'ethnic' narratives" (pp. 86–87). Ibn ᶜArabi left Spain for the Arab East; Llull was stoned to death in Tunis. The former is still too heterodox for many; the latter has been rehabilitated as "an exemplary defender of Christianity" (p. 61); both are valued for what is seen as transcendent in their writings, whose historical and political contingency is denied. Yet "if mysticism were . . . devoid of a social dimension, Llull would never have been stoned, Ibn ᶜArabi would not be redrawn to seem so orthodox. . . . This kind of exile . . . is a starkly political act shaped by a maelstrom" (p. 89).

Menocal argues (ch. 2, "The Inventions of Philology") that lyric, "invented in bitter exile" (p. 91), voices political and social conflicts and tensions that the master narrative endeavors to suppress (a point to bear in mind as we study other lyric traditions; discomfort with the notion that love poetry might have political implications has certainly marked studies of Middle Eastern poetry). "In our books, politics—especially deeply corrupt, incomprehensible, and violent politics—is not the true place where sublime writers live" (p. 93). Thus the Dante of the European master narrative is the poet of the *Commedia*, not of those "searing poems" of love in the "still renegade" vernacular.

But the deep involvement in politics which marks both Dante's lyrics and the *De vulgari eloquentia* (written in response to his exile from Florence) defies the "legitimizing belief" that the languages and texts we make official, by making them objects of study, were never fought over, "that they themselves never participated in such vulgar fights" (p. 97). In the name of "History" and "Tradition" we embrace a fundamental ahistoricity, as history itself is "reconfigured to mean something like antiquarianism and values that are beyond contingencies, and literature itself is banished from any construct of history that includes stark ideology, bloody politics" (pp. 97–98).

If the European lyric holds important lessons for us, so, too, does the story of Romance philology. Menocal sees Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis* (itself a product of exile) as exemplary both in rejecting the "Great Tradition," with its underlying

provincialism, and in eschewing the division between "language" and "literature" which subordinates one to the other and by virtue of which, "if they appear at all, literary texts are but the documents that carry linguistic information" (p. 113). This division is still very much with us (we study poetry to learn Arabic, not the other way around); it seriously distorts our view of the "tradition" as we focus on, and thus canonize, those texts that are "correct" (i.e., grammatical). By contrast, Auerbach (like Dante) seeks "[to integrate] the vernacular, the living and not yet canonized, with the traditions that normally get the respectful explications de texte" (p. 111).

One such vernacular tradition is the Provençal lyric, whose antisocial and heterodox poetics were outlined in Denis de Rougemont's *Love in the Western World*. De Rougemont "put back on center stage the dominantly heretical culture that was later . . . relegated to footnote status by the 'successful' narrations of the dominant orthodoxies" (p. 126). The Albigensian heresy to which de Rougemont linked (to the horror of many) the Provençal poetry of courtly love, both shaped and reflected the heterodoxy of Languedoc itself, the scene also of the development of the Jewish Kabbala. De Rougemont was grappling with the problem of a fragmented Europe, whose "crisis was seen to lie, at least in part . . . in the acceptance of a concept of a love that is starkly inimical to the continuity of the social order and to the institutions of continuity and narration (marriage, the Church, and so forth)," a concept he contrasted with "the texts and the traditions that have privileged those continuums, those unities: love that is agape (and not eros), orthodox (and not mystical), narratable (and not lyric)" (p. 134). The same problem led E. R. Curtius to search, in the ruins of European civilization, for "a noble and good tradition that *has* survived all along and that has provided . . . a unity and a continuum that *will* survive," a unity that "stands in visible opposition to the vulgar, the vernacular, the secular" (pp. 134–35). Literary history, like political, is the history of the victors.

Menocal sees comparative literature as the heir to "the exilic Romance philology" of an Auerbach: it "has no set languages or texts, no necessary borders, no temporal constraint or narrative shape . . . it is the literature of exiles, those who have no other homes, or those who do not like staying at home and being absorbed into another story. While the narratives of national literatures are driven . . . by the search for the transcendent, the lyrical mode of . . . comparative literature . . . accentuates the contingencies of each text and its language" (pp. 137–38). This is an ideal many of us would subscribe to; but comparative literature, especially when it approaches non-Western literatures, all too often sees those literatures through the distorting lens of the European master narrative.

Were comparative literature less Euro-centered, more pluralistic than it is, Menocal might have perceived sooner than she did (as she confesses in ch. 3, "Chasing the Wind") the links between Eric Clapton's *Layla and Other Assorted Love Songs* and the Persian poet Nizami, listed on the album cover as co-author of "I Am Yours"—links recoverable because of the current "classicization," in various ways, of rock itself (p. 149). This example illustrates a wide range of literary-critical issues: the separation of "low" or "popular" culture from "high," of "the performed, the 'oral', from the written" (p. 150); our privileging of the latter as we read poems—songs—as if they were fixed texts, forgetting how music "shapes the voice, and in turn the words" (p. 152). The analogy with rock can "help us to retrieve bits and pieces of the lost culture of songs that was the medieval lyric" (p. 153)—to consider, for example, the relationship between the *muwashshahāt* and the troubadour poetry of Languedoc in terms other than the quest for concrete, textual evidence of origins or influences. To ask, "How could the troubadours have known Arabic?" "Why are there no extant translations of, say, songbooks?" is to privilege contacts between dead words over those between living poets.

For if lyric (as Dante wrote in the *Convivio*) is untranslatable, song needs no translation, as those of us who listen to rock (or opera) will know. Our reluctance to see lyric as song is further complicated by our "fundamental model . . . of the artist" as scholar (like the critic), remote from what is young, sexy, or political, rather than as anarchic rock star, and by "a model of culture that sees the past as if manuscripts had always been quaint, as if literature were mostly, perhaps always, a learned enterprise, and as if the artist were some sort of scholarly nerd" (pp. 160–61). (We might recall, for example, that Bashshar's lyrics were sung in the streets of Basra; that the Abbasid singing star Mukhariq performed a *zuhdiyya* by Abu al-ʿAtahiya in a graveyard; that Rumi's "transcendental" *ghazals* were sung, and danced to, in the far from elitist Sufi *samaʿ*.) The differences between medieval and modern song do not reduce the utility of the analogy, which demands that we look at texts by dead poets as what they once were: living performances.

But there is, says Menocal, "perhaps one more deadly passion" that tempts the poet away from the contingencies of song as performance: the "desire to be a classic," in which the lyric's radical modernism is tempered by an "equally acute canonicity . . . revealed in a variety of reflexively classicizing gestures" (p. 176). Audiences want to hear songs sung the old way; poets, and singers, oblige, in part to prevent their songs from being "mangled" by the masses; and their songs become part of the Great Tradition, texts for philologists to ponder.

Menocal concludes (part II, "Desire") by returning to the links between lyric and exile, to the pain, and the memories, that engender song and bring the poet, finally, out of exile. Part IV ("Readings and Sources") forms a "running commentary" on her text, both noting her "debts to others" and "suggesting the contours of other readings, of lines of inquiry not pursued" (p. 191). It is impossible to do justice to these essays here; one may note the important section on the role of memory in

medieval literature and culture (pp. 199–203); the critique of the ideological drive of Spanish literary history and the "Albornozian view of Spain and her civilization ruined by the Arabs and Jews" (pp. 210–12); further explorations of the conflict between mystical poetry and exegesis (pp. 220–28), the ahistoricism of philology (pp. 232–39), the analogy between lyric and rock (expanded, via Majnun, to take in Ottoman; pp. 254–55), and the relations between oral and written culture (pp. 259–60).

This book will be dismissed by many. It is, like the lyric it examines, heterodox, discontinuous, and political. Those who prefer orthodoxy, a univocal, coherent narrative, "objectivity" and the search for the transcendent will not like it. Those who do like it (like this reviewer) will think of yet other voices that might join in its celebration of song.

JULIE SCOTT MEISAMI

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Religious Polemic and Intellectual History of the Mozarabs, c. 1050–1200. By THOMAS E. BURMAN. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 52. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1994. Pp. xv + 407. HFl 165, $94.50.

This volume represents a valuable addition to an underrepresented field of medieval Iberian history. As the author states in his introduction, "unlike the Mudejars and Spanish Jews, who have been the subjects of very extensive study in our times, the Mozarabs of the twelfth century and later are in some respects 'a forgotten community' as far as modern scholarship is concerned" (p. 2). This lacuna owes less to modern forgetfulness than to the rarity and extreme difficulty of texts documenting the life and beliefs of Arabic-speaking Christians in medieval Spain. Very little is known about this community, and there exists almost no information on the Mozarabs in the period between the ninth and the eleventh centuries. Even the name of the community is problematic for—as Burman points out (pp. 7–9)—it is debatable whether Arabic-speaking Christians should be collectively referred to as "Mozarabs." Burman adopts the term, for the sake of simplicity, but his discussion emphasizes the variety and "permeable boundaries" (p. 28) of the Mozarabic community in the later middle ages.

Only a few Mozarabic texts (all works of Christian polemic) survive from the twelfth century, and these have been studied in the past by M.-Th. d'Alverny, N. Daniel, and others. However, the strictly religious character of these writings has precluded much analysis beyond their overt content. How can a scholar use polemical texts to glean information about the society and intellectual milieu which produced these works? This is the question which Burman tackles in his book, and he provides a brilliant example of the way in which painstaking study, a deep knowledge of contemporary theological writings, multi-lingual expertise, and a different set of questions, can seduce new information out of unpromising sources.

Burman devotes the first half of his volume to a close analysis of a small handful of Mozarabic religious writings, all produced in the twelfth century by authors about whom we know almost nothing. An edition and facing English translation of the most important of these texts, the *Liber denudationis sive ostensionis aut patefaciens*, takes up the second half of the book. These texts were originally written in Arabic, although the *Liber denudationis* only survives in one execrable medieval Latin translation. Burman's thesis is that the Mozarab authors of these works were well versed in a number of theological traditions, and they drew their arguments from a wide variety of sources, both Christian and Muslim. They were familiar not only with the works of oriental Christian authors, but also with Muslim polemic, theology, commentary, and tradition. Burman demonstrates the facility of Mozarab authors for adapting the techniques of Muslim tradition for their own ends. To some extent, they directed their writing to Muslim readers familiar with the Qur²ān, *tafsīr*, and *ḥadīth*, and they turned quotations from these Muslim sources to argue in favor of Christianity. Their writings show that Mozarab scholars were steeped in an Arabic intellectual tradition, and it was a natural format for their arguments. All this is striking, but not so surprising given the Arabic milieu in which these authors were trained. What is more unexpected is that Burman also shows that the Mozarab polemicists incorporated contemporary Latin theology, including the ideas of Peter Abelard, into their writing. By identifying points of Latin theological influence in Mozarabic writings, Burman argues for a "resurgence of Latinity" among the Mozarabs in the twelfth century. At the same time, he makes an important statement that the transfer of ideas was more dynamic and multi-directional than previously suspected. Suddenly, these obscure Mozarab theologians, probably working in Toledo, emerge at the very center of twelfth-century intellectual activity.

The first half of this book provides striking new insights on the nature of the Mozarab community in the twelfth century, and it is an important contribution to the field. The second half of the book, devoted to an edition of the *Liber denudationis*, is also valuable, but much more specialized. Despite the interest of this text, this is its first edition—probably because its Latin is so dreadful that the unique manuscript was long considered to be too corrupt to be worthy of editing. However, as Burman cogently argues, the text is not corrupt, but instead a hasty Latin translation of an Arabic original (now lost), made by an under-qualified medieval translator. As with the other Mozarab polemical works, the *Liber denudationis* weaves together argument and quotation from several traditions, and