

Formen und Funktionen des Layouts in arabischen Manuskripten anhand von Abschriften religiöser Texte: Al-Būṣīrī's Burda, al-Ġazūlī's Dalā'il und die Šifā' von Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ. By FREDERIKE-WIEBKE DAUB. Arabische Studien, vol. 12. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ, 2016. Pp. ix + 229, illus. €68 (paper).

Frederike-Wiebke Daub's slightly revised PhD thesis (Jena, 2015) analyzes layout features and their functions and developments in manuscript copies of three well-known and widely distributed Arabic works: *Qaṣīdat al-Burda* by al-Būṣīrī, *Dalā'il al-khayrāt* by al-Jazūlī, and *Kitāb al-Šifā'* by Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ. Her monograph is a contribution to the fields of manuscript studies, Islamic history, and historical anthropology. It especially benefits those whose work heavily relies on codicological aspects of manuscripts. Daub provides her readers with 208 illustrations of manuscript examples, which makes her work even more comprehensible and enhances the value of her analysis.

The samples of text in Daub's study are strategically chosen: for a quantitative survey of the layout of manuscripts, the number of extant copies of a single work must be large, which is indeed the case in regard to all three works covered. These texts are still held in high esteem by Muslims and have therefore attracted the attention of Western scholars for decades. In the introduction (pp. 1–9), Daub briefly acquaints the reader with and discusses publications that deal with the content and use of the three works (e.g., Aslan 2008; Schimmel 1985; Stetkevych 2006, 2010) as well as major contributions to manuscript studies (Déroche 2006; Gacek 2009). Hers is the first monograph to be written exclusively on the codicological aspects of all three works.

Daub's focus is on the Sufi Sharaf al-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Sa'īd al-Būṣīrī's (d. 1294 or 1297) *Qaṣīdat al-Burda* (Ode of the mantle), a poem of praise for the Prophet, which takes up two-thirds of the book (pp. 10–132). Al-Būṣīrī's *al-Burda* was disseminated across the Islamic world, becoming one of the most popular texts in Muslim households. This massive distribution led to considerable variety in the layout of manuscripts copied from the time of composition to the nineteenth century. Daub's analysis, which pays close attention to the different uses of the reproduced work, shows clearly the variety at hand.

In her examination of 105 copies of *Qaṣīdat al-Burda*, Daub establishes a typology of manuscripts (types I, II, and III) based on layout features as well as on dates given in the colophons and data found in catalogues, which she uses to locate and date the manuscript in question. In type I copies, the page layout amounts to a block of text, which offers no particular insights into its actual usage (according to Daub, its purpose was mainly to preserve the text of the *qaṣīda* typically known by heart). In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the layout changed due to different use—manuscript copies, especially those produced in the Maghrib, now contained columns of hemistiches (type II). This layout, with features such as colored textual dividers (dots, rosettes, etc.) between the two halves of the verse, creating the column structure, suggests that it was now more important to locate a certain verse than it had been earlier. Daub explains this development by suggesting that the *qaṣīda* was appropriated in either a *madrasa* for teaching and studying purposes or a Sufi convent (*zāwiya*) for recitation.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw an increase in the production of *Qaṣīdat al-Burda* manuscripts in the Maghrib. These type III copies are easily distinguished from the former by their arrangement in alternating half verses. Daub proposes that the public recitation of at least parts of the text on the occasion of the Prophet's birthday (*mawlid*) and at Sufi gatherings (sing. *ḥaḍra*) as rites of passage (now recited by more than one person) necessitated another type of layout. Additionally, we now find very small copies of al-Būṣīrī's *Burda* in the Islamic West, which Daub exemplifies by reference to new practices such as the use of copies as talismans when traveling. These small copies were carried in leather bags with other texts, such as *Dalā'il al-khayrāt*, throughout North and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Predictably, not every extant copy of *Qaṣīda al-Burda* fits into Daub's typology, which she readily admits when dealing with subgroups of type III (A, B, and C), as located in the Maghrib (A), in the eastern Islamic world (B), and in the Malay archipelago (C). Each bears regional features in regard to the use of colored ink, the form of illuminated chapter headings (sing. *ʿunwān*), and textual dividers. Nevertheless, all contribute to Daub's overall typology, and her explanation of the development of type I, II, and III manuscripts, going back to a different use for the manuscripts over time, is quite

convincing. Furthermore, she briefly deals with the layout development of *Qaṣīdat al-Burda* commentaries and tackles the transition of the text from manuscript to printed work.

The second text examined by Daub is the well-known collection of prayers *Dalāʾil al-khayrāt* (Guide of good deeds) by Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Jazūlī (d. between 1465 and 1470) from Sus in present-day Morocco. In her analysis of sixty-six extant manuscripts, which covers less than forty pages (pp. 133–70), Daub elaborates on regional layout features and the connection between the actual use and the layout of a manuscript. Among these layout elements are colored vignettes in the margins of the text, mainly produced in the Maghrib, which helped readers find a certain part of the text. Other features include the colored chapter headings, textual dividers, and the abundant use of colors in the text, which leads Daub to assume that manuscripts of *Dalāʾil al-khayrāt* had a practical (Sufi, *madrasa*, and talisman) context as well as an aesthetic function. As in the case of *Qaṣīdat al-Burda*, these manuscripts show a clear regional distinction between the Maghrib and the Levant in terms of color and the execution of chapter headings and textual dividers as well as in the depiction of Mecca and Medina (cf. Witkam 2007).

The third work is Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ’s (d. 1149 in Marrakesh) legal text *Kitāb al-Shifāʾ*, which is covered in roughly twenty pages (pp. 170–92). Daub first gives a short overview of the biography of the author and the content of his work, and then presents an analysis of a corpus of thirty-seven manuscripts spanning from ca. 1200 to 1850. Because of the lesser number of extant manuscripts compared to the previous two and their visual features (textblock; mostly no devices to help the reader find a paragraph), Daub concludes that the book must have been read in its entirety for studying purposes. This is a salient difference from the first two works examined. For copies of *Kitāb al-Shifāʾ* produced in the Levant in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that include illustrations, Daub suggests paraenetic rather than scholarly reasons.

In her conclusion (pp. 193–204), Daub stresses the close relation between the use of a manuscript and its layout features. In addition to the bibliography, the list of the examined manuscripts (pp. 219–25) is of particularly special interest to the codicologist. Unfortunately, Daub does not provide further details for the manuscripts cited, listing them by library and call numbers only. A more detailed provision of certain features of each manuscript (date, place or region, basic features, and type) would have been helpful.

Another quibble is Daub’s rather random choice of corpus: one may question whether the manuscripts are a representative sample (according to date or region, for example) or were just the most accessible to her. The heavy concentration of German and Dutch collections is striking, especially since traveling to (non)European manuscript collections (specifically in North Africa) has become affordable. Examining more manuscript collections will most likely confirm Daub’s results, but a more thorough basis of investigation—the question of how to compile one’s own corpus—was a requisite. (As an aside, a complementary study is Hiba Abid’s work *La vénération du Prophète en occident musulman*, based on her PhD thesis [Paris, EPHE, 2017]; it treats the very same works. Both studies would have benefited from closer cooperation or at least acknowledgement of each other’s approach—Daub, whose book appeared a year earlier, briefly mentions Abid in her preface but does not refer to her PhD research; on the other hand, Abid does not cite Daub’s work at all.)

Stylistically, worth mentioning are the unnecessary use of “vgl.” (cf.) in Daub’s footnotes and the rather uncommon transliteration of initial hamza (ʾAbū, al-ʾAndalus). More crucial is the absence of important works on Sufism written in German (e.g., by Bernd Radtke or Fritz Meier) when examining the Sufi context of manuscripts. For the *mawlid* celebration, Daub fails to consult Marion H. Katz’s *The Birth of the Prophet Muḥammad*. As a general observation, Daub does not refer to any Arabic publication on manuscripts of the texts dealt with and, apart from two or three exceptions, does not include scholarship written in languages other than German or English—thus, no publications by François Déroche and other codicologists in French. This also applies to the description of the authors of the three literary works: Daub does not cite an Arabic biographical dictionary but relies on English secondary literature.

In summary, Daub’s contribution to the thriving field of Arabic manuscript studies is much appreciated, due to its linking of the layout features of a manuscript to its actual use. She has provided

researchers with a method that assists in locating the manuscripts of her three chosen works in time and space, in particular the copies of al-Būṣīrī's *Burda*, which analysis comprises most of her book. In regard to al-Jazūlī's *Dalā'il al-khayrāt*, researchers are advised to read Abid's publication alongside that of Daub, while for Qāḍī 'Iyād's *Kitāb al-Shifā'*, Dagmar Riedel's ongoing project, *Making Books Talk: The Material Evidence of Manuscripts of the Kitāb al-Shifā' by Qadi Iyad (d. 1149) for the Reception of an Andalusian Biography of the Prophet between 1100 and 1900*, might give further insights into the manuscript production of this important work.

REFERENCED WORKS

- Abid, H. 2017. La vénération du Prophète en Occident musulman à travers l'étude codicologique de livres de piété (XIe/XVIIIe–XIIIe/XIXe siècles). *Archives de sciences sociales des religions* 178: 151–76.
- Aslan, R. 2008. Understanding the Poem of the Burdah in Sufi Commentaries. MA thesis, American Univ. in Cairo, <http://dar.aucegypt.edu/bitstream/handle/10526/1334/2008sumroseaslan.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Déroche, F. 2006. *Islamic Codicology: An Introduction to the Study of Manuscripts in Arabic Script*. London: Al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation.
- Gacek, 2009. *Arabic Manuscripts: A Vademecum for Readers*. Leiden: Brill.
- Katz, M. H. 2007. *The Birth of the Prophet Muḥammad: Devotional Piety in Sunni Islam*. London: Routledge.
- Schimmel, A. 1985. *And Muhammad Is His Messenger: The Veneration of the Prophet in Islamic Piety*. Chapel Hill, NC: Univ. of North Carolina Press.
- Stetkevych, S. P. 2006. From Text to Talisman: Al-Būṣīrī's *Qaṣīdat al-Burdah (Mantle Ode)* and the Supplicatory Ode. *Journal of Arabic Literature* 37: 145–89.
- _____. 2010. *The Mantle Odes: Arabic Praise Poems to the Prophet Muḥammad*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana Univ. Press.
- Witkam, J. J. 2007. The Battle of the Images: Mekka vs. Medina in the Iconography of the Manuscripts of al-Jazūlī's *Dalā'il al-Khayrāt*. In *Theoretical Approaches to the Transmission and Edition of Oriental Manuscripts: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Istanbul March 28–30, 2001*, ed. J. Pfeiffer and M. Kropp. Pp. 67–82, 295–300. Würzburg: Ergon.

PHILIP BOCKHOLT
LEIPZIG UNIVERSITY

The Tale of Genji: Translation, Canonization, and World Literature. By MICHAEL EMMERICH. New York: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2013. Pp. xv + 494. \$95 (cloth), \$35 (paper).

These days, any book “between covers” brings a certain joy. To read with the smell of paper, not the glow of a screen, quickens the heart, especially of the premodernist. When the book, counting notes and online bibliography, is over five hundred pages, though, the blessing may seem mixed. So it was with a twinge of resistance that I opened Michael Emmerich's study on the Japanese classic *Genji monogatari* (*The Tale of Genji*). Steeling myself with the notion that for the moment (of which I had no more than two free) I only needed to check the author's opinion on one thing, I followed the index to the proper page and scanned it. Scanning turned into absorption. Absorption blocked out the rest of the workaday world. Damn.¹ He got me. On I read, heedless of the passing hours.

It is not unusual for a tome on Japanese literature to divide my attention from every other duty, although curiously some of the best recent reads—Tomi Suzuki's *Narrating the Self: Fictions of*

1. I do not consider this swear word a breach of scholarly decorum, since it is directed not at the author, but at the situation, and ultimately at my own inability to foreswear a good time.