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.

Remarkably enough, a trove of materials recently came to light in the library of Marracci's religious order in Rome (Ordine dei chierici regolari della madre di Dio) that sheds enormous light on how Marracci went about creating his *Alcorani textus universus*—a cache of notes, drafts, and reference tools as rich as any that survives, perhaps, for a premodern translator. Fifteen manuscripts, amounting, according to the authors of *Ludovico Marracci at Work*, to some 10,000 pages, this cache includes "different versions of his text, notes, and significant information on his approach to translating and writing a commentary on the Qurʾān" (p. 5). In order to give some indication of how remarkable this material is for understanding not only Marracci's own labors, but seventeenth-century scholarship on the Quran and Islam in general, Reinhold Glei and Roberto Tottoli present in this learned study the successive versions of Marracci's translation of Q 18 (*sūrat al-kahf*). The bulk of the volume under review consists therefore of editions of three earlier drafts and the final, printed version of that sura, together with a parallel synopsis of the translations of key passages alongside the Arabic original and two English versions, all this followed by a commentary (more on all this below).

Before presenting this welcome editorial work, however, Glei and Tottoli offer the rationale for studying "the layers of [Marracci's] work preserved in these manuscripts" (p. 12) in a brief introduction. Then, in part one of the volume, "Marracci and the Islamic Sources" (pp. 15–40), they discuss the textual basis for his translation, the origin of his nonstandard division of Quran verses, and, most intriguingly, his use of Arabic commentaries (sg. *tafsīr*) on the Quran. Indeed, it turns out that Marracci began his translation project not so much with the holy text itself, but with Ibn Abī Zamanīn's (d. 1008) *tafsīr* on it. Not only is one of the fifteen manuscripts in the trove a Maghribī copy of that commentary, but two others ("among the most striking items included in this collection," p. 15) are copies of that very manuscript in Marracci's own hand—copies, moreover, in the margins of which he wrote the first version of his translation. His work with the Muslim exegetical tradition by no means ended there. Curiously enough, while his translation followed the Quranic text as it appeared in Ibn Abī Zamanīn's commentary, it was shaped fundamentally by another Arabic commentary, the renowned *Tafsīr Jalālayn* of al-Maḥallī and al-Suyūṭī (a copy of which also survives among Marracci's Arabic books). Indeed, throughout the several layers of translation, *Tafsīr Jalālayn* is the source of the majority of the explanatory material that Marracci includes in his notes. But even in the earliest stages of his work, Marracci was consulting still other commentaries. As he effectively retranslated the Quranic text in successive stages, he increasingly turned to larger *tafsīr*s such as al-Thaʿlabī's *al-Kashf wa-l-bayān ʿan tafsīr al-Qurʾān* (pp. 37–38).

Part two of *Ludovico Marracci at Work*, entitled "Marracci's Use of the Latin Language in His Translations of the Qurʾān," consists of a brief excursus on how, as he moved from one layer of translation to the next, his Latin style moved from "common Latin to Arabic Latin." Like other Quran translators, therefore, especially Juan Segovia (d. 1458), Marracci opted for a "source-language oriented translation" that imitated Arabic constructions (pp. 41–42). The evidence for this conclusion appears in the editions and commentary that comprise the bulk of this section of the study. Though they provide the full texts of all four layers of the translation process, Glei and Tottoli present them in two editions. The first (pp. 44–59) sets out the earliest layer of translation (from MS B65 of the collection of manuscripts) with the changes introduced in the second layer (MS B69) appearing in the notes; the second edition (pp. 60–80) offers the text of the printed translation of *Alcorani textus universus* with the variants from it in the immediately previous (third layer of) translation (MS B69) likewise in the notes.

Following these two editions is a "Synopsis of Translations," which presents passages that are particularly interesting for the study of the evolution of this project in synoptic style: the Arabic text in transliteration side-by-side with an English word-for-word translation, George Sale's eighteenth-century English version (based closely on Marracci's work), the text of MS B65, and the printed version of Marracci's translation. This synopsis in turn is followed by a fascinating commentary in which we vividly see this movement from "common Latin to Arabic Latin." At verse 18:33, for example, the authors point out that Marracci originally translated *jannatayni min aʿnābin* ("two gardens of grapes") with the compact phrase *duos hortos vitibus consitos* ("two gardens planted with grapes"), which would have pleased Latin schoolmasters; but he opts in the printed version for the Arabicizing *duos hortos ex vitibus*, which follows the Quran's construction faithfully, but is puzzling Latin (p. 118). Likewise,

at 18:44 Marracci clearly understands the sense of the phrase *wa-mā kāna muntaṣiran* ("and he was unable to defend himself"), but only offers the Arabicizing Latin imitation of it, *neque fuit adiuvans se ipsum*, in the printed version (p. 120). By the time he reached the final stage of his translation, then, Marracci's Latin translation had come to lay over "the original text like a transparent foil that allows [us] to see what is behind" (p. 136).

In part three (pp. 137–88) Glei and Tottoli offer a helpful series of appendices: Latin word indices to the first and final versions of the translation; a bibliography; and a collection of sixteen beautiful color plates from the manuscripts themselves.

Ludovico Marracci at Work is a small book about a very big one, but the value of its contribution is not in doubt. While scholars over the last century have learned a certain amount about Marracci's procedures and principles from the printed text of *Alcorani textus universus*, this careful examination of the evolution of his translation of one sura revolutionizes our understanding of his work as a Quran scholar—and, as importantly, should inspire other scholars to make use of this invaluable body of evidence surviving in Rome.

THOMAS E. BURMAN
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Al-Radd al-jamīl, *A Fitting Refutation of the Divinity of Jesus Attributed to Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī*. Edited by MARK BEAUMONT and MAHA EL KAISY-FRIEMUTH. History of Christian-Muslim Relations, vol. 28. Leiden: BRILL, 2016. Pp. vii + 207. $125, €104.

The volume under review is essentially a new critical edition and English translation of *al-Radd al-jamīl li-ilāhiyyat ʿĪsā bi-ṣarīḥ al-Injīl* (A Fitting Refutation of the Divinity of Jesus from the Evidence of the Gospel), based on three extant manuscripts, two of which attribute this work of anti-Christian polemic to Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), one of the most influential thinkers in the history of Islam. The two editors, Mark Beaumont (London School of Theology) and Maha El Kaisy-Friemuth (Erlangen-Nürnberg University), are already known from previous publications on *al-Radd al-jamīl,* which are the groundwork for the introductory essays of the present volume. Described as "the most extensive and detailed refutation of the divinity of Jesus by a Muslim author in the classical period of Islam" (back cover), *al-Radd al-jamīl* has been on the radar of scholars interested in medieval Muslim-Christian polemics ever since the French orientalist Louis Massignon published his article "Le Christ dans les Évangiles, selon al-Ghazâli" in *Revue des études islamiques* in 1932. The first edition of *al-Radd al-jamīl*, based on the aforementioned three manuscripts, was published seven years later by the Lebanese Jesuit Robert Chidiac, with a side-by-side French translation. The Arabic text established by Chidiac (1939) served as the basis for a German translation (Wilms 1966) and for the more recent Italian translation (Peta 2013). Chidiac's edition was likewise the basis for Arthur J. Arberry's English translation of a section from *al-Radd al-jamīl* (1964) and for James Sweetman's extended presentation of the arguments of the entire work (1955). Thus, while Beaumont and El Kaisy-Friemuth cannot be said to be navigating totally uncharted waters here, they do have the distinction of presenting the first complete English translation of *al-Radd al-jamīl* based on their new critical edition of the three known manuscripts.

They must also be credited with putting the spotlight back on a remarkable work that has not yet yielded all its secrets, the first and foremost being the identity of its author. El Kaisy-Friemuth devotes the first chapter (pp. 1–32) to reviewing the scholarly debate on the authorship of *al-Radd al-jamīl*. Massignon's conviction that al-Ghazālī authored this polemical work, apparently shared by Roger Arnaldez (1953), has long since been abandoned. Likewise, the view first advocated by Chidiac has also lost support: that if *al-Radd al-jamīl* was not al-Ghazālī's direct composition, it could well be the work of his circle of students, using lecture notes taken during al-Ghazālī's alleged sojourn in Alexandria after his visit to Jerusalem. The debate today revolves around two positions: the author is likely