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competitive sport is that it can lead to palpably false conclusions. (Using his style of argument, for instance, we might conclude that Ramanujan stole his mathematics.) And since some writers find the temptation to proffer counter-examples irresistible, the style is infectious, as could be proved from many a sad modern case. Thomas Harriot’s brilliant handling of the loxodrome problem, one might be tempted to retort, has a bearing on the brusque dismissal of what Ellis tentatively ‘could have devised’, at a time well before the brazen maps were engraved. Harriot, one could say, would have had no difficulty whatsoever with qibla problems. And in this way one might be drawn into the debate, and begin to slide down a very slippery slope having little or nothing to do with history.

The propagandist style of writing that permeates David King’s book extends even to subsidiary theses that he again attempts to prove by weighing European intellectual potential against the opposition. He is led, for example, to conjecture that Habash was the inventor of an instrument called the *navicula de Venetiis*. It is said to be ‘of such complexity and sophistication that it is not possible, within the framework of our present knowledge of medieval European astronomy, to accept that it was conceived in the milieu from which it is known to us’. Strong words, in view of its name and the fact that the only texts and examples known are European. As for its name, King suggests that it might not be a ‘little ship of the Venetians’ (it resembles a ship) but of the ‘Venices’. I can only say that in Dante’s *De vulgari eloquentia*, the Veneti are the Venetians. But putting aside the primitive culture of Europe, what in the last resort is the strongest reason for ascribing the navicula to Habash? Only that a trigonometrical analysis of the instrument can yield a formula mathematically equivalent to one known to Habash.

Such a mathematical equivalence, however, proves very little beyond the fact that the instrument was well designed. The formula in question is also mathematically equivalent to certain results to be found in the fourteenth-century trigonometrical *Quadripartitum* of Richard of Wallingford, but that fact proves nothing whatsoever about the thought processes of the designer or his sources. It is hard to decide whether King is being serious when he summarizes his own argument in the following words: ‘The *navicula* is a sophisticated instrument. Habash invented sophisticated instruments. Therefore Habash invented the *navicula*. Of course he might be right in his conclusion. Conjectures do often turn out to be acceptable in the long run regardless of the illogical processes that led to them in the first place; but it seems excessively rash to seek out so distant an ancestry on no better grounds than that it would have allowed early Islam to hand over a completed instrument to the West, rather than the means to working out a scheme for such an instrument. It would surely be safer to begin with likely routes of transmission, in the hope that they will then lead on to an intellectual family tree. One reason for colossal uncertainty in King’s approach is that one can derive the relevant mathematical formula (ours!) in several fundamentally different ways. One way that is intrinsically intuitive is to begin with the analemma of Ptolemy, or even with the analemma of Vitruvius. This being so, it would be wise to suspend judgement on transmission until the influence of such thirteenth-century works as William of Moerbeke’s translation of Ptolemy’s *Analemmata* has been thoroughly investigated, which at present it has not. And these remarks about the *navicula* can be

extended to the qibla maps. There are various ways in which we might reconstruct the thought processes of their designer, ranging from the semi-empirical to the brilliantly analytical, and in the absence of a text I do not see any clear way of solving this particular historical problem.

David King’s book has a distinctly autobiographical cast, a fact that often conceals the structure of his arguments. I can well imagine that there are readers who will enjoy a book that is in large measure almost a diary of discovery. Autobiography, however, tends to draw in people, as well as texts and artefacts — and so, polemics of a sort that are not at the level of entire civilizations. It seems to me an error of judgement that he repeatedly cites by name an anonymous author of entries in Sotheby’s catalogues, and there are in fact rather too many examples of polemic that leads nowhere in particular. Since I am not his main target, I can quote with equanimity an example that concerns me. I am said to have claimed that the universal horary quadrant is ‘essentially non-functional’, and that this is a misunderstanding. It is indeed a complete misunderstanding of what I actually wrote, but more to the point, it heads in no detectible direction except that of fending off an imagined slight to early Islamic science. While his feelings do often get the upper hand in this way, that is because he feels passionately about his subject as a branch of science. So much so, in fact, that he is not afraid to recommend that modern Islam remember its glorious past and again make use of the techniques embodied in his Safavid maps. (Whether his recommendation will be accepted remains to be seen, but I think not. Competition from the Internet that takes magnetic deviation into the reckoning is mounting daily.) He has been determined to put his rich materials into the public domain, and credit for the result must go not only to him but to the firm of E. J. Brill of Leiden and the Al-Furqan Islamic Heritage Foundation in London.

Groningen & Oxford, July 2000

J. D. NORTH

---


This book deals with Arabic dialectal poetry in the form of *muwashshahat* (‘girdle poems’), *azjāl* (popular strophic poems in dialect) and *khara+jāt* (the *kharija* is the refrain of the last strophe). In the first chapter, Corriente deals with definitions of these genres, their strophic structure, verses, smaller segments and rhymes, metrical structure, linguistic structure and thematic structure, with the stress on themes of love poetry.

In the second chapter, he discusses the origin and evolution of Andalusian strophic poetry. Strophic Arabic poetry, he says, originated in Andalusia and later spread throughout the Arab world. It was well known by Arab intellectuals, though it was not equally appreciated by everyone. It was ‘discovered’ in the West by European orientalists only in the 19th century, since they were limited in effectiveness by the scarce accessibility of sources, and also by their own ideological

---

1) I do not follow the author’s transliterations in all respects.
orientations. Zajal and muwashshah appeared in the 10th century in al-Andalus and matured there in the 11th century, and one century later the first echo of it appeared in the book by Ibn Bassâm of Santarem. In the 12th century, the first anthology was put together by the Egyptian Ibn Sanâ‘ al-Mulk, followed in the 14th century by the Iraqi Şâfi‘î al-Dîn al-Hillî for the zajal and other non-classical genres. Others who occupied themselves with this kind of poetry were the Andalusi Ibn Sa‘îd (13th century), Ibn Khalûdîn (Tunis; 14th century) and the Orientalis as-Safâ‘î (15th century), al-Ḥamawî, al-Ḥijâzî and al-Sakhâwî, and the Western Arab Ibn Bushrâ (probably in the 14th and 15th centuries) together with the 14th century Granadine author Ibn al-Ḫâṭîb. Although, as Corriente says in a note, the first Western discovery of the ḥarajât occurred in the 19th century — namely by Menéndez Pelayo, who discovered Romance ḥarajât in 1894 in the Hebrew poetry of Yehuda ha-Levi — the rediscovery of ḥarajât in Arabic and Hebrew poetry in the 20th century was made by Samuel Myklos Stern in 1948. He was followed in 1952 by García Gómez, and this gave rise to a huge number of publications, to judge from Hitchcock’s Bibliography (1977) amplified by Hitchcock-Lopez Morillas (1996)². He mentions authors who have described the development of these strophic genres of al-Andalus in an unpolemical way, ranging from Hartmann (1887) to Zwartjes (1997: 66-72), via Stern (1974: 63-122), Rosen-Moqed (1985:103-137) Ghāzî (1979), al-Ahwâni (1957) and Corriente himself.

Important questions are whether the origin of strophic poetry is Eastern Arabic or native Hispanic, taking into account metrical and strophic characteristics, and questions concerning the nature of the ḥarajât and the genetic relationship between muwashshah and zajal, and some minor questions about metre and music.

Although the origin of muwashshah and zajal should be sought in the oriental musammāt, the first zajal fragment as such was composed in 913, as discovered and individuated from the basis of the manuscript. At that time, there was nobody who recognized this practice. Even Monroe — G.G.’s only supporter outside Spain — was sceptical about some of G.G.’s suppositions, and Corriente quotes him on page 95 as follows: “Since neither quantity nor stress appear to be in control, within this prosodic system, we are left with a third metrical possibility, namely that of the Romance languages whose medieval lyrical poetry, contrary to what García Gómez maintained, was based on syllable count alone. At this stage in our analysis, we need to take into account that, in the medieval system of versification used in the Ibero-Romance lyric, to which the Quzmâni system bears the closest affinities, stress patterns also fluctuate within a poem... It would, therefore, be more accurate to describe both the medieval Ibero-Romance and the Quzman systems as entirely syllabic, and to apply G.G.’s tables to them with total disregard for stress.” Corriente calls this a positive idea, because he finds a distinction between tonic and toneless syllables in G.G.’s sense to be without foundation. In Corriente’s words, G.G.’s theory did not go beyond his intuition that accent played an important role in the practice of the metrics.

of Andalusi strophic poetry, but he was not able to give this insight the necessary scientific development, and did not take into account linguistics, dialectology or prosody.

With the appearance of Ghazi’s edition of muwashshahāt (1979) and Corriente’s edition of Ibn Quzman’s Song Book (1980), the basic value of the Classical Arabic metrical system for the metrics of Andalusi strophic poetry was recognized, even when admitting the non-quantitative pronunciation of Andalusi Arabic.

Against G.G.’s Hispanic theory, other Arabists, “successors of Stern in England” and “some distinguished disciples of the Central European school” — such as Hoenenbach, Ritter and Schoeler — have adopted a strictly Khalilian and Classical Arabic position, in the classical line of Hartmann. In some ways, perhaps their position was too rigid, without recognizing the specific Andalusi prosody, as if Classical Arabic prosody could not change in time and according to place. Fortunately, they did not falsify the text, but tried to justify justified exceptions, “although sometimes linguistically not very acceptable”. According to Corriente, a subsidiary principle is needed, one derived from the phonemic tonic stress of Andalusi poetry.

C. is sure he has influenced such researchers as A. Jones, who recently (1992) spoke of an ‘extended Khalilian system’, one which no longer adheres to a strict Khalilian system. C. explains how in 1982 he applied the Khalilian scansion to the muwashshahāt, but adapted it to Andalusi stress, as it functioned in the azjāl. He made a systematic scansion of 30 poems from the anthology of Sana‘ al-Mulk, explaining how and why he made this adaptation. Subsequently, in 1997 C. selected from the 30 poems of Sana‘ al-Mulk’s muwashshahāt 21 poems from the period of the tajfas and the Almoravids, underlining the fact that only 11 of them can be scanned according to the strict Khalilian metre. He discovered yet more metrical failures in the azjāl, which he dealt with in 1988.

According to C., sometimes even Schoeler seemed to have had doubts about the total validity of the strict Khalilian system. In a 1991 article, Schoeler tried to show that an Egyptian zajal had the same licences and deviations from the Classical norm as Ibn Quzman, which according to him, did not mean that Andalusi arād was accentual.

C. wonders why nobody felt the need to respond to the linguistic questions which brought him to his conclusions, namely how a community with a language in which the quantitative rhythm has been replaced by the accentual can use metrics based exclusively on the first, without any type of adaptation3). Then, Corriente concentrates on two arguments mentioned by Schoeler (1991): the objection against a scanon which permits more than one metre, and the presence of identical poetic licences in Egyptian azjāl. According to C., there are metrical schemes of ambiguous origin in a system preoccupied with the creation of new schemes. Against the second argument, C. gives some examples that show that Oriental azjāl do not have all the licences which we meet in Andalusi ones. C. underlines that this means there are no strict arād rules which govern the prosody of these original Andalusi genres, except those cases influenced by Classical reabsorption which later on are also exported to the Orient. From this conviction and the confrontation of the Hispanic and Khalilian schemes, C. proposed a third theory, the ‘bridging hypothesis’. In fact, C.’s new hypothesis is based on the assumption that muwashshahāt and azjāl make fundamental use of Classical Arabic metrics, as something nearly inevitable within the currents of Islamic culture in which they came into being, but through a prosodic adaptation, required by the omnipresence of an Iberian linguistic substrate, which several centuries earlier had in the same manner affected Latin. The Andalusi dialect had lost the quantitative rhythm of ‘Oriental Classical Arabic’ and been replaced by an accentual language; also the metrics had to be adapted to the Spanish native pronunciation of the Arabic. From this viewpoint, C. explains the lack of poetry in al-Andalus before the 9th century by the fact that ʿAbd ar-Rahmān II was preoccupied with promoting Arabic culture in his own country and introducing the art of poetry and Arabic metrics by means of ʿAbbās ibn Firmās. Persons such as ʿAbbās ibn Firmās tried to transpose the Classical Arabic quantitative rhythms into a phonemic prosodic expression which was workable for an Andalusi4). The Khalilian system has a marked element — namely wattīd (v-) and wattīd maftrak (-v) — and according to the theory of Weil5), the long vowel had an ʿetṣ during its recitation. Although it is doubtful whether this is an expatory accent, professors of metrics may have used it as a pedagogic means to indicate to their pupils the marked segment, and Andalusian pupils — future professors in their turn — who had phonemic stress in their dialect, maintained this as being fundamental for the introduction of the system of feet and metres in their homeland.

This teacher then maintained marked ‘long’ syllables, so that stress was introduced into every metre; e.g. tawīl has stress on the syllables 2-5-9, basīṭ on 4-7, madīd on 3-7, etc., the long syllable of the wattīd beingaccentuated. According to C., this resolved the problem of maintaining an acoustic and phonemic problem perceivable to the ear. Moreover, the fact that the strophic forms muwashshah and zajal have some unusual licences in their metrical system derives from their popular origin, because the ‘analphabets’ who created these songs did not fully understand the quantitative system, and composed from hearing.

Finally, C. wants to evaluate the hypotheses of Schoeler and Monroe. The best argument of Schoeler is the relative

3) C. also raises a question with regard to the Hebrew poets (p. 104), how one could explain that when the Hebrew poets of al-Andalus took over the Classical Arabic metre, they did not follow the traditional pronunciation of Hebrew [with long and short vowels], but made long all the vowels, and short the murmuring sound [shewa] which could not bear an accent at any time? I cannot go deeply into this matter here, but it is undeniable that in some cases of traditional pronunciation of Hebrew there are accents, namely in segolate forms (such as melēk and ōcean) and such other forms that have minimal pair oppositions in Hebrew with the accent playing a role. So Yehudah ha-Levi complained that the Hebrew accent was destroyed by the Arabic metre, e.g. the distinction between okhlah [allongated imperative: ‘eat’] and okhleḥ [‘eating’ F. as equivalent of okhelet] was lost in metre (See Yehudah ha-Levi, Kiṭab al-Radd wal-Dalil fil-ṭin al-dhalil [=the Kuzari], ed. D.H. Baneth, Jerusalem 1977, 82-83).

4) About the introduction of Classical Arabic metre into Spain, now is also available the article by Dmitry Frolov, ‘Notes on the history of Arād in al-Andalus’ in Anaquel de Estudios Arabes 6 (1995), 87-110.

5) For Weil, see Stoezter in J.S. Meisami and P. Starkey, Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature, London 1998, s.v., Prosody (p. 622): “W. Stoezter has argued that a purely quantitative analysis without Weil’s stress postulate is possible on the basis of the quantitative equivalence of sabah (one long syllable) and wattā (short-long syllable). Such a way of calculating (in which the independent short syllable has zero quantity) is in line with Khalil’s premises in which the independent short syllable is no scansion element.”
infrrequency with which licences were permitted in this Andalusian poetry. According to C., this is due to the 'reabsorption' of the Classical system. Monroe's theory supposes that in the prosody of the *zajal* the number of syllables are accentuated by means of an ictus, regardless of the normal linguistic accent of the word. C. gives examples of a poem scanned by Monroe (and G.G.) according accents in the positions 1-3-5-7-9, in the Khalilian way (as Schoeler would do), and in his own manner, with accents according to the normal word accent, which gives a perfect rhythm 2-5-9 according to the tawil pattern mentioned above.

C. cannot be sure whether the Andalusian prosodic system — with a phonemic tonic accent in the first centuries — has been evolved in its final phase towards another formula: this could explain the absence of licences in late Granadine poems.

At the end C. discusses in passing two explications, one by famous Hebraists and one by famous musicologists. The Hebraists Millas, Canteras and Diaz Esteban defend that the Jews of al-Andalus could have known the work of the *paytanim* (the pre-Islamic Palestinian liturgical poets), whose technique of refrains was probably imitated by the response of the Christian liturgy and produced a strophic system (abbb, cddd, etc.) similar to the Andalusi system.

But C. argues that this similarity is sporadic and the composition of similar works among the Jews of al-Andalus is not documented. And it would be difficult to imagine that gentiles would have imitated a supragnostic choral form and turned it into a laic strophic structure. The second explanation made by Ulf Haxen (1978) and Wulstan (1982) was based on musicological facts, which also impressed some contemporaneous Arabic authors, especially al-Ahwâni (1957), in the sense that these could be explained by the rhythmic exigencies of the music for which they were composed.

However, C. comments that the poem precedes its use as a song and that consequently it has all the structures of the poetry which is composed only for recitation, so that the problems of these cannot be solved by this musical explanation. Put more clearly: there are too many metrical coincidences between strophic Andalusian poetry and the 'ardus to affirm that this poetry is ruled by another metrical or musical system, even when one speaks of an adaptation of it.

After reading the third chapter some minor questions with regard to C.'s remarks about the language substrate of Andalusi Arabic came to mind. In my view, the question remains whether metrical quantity — something which belongs to a metrical system of an unnatural poetic language, such as Classical Arabic, which was never spoken as a mother tongue — has anything to do with natural languages. In my view, the adaptation of the ear to Classical Arabic metre is a question of someone's education rather than his or her spoken language and its possible substrate, because without education no ear of whatever natural language speaker — including those of Oriental Arabic dialect speakers — will be adapted to a metrical system without education. A language substrate is difficult to prove when we possess no data at all about the former Iberian languages, and have no knowledge about any other feature of the substrate languages in question. Moreover, Andalusi Arabic as described by C. is not such an exception within the corpus of Arabic dialects: in most Arabic dialects, stress seems to play a phonemic role, sometimes together with phonemic quantity. Some Arabic dialects, some Western dialects (including Andalusi Arabic) and some — if not all — Moroccan dialects have no phonemic quantity but only phonemic stress, except in cases of interference with Standard Arabic (C.'s classical reabsorption).

These questions of mine are not meant to detract from the great value of C.'s discussion and survey of the mentioned issues. In conclusion, I will limit myself to the possibility that at a certain stage Andalusian Arabic poets wanted to make an accentual metrical system of their own, or were not educated enough in the beginning to be well versed in Classical Arabic metre.

In any case, in my view, it can be proved from the history of Hebrew poetry that the Khalilian system which still was the basis of Hebrew metrics from Duecento until Cinquecento and afterwards, can go together with Romance metrical forms such as *Sonnet* and *Ottava Rima*: poets such as Immanuel ha-Romi (14th Century) and Samuel Archivolti (16th Century) composed sonnets in the traditional Andalusian Hebrew metre. Here come the Khalilian quantity and the Romance stress together. A second question of mine is whether the *zajal* genre was really made 'by analphabetes'. What are the arguments for this supposition? Is the only reason alleged for it that *zajals* are strophic forms in dialect? Could they not be the result of intellectuals amusing themselves by creating poems in a stylised Andalusi dialect? I hope these questions will be solved in the future.

One has to be grateful to C. for the work he has done in clearing up the many difficulties of the language of the *zajal* and its linguistic analysis, and in determining its metrical system. At the end of the book are several appendices containing examples of the different types of the *muwashshah*, a catalogue of *kharajât* of *muwashshahât* in Andalusian Arabic, a catalogue of *kharajât* of *azjâl*, and a catalogue of Romance *kharajât* and their interpretations, from Hebrew as well as Arabic *muwashshahât*. Here the author also deals with Andalusian Romance in Ibn Quzman's *lyrics*, and presents grammatical lexical notes.

The lists of Arabic and Romance *kharajât*, taken from Hebrew as well as Arabic poetry, are very impressive, as are the many useful emendations C. made. However, I should like to make one small point as far as the *kharajât* are concerned. In one of the Hebrew *kharajût* (H23 p. 322, note 314), C. suggests that the Hebrew *ahuhi* rather than the Arabic *habibi* is a later, spurious addition. However, within the function of this *kharja* it is better to maintain *ahuhi*, since the Christian girls who are the lovers in the *kharajât* direct themselves to beloved ones from other religious communi-
ties. Therefore, they use habibi for their Arab beloved and ahubi if the lover is a Jew. In many cases, the word habibi is the only Arabic word among other Romance words. It would be worthwhile to investigate which Arabic words are used in a further Romance context, in order to determine the intentional symbolic contents of these inserted words.

Although it is understandable that C.'s list of kharajdt is not exhaustive — since recent findings in the Genizah material have brought to light(10), and will continue to bring to light, other kharajdt not listed by C. — both the list and its linguistic analysis in this book will greatly help present and future scholars to gain an insight into the language of the kharajdt. We should therefore be grateful to Corriente for putting together and analysing all this material, which for most of us would be difficult to understand without his help.

Amsterdam, 7 March 2000

Arie Schippers


Obwohl Theologie und theologische Anthropologie differieren, ist christlichen und islamischen Traditionen ein grundlegender Androzentrismus mit einer korrespondierenden rechtlichen und kulturellen Unfähigkeit für Frauen gemeinsam (W. W.: Islamische Fundamentalist/innen würden hier wahrscheinlich vom islamischen Standpunkt aus widersprechen!). Diese Konvergenz der Gender Modelle, in der eine spezifische Weiblichkeit definiert wird, nicht aber eine korrelative spezifische Männlichkeit, ist, so die Autorinnen in ihrem kurzen grundlegenden Vorwort, in der Religionswissenschaft noch unerforscht. Forschung, die bei der Untersuchung der christlichen und islamischen Traditionen die Geschlechterrollen als die wesentliche analytische Kategorie zugrunde legt, wird sich, so formulieren die Verfasserinnen anschließend und zu Recht, als sehr fruchtbar erweisen.


Meine neueren Erkenntnisse zum Frauenbild in »Tausend-und­dunender Nacht«, ergänzend und korrigierend zu meinem

2) Vgl. ibid., Vorwort S. 8, und die Bibliographie.