

Chapters 10–12 are arguably the most important in the book, given the authors' conviction that Sallam's travelogue represents a *bona fide* journey, which they endeavour to reconstruct. Since the argument is dependent on clear and consistent communication of the geography involved, separate maps in the main text for each segment of the journey would have been extremely helpful. The only relevant map is one of the entire journey at the back of the book (map 4), which is missing many of the toponyms mentioned in either the text or the summary statements at the end of chapters 10 and 12 (e.g. Ardabil, Darial Pass, Lake Ara-köl, Dzungarian Gate, Talki Pass, Bishbalik, Altmishbalik, Loulan, Bedel Pass, Ghuriyan, Barskhan, Isfijab, Tashkent, Ushrushana and Merv). The narrative of the journey is additionally cluttered by extensive historical background on various polities located along the way, better addressed in appendixes (e.g. pp. 192–4, 198–202). Moreover, there is confusion over Qocho, located in the Turfan Oasis, not on the Guchen-Barkol route (p. 202).

A lack of synchronization between toponyms mentioned in the main description of the journey and those in the summary statements (e.g. Samandar, Aktogaj, Koktash, Kabchagay, Lake Aibihu, Bukluk, Kara-köl, Tokmak, Ak-Beshim, Kish, and Nakhshab) further confuses the situation for the reader attempting to follow the route without the aid of more detailed maps. References to alternative routes that Sallam may have taken on certain legs of his journey are not consistently synchronized between the main text and the summaries (e.g. p. 195 vs. p. 197, pp. 239–40 vs. p. 242 vs. map). Again, comparison with journeys by others in the opposite direction (e.g. pp. 209–14, 230–3) would benefit from maps in the text.

The identification of the barrier that Sallam reached with the “Jade Gate” at Yumenguan (chapter 11) is generally well argued, but this chapter too needs a map or maps, and comparison with Abu Dulaf's *Risala* is less than convincing. However, despite these shortcomings, the volume will be welcomed by scholars of Islam and Eastern Christianity as an important contribution on this fascinating literary theme.

Mark Dickens

JOHANNA PINK:

Sunnitischer Tafsir in der modernen islamischen Welt. Akademische Traditionen, Popularisierung und Nationalstaatliche Interessen.

(Brill Texts and Studies on the Qur'an.) xiv, 380 pp. Leiden und Boston: Brill, 2011. €119. ISBN 978 90 04 18592 0.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X11000942

The author achieves something extraordinary with this book: for the first time in the history of Western *tafsir* studies, she manages to compare and contrast modern Quran commentaries from three linguistically different parts of the Muslim World and analyse these in their original languages (Arabic, Turkish and Bahasa Indonesian). Since Baljon's seminal 1968 study, which included Egyptian and South Asian commentaries, no other author has had either the linguistic ability or the contextual knowledge to combine two languages in their studies, let alone three. In addition, Pink has chosen several commentaries from each language (six in Arabic, three in Indonesian, and two in Turkish), on half of which nothing has been written before (e.g. the *tafsir* of Abū Zahrā, Ṭanṭāwī al-Zuhaylī and Sa'īd Ḥawwā). All of the commentaries examined here were published (even if written

earlier) between 1967 and 2004, thereby updating Baljon's and Jansen's (1974) accounts by several decades.

After a short introduction (chapter 1), in chapter 2 Pink provides a brief survey of the historical development of modern *tafsīr* since the nineteenth century, including an account of that earlier and pre-modern *tafsīr* which served as a point of reference (*Referenzkommentare*, e.g. al-Ṭabarī, al-Rāzī) for the authors she has studied. In chapter 3, Pink suggests a typology into which she wants to group her eleven commentaries: first, scholarly *tafsīr* (*Gelehrtenkommentare*); second, institutional *tafsīr* (*Institutenkommentare*); third, homiletic *tafsīr* (*Predigerkommentare*), and fourth, a hybrid of all three (*Hybride Formate*). The first category is represented by the four authors Ṭanṭāwī, al-Zuḥaylī, Süleyman Ateş and M. Quraish Shihab; the second by the Azhar Committee of the Islamic Research Academy and the Research Committees of the Indonesian and Turkish Ministries of Religion; the third by Hamka and M. Mutawallī al-Sha'rāwī, and the fourth by M. Abū Zahrā and Sa'īd Hawwā. This is certainly a novel typology and goes beyond conventional labels such as modernist, traditionalist, Islamist and revivalist, and yet, since the criteria of this typology are so heterogeneous, e.g. status (scholar), multiplicity of authorship (institution), and purpose (homily/sermon), I wonder where its epistemological value lies. If Pink had intended to show that, for example, institutional *tafsīr* interprets verses of the Quran differently due to the fact that it *is* institutional *tafsīr*, things would be different, but she does not. Instead, what comes through time and again in her analysis is the fact that commentaries differ not because of their status, number of authors or purpose, but because they were written in either Egypt, Syria, Turkey or Indonesia, or because their authors adhere to conservative or liberal religious norms (which, almost *en passant*, Pink admits in her conclusion). However, what should be taken from Pink's typology is the possibility of classifying *tafsīr* work not exclusively on the basis of its content or ideological purpose (Wielandt, *EQ*, 2, 126–39), but on the basis of its form, structure and methodology, thus developing formal criteria for the study of *tafsīr* as a specific and independent literary-religious genre.

Chapter 4 contains the bulk of Pink's *tafsīr* analysis, covering 175 pages, in which she examines commentaries on five Quranic passages (Q23: 1–11; Q2: 2–5; Q33: 35; Q9: 111–2; Q2: 62), all of which, in one way or another, discuss the question of who is and who is not a believing Muslim, and what legal and eschatological consequences this has. Given that Pink's interest is structural and not content-based, one would expect her to state her reasons for choosing this theme (I suspect it is because it is content-wise very topical) and to talk about the relevance of this theme within the context of the infamous *takfīr* debates of recent years. But in spite of the book's subtitle, which suggests lots of extra- and intertextual references to the intellectual and socio-political context in which Egyptian, Syrian, Turkish and Indonesian commentaries on these passages operate, one hears in fact very little about this (and if one does, then with a rather speculative tone, e.g. pp. 131, 136, 164, 171). In fact, the strength of this chapter lies elsewhere: Pink manages to analyse these contemporary Quran commentaries as part of a wider and longer *tafsīr* tradition that stipulates that its members – whether modernist, traditionalist or Islamist – manoeuvre their way through a whole arsenal of exegetical tools and strategies (e.g. use of *ḥadīth*, *Isrā'īliyāt*, *tafsīr* authorities, non-exegetical sciences, *ijtihād*). It is compelling to read her assessment about which author(s) use(s) which textual and exegetical method in order to promote their favourite interpretation of a passage. Her comparative perspective, using all eleven commentaries for each lemma, allows her to judge to what extent, for example, the omission of one exegetical tool (e.g. quoting a *ḥadīth* for a *sabab al-nuzūl*, the cause of a revelation) leads to a different interpretation and why.

Pink's conclusion, stated in her last chapter, stresses that in spite of individual and regional differences in tone and emphasis, no real radical break, either in terms of content or methodology, has occurred between the modern and pre-modern *tafsīr* tradition. Arabic *tafsīr* is more conservative, more exclusivist and less philosophical, mystical and historical than its Turkish and Indonesian counterparts. But none of the authors seem to dare to confront the reader with novel hermeneutical "turns", nor does anyone follow extreme examples of commentaries that are predominantly *ḥadīth*-based, monovalent and that ignore the exegetical tradition (like Ibn Kathīr or al-Shawkānī). This certainly raises the question of whether one can still adhere to the hitherto prevalent view (from Goldziher to Calder) according to which modern *tafsīr* represents a kind of departure from the classical tradition. The other important observation refers to what Pink calls *Referenzkommentare* and her observation that almost all authors frequently use earlier reformist *tafsīr* in their exegesis. This shows how increasingly important it is for any student of *tafsīr* to be aware of the commentaries of reformist *mufasssirs*, such as al-Qāsimī, Rashīd Riḍā, al-Maghārī, Ibn 'Ashūr, 'Izzat Darwasa, Sayyid Quṭb and al-Mawduḍī, in order fully to understand current writings on the Quran.

The book contains three appendixes, one of which provides long passages in German translation from each examined *tafsīr* regarding Q2: 62, enabling readers not only to read the primary material for themselves, but also to appreciate the solid and sophisticated nature of Pink's analysis in chapter 4.

This is a finely produced work with very few misspellings, virtually no mistakes in transliteration, and very few omissions (e.g. Ā'isha 'Abd al-Raḥmān – Bint al-Shāfī within the account of Egyptian *tafsīr*). For all these reasons the book is highly commended.

Andreas Christmann

CHRISTIANE GRUBER (ed.):

The Islamic Manuscript Tradition: Ten Centuries of Book Arts in Indiana University Collections.

xviii, 281 pp. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2010. ISBN 978 0 253 35377 1.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X11000954

The main title of this work may lead one to expect a wide conspectus of the whole range of Islamic book production; the subtitle indicates a limitation of the field. Nevertheless, we may admire the richness of the holdings of Indiana University, especially as represented in the Lilly Library of Rare Books and Manuscripts, and the Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender and Reproduction. This handsomely produced book, composed of an introduction by Christiane Gruber and seven essays by six further contributors, is the fruit of a graduate seminar and also of an exhibition. Perhaps with the exhibition visitor particularly in mind, Gruber herself offers an excellent general account of the manuscript tradition as an introduction, using items in Indiana Libraries as stepping-stones. The content of the works studied in the essays that follow is mainly religious or informative. The major emphasis in treatment is on function and cultural significance, rather than codicology and aesthetic qualities.

Janet Rauscher leads off with an essay on Ruth E. Adomeit of Cleveland (1910–96), a collector of miniature volumes, who bequeathed her collection of some