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

to have been a Copt who converted to Islam (Hava Lazarus-Yafeh, Gabriel S. Reynolds, I. Peta, and Martin Whittingham) or he was a Muslim-born polemicist who was familiar with the New Testament in its Coptic arrangement and had an intimate knowledge of Coptic theology and inter-confessional Christian polemics, as the text of *al-Radd al-jamīl* amply demonstrates (El Kaisy-Friemuth). In the opinion of this reviewer, even though El Kaisy-Friemuth's opinion is plausible (we do know of other Egyptian Muslim polemicists, such as Ṣāliḥ ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Jaʿfarī [d. 668/1270], who made a serious effort to read Christian literature in view of composing their refutations), the fact that the author of *al-Radd al-jamīl* quotes the Coptic translation of Jn 1:14 to defend his interpretation of the text (see pp. 164–65), without being in itself a conclusive argument, strongly argues in favor of the thesis that a Coptic convert to Islam was the author of the work. Like Arberry before her, El Kaisy-Friemuth views that fact as indicating that the author apparently believed "that the Gospel was originally written in this language rather than in Greek" (p. 2). In her thinking, this makes a strong argument against the possibility of the author being a convert: "[I]f the author was a Copt who converted to Islam, then how could he have held the view that the Gospel of John was written in Coptic? No knowledgeable Copt would have entertained such a belief" (p. 20). However, it is a mistake to conclude that the author of *al-Radd al-jamīl* labored under the illusion that the language in which the Gospel of John was originally composed was Coptic; his point rather was that, unlike the Arabic translation of Jn 1:14 that he quotes (*wa-l-kalima ṣāra jasadan*), the Coptic version of this same passage admits a reading that does not contradict "intuitive intelligence" (*badīhat al-ʿaql*) and therefore reflects better what he considers to be the intended meaning of the original Greek text. It should be kept in mind that the Coptic translations of the New Testament go back at least to the fourth century (Askeland 2013) and that Arabic versions of the Gospels circulating in the churches of Egypt were translations from Syriac and (as early as the tenth century) Coptic, not direct translations from the Greek tradition.

Indeed, the possibility of a Coptic convert to Islam being the author of *al-Radd al-jamīl* would help explain other peculiarities of the work, such as the lack of any accusation of the textual falsification of the Bible (*taḥrīf al-naṣṣ*) and the prominence of quotations from the Gospel of John. Concerning the latter point, it bears noting that "John's Gospel survives not only in the greatest total number of Coptic manuscripts, but also in the largest variety of dialects—seven in total" and that "[t]he diversity of extant dialects suggests that John's Gospel was the most widely read not only of the Gospels, but indeed of any biblical text" (Askeland 2015: 316, 321). Thus, the abundance of references to the Gospel of John in *al-Radd al-jamīl* would seem to affirm the importance of this particular gospel in the Egyptian Coptic milieu.

As for the apparent acceptance of the textual integrity of the Bible while disputing the Christian interpretation of certain of its passages, it is debatable whether this is merely an interested concession for polemical purposes, as Reynolds and Whittingham maintain, or a genuine acceptance of the biblical text in the possession of the Christians, as El Kaisy-Friemuth is inclined to think (see pp. 8–10). While recognizing that any reply must necessarily be speculative, this reviewer tends to side with El Kaisy-Friemuth on this issue. At a certain point in *al-Radd al-jamīl* the author takes pains to reconcile two apparently discordant passages of the Quran and the Bible, namely, Q 27:12 and Ex 4:6 (see pp. 92–93). If the author's acceptance of the biblical text were a mere stratagem, it would have been easier to pass over the issue in silence, as the biblical passage in question is not directly related to Christian attempts at providing a scriptural basis for their belief in the divinity of Jesus. Another intimation of a genuine acceptance of the integrity of the biblical text is the author's opinion—unprecedented in Islamic writings on Christianity—that Jesus had been granted a privilege not accorded to any other prophet, not even to Muḥammad, namely, the privilege of speaking of the mutual indwelling (*ḥulūl*) of the Father and the Son (Jn 17:17–22; 1 Jn 4:12–14) and of using expressions such as "I and the Father are one" (Jn 10:30) (pp. 124–25). The author of *al-Radd al-jamīl* is quick to point out, however, that the Christians err in interpreting such language[1] as literally implying an ontological union of divinity and humanity in the person of Jesus, when it is only a metaphorical expression of the profound spiritual union between the human prophet-messenger Jesus and God, a union that consists in loving what

1. Chidiac refers to it as "langage théopathique" (p. 56). See also Arnaldez 1953: 245 and Pisani 2014.

God loves, hating what God hates, and willing what God wills. As Beaumont notes, this recourse to metaphorical interpretation of Jesus's statements "is not unique to *al-Radd al-jamīl*, but no previous Muslim polemicist is as thorough in his treatment of Johannine texts" (p. 52).

In chapter two (pp. 33–42), Beaumont provides a helpful outline of *al-Radd al-jamīl*, which, as a road map, guides the reader through its, at times, convoluted argumentation. Also appreciated is Beaumont's effort in chapter three (pp. 43–78) to situate the main themes that emerge from *al-Radd al-jamīl* within the history of previous treatments of Christian beliefs by Muslim writers, thus allowing the reader to identify the elements of continuity and discontinuity. The themes are as follows: "Jesus' miracles do not confirm his divinity; the gospels provide evidence for the fact that Jesus was a messenger sent from God; passages in the fourth gospel that Christians propose as literal proof of the divinity of Jesus should be interpreted metaphorically; the Jacobite belief that the union of the soul and body is an analogy for the union of the divinity and humanity of Jesus is inappropriate; the Melkite separation of the divine and human natures in Jesus at the point of his death is irrational; the Nestorian conviction that the will of Jesus was united with the will of God is not supported by the Christian gospels; Christian scriptures show that titles given to Jesus that Christians believe point to his divine status should be taken as symbols of his spiritual eminence as a messenger of God; Christian appeal to the Qurʾān to support the divinity of Jesus is mistaken" (pp. 44–45).

It is regrettable that more attention was not given to eliminating a certain lack of coordination between the two editors of the volume; e.g., while El Kaisy-Friemuth divides *al-Radd al-jamīl* into three sections (see p. 1), Beaumont divides it into six sections (see pp. 43–44). More attention should also have been paid to copyediting the volume, which shows too many errors and inconsistencies in the transliteration of Arabic (in the treatment of initial *hamza* and of *tāʾ marbūṭa*, in the transliteration of letters bearing a *shadda,* in the use of diacritical marks, in the treatment of "ibn" between two proper names, etc.). For instance, Theodore Abū Qurra's *Maymar fī taḥqīq nāmūs Mūsā al-muqaddas wa-l-anbiyāʾ alladhīna tanabbaʾū ʿalā al-Masīḥ* (Treatise on the Holy Law of Moses and the Prophets Who Prophesied about the Messiah) is referenced as "Maymar fī taḥqīq nāmūs Mūsa al-maqaddus wa-l-anbīyāʾ aladhīna tanabʿu ʿalā al-Masīḥ" on p. 46 n. 3 and as "Maymar fī taḥqīq nāmūs Mūsā al-muqaddas wa-l-anbīyāʾ aladhīna tanadāʿu ʿalā al-Masīḥ" on pp. 91 n. 8 and 195. Also, "Imāna al-Urthūduksiyya," listed among Abū Qurra's works (p. 195; see also p. 61 n. 45), should read "Amānat al-Urthūdhuksiyya" (The Confession of Faith of the Orthodox [Christians]). Finally, although we cannot expect citations of the very latest publications in the field, it is surprising to see the editors of this volume referring to the 2008 doctoral thesis of Hikmat Kachouh without any recognition of the 2012 published edition.

In all, however, these observations should not in any way detract from the many positive aspects of the volume under review, which represents a welcome addition to Brill's excellent series on the History of Muslim-Christian Relations.

DIEGO R. SARRIÓ CUCARELLA
PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE FOR ARABIC AND ISLAMIC STUDIES, ROME

REFERENCES

Arberry, Arthur J. 1964. *Aspects of Islamic Civilization as Depicted in the Original Texts*. London: George Allen & Unwin. Pp. 300–307.

Arnaldez, Roger. 1953. Controverses théologiques chez Ibn Hazm de Cordoue et Ghazali. *Les Mardis de Dar El-Salam*. Pp. 207–48.

Askeland, Christian. 2013. The Coptic Versions of the New Testament. In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the* Status Quaestionis, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2nd ed. Pp. 201–29. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2015. A Lycopolitan Forgery of John's Gospel. *New Testament Studies* 61: 314–34.

Chidiac, Robert. 1939. *Réfutation excellente de la divinité de Jésus-Christ d'après les Évangiles*. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.

Kachouh, Hikmat. 2012. *The Arabic Versions of the Gospels: The Manuscripts and Their Families*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Peta, Ines. 2013. *Il Radd pseudo-ġazāliano: Paternità, contenuti, traduzione*. Palermo: Officina di Studi Medievali.

Pisani, Emmanuel. 2014. Le Christ musulman du *Radd al-ǧamīl* attribué à al-Ġazālī: Enjeux pour une pastorale du dialogue islamo-chrétien. *Nouvelle revue théologique* 136: 462–67.

Sweetman, James W. 1955. *Islam and Christian Theology: A Study of the Interpretation of Theological Ideas in the Two Religions*, pt. 2, vol. 1. London: Lutterworth Press. Pp. 23–25, 262–308.

Wilms, Franz-Elmar. 1966. *Al-Ghazālīs Schrift wider die Gottheit Jesu*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Christians and Others in the Umayyad State. Edited by ANTOINE BORRUT and FRED M. DONNER. Late Antique and Medieval Islamic Near East, vol. 1. Chicago: ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 2016. Pp. ix + 213. $24.95 (paper).

This volume—the first in a new book series, "Late Antique and Medieval Islamic Near East" (LAMINE), from the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago—is a collection of essays following the conference "Christians, Jews, and Zoroastrians in the Umayyad State" held at the University of Chicago in June 2011. From the outset, the editors, Antoine Borrut and Fred Donner, point to the haziness of religious and cultural boundaries among late antique and early medieval Islamic communities as the premise of their inquiry. While they note the growing scholarly interest in the different spheres of interreligious encounters, they also refer to what is, to their mind, a relative absence of studies devoted to the question of "non-Muslims *within* the early Islamic state" (p. 2)—given the problematic nature of the extant sources, the Umayyad era is treated far less in this regard in comparison with later times.

Moreover, the Umayyad period heralded a crucial historical moment, during which conceptions of in and out, of believers and non-believers, gradually molded into a clearer vision of a Muslim community. Borrut and Donner belong to a school of historians that for some time now has been arguing that the Muslim–non-Muslim dichotomy only became operative toward the end of the seventh century, when, initially, the threshold of the community established in Medina was broadly termed by belief. The early Umayyads "seem to have conceived themselves as a regime of 'Believers'" (p. 3), a notion that is supported by early administrative documentation. Accordingly, Umayyad conceptions of non-Muslims who ascribed to the idea of the unity of God as believers were likely to dictate a social reality that was governed by a unique set of considerations.

Thus, both methodological shortcomings and conceptual ambiguities have contributed to the relative scholarly neglect of the topic at hand, rendering the eight chapters in this volume, written by a highly distinguished group of scholars, especially welcome. These touch upon a diverse set of questions, and present not only the thematic diversity pertaining to the place of non-Muslims under the Umayyad regime but also a plethora of methods by which the topic can be approached. That said, the editors are well aware of the partial image they are offering—the volume's title has for good reason been changed to Christians "and others."

The first chapter, "Notes for an Archeology of Muʿāwiya: Material Culture in the Transitional Period of Believers" by Donald Whitcomb, is the only one concerned with material evidence. Instead of addressing the question of non-Muslim, or rather Christian, participation in the Umayyad state, the essay looks at the fascinating blend of Arabian, Byzantine, and Islamic features embodied in the architectural enterprises of the founder of Umayyad rule, Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān (r. 661–680). Thus, for example, the palace of Ṣinnabra, a castle by the Sea of Galilee, which was initially a seasonal residence of the governor of Syria and later of the Umayyad caliph, resembles, Whitcomb notes, the Roman praetorium in Tiberias, reflecting an Umayyad accommodation of Roman imperial edifices. The trend can be seen also in the caliph Hishām's (r. 724–743) hall in Ruṣāfa, where Umayyad governmental and religious centers were erected adjacent to Christian and Roman complexes. In exploring what he terms the "archeology" of Muʿāwiya, Whitcomb presents him as a leader who sought to balance his authority among a mixed religious population. His construction initiatives suggest a transitional phase