

(known as Petrus “Monachus”), could have prompted Garstad to discuss the question in more detail than a few scattered references. Prinz’s second article, “Eine frühe abendländische Aktualisierung,” *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 41 (1985): 1–23, presents a discussion and edition of a Latin epitome of the *Apocalypse* completed c.732, not long after Petrus’s original translation. This epitome gives a clear sense of what Petrus’s contemporaries found interesting and notable in the *Apocalypse*, and it would have been very nice to have had it translated (or at least cross-referenced) alongside Petrus’s unabridged translation.

Second, one might wonder why Garstad has chosen to translate both the Greek and the Latin versions into English. The differences between the two texts are relatively small, and a translation of the Greek, with notes to the differences in the Latin, might easily have sufficed. One might expect, then, that with both texts translated, some attention would be called to their small but significant differences in meaning, but this is not done, and it is left to the reader to flip back and forth between the two English versions (on the differences, see the apparatus in Aerts and Kortekaas, and my chapter “One Other on Another” in *Difference and Identity*, 2010). The similarities between the Greek and Latin can also suggest how Petrus dealt with biblical quotations in the Greek: it is clear, contra Garstad’s comments (xiii–xiv), that Petrus sometimes made partially “retrograde” translations of the Greek Bible, rather than substituting the appropriate Vulgate passage (a failing shared with the translators of the Lateran *acta* of 649); e.g., page 112, where, in a quotation of Rom. 1:27, *retributionem* (absent from the Vulgate) is clearly translating the Greek Bible’s ἀντιμισθίαν (40).

Finally, with regard to the *Excerpta* or *Alexandrian World Chronicle*, the main criticism that could be leveled is that Garstad’s explanation for the circumstances of its arrival in Francia, and its subsequent translation, does not inspire complete confidence. This is particularly so if one only reads the very abbreviated arguments presented in this introduction, and not Garstad’s recent article on the same subject, “Barbarian Interest in the *Excerpta Latina Barbari*,” *Early Medieval Europe* 19 (2011): 3–42. First, Garstad suggests that the original Greek version was a gift from Emperor Justinian to Frankish king Theudebert I, but such a lofty explanation rests precariously on a few, tiny manipulations made to this long text to supposedly make it Frank-friendly. Second, Garstad argues that the text was finally translated into Latin in the eighth century (implying the mid-eighth) because its dismissive account of pagan gods was thought useful for missionaries (like Boniface) working across the Rhine. Yet one might still doubt that a pragmatically minded missionary would have gone to the great effort of translating (or having translated) a long Greek text that would have seemed almost wholly irrelevant to an eighth-century Saxon. Indeed, the subsequent failure of the translation (it survives, as mentioned, in only one manuscript) should attest to its limited relevance to eighth- and ninth-century life.

These criticisms are all quite minor, especially in light of the excellent, careful work that Garstad has done in making these texts available, with good translations and learned commentary. No doubt their interpretation will be the subject of continuing debates, all of which will need to refer to this volume.

RICHARD MATTHEW POLLARD, University of British Columbia

AHMAD GHABIN, *Hisba, Arts and Craft in Islam*. (Arabisch-Islamische Welt in Tradition und Moderne 7.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009. Pp. 287. \$72. ISBN: 9783447059329. doi:10.1017/S0038713413000948

One of the historiographic peculiarities of Islamic art history, demarcating the field from its Byzantine and Western medieval cousins, is a notable inattention (or resistance) to

juridical and theological sources. Studies of specific kinds of material forms and practices—among them early funerary rites and Qur’anic epigraphy—have drawn liberally from both exegetical literature (*tafsīr*) and Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*), generally to excellent effect. Consideration of such sources is not, however, a standard feature of the modern scholarly landscape. On the contrary, for many historians of Islamic material culture, sources of this kind are doubly compromised, marked by an assumed lack of historicity and practical effect that consigns them to an entirely textual universe, even when they relate to the production or reception of material things.

This book by Ahmad Ghabin bucks the trend by offering the first synthetic study of the institution of *ḥisba* and the office of *muḥtasib*. Both terms derive from the Arabic root ḥ*s*b, which carries with it connotations of counting or reckoning, both in an eschatological and financial sense, highlighting an intrinsic relationship between economics and ethics. The principle underlying both institution and office is contained in the Qur’anic injunction to command good and forbid evil (*al-amr bi’l-ma’rūf wa’l-nahy ‘an al-munkar*). This abstract formulation found practical expression in the development of an institution designed to safeguard public morals by means of powers that were (in theory at least) both regulatory and corrective.

The *muḥtasib* was tasked with the regulation of public space and practice. The activities that fell within his purview ran the gamut from the constitution and form of artifacts to pricing and urban morphology. Among his specific duties were the prevention of encroachment on public thoroughfares; regulating public hygiene; enforcing sartorial regulations; ensuring gender segregation (especially during funerals and weddings); forbidding nudity in bathhouses; punishing prostitutes; preventing the production, consumption, and sale of alcohol, musical instruments, and figural artifacts; preventing fraud (tampering with weights in the market, for example); and addressing the reassuringly transhistorical problem of artisans or craftsmen overcharging or running over time on a commission.

Holders of the office of *muḥtasib* might avail themselves of, or even compile, *ḥisba* manuals, which survive from the tenth century onwards, produced in regions from al-Andalus to Iran. *Ḥisba* manuals are often permeated by a strong local flavor, providing insights into the sorts of artifacts produced or sold in various locales at the time of their composition. As Ghabin notes (76), their interest lies in the fact that they articulate transhistorical norms in ways inflected by the historical particularities of market conditions. Questions about the practical effect of *ḥisba* do not, therefore, negate the value of *ḥisba* manuals as potential sources for historical attitudes to the production, consumption, and reception of crafted artifacts. This being so, it is remarkable that Ahmad Ghabin’s welcome study represents the first major synthetic survey of the genre.

Ghabin’s stated aims are twofold: to outline the history of the institution of *ḥisba* and to consider its impact on the visual arts and crafts in medieval Islam. In pursuit of the goal, the book is divided into three parts: the first surveys the origins and development of the institution of *ḥisba* from the early Islamic period to the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 1517; the second traces the textual foundations of *ḥisba*, from the Qur’an to medieval *ḥisba* manuals; the third considers the value of *ḥisba* manuals for the history of arts and crafts. The latter category is broadly conceived to include architecture, textiles, ceramics, glass, and metalwork. It thus represents a laudable attempt to shift attention away from the milieu of courtly art, or as Ghabin puts it, to refocus the gaze of historians of art and material culture on the *‘amma*, the non-elite classes, rather than the patronage of the *khāṣṣa*, the ruling elite.

The first two sections of the book are characterized by polemical interventions in debates about origins, following a pattern familiar in scholarship on early Islamic institutions. Making a sustained case for a continuous development of the institution of *ḥisba*

from indigenous pre-Islamic Arabian institutions rather than Greco-Roman or Sasanian practices, Ghabin tends to marginalize contentions over the nature of trade in the pre- and early Islamic Hijaz. Better use might also have been made of archaeological and epigraphic evidence. The suggestion that the office of *muḥtasib* was shaped by the Umayyads (r.661–750) might, for example, have been bolstered by reference to the economic activities of the caliph Hisham ibn ‘Abd al-Malik (r.723–43), including the archaeological and epigraphic evidence for the construction of markets in both Baysan and Rusafa, part of an orchestrated investment in economic infrastructure.

The reluctance to engage with extant artifacts is perhaps the greatest weakness of the book and is most keenly felt in the third section, which will hold the most interest for historians of material culture. Here, the self-avowed aim to consider the impact of *ḥisba* on the visual arts and crafts in medieval Islam is frustrated by the resolutely textual nature of the analysis. This also leads to anachronisms and contradictions. The translation of *qirtās* as paper (42) rather than papyrus, which is more likely in relation to events occurring in the 720s and 730s, is one case in point, as is the assertion that lustered glass was produced in imitation of luster ceramics (251), ignoring the fact that the earliest dated examples of luster actually occur on glass. Similarly, the idea that the deterioration of the office or powers of the *muḥtasib* in the eastern Islamic lands enabled the emergence of figurative arts (215) not only assumes too much about cause and effect, but is plainly contradicted by the evidence from Mamluk Egypt and Syria, in which Ghabin sees the office of *muḥtasib* as gradually declining during a period that also saw a palpable decline in the production of figurative arts.

The question is not a minor one, for although the discussion in the third section is arranged logically and usefully by medium, this structure is interrupted by a discussion of “figurative arts,” treated as a category apart. The resulting disjunction is paradoxical in a work that seeks to tackle the orthodoxies of modern scholarship, be they the derivative nature of Islamic institutions or the irrelevance of juridical texts to material practice. It reflects the looming shadow that the idea of the *Bilderverbot* continues to cast on the historiography of Islamic art. One of the great strengths of the material presented here is, however, its potential to drive a stake through the heart of this particular specter once and for all. What the literary genre of *ḥisba* underlines is the fact that when questions about images arise in theological Islam (whether in *ḥadīth*, *fiqh* or *ḥisba*), they are integral to broader discussions about consumption, materiality, and value. Like many juridical texts, *ḥisba* manuals take their lead from *ḥadīth* in treating questions about images in relation to practices of sociability and sumptuary matters, including the artificial embellishment of the human body, the fashioning of vessels from precious metals, the wearing of gold and silks, or the consumption of alcohol and the making or use of musical instruments. This linkage to apparently disparate topics, which has a Platonic genealogy, belies the disaggregation through which the *Bilderverbot* (as both term and phenomenon) has been produced in Orientalist scholarship. The material presented here clearly demonstrates this, but Ghabin could have driven home the point by resisting the temptation to treat the image as a thing apart, divorced not only from medium but, more importantly, from its position as a nexus within a complex conceptual matrix in which aesthetic, ethics, and economics are mutually implicated and implicating.

Despite such missed opportunities, this is an extraordinarily useful work, clearly the result of extensive research. Its author is to be commended for drawing attention to the potential historical value of *ḥisba* manuals and for presenting a wide range of rather scattered materials in an accessible synthetic form. Medievalists are well aware of the need to make the most of whatever flotsam we are fortunate enough to have at our disposal. In attempting to expand our horizons by introducing this fascinating and rich genre of legal

text to a wider audience, Ghabin has done a service to the field of medieval studies in general.

FINBARR BARRY FLOOD, New York University

CÉDRIC GIRAUD, *Per verba magistri: Anselme de Laon et son école au XII^e siècle* (Bibliothèque d'histoire culturelle du Moyen Âge 8.) Turnhout: Brepols, 2010. Pp. 631. €85. ISBN: 9782503533414. doi:10.1017/S003871341300095X

This book by Cédric Giraud belongs to the great tradition of Franco-German medievalist scholarship, which has produced the likes of Martin Grabmann, Artur Landgraf, Joseph de Ghellinck, Jean Leclercq, and Odon Lottin. It combines meticulous scholarship with a broad vision of intellectual history in the Middle Ages and, indeed, beyond. Thus, the book is relevant on several levels: readers who are interested in the figure of Anselm of Laon and the theological movement of the twelfth century will find it just as valuable as those whose research is focused on the emergence of notions of authority and authorship in medieval theology, or on the shifting definitions of theological authority in the Catholic Church.

Per verba magistri endeavors to answer three closely related questions: What status did Master Anselm enjoy among his contemporaries? What was the nature of his theological teaching, to the extent that this can be gathered from *sententiae* attributed to him? Is there evidence of the formation of an Anselmian school in the theological collections that exhibit his influence? In his conclusion, Giraud sums the three questions up in a larger one: “Is Master Anselm the harbinger of the unstoppable ascent of the theologian in the medieval West?” (494).

The three parts into which the book is divided mirror these three questions. Part 1 sets out to reconstruct Anselm's biography (chapter 1) as well as the *fama* that Anselm enjoyed among his contemporaries (chapter 2). This *fama*, Giraud emphasizes, was not simply due to the fact that Anselm's moral life embodied the Christian message of his teaching; rather, his reputation had its roots in Anselm's *magisterium*, that is, “the scriptural competence which makes the master a norm of orthodoxy” (176).

Part 2 then moves on to an examination of the substance of Anselm's teaching—not an easy task, because there is great uncertainty as to which among the numerous works attributed to him are authentic, and because the works that are perhaps authentic are not available in critical editions. For this reason, Giraud concentrates on collections of *sententiae*, in particular the *Liber pancrisis*, which was composed in the decade of 1140–50 (chapter 1). This choice also has the advantage of permitting the study of Anselm's theology precisely as seen through the prism of his pupils, who accorded him his *auctoritas*. The latter is thrown into high relief by the way in which the *Liber pancrisis* presents Anselm's theological opinions: together with those of his brother Radulfus, William of Champeaux, and Ivo of Chartres, Anselm's *sententiae* appear alongside those of the Fathers, being granted the same level of authority. After careful examination of the *Liber* (chapter 2), Giraud comes to the conclusion that “the main intellectual characteristic of the man from Laon is his moderation, which distinguishes him clearly from Abelard” (325). Furthermore, Anselm's emphasis upon inner conversion as the mainspring of religious life is notable. It may well explain why some of his pupils came to embrace the religious life, and why his *sententiae* circulated in monastic communities.

Part 3 opens with methodological considerations regarding the very notion of a school. Giraud questions the adequacy of an older, “linear” conception, according to which a school of thought is constituted either by a dependence, seen in different works and authors, upon the same set of source texts, or by doctrinal similarities, or by a combination