admitting that the systems were far better than those used by most excavators of that time. His principal observations are that levels were established based on architectural modification, not soil stratigraphy, and that those levels were applied site wide. These methods would not have taken into consideration the various occupation levels within an architectural phase or the varied times required for the growth (and destruction) of parts of the site. He also suggests that a large number of objects were deposited during and after the abandonment of the site, indicating a later date in many instances than those assigned by the excavators.

The second section of this publication contains information on 160 representative artifacts from the two exhibitions, with photographs and some additional commentary. This is admittedly but a small sample from the almost 50,000 objects preserved in the Kelsey Museum, but it is arranged to suggest the range of subjects for research and topics of interest that can be illustrated. These include the Early History of the Site; Religion: Egyptian and Hellenistic Traditions; Objects in Context; Fragments; Occupations and Activities; Money, Taxes, Agriculture and Paperwork; Lost, Discarded and Hidden; Home Security; Stratigraphy; Finding Magic; Toys in Context; Late Karanis; Christianity; Mysterious Bones; The Roman Military; Pottery; and A Karanis Burial. In addition there are two short sections on objects from the two archaeological sub-projects that were carried out at Dimé (Soknopaiou Nesos) and Terenouthis. These headings illustrate the range of materials that document the history of the site; the depth of the collection can only be suggested in a popular publication such as this.

The third section contains a sampling of essays that are concerned with present, on-going, and possible future research. They range from the examination and conservation of a Roman leather cuirass to the experimental exploration of the ancient "soundscape" at Karanis. The potential for the examination of many aspects of life in an Egyptian town of the Ptolemaic-Roman Period is obvious. The richness of the collection in the Kelsey Museum offers a unique opportunity for research. In organizing this publication the editors have done an admirable job in exposing the wealth of the material, its history, and its possible future. This was based, as stated above, on two previous exhibitions, but the advantage of a publication such as this makes it much more widely available to both the scholarly and popular world.

<div align="right">

William H. Peck
Detroit, MI

</div>

Al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān, *The Disagreements of the Jurists: A Manual of Islamic Legal Theory*. Edited and translated by Devin J. Stewart. Library of Arabic Literature. New York: New York University Press, 2015. Pp. xxxviii + 405. $40.

This volume is a welcome addition to the growing collection of English translations on Islamic law in general and Shiʿi-Ismaʿili law in particular. *Kitāb Ikhtilāf uṣūl al-madhāhib* (hereafter, *Ikhtilāf*) is a foundational legal text in the Ismaʿili school wherein its celebrated author al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān (d. 363/974), the school's founder, lay down the principles of legal theory prior to the composition of his magnum opus *Daʿāʾim al-islām* (The Pillars of Islam; hereafter, *Daʿāʾim*). Written under the guidance of the fourth Fatimid caliph-imam al-Muʿizz li-Dīn Allāh (r. 341–365/953–975), the latter is a manual of Ismaʿili law for the use of the newly founded Fatimid state and the broader Ismaʿili community. Though it was composed more than a thousand years ago it still remains the supreme authority among the Mustaʿli-Tayyibi community of the Bohras in the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent for personal and family matters. This is because after al-Nuʿmān there was no significant development in Ismaʿili law for various reasons that are beyond the scope of this review (see Ismail K. Poonawala, "Al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān and Ismaʿili jurisprudence," in *Mediaeval Ismaʿili History and Thought*, ed. F. Daftary [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996], 131–32).

Ikhtilāf was first edited with an elaborate and erudite English introduction by Shamʿūn Ṭayyib ʿAlī Lokhandwalla (Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1972) from two recent manuscripts of Indian provenance (the editor states that his access to a third manuscript was limited to a few hours, merely for perusal). Another edition by Muṣṭafā Ghālib, likewise based on two recent manuscripts, appeared the

following year (Beirut: Dār al-Andalus, 1973). Although editions by this latter editor and his colleague ʿĀrif Tāmir are not trustworthy and their introductions should be taken with a grain of salt (see my edition of al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār* [Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2000], 1 [Eng.], 48–49 [Ar.]), the question that pops to mind is, What brought Devin Stewart to re-edit and translate *Ikhtilāf*? Certainly, as a student of Islamic law he realized that it is one of the basic works of legal theory in the history of Muslim legal thought. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to state that *Ikhtilāf* is a major milestone in the development of Islamic legal theories following the seminal work of Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī's (d. 204/820) *al-Risāla*, as previously indicated by Lokhandwalla. The need for an English translation was acutely felt by students of Islamic law working to track the course of legal theoretical development prior to the emergence of the four Sunni schools of law, most probably toward the end of the fourth/tenth century. And we are grateful for this admirable translation, which fills a major lacuna in our field.

The editor's introduction briefly addresses al-Nuʿmān's life and his legal works. It then covers the content and significance of *Ikhtilāf* against the backdrop of the dominance of Sunni legal theories. This sheds light on their early history, especially during the period of more than a century and a half after al-Shāfiʿī's death, which is also al-Nuʿmān's most significant contribution. All the sections of the introduction are succinctly written and interwoven with each other. Stewart is quite correct in indicating that al-Nuʿmān draws heavily on Muḥammad b. Dāwūd al-Isfahānī (d. 297/919), the son of the founder of the Ẓāhirī school, and his work *al-Wuṣūl ilā maʿrifat al-uṣūl*. Al-Nuʿmān cited him four times by name, omitting the title of the book as was the norm (note to indexer: Muḥammad b. Dāwūd's name does not appear on pp. 223–25, 247, 267, and 277, as indicated there). Stewart further surmises that al-Nuʿmān's *Ikhtilāf* is modeled on Ibn Dāwūd's work; however, he neither elaborates nor presents any specific evidence to corroborate this assertion.

Not an expert in Ismaʿili studies, Stewart was misled by Agostino Cilardo and regrettably repeats the latter's view that *Minhāj al-farāʾiḍ* was al-Nuʿmān's work dealing with the law of inheritance, which I have demonstrated (review of Cilardo, *The Early History of Ismaili Jurisprudence*: *Law under the Fatimids*, in *Arabica* 61 [2014]: 455–58) is not an authentic work of al-Nuʿmān (see also I. Poonawala, "Anonymous Works and Their Ascription to Famous Authors: Are They Cases of Mistaken Identity or an Outright Forgery?" in *Arabica* 62 [2015]: 404–10). Unfortunately, Stewart did not have access to this review, or to my article "The Evolution of al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān's Theory of Ismaʿili Jurisprudence Based on the Chronology of His Works on Jurisprudence" (in *The Study of Shiʿi Islam: History*, *Theology and Law*, ed. F. Daftary and G. Miskinzoda [London: I. B. Tauris in association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2014], 295–349) wherein I analyzed the contents of *Ikhtilāf* and its role in the evolution of al-Nuʿmān's theory of Ismaʿili jurisprudence from a different perspective, namely, the evolution of al-Nuʿmān's views on legal theories until the culmination of his thought with his founding of the Ismaʿili school of jurisprudence as expounded in *Daʿāʾim*.

For the new edition Stewart used two recent manuscripts of Indian provenance preserved in the library of the Institute of Ismaili Studies, London—Zāhid ʿAlī MS no. 1131[1] and MS no. 256[2]—but the edition is based primarily on the Zāhid ʿAlī manuscript and Lokhandwalla's edition. Zāhid ʿAlī was an Ismaʿili Bohra scholar of repute from a learned family in Hyderabad, India. He was a professor of Arabic at the ʿUthmāniyya University and is well known for his monumental edition (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Maʿārif, 1352/[1933–34]) of the *Dīwān* of Ibn Hāniʾ al-Andalusī (d. 362/973), renowned court poet of the Banū Ḥamdūn, rulers of Masīla, and of the fourth Fatimid caliph al-Muʿizz li-Dīn Allāh. He also authored two books in Urdu: *Tārīkh-i Fāṭimiyyīn-i Miṣr* (Hyderabad: Osmaniya University, 1948) and

---

1. See D. Cortese, *Arabic Ismaili Manuscripts*: *The Zāhid ʿAli Collection* (London: I. B. Tauris in association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2003), 51. Her description of the manuscript is sketchy and states incorrectly that Lokhandwalla had translated it into English. Stewart has listed this catalog in the bibliography but did not indicate it in his own very brief description of the manuscript.

2. See A. Gacek, *Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the Library of The Institute of Ismaili Studies* (London: Islamic Publications, 1984), 1: 31. Gacek's description is also inadequate. The Ismaili Association in Bombay acquired this as well as other manuscripts from Bohra families. They were transferred to Karachi after the partition of India in 1947, and then to London when the Ismaili Institute was founded. This catalog is missing in Stewart's bibliography.

Hamāre Ismaʿili madhhab kī ḥaqīqat aur uskā niẓām (Hyderabad: The Islamic Academy of Islamic Studies, 1954), the latter on the Ismaʿili faith and its organization. Both works clearly attest the author's fair and critical approach and reveal the progress in Ismaʿili studies up to that time.

At the end of the manuscript there are three pages of copious notes concerning the contents and their page numbers in the manuscript in Zāhid ʿAlī's hand, which I recognize from letters he wrote to my father. There is one long biographical note that runs in the margins of five consecutive pages about the Qāḍī ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Muḥammad b. al-Nuʿmān, al-Nuʿmān's grandson, in whose recension the *Ikhtilāf* has come down to us. It was copied by Zāhid ʿAlī from the Egyptian historian of the Fatimid dynasty, al-Maqrīzī's *Ittiʿāẓ al-ḥunafāʾ bi-akhbār al-aʾimma al-khulafāʾ*. The note is quite relevant, but is sadly not mentioned by Stewart; indeed, most of Zāhid ʿAlī's comments and several corrections in the margins are not included. The manuscript was read, corrected, and collated by an Ismaʿili scholar, thus enhancing its value, and more vigilance to this fact would have added more weight to this new edition. In addition, certain basic rules for a text edition have been neglected; e.g., the description of his main witness, i.e., the Zāhid ʿAlī MS, is perfunctory and its original page numbers are not indicated in the published text.

Unless we have an exemplar copy derived from the autograph or an old manuscript not far removed from the author's time, two copies are not enough for establishing a text. The more extant and accessible manuscripts the edition is based on, the more the base of the edited text is broadened and deepened. We do not have an old Yemeni witness of *Ikhtilāf* and the time gap between the author and the recent copies is very wide, yet there are more extant copies. Unfortunately, despite its large and valuable collection of Ismaʿili manuscripts in Surat and Mumbai, the Bohra religious establishment does not cooperate with scholars, even those of its own community. Even so, there are additional manuscripts listed in my *Biobibliography of Ismaʿili Literature* (Malibu, Calif.: Undena Publications, 1977, 55) that could have been consulted. I would have gladly provided Stewart with a copy transcribed on the seventeenth of Shaʿbān in 1283 (December 25, 1866), which I have in my late father's *khizāna*. Similarly, he could have easily obtained another copy preserved in the university library of Tübingen. A third copy, which belonged to a learned shaykh, is held in a private collection in India; I am sure it would be an interesting copy and I could have reached out if requested as I know the trustees.

With regards to the edition, in my view it would have been preferable to have the text vocalized at least moderately, and many sentences, as is common in Arabic, run on too long; a few commas would not have been amiss. There is much to be desired in the actual editing, for which a few examples only must suffice. The edited text on p. 2.9 reads: *wa-l-aʾimma min abnāʾihi*. In the note (n. 4) it is remarked that Lokhandwalla's main witness reads *waladihi*. The note fails to mention that the Zāhid ʿAlī manuscript also reads *waladihi*. The manuscript in my father's collection (hereafter, Q) has the same reading. I do not see anything wrong with that reading, which is recorded in all three manuscripts. The reading *abnāʾihi* seems arbitrarily selected from Ghālib's edition (without indicating the source), where the expression is quite different. It states: *wa-ʿalā ābāʾihi al-ṭāhirīn, wa-abnāʾīhi al-akramīn*, while the reading in the three manuscripts is *wa-ʿalā ābāʾihi al-ṭāhirīn wa-l aʾimma min waladihi al-akramīn*. In Stewart's text, the false impression is now given that the established reading is in accordance with the Zāhid ʿAlī manuscript. Note 2 on the same page is also misleading. The Zāhid ʿAlī MS does not add *wa-ʿanhum*. These errors cannot be due to oversights.

A few other problems: the last line on p. 32 reads: *wa-li-annahu jaʿalahu . . . .* Four manuscripts (Zāhid ʿAlī, Lokhandwalla, Ghālib, and Q) read: *wa-an jaʿalahu*. I do not think there was any need to improve the style (if that is what the editor intended). The text on p. 33.5 reads: *al-shākir limā ḥaẓiyahu* compared to *al-sāʿī fīmā aḥḍāhu* (Zāhid ʿAlī), *al-sāʿī fīmā aḥẓāhu* (Lokhandwalla), and *al-sāʿī fīmā aḥṣāhu* (here, ṣ is an obvious *taṣḥīf* error for ḍ) (Ghālib and Q). The text on p. 33.6 reads *wa-l-sāʿī*, which reading is not in Zāhid ʿAlī. All minor issues perhaps and not affecting the contents, but imperative for a trustworthy edition.

The English translation, on the whole, is admirable except in a few cases. One glaring example is at the bottom of p. 3. The expression *rabb al-ʿālamīn* also occurs in the Quran, *sūrat al-Fātiḥa*, and is generally translated as "the Sustainer of all the worlds," or "the Lord of all Beings." Stewart has rendered it as "Lord of all the generations," which I do not think is quite correct because it excludes other creatures. Of course, the word *ʿālamīn* is derived from Syriac, meaning the world, the eternity, or

all ages. It is used in the Quran as an attribute of God. In his Quran translation, Alan Jones correctly observed that it has become standard to translate ʿālamīn as "the worlds" in accordance with the development of the word in Arabic. However, it would appear originally to have meant "all created beings" (see also M. Carter, "Foreign Vocabulary," in *The Blackwell Companion to the Qurʾān*, ed. A. Rippin [Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2007], 131).

It should be noted that the extant fragment from *Kitāb al-Īḍāḥ* of al-Nuʿmān (p. xxxvi n. 8) edited by Muḥammad Kāẓim Raḥmatī was originally published in Qom in *Mīrāth-i ḥadīth-i shīʿah*, ed. M. Mihrīzī and ʿA. Ṣadrāyī-Khūyī in 1382/[2004], vol. 10. The Beirut edition of 2007 cited by the editor is a pirated one. The two dates suggested for the composition of *Daʿāʾim al-islām* are 347/957 and 349/960 (p. xxxvi n. 12; the source cited is S. Hamdani). The former was suggested by Wadād al-Qāḍī in her article "An Early Fatimid Political Document" (*Studia Islamica* 48 [1978]: 117–43) while the latter was indirectly inferred from a historical source by me in my "Al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān and Ismaʿili jurisprudence" (pp. 126–27, where I refute the speculative date 347/957 originally surmised by Ivanow).

I found a few typographical errors, of which I should note the following: p. xxx l. -5 should read: Ṣafar 1272; p. xxx l. -1 should read: Jumādā al-thānī; p. xxxvi n. 9 should read Waḥīd Mīrzā (not Wāḥid Mīrzā); and (in the same note) ʿĀrif Tāmir (not Tāmir ʿĀrif).

Stewart has rendered al-Nuʿmān's work into intelligible and elegant English, in keeping with the goals of the Library of Arabic Literature series to open up certain valuable and influential works in the Arabic tradition to a wider reading public. Instead of retaining Arabic legal terminology, a procedure usually followed in translating books of Islamic law, Stewart judiciously chose to abandon that practice. The use of the same terms in differing situations with slightly varied meanings fails to convey the intent underlying the acoustic symbolism of its terms. Hence, Stewart has aptly translated those terms into English in varying contexts and occasionally with a little different nuance in their meanings. A good example is the term *taqlīd*, generally translated as "blind faith," which has been rendered, depending on the context, as "submission to authority," "illegitimate authority," or "arbitrary submission to authority." Another feature for which Stewart deserves full credit—and which oddly is not addressed in the introduction—is that innumerable Quranic verses cited by al-Nuʿmān are deftly rendered into idiomatic rendition. I do not think any existing English translation of the Quran would have adequately served his purpose. Contrarily, it would have interrupted the smooth flow of the translation. Stewart's rendering of those verses is superior to others currently available to us.

ISMAIL K. POONAWALA
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century: Scholarly Currents in the Ottoman Empire and the Maghreb. By KHALED EL-ROUAYHEB. New York: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2015. Pp. xvi + 399. $99.99, £64.99.

This is an important book. While the political and social history of the early modern Muslim world and especially the Ottoman empire has received a great deal of attention over the last few decades, the same cannot be said for its intellectual history. There have been some excellent studies of individual thinkers—a personal favorite is Stefan Reichmuth's book on al-Zabīdī—but no synthetic overviews that offer a comprehensive narrative of the intellectual developments in the Muslim world from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries (the field of jurisprudence is a notable exception, but there, too, more is needed). This book does precisely that, and the research and effort that went into it go some ways to explaining why no one had written such a book before. Khaled El-Rouayheb's accomplishment is to define criteria for measuring intellectual vitality and development in a broad number of fields— logic, dialectics, reading strategies, theology, and Sufism among them—and then to show how and why during what we might call the long seventeenth century the scholarship of the central Ottoman lands was revitalized in these areas. In doing so he acquaints his reader with an impressively broad array of