

Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

André Raymond. *Cairo*, trans. by Willard Wood (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 2000. Pp. 436. Illus., maps, photos, bibliography and index. (Originally published by Fayard in Paris, 1993, as *Le Caire*.)

Virginia H. Aksan

Volume 30, Number 1, October 2001

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1015949ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1015949ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (print)

1918-5138 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Aksan, V. H. (2001). Review of [André Raymond. *Cairo*, trans. by Willard Wood (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 2000. Pp. 436. Illus., maps, photos, bibliography and index. (Originally published by Fayard in Paris, 1993, as *Le Caire*.)]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 30(1), 72–73.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1015949ar>

trained to fit into the human world of work and pleasure. Besides, pet shops have no trouble selling them as commodities. As for food production, only a few people—vegetarians—deny themselves meat. A few more may decry assembly-line output and ask for “free-range” chickens and the like. But the vast majority of human beings have no qualms about industrially raised and slaughtered beasts.

As for the third way we deal with animals, societies advocating the prevention of cruelty to animals, groups demonstrating against seal hunts or decrying the penning of dolphins and orcas for amusement, and still others protesting inhumane treatment of laboratory animals receive media attention, usually, of course, when they dramatize conditions. (Zoos are not discussed). Perhaps these concerns reflect a society that can now afford to be nice to animals, compared, say, to the early settlers who saw wild beasts as competitors on the land and as threats to human survival.

I do not think the author has gone far enough in space and time, however. The western city as such is not the problem and our culture runs historically much deeper than western capitalism about which she often decries as the culprit. First, the ten proffered photos of sculptures of animals and people in Toronto are interesting. Yet the bronze cows resting in the Toronto-Dominion Plaza in Toronto are only a step away, as it were, from the cows chewing their cud in a fenced pasture. Such a pastoral scene is also an artifact of human invention. Also consider that before there was a Jerusalem, the ancient Israelites, while still camping en route to the promised land, brought down Yahweh's wrath by worshipping the golden calf image. So the city is secondary, and no more of an artifact than much of the work of agricultural people in the past. In fact, their work through the ages has contributed to the making of the modern city.

The author thus has a problem of continuity. Why blame capitalism? As we know our predecessors in early post-glacial North America quickly hunted to extinction several of the megafauna of the period. Paleolithic people domesticated dogs capable of obedience. Neolithic folk domesticated cattle and a few other animals that can be herded owing to their hierarchical social structure, and also domesticated plants.

What we have seen over the past almost half a millenium does not represent a clear cultural separation from earlier periods but an *intensification* of economic activity. Through technological improvements, aided greatly by the burning of inanimate fossil fuels, modern societies, at least in the rich world, have raised the exploitive ante a notch higher than that of earlier times. So the assembly, or rather more precisely disassembly, lines in abattoirs are speedier and more refined. Besides, capitalists are hardly a new phenomenon; think of the Medicis or investors reported in biblical stories.

Does the rising tide of concern about liberating animals from human constraints signify a new grand era in world history? I would not hold one's breath. The odds favouring widespread meatless dining are virtually minuscule, that is unless people kill off all the beasts and are forced to forage for plants. Nor will people treat pets as equal citizens; we will eat them, too, if des-

perate. Human beings have indeed put enormous stress on habitats. But I doubt whether we as the dominant species possess enough virtue to follow what Annabelle Sabloff advocates.

Besides, if humans are so stupid as to foul our nest so mightily as to ensure our demise as a species, and if we take with us the squirrels, raccoons, skunks, mice, rats, even cockroaches and the like with which (whom?) we cohabit in the city, the bacteria will likely still survive beyond what has been referred to as the “fifth great extinction”.

Jim Lemon, Professor Emeritus,
Geography Department,
University of Toronto

André Raymond. *Cairo*, trans. by Willard Wood (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 2000. Pp. 436. Illus., maps, photos, bibliography and index. (Originally published by Fayard in Paris, 1993, as *Le Caire*.)

André Raymond, distinguished scholar of Arab pre-modern cities, has published in *Cairo* a remarkable portrait of one of the most storied cities of mankind. Mummies, pharaohs and pyramids most often spring to mind when the word Cairo is uttered. For Raymond, Cairo, (for *Qahirah*, the city of the tenth century Fatimids), evokes the Citadel, the Ibn Tulun mosque, or the hospital of Mamluk Sultan Qalawun. His is the Muslim city, beginning with its foundation in 642 as Fustat, the garrison capitol of the original Arab conquerors. Raymond has spent more than two decades in the study of the great Arab cities of the Middle East, first with his major work on the crafts and tradesmen of pre-modern Cairo (*Artisans et commerçants au Caire au XVIIIe siècle*, published in Damascus in 1973–74). A second important work, *The Great Arab Cities in the 16th to 18th Centuries: An Introduction*, was published in New York in 1984. Both titles have had a tremendous influence on the way urban and social historians have viewed and written about the “traditional” Muslim city.

Apart from the impeccable credentials of its author, and an immensely readable translation by Willard Wood, this is a work that has also been given very handsome treatment by the press. Each of the four parts is illustrated with period drawings and photographs and black-and-white urban plans of the city for the period under discussion. Thus, it is possible to observe the evolution of the city as represented in contemporary histories (mostly Arabic before Napoleon's invasion in 1798), and as excavated or plotted in more recent times, when that has been possible.

Raymond chose to organize the history chronologically, which in the Cairo example, means a division by the major dynastic influences on the city. Part One: Foundations (642–1250) starts with the Arab conquest and ends with the crusades. Part Two: Medieval Cairo (1250–1517) encompasses the era of the Mamluks. Part Three: The Traditional City (1517–1798) treats the Ottoman period, which Raymond acknowledges has “long been spoken of as a foreign rule, tyrannical and obscurantist, responsible for the decline of Egypt and Cairo” (p. 189). His will be a different

view, he continues, as “in fact, Ottoman Cairo represented the pinnacle of an 800-year history” (p. 190). Part Four: Contemporary Cairo (1798–1992) begins with the arrival of the French and carries the history up to 1992. It includes the period of the colonial occupation by the British (until 1936) (given surprisingly short shrift) and a long chapter (16) entitled “The Nightmares of Growth (1936–1992).” The latter is a cautionary note about the pain and disaster of modernization, western-style, of an old city. Between 642 and 1850 that old city occupied roughly only 400 of the 30,000 hectares that make up present-day Cairo (p. 375). It is also a split city, between traditional and colonial, oriental and modern, typical, as the author often notes, of North African cities. (Raymond uses all such descriptors with great care, sometimes with quotation marks, implicit acknowledgment of recent vociferous debates about Orientalism.)

The core of the book lies in Part Two and Three. The delightful part of the narrative of Mamluk and Ottoman history here represented is its insistence on using and evoking the voices of contemporary sources. It reflects the explosion of research in the last two decades, on the Mamluks in particular, but also on the Ottoman period. Raymond makes very effective use of Ahmad al-Maqrizi, 1364–1442, primary historian of the Mamluk rulers who left such a monumental and indelible mark on the old city. Between 1293 and 1340, Raymond estimates that fifty-four mosques and madrasas (schools) were built, representing just a quarter of the 198 monuments credited to the Mamluks (p. 120).

For the eighteenth century, he relies on Abd al-Rahman al-Jabarti and *Description de l’Égypte*, the famous record of the expedition and explorations of the brief French occupation (1798–1801). Chapters 12 and 13 in Part Three are particularly rich on the inner life of Ottoman Cairo, its administration and social welfare system as well as its commercial vitality. The sources dictate in some respect Raymond’s focus on the architectural achievements of its various rulers, and the intricacies of its trading system. They also allow the reader to see the scale of human disaster, such as Maqrizi’s description of the 1348 plague that probably killed 100,000 inhabitants (p. 140).

The section on the modern city is a litany of unequal development, uncontrollable population growth and gradual neglect and destruction of the ancient core. Since the 1940s, the city’s human growth has been phenomenal, “...presaging a doubling of the population every eighteen years” (p. 348). The city that the pages of Raymond’s work evokes has all but disappeared, making his careful reconstruction of trades, residential quarters, regulations, ethnic distribution, and elaborate web of entrepreneurial and patronage alliances so valuable to urban historians.

Cairo as a trading city, integral to medieval and early modern world markets, is one of the main themes of much of the work, linking Raymond’s work to that of Braudel and the more recent world-history movement, sometimes overtly (p. 11 and following on the Geniza archives, for example). The Nile and its ecological implications for city growth and management, however, are more assumed than woven into this history of the city, except where the river impeded its expansion, or the desert environ-

ment required extraordinary measures. (The description of Baron Empain and the Heliopolis Oasis Company, builders of a suburb of Cairo after 1906, ten kilometers from the center of the city, on territory without water, is a fascinating example.) In an age of satellite imaging and GIS systems, some sense of the enormity of the riverine ecology of Egypt would not have come amiss. That minor objection aside, this book, the labor of a lifetime, joins an increasingly rich bookshelf of works on the urban Middle East.

Virginia H. Aksan
Department of History
McMaster University

Peter Borsay. *The Image of Georgian Bath, 1700–2000: Towns, Heritage, and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Pp. viii, 434. Illustrations, maps, tables, bibliography, index.

In this book, Peter Borsay sets out to examine the history of the image of Georgian Bath. Covering the period from 1700 to 2000, Borsay looks at the genesis of the image, at its characteristics, and how they have changed over time, and finally, at the uses to which the image has been put during the last three hundred years. Obviously, this is not a standard local history of a particular English town. Borsay charts the rise, fall, and resurrection of Bath’s image as a primarily Georgian city. Clearly influenced by post-modernism, Borsay argues that

sources were not (more or less) transparent windows on a real world, but images, and that if there was any reality to be discovered, it was in the images themselves rather than in what purportedly lay behind them. (p. 5)

The questions Borsay explores are interesting ones: Why and how has Bath come to be known as the Georgian city *par excellence*? And why has this period become so crucial in the city’s reputation and identity? In answer, Borsay begins by discussing contemporary Georgian perceptions of Bath as a desirable place for the fashionable elite to live, visit, and restore its health. Bath’s Roman past was celebrated during the eighteenth century, but did not diminish the contemporary image since the Georgians saw themselves as the heirs to the Romans, carrying on the great classical tradition. In the nineteenth century this “classical duopoly” (p. 66) constituting the image of Georgian Bath suffered an eclipse, however. The Victorian fascination with the Gothic and the Medieval, their disapproval of Georgian morals, their faith in progress, and their sheer proximity to the Georgian period all contributed to the decline of Bath’s image as a Georgian city. In the twentieth century, in turn, as Victorianism fell out of fashion, the idea of Georgian Bath again grew popular, especially after World War I. After the Second World War, “an enthusiasm for the present and future and their cultural manifestation, modernism, temporarily reduced the spa’s deference” to its classical past (p. 96). Britain’s relative decline in the 1970s called this optimism into question, however, and with the conservative resurgence classicism re-emerged triumphant,