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treatment of women in Andalusi historical documents is quite chilling in its detailing of how even Muslim women were on occasion dealt with by conquering Muslim armies. How accurate these accounts are we do not of course know, and the worst of the behaviour tends to be attributed to soldiers of the lowest status, which is an indication at least of the authors’ disapproval of what is said to have happened. Yet they bring out, as do many of the other stories of the wars during this early period, the ruthlessness and brutality of people who do not seem to have reflected on how their religion might have expected them to behave. Not of course that there is anything specifically Islamic about this, the phrase ‘the rules of war’ is generally oxymoronic, but it does serve to remind us that the rhetoric we often hear of how comparatively gentle, or vicious, the forces of Islam tend to have been in the past miss the point. They were just like anyone else.

OLIVER LEAMAN
University of Kentucky
DOI: 10.3366/jqs.2016.0254


This is the second edited volume in the Qur’anic Studies series published by the Institute of Ismaili Studies to be dedicated in its entirety to the study of *tafsīr*. It thereby testifies to the remarkable development the study of *tafsīr* has undergone in recent years. Pink and Görke’s volume offers a good overview of current approaches and topics in this nascent field, and the analytical challenges it is facing.

The editors’ introduction to the volume gives a highly valuable précis of the history and current state of *tafsīr* studies, as well as the major issues under discussion within the discipline. Pink and Görke describe how the study of *tafsīr* has emancipated itself from being the handmaid of Qur’anic Studies; they discuss current definitions of *tafsīr* and their problems; and problematise existing taxonomies of the genre (which are, according to the editors, usually divided ‘along ideological lines with an added chronological component’ (p. 7)). They consider the most important task at hand to invest in the currently underdeveloped analytical study of *tafsīr*. Two core questions, they state, should be at the centre of such an analytical approach: the question of what *tafsīr* actually is, and the question of how to structure and categorise the vast amount of exegetical literature in a meaningful way. Beneath these core questions lie several issues related to the boundaries of the genre: what is its object of study, i.e. what is the
definition of tafsīr? Where does it cross over into other fields? And by what criteria does one develop the required analytical categories to structure the genre meaningfully? This issue of boundaries, the editors claim, ‘is at the heart of the present volume’ (p. 3).

The five sections of the volume, each consisting of three chapters, therefore all deal with a certain aspect of boundaries within the genre of tafsīr. Section I, ‘The Formation of Boundaries: Early Evolution of the Genre’, consists of three contributions that all focus on the formation of boundaries in the earliest, formative stage of the genre. In ‘Eve in the Formative Period of Islamic Exegesis: Intertextual Boundaries and Hermeneutic Demarcations’ (pp. 27–62), Catherine Bronson argues that the early exegetical discourse on Eve mainly took place outside the boundaries of the Qur’an itself, and depended largely on Late Antique Jewish and Christian sources. This explains the discrepancy between the Qur’anic text, in which responsibility for the fall of mankind is equally shared by Adam and his spouse, and the ‘retributive theodicy’ in exegetical literature, in which Eve, as an archetypical seductive woman, is more emphatically held responsible.

To shed new light on the origins, transmission, and theological orientation of the exegesis of Mujāhid, Claude Gilliot in his contribution entitled ‘Mujāhid’s Exegesis: Origins, Paths of Transmission and Development of a Meccan Exegetical Tradition in its Human, Spiritual and Theological Environment’ (pp. 63–112) thoroughly analyses a hitherto little used and an unused source respectively, namely the historiographical work of Ya’qūb b. Sufyān al-Fasawī and the entry on Mujāhid in Abū Nu‘aym al-Īṣfahānī’s Ḥilyat al-awliyā’. He concludes that the theological orientation reflected in different transmissions is not as exclusively qadarī as often assumed, but also contains other orientations, as well as material from storytellers (quṣṣāṣ) and of spiritual orientation. In the third chapter of this section, Nicolai Sinai, in ‘The Qur’anic Commentary of Muqātil b. Sulaymān and the Evolution of Early Tafsīr Literature’ (pp. 113–145), discusses the tension between its narrative style, on the one hand, and its glossary style, on the other. He explains how these two styles coexist within the work, with the qaṣaṣ material mostly subdued to the text-lemma structure characteristic of the genre of tafsīr, but with ‘sporadic outbursts of narrative’ (p. 121). Sinai suggests that Muqātil was probably the first to see exegetical completeness as an end in itself.

In Section II, ‘Disciplinary Boundaries and their Permeation: the Place of Tafsīr in Islamic Scholarship’, disciplinary boundaries are the main issue. The three chapters in this section deal with the question of how tafsīr relates to other disciplines of Islamic learning, and how all of these influence each other. In ‘Interrelations and Boundaries between Tafsīr and Hadith Literature: The Exegesis of Mālik b. Anas’s Muwatṭa’ and Classical Qur’anic Commentaries’ (pp. 147–186), Roberto Tottoli shows that
exegetical material from Mālik’s *Muwatta* is rarely quoted in works of *tafsīr*, concluding that *tafsīr* and *hadith* are largely separate disciplines of knowledge in which authority is constructed in different ways. In ‘Ṣāfi’ī Hermeneutics and Qur’anic Interpretation in al-Jāḥiẓ’ s *Kitāb al-*Uthmāniyya* (pp. 187–222), Ignacio Sánchez indicates the importance of hermeneutics in ‘Abbāsid debates on the Imāmate: although the *Kitāb al-*Uthmāniyya is not a work of *tafsīr*, conflicting theories of Qur’anic interpretation that go further than mere legal exegesis play an important role in its discussions on the Imāmate. Rebecca Sauer, in ‘Tafsīr between Law and Exegesis: The Case of Q. 49:9 (the Rebellion Verse/āyat al-baghy)’ (pp. 223–252), uses the case study of Q. 49:9 to show that the main concern of exegetes was generally not the legal implications of the verse, and that there is a clear distinction between the treatment of the verse by exegetes and by jurists.

Section III, ‘Boundaries of Dogma and Theology: The Expression of Ideas through *Tafsīr*’, focuses on the boundaries of dogma and theology as witnessed within the *tafsīr* tradition. It consists of two articles focusing on the hermeneutical theory of medieval scholars, and one on the commentaries of modern Islamist ideologues. Nejmeddine Khalfallah’s ‘Al-Jurjānī: Tafsīr Theory between Linguistics and Theological Dogma’ (pp. 253–272) discusses al-Jurjānī’s hermeneutical ideas and his influential criticism of the exegetes of his age. In ‘Interpretation and Reasoning in al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār’s Qur’anic Hermeneutics’ (pp. 273–288), Abdessamad Belhaj similarly focuses on one single theologian’s hermeneutical theory, showing the importance of the primacy of theology over the apparent meaning of the Qur’anic text in his theory. Neguin Yavari’s ‘*Tafsīr* and the Mythology of Islamic Fundamentalism’ (pp. 289–322) contains some thought-provoking statements on the relationship between Islam and politics, but one would wish that, true to her promise at the beginning of her chapter, she had given more sustained attention to the *tafsīr* works of Quṭb and Khomeini.

Section IV, ‘Reassessing Conventional Boundaries: Chronology, Geography, Media and Authorship’ (pp. 323–418), reassesses the ‘conventional’ boundaries of the genre pertaining to chronology, geography, media, and authorship, and contains three important contributions. In ‘Where does Modernity Begin? Muḥammad al-Shawkānī and the Tradition of *Tafsīr*’ (pp. 323–360), Johanna Pink reassesses the perceived boundary between ‘premodern’ and ‘modern’ works of *tafsīr* through a case study of al-Shawkānī’s commentary and hermeneutical method, and concludes that a clear-cut distinction is very difficult to uphold. In ‘Redefining the Borders of *Tafsīr*: Oral Exegesis, Lay Exegesis and Regional Particularities’ (pp. 361–370) Andreas Görke makes the important point that scholarship on *tafsīr* needs to pay more attention to oral and lay exegesis in vernacular languages, to correct the academic bias favouring printed Arabic scholarly sources which leads to a lack of insight into what is happening in different regions and societies of the Muslim world.
Andrea Brigaglia’s ‘Tafsır and the Intellectual History of Islam in West Africa: The Nigerian Case’, arguably the highlight of the volume, very aptly showcases the new direction in tafsır research that Görke proposes. Combining ethnography with a history of Islamic education, scholarly networks, and scholarly books like the Tafsır al-Jalālayn in the Nigerian context, he offers an excellent and well-informed discussion of the role of public oral exegesis in Nigeria, its interplay with a longstanding local educational and scholarly tradition, and its doctrinal and social effects with respect to the Şüfi/Salafi divide in Nigeria. It is hoped that this multidisciplinary contribution sets the standard for comparable research on local tafsır traditions in other regions. There is much exciting work to be done in this field.

The contributions in Section V, ‘An Expansion of Boundaries: The Tafsır Tradition in Modern Times’ (pp. 419–440), discuss how the boundaries of the tafsır tradition have changed in modern times. Focusing on gender concepts in the contemporary tafsır works of Ibn ʿĀshūr and Ṭabāṭabāʾī, Kathrin Klausing’s contribution, ‘Two Twentieth-century Exegetes between Traditional Scholarship and Modern Thought: Gender Concepts in the Tafsırs of Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabāʾī and al-Ṭāhir b. ʿĀshūr’ (pp. 419–440), problematises the categories of ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’ in the study of tafsır. She argues that both traditional and modern ideas are reflected in the works, and that these works should rather be seen as individual contributions to a discursive tradition that transcends such labels. Kathrin Eith in her ‘Yaşar Nuri Öztürk: A Contemporary Turkish Tafsırf Theorist’ (pp. 441–464) discusses theories on the Qur’an and its interpretation as proposed by this contemporary Turkish Muslim thinker. She shows how he tries to formulate a new approach to Sunnī Islam that is also attractive for a Kemalist-modernist audience, and still draws upon the classical tradition of tafsır.

Andrew Rippin, in ‘The Contemporary Translation of Classical Works of Tafsır’ (pp. 465–488), gives a good overview of contemporary translations in the western context. Based on this overview he distinguishes two important and seemingly contradictory trends in the scholarly and Muslim attitudes towards the tafsır tradition respectively. On the one hand, these translations testify to a shift of scholarly interest in tafsır from being merely a means to understanding the ‘true’ meaning of the Qur’an, to a genuine interest in the genre itself. On the other hand, the translations represent a shift in Muslim attitudes away from the classical focus in tafsır literature on the study of Arabic grammar and related traditions, to a purer and more personalised focus on the meaning of the Qur’anic text.

To conclude, this edited volume is very valuable. Although not all contributions are of the same high quality, as is often the case in edited volumes, it contains important contributions of a high standard that pave the way for future research in the field. Moreover, it poses the right questions on the nature of the genre and the analytical
tools needed to study it. Coherent answers to the two main questions are not given throughout the contributions: authors seem to differ on both the definition and the taxonomy of *tafsir* as a genre, and it is clear that scholars of *tafsir* will have to keep formulating new responses to this issue in future research. One of the strengths of this volume is the topical diversity of its contributions: it shows very well how *tafsir* can be a suitable lens to approach various disciplines within Islamic Studies. The only thing lacking is a thorough contribution on *ishā`ī* *tafsir*, or otherwise *tafsir* in a Sufi context, which may have deserved a place, given the increased scholarly interest in the topic in recent years.

**Pieter Coppens**
Utrecht University
DOI: 10.3366/jqs.2016.0255

---

**Nichi-A Taiyaku Kuruān: < Fu > Yakukai to Seitō-Jū-Dokuju Chūkai.**

This is the first Qur’an translation, not only in Japan, but in the world, to include translations of all of the ten *mutawātir* readings of the Qur’an.

Today, there are five complete Japanese translations of the Qur’an translated directly from Arabic, including this version, all of which are easily obtainable. The oldest is the *Kōran*, translated by Shūmei Ōkawa (1886–1957) in a literary style.² Ōkawa majored in the science of religion at Tokyo Imperial University, and translated the Qur’an into Japanese during a period in which he was hospitalised at the most famous mental hospital in Japan, Matsuzawa Hospital. His translation relied primarily on the original Arabic, but also referred to various translations in Chinese, English, French, and German. The entire work, which contained both translation and commentary, took him about two years (from early in the spring of 1946 to the beginning of the winter of 1948), and was published by Iwasaki Shoten in 1950. In the text, Ōkawa mentions that it is only ‘a Turkish publication of an Arabic text which spread between Sunni Muslims in Turkey, Egypt, India, China, and so on’. This translation is written in a sonorous and elegant literary style, and is so highly valued that it was reprinted as the *Bungoyaku Kōran* (‘Literary Translation, the Qur’an’) in 2009 by Shoshishinsui.³

The second *Kōran* was translated by Toshihiko Izutsu (1914–1993). Izutsu graduated from Keio University, Japan, and then became a professor at the Faculty of Letters there in 1954. He held professorships at McGill University in Canada and the Imperial Iranian Academy of Philosophy, but returned to Japan after the Iranian Revolution