

Dans les chapitres suivants, qui constituent le troisième axe de cette démonstration, Warscheid se pose la question à la fois de ce que fait le juge face aux cas devant lui (tranche-t-il selon les règles de *fiqh* ? Est-ce un simple médiateur social ?) et de ce que font les justiciables avec cette instance, construisant ainsi eux mêmes et dans l'interaction, une culture de *fiqh* largement diffusée. Dans une belle reconstitution d'un procès, il montre comment le juge applique et suit les règles de la procédure et finit par trancher entre les parties par une sentence décisive. Si les solidarités lignagères se déploient, elles le font dans le cadre des normes tracées par ce droit, où les acteurs font preuve d'une maîtrise plus ou moins avancée. L'écrit est largement répandu et utilisé dans les prétoires (en dépit de ses limites probatoires), donnant là aussi la preuve d'un travail profond d'appropriation. Beau chapitre donc où l'auteur laisse tomber cette vraie-fausse question—le juge juge-t-il ? est-ce un simple médiateur et notaire ?—qui dénote d'un anachronisme évident. Dans les sociétés d'ancien régime, la différence entre juger, certifier, décider, gérer les affaires publiques etc. (débatues par les juristes) ne sont pas aussi tranchées et le terme *hukm* (décision) est un terme générique qui recouvre à la fois ce que font au quotidien les autorités politiques ou judiciaires et n'empêche pas la distinction entre ces différents actes (voir par ex. L. Mannori et B. Sordi, "Science of Administration and Administrative Law," in *A Treatise of Legal Philosophy and General Jurisprudence*, vol. 9: *A History of the Philosophy of Law in the Civil Law World, 1600–1900*, ed. D. Canale, P. Grossi and H. Hofmann [Dordrecht: Springer, 2009], notamment 226 et ss).

Le dernier chapitre aborde la question de l'accès des "subalternes" à la justice charaïque, en prenant le cas des femmes, qui se défendent âprement devant les juges. Celles-ci sont présentes, mais toujours dans un cadre lignager (conflits matrimoniaux ou d'héritages le plus souvent). L'étude souligne la double position du magistrat: d'une part, il est vrai qu'il est un soutien pour cette catégorie juridiquement faible, mais il défend en dernière instance le cadre patriarcal et reproduit l'ordre social en se fondant entre autres sur les mécanismes du *hajr* (limitation de la capacité) et de la *wilāya* (tutelle) du père ou du mari. Ce chapitre, fin et subtil, comme l'ensemble des démonstrations dans cette étude, pourrait être interprété comme allant à l'encontre de ses partis-pris pragmatistes. Mais Warscheid, et comme il l'a si bien démontré pour ce qui concerne le processus d'acculturation normatif entre *urf* et *fiqh*, sait très bien que les normes juridiques ou sociales sont à la fois reproduites et réinventées par les acteurs, tous les acteurs, dans la confrontation des revendications et des interprétations. Certes, ils ne disposent pas tous des mêmes ressources dans ces batailles au quotidien, cependant, et il l'a très bien illustré, les femmes (comme d'autres catégories juridiquement faibles) disposent d'un pouvoir d'agir (agency) tout à fait réel, dont les conséquences sur les normes ne peuvent sans doute être relevées que sur le très long terme.

Pour finir, cette recherche est une belle démonstration de la non pertinence des oppositions villes/campagnes, cités/tribus ou sociétés orales/sociétés de l'écrit. Nous sommes (comme au nord de la Méditerranée d'ailleurs) en présence de sociétés lignagères, à diffusion restreinte de l'écrit depuis bien avant le Moyen Âge, travaillées par la concurrence des normes et des juridictions, où l'Etat est absent ou quasi absent et ne commencera à prendre réellement le pas sur les autres juridictions qu'au dix-neuvième siècle, et surtout avec la colonisation. Warscheid, de la sorte, nous invite à tester ses résultats au cœur des cités-capitales, ce qui est un vaste champ de recherche qui s'ouvre pour tous les chercheurs.

SAMI BARGAOUI  
MANOUBA UNIVERSITY, TUNISIA

- 
- A Dictionary of Medieval Judeo-Arabic in the India Book Letters from the Geniza and in Other Texts.*  
By MORDECHAI AKIVA FRIEDMAN. Jerusalem: BEN-ZVI INSTITUTE, 2016. Pp. xxii + 1017. \$37.  
*A Unique Hebrew Glossary from India: An Analysis of Judeo-Urdu.* By AARON D. RUBIN. Gorgias  
Handbooks. Piscataway, NJ: GORGAS PRESS, 2016. Pp. xii + 134. \$48 (paper).

These two important works rely on a fundamental principle of Jewish ethnolects: context and the specific corpora of texts produced in that context play a critical role in making meaning. In terms of

Judeo-Arabic, this phenomenon has been brought into relief by Benjamin Hary's use of the term "multiglossia," replacing diglossia or bilingualism. Hary's contribution identified that the space between acrolect (standard speech) and basilect (colloquial speech) includes more than just a single mesolect (intermediate variety of speech)—rather, that space is actually a continuum encompassing a dynamic plethora of variations on these themes. This continuum has been underscored by Joshua Blau's many publications on the grammar, emergence, and linguistic background of Judeo-Arabic, which acknowledge the variability of morphology, syntax, and vocabulary of the language while nonetheless drawing the connection between the ethnolect and classical Arabic. Blau's *A Dictionary of Mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic Texts* (Jerusalem, 2006) uses as its base a corpus of literary texts written in Judeo-Arabic; he provides definitions of words and their Judeo-Arabic roots as well as the range of meaning of these roots across their various forms as they appear in that corpus of texts. Blau also regularly includes references to S. D. Goitein's discussions of particular words in *A Mediterranean Society* (6 vols., Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967–1993), as well as references to specific documents in the corpora of Geniza documents published by Moshe Gil and others, including one of the authors of the books under review, Mordechai Friedman. The plethora of usages for any given word provided by Blau gives the reader a number of points on the multiglossic continuum and even allows the reader to see the development of a given word over time.

On the surface, Friedman's *A Dictionary of Medieval Judeo-Arabic* is more modest. Completing his title is the corpus of texts underpinning his analysis of words and their roots: "the India Book Letters from the Geniza and Other Texts." The publication of this dictionary follows upon a lifetime of scholarship on the Jewish merchants who plied the Red Sea, primarily in the twelfth century, in the direction of the Malabar Coast of India and beyond. This field of study was founded by Friedman's teacher Goitein, who called his study-to-be of Geniza documents concerning India Ocean trade and traders his "India Book." Friedman took on the mantle of the "India Book papers" when Goitein died in 1985 (although Friedman's own involvement with them extends as far back as 1962, when he was Goitein's research assistant). In 2008, Friedman published a synthetic volume on the India trade that took Goitein's own work as its foundation. This volume, *India Traders of the Middle Ages: Documents from the Cairo Geniza ("India Book," Part One)*, included discussions of some of the prominent dramatic personae of Goitein's India Book documents as well as "select studies on shipping and travel"; these narratives were followed by annotated translations into English and detailed discussions of some two hundred of the documents from the India Book corpus. Friedman subsequently published five volumes of the documents themselves in their original Judeo-Arabic, with translations into Hebrew, high-quality images, and extensive narrative analyses, under the auspices of the Ben-Zvi Institute in Jerusalem. These volumes also contain lexicographic references to words that appear in the India Book corpus. One might therefore see the India Book as providing the base set of texts supporting Friedman's *Dictionary*, and the dictionary in a way as simply a concordance of those texts forming a lexicon of sorts of the Judeo-Arabic of the India merchants as an expansion of the India Book volumes themselves. But that would be incorrect. The *Dictionary* may be seen as a companion to the India Book, but it is much more. First, Friedman's mention of "other texts" in his title is exceedingly humble; the actual base of texts is much broader than the India Book letters. Importantly, it includes not only literary materials but also material from the "documentary Geniza" that sharpens the definitions of words and roots that also appear in the India Book letters. This allows one to see the nuances of meaning as one moves from the twelfth-century India trade to other points on the linguistic continuum in terms of time, place, and written genre. Friedman's references to classical Arabic dictionaries help with this as well. Often, however, Friedman's entries go beyond providing definitions by quoting the phrase in which a word might appear and then translating that phrase into modern Hebrew; and where he can, Friedman brings to bear both the scholarly literature on the Geniza and Goitein's own personal note-cards on the Geniza corpus in order to put a finer point on the definition of a word. This enhances the utility of the work beyond electronic databases, such as the *Princeton Geniza Project* (<https://geniza.princeton.edu/pgp/>), which allow users to search specific corpora of the documentary Geniza in order to find words in their context; by referring to the scholarship that discusses the words he defines as well as their actual usage, Friedman opens up to the reader a fuller understanding of those words or roots. Thus, all scholars of

the Geniza, not just those working with documentary materials and not just those working in the India trade, will find Friedman's dictionary a powerful and helpful addition to their toolboxes.

Medieval Arabists working outside the Geniza might also wish to use Friedman's *Dictionary* to add to their understanding of the semantic range of words in so-called Middle Arabic; Friedman himself has written explicitly that the Geniza documents may be used to understand the documentary production of the medieval Islamic world as a whole. Yet his decision to organize the entries according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet rather than the Arabic alphabet drives home the suggestion that what we have in the Geniza is a Jewish ethnolect; and, as he reminds us in his introduction, the Judeo-Arabic texts are, of course, written in Hebrew letters. Where a single Hebrew letter may represent either of two Arabic letters (sometimes differentiated in documents with a dot), Friedman has helpfully separated the entries, but the order of entries may initially be awkward for those who use Blau's *Dictionary* or primarily use dictionaries of Arabic itself. A related concern might be that Friedman's *Dictionary*, like Blau's, is in Hebrew, while its potential audience extends to Arabists far beyond those who read Hebrew.

Unlike Friedman's dictionary, which mentions a single narrow corpus of materials but actually draws on a much more extensive base of material, Aaron Rubin's *Unique Hebrew Glossary from India* is truly narrow in its scope in that the available material in Judeo-Urdu is severely limited; beyond occasional words in Judeo-Urdu that have found their way into Hebrew manuscripts, Rubin identifies only four extant texts in the language. Of these four texts, two are plays printed in the 1880s. The manuscript of one is currently held by the British Library and may be viewed online on their website; a copy of the printed version of the other play is at the National Library of Israel. Copies of three of the four texts were held by the Valmadonna Trust Library but were part of a major acquisition of its collection purchased by the National Library of Israel in 2017 for an undisclosed sum. Rubin's work focuses on one of the remaining texts, a late nineteenth-century glossary, a copy of which was found in the collection of David Solomon Sassoon (1880–1942), scion of the Sassoon family of Baghdad and leader of the Jewish community of Bombay (p. 3).

In his analysis, Rubin explicitly pushes back on the idea of a Judeo-Urdu ethnolect; he argues instead that the use of colloquial or nonstandard forms of Urdu when written in Hebrew characters should capture the interest of scholars of Hindi and Urdu as a whole. As Rubin points out, the glossary he analyzes in his book “shows close affinities with the under-described colloquial Hindi/Urdu variety of Bombay” (p. xi). He does consider the corpus of Judeo-Urdu as a whole in concluding that “some Jews could also understand and appreciate a more literary variety of Urdu” (p. 87), but he spends much of his time identifying the nonstandard features of the 130 terms from the glossary he discusses, whether the Hebrew versions of those terms as they appear in the glossary diverge from classical forms in Hebrew or the corresponding Judeo-Urdu forms diverge from classical forms in Urdu. There are frequent divergences from classical Hebrew vowelings, and some words are even voweled differently when they appear in different parts of this brief glossary. There is at least some influence of Arabic on Judeo-Urdu spelling, but there are also choices of spelling in Judeo-Urdu that diverge from Arabic—see, for example, *ṣāheb* for Urdu (or Arabic) *ṣāhib* (p. 29). The confusion of *h* for *ḥ* is reversed when Hebrew *ṣāḥaq* is translated as Judeo-Urdu *ḥasā* instead of *hāsā* (p. 35); the glossary also reveals Urdu *dh* transcribed as Judeo-Urdu *z* (p. 31)—something that Rubin might have noted on his transliteration chart (p. 43). Likewise, he might have noted there that the *ʿayn* is also transliterated at least once as an *alif* (p. 33). Reading his analysis of Judeo-Urdu orthography and phonology drives home what Rubin identifies as a “reduction in morphological complexity,” but he argues that Judeo-Urdu is not simplified to the degree of other pidgin dialects—instead, it is “a simplified version of Hindi/Urdu, and that it is spoken largely by native speakers of other languages, most of whom have not had formal education in Hindi or Urdu” (p. 86). Rubin's analysis of the glossary makes for a handbook preparing the reader of Hindi and Urdu to begin engaging this Judeo-Urdu text—or, perhaps, a broader corpus of texts if and as more such texts become available—with an understanding of how Judeo-Urdu diverges from classical and colloquial Hindi and Urdu alike.

These two works together remind us that the disciplines of social history, philology, and linguistics are inseparable. Particularly where ethnolects are concerned, there may be no such thing as an acrolect, but an ethnolect responds to an acrolect just as we might find the law or literature of the Jewish com-

munity of the medieval Islamic world responding to—at times absorbing, at times rejecting—classical Islamic law or literature. These two studies, then, are important not only for reading texts in Judeo-Arabic and Judeo-Urdu, but also for placing the Jews who wrote them in their broader societies in the medieval and modern periods.

PHILLIP I. LIEBERMAN  
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY / VANDERBILT LAW SCHOOL

*Ruby in the Dust: Poetry and History in Padmāvat by the South Asian Sufi Poet Muḥammad Jāyasī.* By THOMAS DE BRUIJN. Leiden: LEIDEN UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2012. Pp. 371. [American ed., 2013. Dist. by University of Chicago Press.]

The separation of Hindi and Urdu into distinct languages with distinct scripts and belonging, supposedly, to distinct religious communities occurred in northern India during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Over the past century or more, the sorry state of cultural politics in this zone has meant that Muslims are routinely assumed to have produced literature first in Persian and later in Urdu and that Hindus are routinely assumed to have produced literature first in Braj and Avadhi and later in Hindi. Particularly within the modern literary-critical establishment in Hindi, including university departments of Hindi, this has meant that poetry composed by authors with recognizably Muslim names has needed considerable explanation and commentary, even the very fact that it exists. Essentially, modern critics of Hindi literature have felt the need to ask some version of the following question repeatedly: why did a Muslim poet compose in Braj or Avadhi, and not in Persian? And, as a close corollary, the other question that invariably follows is this: to what extent should this poem be read as “Islamic”? And to what extent does it reveal elements that can be identified as “Hindu” or, its relatively less-sectarian corollary, as “Indic”?

Among the poems that have survived in this category, Malik Muḥammad Jāyasī’s *Padmāvat* (composed circa 1540) has attracted particular scholarly attention. Not only did a poet named Muḥammad compose a long narrative poem (approximately six hundred stanzas of nine lines each) in Avadhi, but, even more strikingly, his poem celebrated a Rajput prince named Ratansen and his beloved wife Padmāvati, and their resistance against the Muslim overlord, Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khaljī of Delhi. It is worth noting here that Jāyasī, as the poet is popularly known, never feels the need to explain this choice of theme and language. And it follows that, most likely, his immediate readers also did not need explanations for these choices of language, genre, and socio-cultural orientation. And yet, every scholarly interpreter of the *Padmāvat* over the course of the twentieth century has felt the need to pose the questions about language, genre, and politics, repeatedly. It is in this context of scholarly reception that Thomas de Bruijn’s *Ruby in the Dust* makes important interventions.

For one, de Bruijn forces readers to confront squarely the role of academic departments of Hindi literature in establishing canonical (and clearly reductive) interpretations of literary works from the past. As he puts it succinctly, any “confusion over where to clarify this work” lies in the observer, and not in the object under observation (p. 173). He traces carefully the emergence of an interpretive consensus around the works of major early modern poets like Jāyasī, Kabīr, and Tulsīdās, reconstrued in the early decades of the twentieth century as among the predecessors for an imagined Hindi-cultural nation in the modern period. Within this canonical interpretation of literature from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, particular texts were understood as “an effort at bridging” the putative gap between Hindu and Islamic precepts and practices (p. 15).

In place of this canonical reading, dependent on projecting imagined cultural boundaries from the present onto a radically alien past, de Bruijn elaborates a deeply historicist interpretation for the *Padmāvat*. He does this by reading the *Padmāvat* within the context of Jāyasī’s entire oeuvre, gleaning information about Jāyasī’s own biography and about his social world from all of Jāyasī’s surviving works. This approach allows de Bruijn to explore how the *Padmāvat* “developed its own aesthetics,