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Cover
Mašhad, Kitâbḫāna-i Āsitân-i Quds-i Raḍawī 300, f. 1v
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, grec 1853, f. 186v
Syriacus, Arabicus, Armeniacis Persicisque commentatio (1842). Information is given also on the preparatory essays published before he submitted his magnum opus to the Académie Française, that in 1884 had launched a prize competition for the best work on Hebrew translations in the Middle Ages. It took forty years for Steinschneider to collect the data, from his early project to the submission to the Académie Française (pp. 14-18). The Introduction ends with historical details of great interest, and a portrait of Steinschneider’s intellectual profile.

The part of HUE translated and updated in this volume is comprised of three introductory items: (i) Steinschneider’s Introduction to the Mémoire, written in French, which was submitted in December 1884 to the Académie Française (pp. 37-42), (ii) the Preface to HUE (pp. 43-50), and (iii) its “General Remarks” (pp. 51-67). Then the translation of the part on Jewish philosophers comes (pp. 68-230), accompanied by an Appendix (“Conspectus of the Contents of Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters”, pp. 231-42). The Index of manuscripts (pp. 243-6) and a General Index (pp. 247-55) concludes this first issue of a painstaking, erudite work that deserves the gratitude of all those interested in the transmission of knowledge from Antiquity to the Middle Ages and beyond.

EC


For a long time, the intellectual life of the Islamic world in the 17th century was considered of little interest and typical of an age of stagnation and decline; in particular, as regards the Ottoman area, this epoch is commonly represented as the beginning of a long period of obscurantism and negative attitudes toward whatever original cultural phenomenon under the pressure of taqlīd (uncritical imitation of the predecessors). Khaled El-Rouayheb’s book is the first concrete attempt to investigate some of the intellectual currents of this period, in an area stretching from Anatolia to North Africa. The focus is on the intellectual outcome of the learned ‘ulamā’ (treatises, commentaries, marginalia, etc.), in order to grasp the main trends in the exchange of ideas and transfer of knowledge within the geopolitical milieu of the Ottoman Empire. The book falls into three main parts, each devoted to a movement of ideas, so to speak: Part I, “The Path of the Kurdish and Persian Verifying Scholars”, is comprised of Chapters 1-3, and deals with the “westward movement”; Part II, “Saving Servants from the Yoke of Imitation”, is comprised of Chapters 4-6, and focuses on the eastward movement from the Maghreb towards the capital of the Ottoman empire; finally, Part III, “The Imams of Those who Proclaim the Unity of Existence”, is comprised of Chapters 7-9, and is devoted to the spread of the influence of Sufi orders in the 17th century.

The overarching concern of this book is to deconstruct what El-Rouayheb calls “the myth of the triumph of fanaticism” (p. 14 and 348), namely the widespread idea that starting from the end of the 16th century no more space was left in the Ottoman domain for the study of philosophy and the “rational sciences”. This is done especially in Chapter 1, “Kurdish Scholars and the Reinvigoration of the Rational Sciences” (pp. 13-59), not without discussing the hostility to all rational sciences of the puritan movement initiated by Meḥmed Kaḍızade toward the end of the 16th century. The famous scholar and librarian Kātib Çelebī complained on the sciences that sank into oblivion because of the increasing influence of the Kaḍızadelis; despite this, El-Rouayheb shows through a careful prosopographical analysis that during this period in the Ottoman world the study of philosophical and religious disciplines such as logic, theology and textual criticism has continued uninterruptedly and vigorously, and this especially in the Maghreb, Hejaz, and in the Kurdish provinces of the Empire. It is from these provincial areas...
that many influential scholars moved to Istanbul, where they occupied prominent places in scientific institutions. The importance of these areas of the Empire is highlighted in Chapter 4, “Maghrebī Theologian-Logicians in Egypt and the Hejaz” (pp. 31-72). Opposition to taqlīd and assessment of the necessity of ṭabqīq (verification) as the basis for assent to the Islamic faith seem to inspire scholars like al-Sanūsī (d. 1490), whose works were destined to a long-lasting influence in the teaching tradition at al-Azhar (pp. 175-6). But al-Sanūsī is only the most prominent among a series of scholars whose accomplishments in the fields of theology and theologically oriented logic are described in Part II.

The work of Khaled El-Rouayheb also has the great merit of highlighting the existence of a real philosophical-theological koiné that in the 17th century stretched from the Mughal India and Safavid Persia to the Ottoman Anatolia and Maghreb.

Chapter 7, “The Spread of Mystical Monism” (pp. 235-71), and 8, “Monist Mystics and Neo-Ḥanbalī Traditionalism” (pp. 272-311) advance a very interesting perspective for further research: the influence of mystical monism “appears to have lead to an assault on established Ashʿarī and Māturīdī theology in favor of more traditionalist, near-Ḥanbalī positions on a range of issues: the status of the ‘imitator’ in the Islamic creed; the value of rational theology; the nonliteral interpretation of apparently anthropomorphisms in the Quran and hadith; occasionalism and the creation of human acts; and the eternity of the sounds and letters of the Quran” (p. 350).

A deeply interconnected world emerges from this beautiful book, in which scholars and texts appear to move quickly beyond regional borders, reaching places far from each other and giving rise not only to original doctrinal approaches but also to new political theories based on them – theories which often provided doctrinal grounds to the political structures of the time. If he had included in the picture two foundational studies by Gerhard Endress, “Die dreifache Ancilla. Hermeneutik und Logik im Werk des Sayfaddīn al-Āmidī” (2005) and “Reading Avicenna in the Madrasa: Intellectual Genealogies and Chains of Transmission of Philosophy and the Sciences in the Islamic East” (2006), and if he had taken into account the studies gathered in the volume Organizing Knowledge. Encyclopaedic Activities in the pre-eighteenth century Islamic World, edited by the same scholar in 2006, he would surely have contributed to tracing a new path in this map.
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