lematic laws, so that bringing about reform without compromising the identity of and fidelity to the legal and cultural tradition to which the concerned parties belong can be accomplished.

DELFINA SERRANO RUANO
CSIC, MADRID

Gender Hierarchy in the Qur'ān: Medieval Interpretations, Modern Responses. By KAREN BAUER. Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization. New York: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2015. Pp. xi + 308. $99.99, £64.99.

Gender and Muslim Constructions of Exegetical Authority: A Rereading of the Classical Genre of Qur'ān Commentary. By AISHA GEISSINGER. Islamic History and Civilization, vol. 117. Leiden: BRILL, 2015. Pp. xi + 319. $163, €126.

Tafsīr *and Islamic Intellectual History: Exploring the Boundaries of a Genre*. Edited by ANDREAS GÖRKE and JOHANNA PINK. Qur'anic Studies Series. New York: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, in association with the INSTITUTE OF ISMAILI STUDIES, LONDON, 2014. Pp. xxi + 547. $99.

Despite the bundling here of three volumes on Quranic exegesis that appeared within the space of a year, the field of *Tafsīr* Studies is still in its infancy, as Andreas Görke and Johanna Pink point out in the introduction to their collection, Tafsīr *and Islamic Intellectual History*. Since the 1990s an increasing number of monographs, collections, and articles devoted to *tafsīr* have appeared. It seems to me that this formative period of *Tafsīr* Studies is analogous to the formative period of *tafsīr* itself. Just as the genre of *tafsīr* gradually emerged and distinguished itself from other early Islamic literary genres, so too the study of the genre is emerging and seeking to define its scope and even the object of its study. Görke and Pink also note that the field remains fragmented, lacking thus far even a comprehensive history of *tafsīr*. Two key questions remain: what is *tafsīr* and how can it be categorized in a meaningful and analytically useful manner? The two editors frame the former question in terms of boundaries of the genre. Does one include every text (written or oral) that seems to interpret the Quran? Does one include anything the author self-identifies as *tafsīr*? Both methods are problematic given that the first is vague (and unmanageable) and the latter inconsistent. Limiting the study to just those texts with fixed characteristics or by the sources employed likely limits *tafsīr* to texts produced in the fourth/tenth century or later. But even prominent exegetical works would be hard pressed to meet all the characteristics. Görke and Pink's edited volume therefore wisely seeks to explore the boundaries of the genre and their permeability though a variety of approaches dealing with various epochs, regions, and (possible) subgenres of *tafsīr*, and in so doing to start exploring the characteristics of *tafsīr*, its place in Islamic intellectual history, and its relation to other genres within that history. Although in their respective books Aisha Geissinger and Karen Bauer do not necessarily identify these core issues using the same terminology, both wrestle with the same issues while looking at gender through the lens of *tafsīr*.

In *Gender and Muslim Constructions of Exegetical Authority*, Geissinger examines the limited but significant exegetical material attributed to female figures. She recognizes that it is impossible to reconstruct early Muslim women's interpretations of the Quran and assiduously avoids historical claims about these female figures. The question Geissinger does explore, however, is what cultural labor gender performed in the making of the classical Sunni *tafsīr* genre and how? Careful not to impose essentialized, ahistorical notions of gender on the premodern exegetes, her analysis begins by demonstrating that socio-political and religious authority was understood in masculine terms and that interpretative authority in particular was emblematically masculine, whereas femaleness encompassed intellectual, physical, and moral deficiency. In her second chapter, Geissinger moves to an examination of women in early exegetical sources, focusing on eight early works and the frequency with which women appear, the literary genre of the material, and the topics of the Quranic verses they explicate. Women are primarily present as objects of male exegetical gaze and later as sources. They have no explicit exegetical role, except when their statements are unwittingly exegetical. She concludes that there is nothing to suggest a discrete body of exegetical materials from women, among whom the

Prophet's wives ʿĀʾisha and Umm Salama are the most prominent, and female exegetical activities decrease with time. Turning to the second/eighth- and early third/ninth-century exegesis, she sees this interpretive intentionality developing—from women as unwitting sources to women clearly intending to interpret, though the latter are still uncommon. Often the female interpreter is put in her place by a male interpreter, but occasionally she is given the last word by the compiler. But even this exceptionality reaffirms that exegetical authority is primarily masculine. For the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries, Geissinger turns to the *tafsīr* chapters in major Sunni hadith collections, such as that of al-Bukhārī. ʿĀʾisha becomes a preeminent source for exegesis, establishing her as a reliable and prolific transmitter.

Chapter five examines the ways that exegetes memorialized the "abode of the Prophet's wives." Whereas the Quran limited the visual access to the Mothers of Believers, exegetes paradoxically rendered this idealized space permanently visible in order to authoritatively resolve exegetical questions about gendered social hierarchies and legal, theological, and sectarian debates. ʿĀʾisha and to a lesser extent Umm Salama acquire interpretive authority and the former becomes a mediator of the relationship between Muḥammad and later generations of Muslims; her authority was far from being unproblematic even for Sunnis. In the final chapter Geissinger demonstrates that the individual male authorities in the fourth/tenth century selected from the past exegetical materials ascribed to women and framed them so as to (re)construct a gendered vision of a sacred past. Some, of course, opted not to draw on female sources. And even when they did, the inclusion of a significant number of hadiths attributed to ʿĀʾisha may be a methodological byproduct rather than the result of an intentional focus. Yet, her presence within the tradition justified the creation of a limited space for women (usually from scholarly families) to participate (on the margins) in the fourth/tenth century.

Geissinger concludes that women had limited interpretative authority in the formative, early, and medieval periods, with no discrete body of exegetical materials ascribed to them. But, whereas there was initially no agreement on whether they could even be quoted, later it became increasingly de rigueur. The presence of women within the exegetical tradition may have been small, but since they were used to gender interpretive authority, the impact was greater.

Bauer's approach to gender in her monograph, *Gender Hierarchy in the Qurʾān*, is at the same time narrower and broader in scope. She narrows the focus of her analysis by focusing on three key issues: testimony (through an examination of Q 2:282, which has been read to imply a woman's testimony is half that of a man), creation (through an examination of Q 4:1, which states that humanity was created from a single soul), and marriage hierarchy (through Q 2:228 and Q 4:34, both of which seem to place men above women with the latter seeming also to permit the use of violence). She broadens the focus with her diachronic approach, starting with an examination of the Quranic context of the verses and their premodern interpretations from the earliest to the medieval commentaries and concluding with a survey of modern interpretations, which often includes interviews with both Sunni and Shiʿi, male and female Islamic scholars or ulema. Broadly speaking, Bauer concludes that medieval interpreters assume that hierarchies in society and marriage are natural and just, and that gender inequality is appropriate based on women's deficiencies. Modern interpreters of these verses, whether conservative or reformers, generally jettisoned the notion of gender inequality, but the former often maintain that the Quran's hierarchies remain appropriate. All of the modern interpreters also share the invocation of modern sources (such as science or popular science) to justify their positions. Through her exploration of the Quran and its *tafsīr*, Bauer highlights the links between medieval and modern interpretations and the impact of the social and intellectual context on the production of religious knowledge.

Beginning with how and why medieval interpretations of women's testimony developed, Bauer examines the Quran and the earliest interpretations of Q 2:282 in *fiqh*, hadith, and grammar, and discovers that the issue is hotly contested, with genre and social circumstances influencing those interpretations. Bauer is correctly cautious about imputing motives to the exegetes, though none considered women equal. Later exegetes could pick and choose what past material to include, but the pattern had already been set. Differences remained—for example, in the fourth/tenth century little explanation is provided, whereas in the fifth/eleventh century the emphasis on women's deficiency comes more to the fore. These medieval rulings have a significant impact on modern interpretations. Conservatives uphold them but provide modern justifications from physiology or pop-psychology. Reformers begin

with the premise of equality and so shun the earlier rulings but still address them. They develop a new *fiqh* and historicize the Quran. And neo-traditionalists reinterpret some aspects, but remain based in the tradition; the Quran is constant, but new laws need to be derived through time.

The gendered interpretation of Q 4:1 is accomplished by reading it and other verses as a shorthand version rather than as an alternate story of the biblical account of creation, with the assumption that Eve (as the archetypal woman) was created from and for man. The early and medieval exegetes thus emphasized the secondary, dependent, and imperfect nature of woman and, as a result, the naturalness of gender hierarchy. She was, as many hadiths point out, made from a crooked (left) rib. Once again, modern exegetes including conservatives agree on equality. In fact, Bauer finds the differences between reformers and conservatives to be far less pronounced than those between Sunnis and Shiʿis. Sunnis such as Muḥammad ʿAbduh argue that the verse refers to human origins, not to Adam and Eve. Rashīd Riḍāʾ, however, disagrees. Even Sayyid Quṭb holds men and women to be equal—though each gender has different abilities and roles. None of these positions deviates from the earlier exegetes, who were also willing to accord women spiritual equality albeit not worldly equality. Shiʿi exegetes by contrast were strongly influenced by the Imami Shiʿi Ṭabāṭabāʾī, who rejected the rib hadiths (though he was primarily concerned with refuting evolution). Conservative and reformer Shiʿis agreed that the sexes are of equal value; in rejecting the medieval hadiths, only their means differ, with the former focused on chains of authority (sg. *isnād*) and the latter employing rationality (*ʿaql*) when assessing the reliability of hadiths.

Bauer's analysis of marriage follows a similar pattern. Hierarchy, with the husband in charge and given the right to discipline if necessary, is at the heart of the medieval Islamic conception of marriage, though both partners are to be kind to one another and the husband must maintain his wife. The role of the husband was often modeled on that of a just ruler. Bauer also points out that exegetes were aware of the imbalance; in the case of disobedience and discipline, they discussed the ethics of the hierarchy and some expressed considerable concern that husbands use their power fairly and not inflict injury. With superiority came responsibility. Often it was justified to preserve fellowship or because of men's presumed greater religious sense. Men must guide and educate, women must be obedient.

Modern exegetes likewise struggled with Q 2:228 and Q 4:34. Conservatives maintained the hierarchy and inflexible roles of men and women based on their intrinsic, natural differences: women are equal but different. The conservatives granted women rights, but then so had the medieval exegetes, but now the selective use of science justifies the differences. Neo-traditionalists attempted to mitigate traditional interpretations by contextualizing verses, viewing them as descriptive rather than prescriptive, or reinterpreting *nushūz* ("disobedience") in Q 4:34 to mean "adultery"—in which case the verse lessens the punishment for women compared to that for men. All this shows that even exegetes similarly categorized are not monolithic in their methods or interpretations. Reformers see the verse not as an eternal ethical one, but as a historically bound one; in other words, it is abrogated.

Bauer concludes by highlighting how different milieus affected the way in which both premodern and modern exegetes have interpreted verses on women's status. The former were influenced by changes in the socio-political nature of the empire, patriarchal society, the developments in the sources used in *tafsīr*, and their regional and legal affiliations. Modern exegetes were clearly impacted by liberal ideas, the colonial encounter, science, corrupt secular regimes, Salafism, and education programs from Saudi Arabia. Bauer rightly concludes that the interpretations of all of these exegetes may reveal more about the worldview of the interpreters than they reveal about the Quran. As Geissinger also argued, authority in the temporal and spiritual realm is masculine, and before the twentieth century female participation was limited; males were writing for males—about women.

Geissinger and Bauer also mark a shift in the study of *tafsīr* with their methodological and theoretical sophistication. Both are aware of historical-critical issues, cautious not to read the attributions given in the *isnād*, for example. Bauer's use of interviews expands the boundaries of *tafsīr* and in her chapter six in particular has her own personal life drawn into the discussion, allowing for the realization that she is not a neutral reader or interviewer of these "texts." Geissinger's and Bauer's sophistication makes demands of the reader, for they draw on Michel Foucault, Georg Gadamar, Jan Assman, and so forth. Their books also exemplify the very issues on which Görke and Pink's collection focuses.

The fifteen essays in the last-mentioned volume, each to receive a very brief summation, examine the boundaries of the genre of *tafsīr* from five perspectives. The first three essays—by Catherine Bronson, Claude Gilliot, and Nicolai Sinai—explore the formation of boundaries that came to define *tafsīr*. Through an examination of the earliest Muslim discourse on Eve from the first/seventh to fourth/tenth centuries, Bronson shows that the formative material hails from an acculturating milieu and the exegetical traditions of other religions, and in this adaptation the sparse and largely egalitarian Quranic Eve is transformed into a symbol of women's derivative and deficient nature that justifies gender hierarchies. Gilliot illuminates how the exegesis of Mujāhid b. Jabr blurs the boundaries of genre, seeing in his exegesis embryonic theological ideas developed by Muʿtazilīs, Qadarīs, and predestinationists, and highlights how Mujāhid drew upon popular storytelling (*qaṣaṣ*). Sinai examines the early *tafsīr* of Muqātil b. Sulaymān, whose work reflects the formation of the genre, for it also draws on the narratives of *qaṣaṣ*, but "cannibalizes" or recycles them into disconnected glosses fitted into a running commentary. Thus, there is a tension between *tafsīr*-like deference to the structural priority of the Quran and the sporadic narratives that disrupt the exegetical framework. And although later works, such as that by al-Ṭabarī, did not employ Muqātil, they follow in his footsteps—he was one of the first to work through the Quran from the beginning to the end.

The next three essays—by Roberto Tottoli, Ignacio Sánchez, and Rebecca Sauer—highlight the emergence, affirmation, and permeation of disciplinary boundaries. Tottoli examines the connections between *tafsīr* and hadith literature using Mālik b. Anas's *Muwaṭṭaʾ* and classical works of *tafsīr*. These works largely disregard Mālik's exegetical material, showing that definable boundaries between the genres had emerged. Sánchez's examination of al-Jāḥiẓ's *Kitāb al-ʿUthmāniyya* and the hermeneutics of al-Shāfiʿī, by contrast, show the permeability of those boundaries. Its focus is on epistemology and hermeneutics, and classifying the *ʿUthmāniyya* as belonging to the legal, theological, or political genres is misleading. Sauer's analysis of exegesis of the "rebel verse" (Q 49:9) from the fourth/tenth to the seventh/thirteenth centuries shows that there were no set norms in *tafsīr* literature for the treatment of law and legal traditions, and she suggests that it was the jurists (*fuqahāʾ*), not the exegetes (*mufassirūn*), who assigned the verse its legal implication.

The third section of the volume, with its essays by Nejmeddine Khalfallah, Abdessamad Belhaj, and Neguin Yavari, focuses on how the dogmatic and theological debates influenced a *tafsīr*'s agenda or methodology. Khalfallah attempts to systemize the exegetical theory of the grammarian and literary theorist ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī—highlighting the fact that important and influential exegetical developments occurred outside of the exegetical field, even by a scholar who never authored a commentary. Al-Jurjānī also links the validity of exegesis to its compliance with the creeds of Sunni dogmatic theology. Belhaj examines the hermeneutics of ʿAbd al-Jabbār. His Muʿtazilī agenda sought to remove ambiguity from the text in favor of the manifest meaning by referring to grammar and lexicography, but he employed figurative meanings to circumvent the manifest meanings when they proved problematic from a Muʿtazilī perspective. Yavari examines the exegesis of Sayyid Quṭb and Ayatollah Khomeini, both of whom employed exegesis for the dissemination of a political or "Islamist" agenda against tyrannical regimes and Western imperialism. But there the similarities largely end. Quṭb argues that the meaning of the Quran is obvious and apparent to all and so calls for absolute adherence; Khomeini maintains aspects of its meaning may be discovered, allowing for divergence from legal prescriptions.

The fourth section includes essays by Johanna Pink, Andreas Görke, and Andrea Brigaglia that question conventional boundaries of time, geography, media, and authorship. Pink, for example, sees in the exegesis of Muḥammad al-Shawkānī reason to doubt the validity of the premodern and modern distinction in *tafsīr* (which was so prominent in Bauer's book). Al-Shawkānī's work has many of the characteristics of classical *tafsīr* (as defined by Norman Calder), but also important differences. It seems both reformist and traditionalist. Görke points out that *Tafsīr* Studies have hitherto relied heavily on the printed text (usually in Arabic), when much exegesis is performed orally by "lay Muslims" in the vernacular languages of the Muslim world and is available to Muslims via audio or video. He urges scholars to redefine what exegesis is if they wish to know what a particular Quranic verse means to contemporary Muslims in a specific region. Brigaglia explores the key role that the public performance of *tafsīr* plays in the social and intellectual life of Nigeria. He shows how it is both a product of its regional context and of the interaction with the Arab Muslim world.

The fifth and final section further focuses on twentieth- and twenty-first-century developments in exegesis and is comprised of essays by Kathrin Klausig, Kathrin Eith, and the late Andrew Rippin. Klausig takes up gender issues with al-Ṭāhir b. Āshūr and Ṭabāṭabāʾī. Her arguments fit nicely with those of the second section of Bauer: the Sunni-Shiʿi differences matter little, and these exegetes both rely on modernist science to defend traditional positions on gender roles in the family. Eith examines the Turkish theologian Yaşar Nuri Öztürk, who believes the Quran to be in harmony with modernity and a political and legal system based on Western precedents. The polyvalent character of the Quran frees the exegete from traditional interpretations and permits different interpretations for different times. Andrew Rippin's essay on the contemporary translation of classical works of *tafsīr* closes the volume. It highlights both the local and global nature of *tafsīr* today. Although no doubt of benefit to scholars of *tafsīr*, many of these translations are meant to encourage independent study of the Quran by Muslims, and for better or worse, open the world of classical *tafsīr* to the modern Muslim ethos. More boundaries are bound to be permeated and erased.

These three excellent books (and essential reading for those interested in *Tafsīr* Studies or gender in the Quran and exegesis) mark significant landmarks of the maturation of the field. Geissinger and Bauer provide an excellent model for thematic and diachronic studies of key issues and for how to integrate critical theory into a field that hitherto has seemed somewhat oblivious to it. Together with the contributors to Görke and Pink's volume, they bring much needed discussion of how *tafsīr* emerged and developed, how its boundaries are demarcated and transcended, and how increasingly diverse the interpretation of the Quran continues to become. Görke and Pink are no doubt correct that there is no point in offering an ultimate definition of *tafsīr*, but our efforts to do so are critical to the continued development of *Tafsīr* Studies.

HERBERT BERG
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA WILMINGTON

Ludovico Marracci at Work: The Evolution of His Latin Translation of the Qurʾān in the Light of His Newly Discovered Manuscripts. With an Edition and a Comparative Linguistic Analysis of Sura 18. By REINHOLD F. GLEI and ROBERTO TOTTOLI. Corpus Islamo-Christianum, Arabica-Latina, vol. 1. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ, 2016. Pp. 188. €48.

In 1698 Ludovico Marracci, a brilliant Arabist and scholar of Islam in Rome, published his *Alcorani textus universus*, a gigantic achievement in the history of European scholarship on Islam and its holy text: a painstaking edition of the Arabic text of the Quran together with a literal translation into Latin, accompanied by ample notes based on wide reading in the Arabic tradition of Quran exegesis. It was intended, to be sure, as a tool for attacking Islam—its first massive volume was called *Prodromus ad refutationem Alcorani* and abundant further polemical content appears as notes to the Latin translation in volume two. Yet as a scholarly accomplishment it is none the less staggering. Though European scholars had intently studied the Quran and had translated all or portions of it into Latin intermittently since the mid-twelfth century, nothing remotely like this had been published (for more on the historical context of this translation, see Thomas E. Burman, "European Qur'an Translations, 1500–1700," in *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, vol. 6: *Western Europe (1500–1600)* [Leiden: Brill, 2014], 25–38).

It was, in fact, the product of forty years of effort (Marracci died just two years after its publication), and, as anyone who has opened these volumes can attest, the effort was Herculean: Marracci presents the Quranic text in successive, short sections of a page or two in length, each of which is followed immediately by a painstaking literal translation into Latin; the translation in turn is followed by explanatory *notae* that discuss philological and interpretive issues arising in the passage; these notes in turn are followed by the *refutationes* or *refutata* mentioned above. At every turn, moreover, Marracci's work is informed by years of studying Muslim commentators: al-Suyūṭī, al-Bayḍāwī, al-Zamakhsharī, and, especially in the initial stages of his work, the Andalusī Ibn Abī Zamanīn.