that this contrast is visible in the different role of mathematical tables in the *Almagest* and the *Handy Tables* ("Mathematical tables in Ptolemy's *Almagest*", *Historia Mathematica* 41, 2014, 13–37, esp. p. 28) offers us a model for how different levels of technical expertise are registered in textual forms, and several papers, especially Raymond Mercier's discussion of Bar Ḥiyya's tables, speak to the question of levels of expertise. The most accessible of these discussions, however, is probably Ilana Wartenberg's description of the contrast between Bar Ḥiyya and his late eleventh–early twelfth-century CE contemporary Jacob bar Samson. As Wartenberg emphasizes these two authors differ in their ability to access the Arabic scientific tradition (Bar Ḥiyya yes, Bar Samson no) and also in the way that they approach technical issues: "Bar Ḥiyya … provides numerous algorithms to verify the result of the *molad* calculation and he explains the logic behind it. Bar Samson does not go much beyond providing dry, technical rules" (p. 108). Here we have a solid example of the same contrast in levels of expertise that Sidoli postulates for users of the *Almagest* and the *Handy Tables*, and the crucial factor for Bar Ḥiyya (like Ibn Ezra) seems to have been his ability to interact with Arabic materials. We can only hope that the new editions of works by Bar Ḥiyya and Bar Samson, currently being prepared by Sandman and Wartenberg, will continue this important line of work on the textual criticism of technical literatures and diagrammatical forms. The volume as a whole represents an important contribution to ongoing work on ancient calendrics and no doubt Sacha Stern's research group at UCL as well as Charles Burnett's extensive work on Arabic traditions in medieval Europe will continue to foster efforts such as this in the coming years.

J. Cale Johnson
Freie Universität Berlin

MAURO ZONTA:
Saggio di lessicografia filosofica araba.
(Philosophica. Testi e studi.) 330 pp. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 2014.
€34. ISBN 978 88 394 0865 5.
doi:10.1017/S0041977X1500018X

This work brings to completion Zonta's studies on Arabic philosophical terminology started over twenty years ago with the publication of *Un dizionario filosofico ebraico del XIII secolo. L'introduzione al «Sefer De'ot ha-Filosofim» di Shem Tob ibn Falaquera* (Quaderni di Henoch. Turin: Zamorani, 1992). The two aims of the book are stated in the preface (pp. 9–10). First, it documents in detail, especially on comparative grounds, the well-known and thoroughly researched thesis according to which the relationship between Arabic and Greek philosophy depended upon the mediation of the Syriac philosophical and religious literature and translations from Greek into Syriac carried out by Christians. Second, it introduces an intriguing and hitherto rather neglected thesis: that of the possible influence on philosophical Arabic terminology of the languages which convey the culture not only of the Near East, a heavily Hellenized area, but also of the Middle East and Asia. The Islamic world had cultural relationships with these eastern regions beginning in the eighth century. An essay on the *status quaestionis* of these two issues opens the volume.

Zonta refers in his analysis of the philosophical Arabic terminology to: Greek, Syriac, Classical and Medieval Latin, Classical Armenian, Classical Georgian,

Mandaean, Coptic, Ancient Nubian, Geʿez or Classical Ethiopic, pre-Islamic South Arabian, Akkadian, Biblical Hebrew, Ancient Persian, Middle Persian, Parthian, Pahlavi, Sogdian, Chorasmian language, Saka language, Tocharian, Sanskrit, Turkish languages, Classical Tibetan, Classical Mongolian and Medieval Chinese. At the end of the introductory essay he provides a brief bibliography of all the dictionaries and the lexicons he consulted (pp. 21–33). A more extensive bibliography, relating not only to linguistics but also to the history of philosophy, features in the footnotes of the pages which are dedicated to each term examined.

In the lexicon Zonta presents a sample of thirty-seven terms on which he conducts his comparative, historical-linguistic study: Accident (συμβεβηχός, *accidens*, *ʿaraḍ*), Affection (πάσχειν, *pati*, *infiʿāl*), Soul (ψυχή, *anima*, *nafs*), Act (ἐνέργεια, *actus*, *fiʿl*), Action (ποιεῖν, *facere*, *fiʿl*), Cause (αἰτία, *causa*, *ʿilla/sabab*), Body (σῶμα, *corpus*, *badan/ǧism/ǧirm*), Definition (ὁρισμός, *definitio*, *ḥadd*), Difference (διαφορά, *differentia*, *faṣl*), Demonstration (ἀπόδειξις, *demonstratio*, *burhān*), Disposition (διάθεσις, *dispositio*, *ḥāl/waḍ*), Division (διαίρεσις, *divisio*, *qisma*), Element (στοιχεῖον, *elementum*, *usṭuqas/ʿunṣur*), Existence (οὐσία/ὕπαρξις, *exsistentia, wuǧūd*), Essence (τὸ τι ἦν εἶναι, *essentia*, *huwīya/ḏāt*), Aim (τέλος, *finis*, *ġāya*), Form (μορφή/εἶδος, *forma*, *ṣūra*), Genre (γένος, *genus*, *ǧins*), Intellect (νοῦς, *intellectus*, *ʿaql*), Limit (πέρας, *terminus*, *nihāya*), Matter (ὕλη, materia, *ṭīna/ʿunṣur/madda/hayūlā*), Motion (κίνησις, *motus*, *ḥaraka*), Nature (φύσις, *natura*, *ṭabīʿa*), Necessity (ἀνάγκη, *necessitas*, *ḍarūra*), Having (ἕξις, *habitus*, *malaka*), Power (δύναμις, *potentia*, *qūwa*), Principle (ἀρχή, *principium*, *mabdaʾ*), Privation (στέρησις, *privatio*, *ʿadam*), Property (ἴδιον, *proprium*, *ḫāṣṣa*), Quality (ποιότης, *qualitas*, *kayfīya*), Quantity (ποσότης, *quantitas*, *kammīya*), Quiddity (τὸ τί ἐστιν, *quidditas*, *māhīya*), Relation (πρός τι, *relatio*, *iḍāfa*), Sensation (αἴσθησις, *sensus*, *ḥass*), Syllogism (συλλογισμός, *syllogismus*, *qiyās*), Substance (οὐσία, *substantia*, *ǧawhar*), Species (εἶδος, *species*, *nawʿ*).

Zonta presents his conclusions in "La terminologia filosofica araba medievale: un ponte tra Oriente e Occidente" (pp. 289–97). He claims that the Arabic philosophical terminology was not the result of a simple and direct transmission of Greek terminology, but presents many differences and discontinuities with respect to Greek. Second, he maintains that the Arabic philosophical terminology was deeply influenced not only by the Syriac philosophical terminology of the fifth–seventh centuries, but also by the no less significant terminology of the Iranian languages and, directly or indirectly, by Sanskrit. On the line of this argument, Zonta observes that in his sample of thirty-seven terms there are four or five cases of evident loans from Greek, but there are also five, perhaps seven, words which are literally taken according to the meaning and in a more or less adapted phonetic-morphological form from languages such as Middle Persian or from apparently even more geographically distant languages such as Tocharian and Sanskrit (p. 291). Even taking into account the limited sample of terms, I do not think that a small number of loanwords from Greek allows one to minimize the influence of the Greek language on the formation of the Arabic technical lexicon for philosophy. The effort of translators into Arabic was to render the concepts of the Greek philosophical texts that they went on to translate. The translators' aim was to translate the words insofar as they convey a philosophical meaning and a philosophical doctrine. They had recourse to loanwords, especially at the beginning of the translation movement, only when they could not extend analogically Arabic terms, or terms of different Eastern origin that the Arabic language had incorporated. The model for this approach in the study of Arabic philosophical terminology remains Gerhard Endress and Dimitri Gutas' *Greek and Arabic Lexicon*. In masterfully investigating the assimilation of the concepts of Greek philosophy in its translation

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X1500018X Published online by Cambridge University Press

into Arabic, Endress and Gutas' lexicon, in its printed and online forms, displays for every Arabic word the various correspondences in Greek, according to the different occurrences in the available texts. Thus, Zonta's criticism (pp. 289–90) seems unfair.

This notwithstanding, Zonta's book opens new perspectives for further study: it is very interesting to investigate the debts of the Arabic language with respect to the other Eastern languages in order to appreciate the efforts of translators from 'Abbāsid Baghdad in assimilating Greek philosophy.

In the last pages of his volume, Zonta mentions the role of the four major pre-Islamic religions of the Middle East and Asia – Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, Manichaeism and Christianity – in creating cultural contamination and linguistic connections. Zonta's study ends with a comprehensive index of terms organized according to all the different languages he considers, an index of ancient sources, and an index of ancient, medieval and modern authors.

Cecilia Martini Bonadeo
University of Pisa

ABDULRAHMAN AL-SALIMI and WILFERD MADELUNG:
Early Ibāḍī Theology: Six Kalām *Texts by 'Abd Allāh b. Yazīd al-Fazārī.* (Islamic History and Civilization.) cvi, 241 pp. Leiden: Brill, 2014. €99.
ISBN 978 90 04 27025 1.
doi:10.1017/S0041977X15000117

Many scholars of Islamic studies acknowledge the importance of Ibāḍī sources to the early history of Islam: as a sectarian group that holds distinctive perspectives on Islam vis-a-vis their Sunnī and Shi'ite brethren, Ibāḍī texts often preserve unique views on early Islamic history, theology and law. In the work under review, Madelung and Al-Salimi provide a critical Arabic edition of six previously unpublished early Ibāḍī theological works by Abū Muḥammad ʿAbdullāh b. Yazīd al-Fazārī (d. after 179/795), an early Ibāḍī thinker of considerable importance. In fact, *Early Ibāḍī Theology* represents a capstone of sorts for Professor Madelung, whose interest in al-Fazārī dates back to his critical edition of the Zaydī Imām Aḥmad al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh's (d. 322/934) refutation in the *Kitāb al-Najāt* of a treatise on predestination by al-Fazārī (*Streitschrift des Zaiditenimams: Wider die Ibaditische Prädestinationslehre*, Wiesbaden, 1985). Similarly, the book reflects Al-Salimi's ongoing work in publishing previously unpublished Ibāḍī manuscripts, as well as in Islamic theology. Along with al-Fazārī's edited texts – the *Kitāb al-Qadar* (Book of Predetermination); *Kitāb fī l-Radd ʿalā Ibn ʿUmayr* (Refutation of Ibn ʿUmayr); *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā al-Mujassima* (Refutation of the Corporalists); *Kitāb al-Futyā* (Book of Legal Opinion); *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd fī Maʿrifat Allāh* (Book of Monotheism in the Recognition of God); and the *Kitāb fī man Rajaʿa ʿan ʿIlmihi wa Faraqa al-Nabī wa huwa ʿalā Dīnihi* (Book about Whoever Reneges on his Knowledge and Departs from the Prophet while Remaining in his Religion) – the editors supply a short ten-page introduction (in English) discussing the works and their author, as well as providing a list and description of the manuscripts consulted for the edition. Several helpful Arabic indices (*fahāris*) accompany the work's end, making the edition quite useful as a tool for research.

Along with ʿĪsā b. ʿUmayr, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbdullāh b. Yazīd al-Fazārī was, for Ibāḍīs of the Maghrib (and especially for the minority community known as the Nukkār), one of the most – if not the most – important early Ibāḍī theologians. Originally from Kufa, where he corresponded with and met Maghribī Ibāḍīs who