

scholar in the premodern period studying the traditional *madrassa* curriculum and feeling part of the inherited intellectual tradition. For the reader who is past the novice stage, Spevack's presentation at times insufficiently engages the scholarly literature on the subject and is uncritical toward the information stated in the texts perused for his study. Hence, his narrative of the development of the schools of law omits discussion of the surrounding debates or of the complexity of the processes involved, while the detail that Abū Shujā', an eleventh/twelfth-century author of a Shāfi'ī primer on law, lived 160 years, according to traditional accounts (p. 82), could have been demystified with a note. Other sections, in particular chapter four on al-Bājūrī's thought, are aimed at a reader who has had extensive exposure to intellectual debates in theology—on the nature of God and the concept of unity of existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*), say—in order to follow and appreciate al-Bājūrī's contributions to these topics. Some translated passages as well only make sense to a reader with knowledge of Arabic (e.g., pp. 28, 40).

Assessing the intellectual contribution of a particular scholar to a field based on his commentary on a work is rife with pitfalls. Commentators draw upon previous commentaries, often without acknowledging all their sources. Unless one compares all extant commentaries—sometimes a mighty undertaking—one might easily attribute elements to the wrong commentator. Spevack has credited al-Bājūrī with “substantial additions” to Ibn Qāsim al-Ghazzī's (d. 1512) commentary on *Matn Abī Shujā'* in the section on animal sacrifice upon a child's birth (*'aqīqa*) (pp. 28–29), when in fact the additional points on grammar, hadith criticism, and condemnation of pre-Islamic practice already show up verbatim in al-Khaṭīb al-Shirbīnī's (d. 1570) commentary on this text. Admittedly, such misattribution is hard to avoid, and Spevack does pay attention to the difficulty of determining al-Bājūrī's voice, yet in this way the intellectual portrait of al-Bājūrī that is painted somewhat overestimates his contribution. In this instance, al-Bājūrī may only have revived an existing discourse or altered the focus of the discussion by including comments that al-Barmāwī, his acknowledged model for the commentary, left out.

Furthermore, one could ask whether the archetypal scholar is defined by his knowledge of only law, theology, and mysticism, or could there be more to what was considered “typical” in the education of the *'ālim* of the premodern period? I would argue that a certain level of accomplishment in *adab* was just as important, by which I do not mean the ability to reach the poetic creativity of Abū Tammām or al-Mutanabbī but the possession of a more than cursory acquaintance with the prosaic and poetic traditions of Arabo-Islamic civilization. A thorough familiarity with *adab* as an academic field was necessary for understanding and debating hadith, Quran, and in general the textual tradition of Islam. The ever-present use of verse in all types of scholarly writings bears evidence that being an *adīb* was an integral aspect of one's scholarly persona. We find this type of literary production in most of the scholars whom Spevack holds up as archetypes—al-Rāzī, al-Suyūṭī, al-Sanūsī, and others. Al-Bājūrī himself is no exception: his commentary on al-Busayrī's *al-Burda* (Poem of the Mantle) speaks to his knowledge of the genre.

Lastly, the book's transliteration of Arabic is too often faulty. Disregarding what could be excused as typos and occasional mistakes made by any scholar, the consistent misuse of the Arabic *tashdīd* is regrettable, e.g., *mu'tammad* for *mu'tamad*, *mustaḥab* for *mustaḥabb*, *aṣaḥ* for *aṣaḥḥ*, *maḥaba* for *maḥabba*. These snafus detract from the otherwise well-rounded presentation of al-Bājūrī as an archetypal scholar working in the intellectual tradition of his predecessors, yet molding and contributing to it according to his own interpretation and his own historical context.

FELICITAS OPWIS  
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

---

Al-Jabartī, *'Ajā'ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa-l-akhbār* (The Marvelous Chronicles: Biographies and Events). Edited by SHMUEL MOREH. Max Schloessinger Memorial Series, Texts, vol. 9. 5 vols. Jerusalem: HEBREW UNIVERSITY, 2013. Pp. 2,780. \$525.

Al-Jabartī's history of Egypt, a chronicle that covers the eighteenth century, the French expedition of Napoleon (1798–1801), and the early years of the reign of Muḥammad 'Alī (1805–1848), up to 1821,

is better known to scholars than most other Arabic historical works. It not only exists in a number of scholarly and non-scholarly editions, the work was also translated into French by Gaston Wiet and Abd al-Rahman Zaki in 1954 and into English by Moshe Perlmann and Thomas Philipp in 1994.

A new critical edition by Shmuel Moreh has now been published. Moreh has spent many years studying al-Jabartī and his works, and already has a number of publications about both al-Jabartī and his chronicle, *ʿAjāʾib al-āthār*. The present edition includes a twenty-five-page introduction in Arabic and an introduction in English, to which has been appended an article on al-Jabartī published by David Ayalon written in 1960, “The Historian al-Jabartī and His Background.” The introduction provides details about how al-Jabartī composed his chronicle, indicating that the first two volumes were based on the texts of earlier historians and the last two volumes, which cover events contemporary to the author’s own lifetime, were based on his observations, as well as on the manuscripts of some of his contemporaries and colleagues, namely, al-Murādī and al-Zabīdī.

As noted, al-Jabartī’s chronicle is probably the most published of Arabic historical chronicles and, certainly, the most published history of Ottoman Egypt. It is therefore appropriate to ask what a new edition of this work adds to what already exists? There are three answers. First, while previous editions have also been based on the Bulaq edition of 1880, Moreh has integrated some other manuscripts into his edition, including a particularly important one preserved in the Cambridge University Library that has an autograph by the author. Moreover, Moreh collated it with a number of other manuscripts of the *ʿAjāʾib*, paying particular attention to the manuscripts that had been copied under al-Jabartī’s own supervision. Al-Jabartī checked these copies himself, writing his corrections in the margins. Although the new additions that this edition brings may not drastically change what we know of the history of the period, the present text is nevertheless more complete and more accurate than previous editions of the work.

Second, the edition of the chronicle under review does not correct the linguistic mistakes that al-Jabartī made, unlike previous editions. It was commonplace for modern editors of early Arabic texts to correct the language and bring it up to the level of standard classical Arabic. This is especially true of manuscripts written during the Ottoman period when there occurred a shift in written Arabic toward a level of language—“Middle Arabic” or, more correctly, “Mixed Arabic”—that was closer to the spoken word. Many texts written in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries contain colloquialisms, incorrect spelling, and grammatical errors, and, the thinking went, therefore required correction. One result was that it became difficult to study the development of language through the use of published texts. The present edition, more in keeping with current trends, does not attempt to correct al-Jabartī’s language, but instead keeps it in the form that he wrote.

This makes the edition particularly valuable; in fact, it shows us that there was a large variety of “Mixed Arabic” in current use in eighteenth-century Egypt. The Arabic of al-Jabartī is unlike that of other contemporary chroniclers, such as Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Ghānī Shalabī or al-Damurdāshī and al-Qīnālī (the authors of the so-called military chronicles); and these are unlike the best-known written text in colloquial of this period, Yūsuf al-Shirbīnī’s *Hazz al-quḥūf*. In other words, there is a wide range of what is generally called “Mixed Arabic” that this term does not cover. Al-Jabartī’s text uses one variety of the wide range of varieties. Moreover, it is interesting to note that while neither al-Damurdāshī nor al-Qīnālī seems to be from the class of ulema and the language register they use may have been related to their level of education, al-Jabartī’s case is different. His chronicle is an example of “Mixed Arabic” written by a top scholar associated with an institution, al-Azhar, that prided itself on its language studies. Thus, although al-Jabartī was critical of writers who used colloquialisms in their texts, he himself was apparently influenced by this trend. This might be a reflection of the level of legitimacy that this register of language had attained in the eighteenth century. This new edition of *ʿAjāʾib al-āthār* may encourage scholars to study the varieties of “Mixed Arabic” in use at the time and the social-historical dimension of the language.

Third, unlike the earlier editions, the present edition includes an index, the fifth volume, which comprises more than one thousand pages and is the largest of the five volumes. The index was undertaken by a number of collaborators and was compiled with thoroughness. It is a useful research tool on a number of accounts. One of these is that it can be very helpful to scholars interested in material history

as well as in cultural and social history. In addition to the usual index entries (names of persons, titles and positions, geographical locations, book titles, etc.) it also has a series of entries on such diverse subjects as food (vegetables, grains, spices), types of cloth and garments, rugs, shoes, and other useful categories that one does not often see, i.e., economic terms, medical terms, and remedies. The index can also be helpful in the identification of particular individuals. Scholars who have used al-Jabartī know that it is difficult to follow an individual emir as his title or position changes in the course of the chronicle. The index helps to answer some of these problems because it groups these different appellations together under one entry. For instance, the entry for the emir ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Katkhudā al-Qāzdughlī, one of the most important figures of the eighteenth century, includes under his name some of his earlier titles and provides some of the variations with which he is referred to (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Katkhudā; ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāwīsh). One particularly interesting entry in the index is one for the author. In his chronicle al-Jabartī referred to himself, his family, his acquaintances, and his students. This autobiographical material thus collected together will be especially useful for anyone who is interested in reconstructing al-Jabartī's life. It can also be useful for the insights it could shed on the more personal side of a great ʿālim. Finally, some of the entries also make reference to major secondary works on a particular entry. In short, it is a very developed index that can be used in multiple ways.

This new edition of *ʿAjāʾib al-āthār* has two disadvantages. To begin with, its size—unlike the Perlmann and Philipp translation of 1994, which used thin paper and was consequently of a reasonable size, the present publication is not comfortable to handle due to its large size and weight. Secondly, its price (with postage and handling it comes to a total of \$570) might limit the number of individuals who can purchase it. Nevertheless, this new edition will take its place in the canon as an indispensable tool for students and scholars of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

NELLY HANNA  
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN CAIRO

---

*The Digital Humanities and Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies*. Edited by ELIAS MUHANNA. Berlin: DE GRUYTER, 2016. Pp. vi + 271. \$140, £74.99, €99.95.

Under review is an edited collection on how to perform computer-supported research in Islamic Studies. Such computing technology can be used for “digitization, publication, and interpretation” (p. 4), and in the last two decades this has been done on such a scale that we can no longer deny the transformative effect it has on our work; the fields of Islamic Studies and Middle East Studies have entered the Digital Age. Elias Muhanna, the editor, sums up his mission statement as follows: “This transformation in the technique and approach of scholarship prompts us to consider the lines of inquiry opened by these new resources, just as it asks the question of what methodological instincts and practices may be eroded by the rise of computational paradigms” (p. 2). Since 2013, Muhanna has given shape to this prompt through his Digital Islamic Humanities Project. Out of the project have come three conferences; the book under review functions as the proceedings of the first. Unlike other proceedings, this volume is not a collection of disconnected contributions; rather the chapters form a fairly comprehensive treatment of the possibilities of using (and abusing) computing technology in Islamic Studies. I would even argue that had it not been for the steep price, this book could be used in the classroom, as virtually all chapters assume no previous experience and feature many full-color illustrations. In this review, then, I shall discuss this book on its merits as an introduction to Digital Humanities (DH) for scholars and students of Islamic Studies.

The book is divided into two parts: The first five and the last chapter are of a more conceptual and theoretical nature, while chapters six through ten are all showcases of different kinds of technology, detailing how they can be executed and showing what kind of results may be obtained.

The first chapter, by Muhanna himself, functions as an introduction. Muhanna demonstrates how DH is something many of us are already engaging with to some extent in our daily work without