

the translation reads well overall, but awkward constructions and opaque passages abound—I feel that much of this interpretive work could have been profitably entrusted to the competent reader. Many of the notes now seem overly elaborate and somewhat gratuitous, and they wear out the reader who must have continuous recourse to them. Where, for example, questions of vocalization provoke lengthy discussion (e.g., the discussion of the vocalization of *m-l-k* at p. 156 n. 2), I wonder whether it would have been wiser to omit the vocalization altogether and leave the matter to the reader’s judgment.

The above is not meant to detract from the value of the work but to indicate ways in which its value could have been enhanced. Readers interested in the development of philosophical ethics in the Islamic world will be grateful to have this meticulous scholarly edition at their disposal.

SOPHIA VASALOU
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Ibadi Theology: Rereading Sources and Scholarly Works. Edited by ERSILIA FRANCESCA. Studies on Ibadism and Oman, vol. 4. Hildesheim: GEORG OLMS, 2015. Pp. 331. €68.

The study of Ibādīsm has matured considerably in past decades; the inevitable impact of this fact on Islamic studies is only “a question of when.” This collection of twenty-seven contributions from a 2012 conference gives much cause for optimism in that regard. Scholars of Islam—both well established and aspiring, with academic and confessional approaches (these not being mutually exclusive categories)—have joined here to give a representative depiction of the state of Ibādī studies in its greater discursive emphases and topical concerns. The success of such an initiative will ultimately be measured by the field’s willingness not only to engage with the historiographical implications of this research, but also to expand our understanding of the development of Islamic theology along a broader textual and conceptual basis than has been the norm.

In light of the conference’s convening in Naples, we are reminded by Ersilia Francesca (pp. 13–20) of the need to recall the pioneering contributions of Italian scholars such as C. A. Nallino, L. Veccia Vaglieri, and R. Rubinacci in using Ibādī sources for the study of early Islam. Their boldness and creativity in utilizing the writings of a group ordinarily categorized as a Khārijite heresy are felt even today. This same fact explains a recurring point of emphasis found in the articles in this volume, namely, the rehabilitation of Ibādīsm as more “moderate” or “rationalist” than is commonly believed—a matter of concern in justifying the study of a topic that might otherwise induce prejudice or squeamishness.

Key Ibādī discourses of “anathemization” (*takfīr*), in fact, do not stray far from either of these two poles, as theological rationalism may create new exclusivist forms of orthodoxy even as it opens new intellectual horizons; likewise, a rigorous public discourse of *takfīr* may invite soteriological gradations perceivable as a gray area of moderate pragmatism. Precisely such matters are helpfully problematized by John Wilkinson (pp. 47–52) in an article that emphasizes the need both for historical contextualization and for grounding our own analytical categories in specifically Ibādī terminology, e.g., “affiliation” (*walāya*), “disavowal” (*barāʿa*), and “suspension of judgment” (*wuqūf*). Readers who would pursue this line of inquiry would be well advised to refer to Yohei Kondo’s excellent exposition of the early elaboration of these teachings in the eighth and ninth centuries (pp. 185–97), which is not only amply sourced, but also explores their practical function in the context of conversion. Addressing a related topic, Moustafa Bendrissou (pp. 165–75) shows how the Ibādī view of sins (great and small) was not only expressed theologically, but juridically mediated as well—a “disbeliever” could still be treated legally as a Muslim. Sunni Islam never formulized an elaborate doctrine of *walāya* and *barāʿa* despite the Quranic origin of the terms; hence, the “rediscovery” of the concept in some forms of salafism (the archetype of Islamic extremism in the modern mind) necessarily revisits the initial theological-exegetical questions faced by Ibādīsm’s Khārijite progenitors—whether to treat sin on the part of individuals and their leaders as faith-defining (and thus impacting *walāya* and *barāʿa*) and, if so, what types of rulings were to apply to them. Ibādīsm’s perceived moderation, then, comes from the ability to

accord Islamic legal status to Muslims otherwise classified as non-believing (*kāfir*). It should be noted, however, that Ibāḍī notions of polytheism (*shirk*)—a topic not fully addressed here—also played a role in negotiating the limits of such “tolerance.”

Deliberations on the nature of the faith were typical of the earliest forms of *kalām*, by both Murjiʿite and Muʿtazilite thinkers. The early influence of Muʿtazilite theses on Ibāḍī discourse suggests itself, given their shared notion of Muslim non-believers, yet reports attribute this thesis to Jābir b. Zayd (d. 712), Ibāḍism’s esteemed founder, thus establishing a distinct parallel trajectory for two theologies of “moderate opposition,” in the words of Wilferd Madelung (pp. 23–28). It is also in the urban context of eighth-century Basra, as Madelung deftly illustrates, that Ibāḍīs took up the methods of their Muʿtazilite neighbors to inaugurate a long tradition of *kalām* alongside their political proselytization efforts. A cursory appreciation of the subsequent crystallization of Ibāḍī theology in its classical form can be gleaned from the contributions of Saleh al-Busaidi (pp. 57–65), Laroussi Mizouri and Farhat al-Jabiri (pp. 157–64), and Mohammed Ech-Cheikh (pp. 103–13), with the latter illustrating the culmination of classical Ibāḍī theology in the work of seminal scholars such as Abū ʿAmmār ʿAbd al-Kāfi (d. before 1174) and Abū Yaʿqūb al-Warjlānī (d. 1175). The concern, both academic and confessional, of distinguishing Ibāḍism from Muʿtazilism and Ashʿarī philosophical tradition is a mainstay in these articles, as is also the case with Moez Dridi’s reflections on *taklīf* in Ibāḍī theology (pp. 177–84).

Two more articles document in detail the persistent importance attributed to *kalām* over a millennium of Ibāḍī theological tradition: Valerie Hoffman (pp. 245–55) recounts classical and modern arguments against the vision of God, both scriptural and ontological, and Abdulrahman al-Salimi (pp. 145–55) recounts a similarly broad scope of material on the creation of the Quran with special reference to newly published material by the eighth-century *mutakallim* ʿAbd Allāh b. Yazīd al-Fazārī. The publication of al-Fazārī’s work by al-Salimi and Madelung (Leiden, 2014) is one of the most exciting recent developments in the studies of *kalām*, useful for what it teaches us about Ibāḍī doctrine, but also because it is the earliest extant testimonial for ontological terminology in Islamic theology. Precisely this aspect of Ahmed Ismail’s article on atomism in Ibāḍī theology merits mention (pp. 207–21), as he utilizes underutilized Ibāḍī sources to shed light on the historical development of broader foundational concepts in *kalām*. Ibāḍī sources are now indispensable for the history of Muslim theology as a whole.

As Ridwan al-Sayyid makes clear (pp. 29–35), the extant sources on early Ibāḍism outnumber those of the early Shiʿa, Murjiʿa, Qadariyya, and Muʿtazila. Such an indisputable fact must inevitably enlarge the typical cast of characters discussed in early Islam and allow for broader recognition of a model of Ibāḍism organized by specific historical stages of development. Josef van Ess’s typically effortless but inspired contribution (pp. 37–45) demonstrates that the radical “decentering” of our narratives on early Islam depends less on postmodern theory than on an awareness of the pertinent textual sources—let alone geographical locations—that underlie the historical specificities of the subject matter: Early Ibāḍism forms part of a broader landscape that demands to be fleshed out in its entirety precisely because of the greater sociological implications suggested by the manifold doctrinal and social forms taken by Islam.

The distinctive elements of Ibāḍī socio-political normativity are to be garnered from varieties of Ibāḍī literature well represented in this volume: Annie Higgins (pp. 257–69) contributes a literary analysis of an eighth-century Ibāḍī *qaṣīda* vividly embodying the camaraderie in “commanding the good and forbidding the reprehensible” within the bonds of *walāya*. Danylo Radivilov (pp. 83–92) summarizes the *Sira* of Khālīd b. Qaḥṭān (d. early tenth century), which contains a uniquely Ibāḍī perspective of early *fitna* narratives as well as important first-hand information on the deposition of Imam al-Ṣalt b. Mālik and its consequences for Omani Ibāḍism. Cyrille Aillet (pp. 67–82) presents a valuable reading of the early *Kitāb fihī badʿ al-Islām* by Ibn Sallām (d. 887), offering observations on the intertextuality underlying its composition as well as the geographically determining factors behind its authorship. Allaoua Amara (pp. 93–101) elucidates the role of Abū ʿAmr al-Māraghnī al-Ṣūfī’s eleventh-century doxography of Maghribi Ibāḍī theology as a means of consolidating Wahbī hegemony over Nukkārism.

The Berber (Amazigh) dimension of North African Ibāḍism likewise receives due attention: Anna Maria Di Tolla (pp. 115–28) provides a survey of Berber conversion to Khārījism and Ibāḍism in their various local manifestations. Leonard Chiarelli’s fascinating article on Berber Ibāḍī settlement in Sicily

from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries (pp. 129–41) makes artful use of numerous sources in no way diminished by some of the more speculative conclusions presented.

Moving into discussions of modern Ibādism, the contribution by Amal Ghazal (pp. 271–81) stands out notably, as she discusses the intellectual formation of the twentieth-century scholars Qāsim al-Shammākhī and Ibrāhīm Aṭfayyish and the journalist/poet Abū l-Yaqzān. Negotiating Ibādī identity in unity and conversation with another type of “salafism,” the pan-Islamic modernism of Muḥammad ‘Abduh, such thinkers found a place for new empirical sciences in the Ibādī *Weltanschauung* and participated in a greater republic of letters facilitated by the new print culture in the Arab world. Ibrāhīm Aṭfayyish stands out here as an important articulator of Ibādī identity in the modern world, addressing the relationship to Khārijism head-on with an eye to both historical precedent and contemporary rapprochement with global Islam. The historiographical and political significance of this is palpable not least in the series of Ibādī public initiatives of which this conference is but one example.

Two further articles treat the hugely influential scholar Muḥammad b. Yūsuf Aṭfayyish (d. 1914), great-uncle of Ibrāhīm. The first, by Moustafa Ouinten (pp. 283–96), provides a survey of his theological works and appraisal of his theological stances in rapprochement with Ash‘arism. Then Farīd Bouchiba (pp. 297–317) discusses and problematizes Aṭfayyish’s borrowing of an Ash‘arī literary model for an heresiographical text—a work by ‘Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī specifically. The question of influence in matters of theology is a thorny one, asking of the historian whether philosophical or exegetical positions must always be characterized in terms of sectarian affiliation as opposed to the sum of their own discursive premises. The question of agency is similarly found in Anna Coppola’s study (pp. 315–24) of a gloss by scholar Nūr al-Dīn al-Sālīmī (d. 1914) of a didactic theological poem that occasions revisiting Ibādism’s relationship to Mu‘tazilism—one thousand years after the fact. Facing notions of Greek or “Western” science, prime examples of genetic essentialism, scholars of the Muslim world have grappled with claims of influence from outsiders in modernity as well as antiquity, and the same may be said to apply to matters of intra-Islamic influence as well; e.g., must rationalism be Mu‘tazilite or extremism be Khārijite? Similar conceptual concerns lie at the basis of the article by Biancamaria Amoretti (pp. 223–31), who questions the historical timelessness of genealogical categories in understanding Ibādism past and present.

Finally, Yacine Addoun explores the “unthought” in Ibādī scholarship, channeling Mohammed Arkoun to critique Ibādī scholarship’s view of slavery from the ninth to the nineteenth centuries (pp. 233–42). His discussions on race, ritual, and the jurisprudential view of abolitionism are valuable; however, the pinning of slavery’s persistence on the desire to free slaves (thereby earning God’s reward) remains the article’s chief weak spot.

A number of the contributions to this volume lack sufficient copyediting and there is much redundancy due to the necessarily repetitive introductory preambles to articles that treat similar topics. The reader would be well advised to consult not only those articles that are of interest, but also the accompanying bibliographical lists, which contain some of the most recent publications (primary and secondary) in the field.

RODRIGO ADEM
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Gouvernance et libéralités de Saladin: D’après les données inédites de six documents arabes. Edited by JEAN-MICHEL MOUTON; DOMINIQUE SOURDEL; and JANINE SOURDEL-THOMINE. Documents relatifs à l’histoire des croisades, vol. 22. Paris: ACADEMIE DES INSCRIPTIONS ET BELLES-LETTRES, 2015. Pp. 148. €30 (paper).

Do not let the slender appearance of this book put you off; in it the authors have gathered together six valuable manuscripts from the reign of Saladin (564–589/1169–1193), which they have reproduced, edited, translated, and analyzed. They have chosen manuscripts that provide information about