of what E.G.G. calls 'critical terrorism' (p. 7). ‘Terrorism’ is surely too strong a word, but the sort of language at which he protests (‘sloppy’, ‘twaddle’, ‘sorry mess’ etc.) ought not to be used in scholarly debate, and is to be deplored. But it is not only offensive language which needs to be eliminated. In El escándalo ... it is insinuated that A.J. may have acquired the Colin manuscript improperly, and may have deprived its rightful owners of it. To say that is outrageous, to print it is a libel. Unfounded and untrue smears have no place in learned controversy.

Let us end on a positive note. Now that A.J. has made the basic texts available, progress can be resumed. It is inconceivable that we should go back to the old readings. Some of the kharjas with which we have grown familiar will stand, some will need to be ‘solved’ afresh. E.G.G., the leading Hispano-Arabic scholar of our twentieth century, was in the forefront when it came to interpreting what evidence was to hand in the 1950's, and still in the 1990's, it would seem from the remarks which I have quoted above about isosyllabism, we can hope for a further statement of his latest views. These will be eagerly awaited. Let us hope, too, that after his outstanding initial contribution to Hispano-Arabic studies, A.J. will soon see his monumental edition of the whole corpus of mauwshah poetry in print. He has already with great generosity made this widely available on computer tape, but one understands that the Gibb Memorial Series will shortly be publishing it in book form.

L.P. Harvey


Professor Bosworth’s avowed aim in this monograph is the “throwing of light on a sector of the Arabic literature of the period between the florescence of the Islamic caliphate in Iraq and the nahda and renaissance of our own times” (p. vii). This aim it has to be allowed is realised in this volume which provides a welcome avenue of approach to a little-studied period of Middle Eastern literary history as well as giving ample scope for the display of Bosworth’s formidable erudition.

The work begins with a short but useful chapter on the author, Bahā’ al-Dīn al-ʿĀmilī, and his age. In view of the jejune (and unattributed) article on Bahā’ al-Dīn in EI2 this is indeed welcome. The would-be reader is however advised that material on “the author and his age” is by no means confined to this chapter and that there is much to be gleaned in this regard in the remainder of the work. The second chapter is on the first of the anthologies with which Bosworth deals, namely the Mīkhālāt (the “nosebag”), and it is in this chapter, where the Mīkhālāt is described as being a “truly amorphous rag-bag”, that what is for this reader a shortcoming of the monograph as presented becomes apparent. We are given some account of the kind of material the Mīkhālāt contains but no real indication as to whether we ourselves might wish to read it, or indeed whether there are any elements which Bosworth himself would commend particularly to our attention as making the acquisition of a copy of the Mīkhālāt worthwhile. (This could have been achieved quite straightforwardly by means of a concluding paragraph for the chapter giving Bosworth’s personal
view of the worth of the volume which would not only have been apposite and
helpful, but which would also have given less of the impression to the reader of
being confronted with, as it were, a "mini-rag-bag" of the "rag-bag".

Chapter III, entitled "The Kashkül: the state of the texts", is the kind of
chapter that would be expected in the introduction to an edition of the Kashkül.
As a preliminary survey of the problems attending the provenance of the text for
a would-be editor it is ideal, but it is difficult to see why such a chapter should
have been included, at any rate in the body of the monograph; it could have
made a worthy Appendix 3 (or 1 for that matter) and the reader would be well
advised to leave this chapter until after Chapter IV-VI which deal with the
Kashkül itself. (In fact a reader could almost omit it altogether, at least until such
time as he had decided to make an edition of the Kashkül for himself, "a gargan-
tuan undertaking" than which according to Bosworth (somewhat surprisingly)
"there are more pressing tasks in Islamic scholarship" (p. 26). It is indeed not
at all clear why Bosworth makes this last comment, as any serious study of the
Kashkül, given the diversity of the published texts let alone the manuscripts, is
bound to require at the outset the establishment of some kind of "textus
receptus".)

Chapters IV-VI show the Kashkül indeed to be an anthology and, although
not entirely literary, it is certainly depicted as providing a treasury of post-
classical Arabic poetry which seems to this reviewer to constitute its principal
value for western scholarship. A variety of differing kinds of examples of the
contents of the anthologies is presented, and it is not always clear why some
elements are given precedence over others. This reader was not particularly
interested, for instance, in a ā′a′da for increasing sexual potency (in the Mikhlat,
see p. 18), nor in the necessity of urinating after copulation "if only a drop"
in the Kashkül, see p. 67)—precious little literary about the above may it be
said—but was interested in hearing about the Persian prose passages, his
appetite whetted by the mathematical one mentioned as being by Shams al-Dīn
al-Shahrazūrī with the citation of Greek authorities (this latter dealt with on p.
70, but the passages dismissed in general as being of no particular interest on
p. 76).

Given the number of anthologies available to the Arabic reader, perhaps the
most telling recommendation for the eastern reader is the work's continued
popularity over many years, evidence for which is provided by the number of
times it has been printed and reprinted and the number of editions it appears
to have passed through (see pp. 28-29). For western scholarship the principal
value must remain its introduction to the post-classical Arabic and Persian
literary world with its host of citations (p. 29), notwithstanding the obvious
importance of the additional information on Bahāʾ al-Dīn's life, the interesting
light it throws on the "intellectual formation of a religious scholar and adīb" and
the insight it gives into Bahāʾ al-Dīn's "Shīʿī sectarian religious attitudes" (see
p. 29). The particular merits of Bahāʾ al-Dīn are, however, to be sought with
some diligence in this presentation, but perhaps the one recommendation which
impressed this reviewer was the evidence that Bahāʾ al-Dīn himself appears to
have been one of the better kind of literary dilettante: "Bahāʾ al-Dīn ... displays
... a fondness for completing an Arabic verse quotation with an apposite Persian
one ... In similar vein Bahāʾ al-Dīn will note that a certain Arabic verse reminds
him of a Persian one with a similar meaning ..." (See p. 77). Despite the fre-
quent mentions of Bahāʾ al-Dīn's own works, it is, all in all, a pity that we have