

reference book that enables a better knowledge of the scientific terms in their medieval Arabic and Hebrew versions.

The first appendix enables a deeper understanding of the tradition of the Hebrew translations: the text of Moses Ibn Tibbon is available in two versions, the original, and one which is contaminated by the translation of Zerahyah Ḥen and is extant in one manuscript only (MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 275). The contamination in this appendix is clearly shown and documented.

The second appendix documents the remarkable fact of the missing aphorisms in the Arabic version of Maimonides' commentary (7.63–87). Three aphorisms have been preserved in the translation of Zerahyah Ḥen and in the translation of Ibn Tibbon that is contaminated by Zerahyah's version.

The most valuable part of the second volume is the glossary: here, Bos lists 2,094 Arabic terms that are used in the Maimonidean commentary, together with their Hebrew counterparts according to the three translations. The contaminated version of Ibn Tibbon's translation is not represented in this glossary. However, this is unnecessary, taking into account that the first appendix is already sufficient for this phenomenon. The glossary includes not just medical terms, but also provides a variety of terms whose appearance form a small dictionary of the Maimonidean language and its various Hebrew translations. Thus, this glossary is not only important for readers of Maimonidean texts, but also for those who are interested in the terminology of the medieval medical literature in general. The volume also contains indexes of the three Hebrew translations, of Greek terms, and of technical terms and *materia medica*.

The two volumes together make an important contribution to our knowledge of Maimonides' medical attitude, and the second volume in particular serves as a valuable reference book for medical and scientific terminology in general. Considering the value of the second volume, one might hope that in future, all of Maimonides' medical works could be supplemented with such a glossary; that there will be – possibly online – a complete glossary comprising all Maimonidean terms in their Arabic originals and available Hebrew and even Latin translations to facilitate the understanding of this important figure in the Islamicate scientific community.

Carsten Schliwski
University of Cologne

BEATA SHEYHATOVITCH:

The Distinctive Terminology in Šarḥ al-Kāfiya by Raḍī l-Dīn al-'Astarābādī.

(Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 96.) ix, 267 pp. Leiden: Brill, 2018. ISBN 978 90 04 36912 2.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X20002682

The *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya* is a commentary on the *Kitāb al-Kāfiya*, “The Sufficient”, a short manual dealing with syntax written by the Egyptian Māliki scholar Jamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Ḥājib (d. 646/1249). At the time, Arabic linguistics was focused on pedagogical treatises that were to be learned by heart (like the famous *Alfiyya* of Ibn Mālik, d. 672/1274). Consequently, the *Kāfiya* is so concise that it begs elucidation. Among the many commentaries that have been written, the *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya*

by Raḍī l-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Astarābādhī (d. c. 688/1289), an Arabic grammarian of Iranian descent, is the most prominent. The work is famous, and is praised for its simultaneous profundity and subtlety – and it is no easy read. Contemporary research has addressed a number of topics treated in the works of al-Astarābādhī, but none so far has deciphered “the distinctive features that set RDA apart from other grammarians and make his writings difficult to deal with” (p. 4). Beata Sheyhatovitch has taken on the daunting task of a systematic study of the terminology used in *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya*, taking as her point of departure the claim that al-Astarābādhī’s uniqueness comes from borrowing from other Islamic sciences, notably logic and philosophy.

After an introduction to the book’s objective and structure in Chapter 1, al-Astarābādhī’s terminology is analysed over the four following chapters. Chapter 2 treats general tendencies, including more accurate formulations, abstract terminology, and the use of Kufan versus Basran terms as well as terms from other Islamic sciences. We learn how al-Astarābādhī distinguishes between what is used in ordinary language on the one hand and technical terminology on the other, but he does not always succeed in being consistent in that respect (illustrated by, e.g., his mixing two senses of the term *ḥāl* as present tense and as a circumstantial qualifier, pp. 17–18). We also learn how al-Astarābādhī brings the use of abstract terminology, derived from grammatical and non-grammatical terms, to new heights by introducing, for instance, *ḵhabariyya* (function of predicate), *zaydiyya* (“Zaydness”), or the untranslatable *faṣliyya* (being *ḍamīr al-faṣl*; cf. p. 26 n. 98). (Along the way, the author herself coins the abstract term “diptoteness”; p. 25.) A discussion of Kufan grammatical terms and concepts used by al-Astarābādhī (like *kināya*, pronoun; *ḥurūf al-idāfa*, particles of annexation) and of terms from the realms of Arab philosophy (such as *mansūb/nisba*, ascription; *muqaddima*, premise) and Islamic jurisprudence (*istiḥsān*, speakers’ or grammarians’ preference) positions the *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya* in the broader context of the Arabic Islamic sciences.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the term *waqʿ* (literally, laying down, establishing) and its derivatives (e.g. *waḍaʿa*, *wāḍiʿ*, *mawḍūʿ*, *waḍʿī*), a term central to the discussion about the origin of language, or language as an invention: (components of) utterances (*alfāz*) are deliberately assigned to meanings (*maʿānī*), whether by God or by humans. The term has been translated in several different manners in the context of its use in Arabic linguistics (such as imposition, institution, assignment), but the author argues for her choice of translating *waqʿ* as “coinage” since it better captures that ideas exist before their verbal expression and utterances are invented to express these ideas, as she interprets al-Astarābādhī’s views on language creation (p. 74). What follows is an in-depth analysis of al-Astarābādhī’s use of the term, revealing how it developed from sparsely used references to the coinage of separate words (Sībawayhi), to coinage of syntactical structures or of speech (Ibn Yaʿīsh), to an explicit technical term in *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya*. As such, al-Astarābādhī is to be considered a precursor of ‘ilm al-waḍʿ, the science of the founding of language as developed in ‘Aḍūḍ al-Dīn al-Ījī’s (d. 756/1355) treatise *al-Risāla al-waḍʿiyya* (Epistle on Coinage) and its commentaries.

Chapter 4 treats derivatives of the roots *ṭ-r-* and *-r-d*. *Tāriʿ* is a term used by fourth/tenth-century jurists to indicate an element that changes a generally accepted rule. In a study of Ibn Jinnī’s use of the term, Michael Carter translates *tāriʿ* as “adventitious” (Ibn Jinnī’s axiom “The adventitious determines the rule”, in A. Kaye (ed.), *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Eighty-Fifth Birthday*, I, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991, 199–208). Sheyhatovitch opts for “pouncing” to highlight that al-Astarābādhī uses the term to explain linguistic

phenomena that “attack” and modify existing forms (p. 128). For instance, a foreign word that is used in Arabic takes on Arabic case markers because the “pouncing factor” – the word’s use in Arabic – changes the original state of affairs (pp. 137–8). “Pouncing” is at work in many different grammatical contexts (e.g. declension, definiteness, grammatical agreement) and although the term partly overlaps with *‘araḍ*, the Arabic translation of the Aristotelian “accident”, derivatives from *ṭ-r-* usually affect grammatical rules.

Terms referring in *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya* to the form–meaning discussion are not unique to al-Astarābādhī. In chapter 5 Sheyhatovitch focuses on five such terms: *ma’ nā*, meaning; *dalāla/madlūl*, signification; *musammā*, referent; *maḍmūn*, content; and *waqa’ a’ alā*, referred to. Of these, the first two are the most widespread in the *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya* and though closely related and presenting overlap, *ma’ nā* is used mainly to refer to abstract ideas while *dalāla/madlūl* often denotes concrete entities. As al-Astarābādhī puts it, for instance, in treating adjectives: *al-dalāla ‘alā dhāti ma’ a l-ma’ nā l-muta’ alliqi bihā*, “signifying an entity together with the meaning linked to it” (p. 184). An elaborate discussion about the differences between these terms results in a picture of the subtle treatment of semantics in the work of al-Astarābādhī.

Sheyhatovitch is to be lauded for her thorough and systematic investigation of the technical vocabulary of al-Astarābādhī’s *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya*, a widely used and cited work in scholarship on Arabic linguistics. Two remarks in conclusion: the study would have greatly gained in clarity and understanding through the incorporation of examples from Arabic language usage; and, I wonder if it would not have been more appropriate and useful to position al-Astarābādhī’s linguistic theory not so much in logic as in pragmatics.

Monique Bernards

Institute for Advanced Arabic and Islamic Studies, Antwerp, Belgium

AHMED EL SHAMSY:

Rediscovery of the Islamic Classics: How Editors and Print Culture Transformed an Intellectual Tradition.

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020. 312 pp. ISBN 978 0 69117456 3.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X20002815

The French campaign in Egypt and Syria (1798–1801) led by Napoleon Bonaparte, as my generation of students of Arabic literature have been taught, jolted the Arabic-speaking territories of the Ottoman Empire out of decline. The foundation myth of the modern Arabic world, if we may thus describe the complex of Arabic narratives of nation-building and modernization, tells the story of Arab cultural and literary *Nahḍa* as the happenstance of two parallel but separate intellectual movements: Westernization and classicism. There is, however, next to no traffic between the two movements. Concrete details are few and far between. *Rediscovering the Islamic Classics: How Editors and Print Culture Transformed an Intellectual Tradition* offers a timely and much needed intervention in the narratives of *Nahḍa* and the revival of Arabic classics. It does so in two significant ways: it offers concrete details of the so-called “post-classical” culture of *inḥiṭāt* in the