

Al-Kindī used the terms *īqāʿāt* (rhythmical modes) and *naqarāt* for beats: for example, he writes “*al-thaqīl al-awwal*, it is three consecutive beats (*naqarāt mutawāliyyāt*), then a quiescent beat, then the rhythm returns as it began”. Unlike al-Kindī, Saʿādiya, who borrowed the theory, does not mention the names of the modes, and he uses *alḥān* for *īqāʿāt* and *naghamāt* for *naqarāt*. He writes: “As for the *first lahn*, its measure is three consecutive beats (*naghamāt*), and one quiescent; this mode stirs the humour of the blood and the temperament of sovereignty and dominion”.

The terminological preferences Saʿādiya adopts testify to his acquaintance with a different theoretical tradition; there is for instance a similar usage in the Brethren’s epistle, where, as mentioned above, they write: “Melodies, or rhythmical modes, (*alḥān*) consist of sounds and rhythms (*aṣwāt* and *naghamāt*)”. In a later, more extensive, definition, the Brethren refer to the measuring of rhythmical beats which, they say, can only be produced in a succession of alternate movements (*ḥaraka*) and quiescence (*sukūn*), terms already mentioned by al-Kindī and Saʿādiya. The Brethren explain the nature of these terms saying, according to my translation: “The ‘movement’ is a displacement from one place to another, during a second interval of time; its opposite is the quiescence that indicates the stopping at the first place, during the second interval of time”. Wright’s translation reads: “we may state that motion is the transfer of an object from its initial position to a second position at a second [moment in] time. Its antithesis is rest, which is [an object] remaining in the initial position at a second [moment in] time”. It seems to me that Wright’s translation is a kind of abstraction of the terms, disconnected from the musical or rhythmical context. In search of a plausible interpretation I came to the conclusion that it is involved in the technique of the plectrum (*midrāb*) in the playing of the *ʿūd*. When a string is plucked with the plectrum, a beat and a note are produced simultaneously, i.e. as a rule they are produced together. The movement (*ḥaraka*) in using the plectrum refers to the fact that when a string is plucked, the player’s hand has to move in order to pluck the string again, and during the interval between the two beats there is a certain silence, due to the special character of the plucked strings of the *ʿūd*, whose sounds disappear immediately after they are produced, bearing the character of percussion. Since the same terms *ḥaraka* (motion) and *sukūn* (quiescence) are used by the Arab grammarians and prosodists, it was easy to grasp a relationship between prosody and rhythm.

I hope that my observations on the intricate terminological ambiguities may add a ray of light to the eloquent contribution of Owen Wright.

Amnon Shiloah

CARMELA BAFFIONI:

On Logic: An Arabic Critical Edition and English Translation of Epistles 10–14.

(Epistles of the Brethren of Purity.) xxv, 201 pp. (English), 204 pp.

(Arabic). Oxford: Oxford University Press in association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2010. ISBN 978 0 19 958652 3.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X11000899

The group of philosophers called the *Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʿ* is very well known to all scholars and students of Arab intellectual history and Islamic philosophy. Their

name may be translated as “Brethren of Purity” (my own preferred option) or “Brethren of Sincerity”. It is generally held that they flourished, probably in Basra, in approximately the ninth–tenth centuries AD. The 52 *Rasā’il* (Epistles) which they produced breathe an air of mystery, at least as far as the actual production of these texts is concerned. As Nader El-Bizri succinctly puts it in his foreword: “The exact dating of this corpus, the identity of its authors, and their doctrinal affiliation remain unsettled questions that are hitherto shrouded with mystery” (p. xviii). And while there have been a number of printed Arabic editions of these texts, the best thus far being the four-volume Beirut (Dār Ṣādir, 1957) edition, there has been no really modern translation into English of the entire corpus, and certainly no bilingual, and fully annotated, Arabic–English edition. This volume aims to be a contribution towards remedying this lacuna in part.

The Institute of Ismaili Studies in London has taken upon itself the most praiseworthy – and much-needed – task of producing an entire critical bilingual multi-volume edition of which the present work is the second to appear. An introduction to the whole series, edited by Nader El-Bizri under the title *The Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’ and their Rasā’il: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), also appeared in 2008.

The present volume, carefully and judiciously edited by Carmela Baffioni, is a pleasure to read and study. It comprises a foreword, a full technical introduction, a full translation into English of Epistles 10–14, copiously footnoted, which survey the *Isagoge* of Porphyry (no. 10), followed by the Aristotelian *Categories* (no. 11), *De Interpretatione* (no. 12), *Prior Analytics* (no. 13), *Posterior Analytics* (no. 14), related appendixes, a bibliography of primary and secondary sources, a subject index and an index locorum. All this, in turn, is followed by a critical edition of the Arabic text of the *Rasā’il*, Epistles 10–14, indicating copious variant readings, together with an Arabic index.

The *Epistles* from the first section of the *Rasā’il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’* are among the most difficult and technical of the 52 produced by the Ikhwān. Baffioni, who is professor of the history of Muslim philosophy at the Università degli Studi di Napoli ‘L’Orientale’, has put us all in her debt with a translation and an Arabic text which is clear, easy to read and carefully annotated with an abundance of textual variants. Her edition “is based on the Atif (‘Āṭif) Efendi 1681 manuscript, the oldest identified in public libraries. It dates back to 1182 (AH 578) and contains the complete text of the logical treatises. It is almost fully vocalized and provides some marginal notes with variants and corrections. The titles and the word *faṣl* are written in red ink” (p. 36). Baffioni has established her final text by collating this text with 13 other principal manuscripts. Her translation follows the Arabic text closely without being totally given over to formal equivalence.

It is intriguing to speculate about the sources which the Ikhwān used. Baffioni tells us in her introduction that “the Ikhwān must have had at their disposal a translation of the *Isagoge*, or perhaps a summary of it; comparisons with the Greek original of Aristotle’s *Categories* shows that the Ikhwān summarize extensively from the whole work, apart perhaps from Chapters 2 and 3” (p. 21). She stresses that “judging by their selection of works by Aristotle, the Ikhwān would seem to be following the tradition that restricted research to the first books of the *Organon* rather than sharing the wider approach of al-Fārābī” (p. 2).

This is an attractive volume both in content and production; it augurs well for the volumes which are scheduled to follow, which, alas, have been somewhat slow to appear.

Ian Richard Netton