

leadership of their day, they do this in the language of jihad". Indeed, "they do this so much that we might even define the earliest jihad as warfare against the enemies of God" (p. 127). Of course, for many Muslims, including but not exclusively Sufi mystics, the concept of *jihād* has come to include not just combat but inner spiritual struggle; the fully-developed Sunni tradition has frequently labelled that inner spiritual struggle "the greater *jihād*", so as to stress its priority over mere fighting. Bonner on several occasions (pp. 14, 22) affirms that this internalized interpretation of *jihād* is consistent with, even in some at least latent sense present in, the Quran. But this seems little more than a polite nod to Muslims who want to stress the more irenic tendencies within and interpretations of their tradition. As he himself casually concedes, and as his historical analysis lays bare, "at least for Sunni Muslims, armed struggle has most often been at the heart of the matter" (p. 79). In this respect, the subject of *jihād* demonstrates how the reconstruction of Islamic history by Western scholars such as Bonner, informed as it is by the best modern critical tools, comes surprisingly close to replicating the understanding of contemporary Islamist radicals who insist on the centrality of armed, physical combat to their definition of "Islam".

**Jonathan P. Berkey**

JONATHAN BROWN:

*The Canonization of al-Bukhārī and Muslim: The Formation and Function of the Sunnī Ḥadīth Canon.*

(Islam History and Civilization: Studies and Texts.) xxii, 431 pp.  
Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007. €129. ISBN 978 90 04 15839 9.

It is refreshing – even for those of us engaged in the debate – to read a study on ḥadīth that does not focus on their authenticity. In fact, by addressing the canonization of al-Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ* and Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ* (the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*), which stand second only to the Quran itself in Sunni Islam, Jonathan Brown answers far more practical and intriguing questions. For some Muslims, to question the authenticity of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, and for some even one of their thousands of ḥadīths, is tantamount to heresy. What Brown demonstrates so convincingly is that this status was never a foregone conclusion and it took centuries to achieve. Tracing how these two collections of ḥadīths were singled out from the many similar collections, and how they came to be accepted by each of the four competing schools of law of Sunni Islam, is useful enough, but Brown also does so with reference to the insights of canon studies in general.

In his first few chapters Brown provides useful introductions to canon studies, canonicity and their applicability to the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*; and to the background and lives of al-Bukhārī and Muslim. Given their later status, the lacklustre, unenthusiastic, and at times hostile reception of their books during their lifetimes and immediately after their deaths can seem very surprising. Al-Bukhārī, in particular, was lambasted by "über-Sunnis" for believing that the *lafẓ* of the Quran was created. As Brown points out, "canonization is not the product of the an author's intention, but rather of a community's reception of texts" (p. 36). Yet the initial reception of these two ḥadīth scholars was one of suspicion, for their works seemed to challenge the tradition of transmitting ḥadīths through "living *isnāds*" which had hitherto served as the main connection to the Prophet and as his authoritative legacy.

In the next few chapters, Brown examines the changing reception of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* in what he terms the “long fourth century” (that is, from 270 AH to about 450 AH, the end of the ninth to the mid-eleventh centuries CE). In Naysābur, Jurjān, and later in Baghdad, a network of scholars developed who worked with these two collections: some produced *mustakhrājs*, which collected ḥadīths using earlier collections as templates, whereas others focused on the flaws (*ʿilal*) of, or made additions (*ilzāmāt*) to, the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. In all cases, in-depth study of these two collections was required. This was largely an endeavour of Shāfiʿīs (though the distinction between them and the Ḥanbalī had not yet “hardened”). Hanafīs transmitted the works, but did not take an early interest in working with these texts. Brown then turns to the pivotal role of al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, who by pioneered the belief that not only were the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* worthy of study, but they also represented a measure of authenticity within ḥadīth criticism itself. Thus, if an *isnād* was not to be found within either of them, it must be suspect. Brown argues that al-Ḥākim was not closing the door on ḥadīth collection, for he himself produced a *mustadrak* which he believed conformed to the standards of al-Bukhārī and Muslim. Instead, al-Ḥākim’s “canonization” of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* was polemically motivated; his target was the Muʿtazila. The canonization process was further spurred by the needs of the Muslim community, particularly as the roles and needs of ḥadīth scholars and jurists diverged. The latter’s focus was on law, and so they needed manageable authoritative and trustworthy references. Also, Shāfiʿīs, Ḥanbalīs, and Mālikīs came to adopt the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* as a common source in their inter-*madhhab* debates. The Hanafīs would not join the fray using the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* for a few more centuries.

In his last three chapters, Brown explores the consequences of canonization and the “canonical culture”. As the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* became synonymous with authenticity and paradigm of excellence in ḥadīth scholarship, several new problems presented themselves, including their pre-canonical critiques and their failure actually to embody all of the conventions of ḥadīth criticism. Brown calls the tendency to deal with these problems by casting the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* in the best possible light “the principle of charity”. Afterwards, the stature of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* remained largely unchallenged until the twentieth century CE. Although Shah Walī Allāh equated criticism of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* with heresy, al-Albānī was willing to challenge iconoclastically the notion that each individual ḥadīth in the two collections was beyond critique. The modern status of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* is made abundantly clear by the vehemence of the counterattack on al-Albānī.

Despite the plethora of evidence produced in support of Brown’s argument, as the reader approaches the end of the book, several nagging questions remain. Brown masterfully anticipates these questions and so concludes his study not with a summary, but with answers to a series of six questions: Why the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* and not other collections? What forces led to their canonization? Why did it occur in the fifth/eleventh century? Did the canon emerge in strife? Was it a product of the Seljuq state or a response to Shiism? Was it a product of a limited region? If there is a critique of his study to be made, it is that some sections read like disjointed biographies of scholars interested in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* without a detailed analysis of the importance of their contribution to canonization. The fault lies in part in the disjointed nature of the extant sources. At times one wishes Brown’s excellent analysis at the end of each chapter was more fully integrated within the chapter. Also, since some chapters are organized thematically rather than chronologically (or scholar by scholar), it is at times difficult to get a clear picture of everything that a particular

scholar (for example, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī) contributed to the canonization process. This minor criticism is in no way meant to detract from Brown's remarkable study and erudition. He has produced an ambitious study that will itself become a canon for the study of the canonization of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, and so like them it is worthy of much attention and analysis.

**Herbert Berg**

IRIS SHAGRIR, RONNIE ELLENBLUM and JONATHAN RILEY-SMITH (eds):  
*In Laudem Hierosolymitani: Studies in Crusades and Medieval Culture in Honour of Benjamin Z. Kedar.*

(Crusades – Subsidia 1.) xxiii, 468 pp. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. £70. ISBN 978 0 7546 6140 5.

This Festschrift is dedicated to Benjamin Z. Kedar, known outside Israel mainly on account of his contributions to the study of the Crusades. This volume honouring him contains thirty contributions grouped into three sections: The Holy Land, Archaeology and Iconography: Mentality, Law, Jews and World History; and The Crusades, The Military Orders and Commerce

The names of the contributors reflect Kedar's outstanding importance in medieval European history and most importantly the study of the Crusades. Among them are the established scholars of his generation (such as Balard, Hamilton, Mayer, Riley-Smith, Richard), but also younger scholars, many of them his students. The contributions are, as might be expected for a publication of this genre, wide-ranging, and the three headings do little to structure the material. The majority of the articles are concerned with the Crusades and the Middle East during the Crusading period. The Crusades are understood here – in line with Kedar's understanding of the term – in the traditional sense, with no contribution touching upon Crusades to other regions, such as the Baltic and al-Andalus/Spain, or upon post-1291 Crusading. A number of articles are concerned with non-Crusader subjects, such as Esther Cohen on pain terminology from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Susan Reynolds on a further aspect of her argument on "feudalism" in Latin Europe, and Diego Olstein's reflections on the difference between world history and comparative history. The refreshing variety of source materials on which the authors draw is noteworthy: in addition to the standard textual sources, studies refer to sources such as icons, seals, archaeological evidence, inscriptions, coinage, jewellery and pulpit reliefs.

As is to be expected in a Festschrift, some articles are concerned with rather marginal topics, such as Hans Eberhard Mayer's vindication of Reinhold Röhrich. However, the majority of the articles are important contributions to ongoing debates as for example Adrian J. Boas' reflections on the development of rural settlement. Some are precursors to forthcoming monographs (such as Yvonne Friedman on symbolic behaviour between Crusaders and Franks during diplomatic contacts) or further develop an aspect of an already published study (such as Iris Shaghrir on naming patterns in the Kingdom of Jerusalem). For readers of this journal, Reuven Amitai's detailed and original examination of early Mongol administration in Syria might be singled out as an example of the excellent quality of many of the contributions. The volume suffers from some shortcomings, most importantly the absence of an index and