THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

C.E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL
W.P. HEINRICHS AND *the late* CH. PELLAT

ASSISTED BY F.TH. DIJKEMA (pp. 1-384), P.J. BEARMAN (pp. 385-1058) AND MME S. NURIT

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME VII

MIF — NAZ

LEIDEN — NEW YORK
E.J. BRILL
1993

around Baghdād in Ṣafar 517/April 1123 (Ibn al-Athīr, x, 435; Ibn al-Djawzī, ix, 243), building the octagonal palace (*al-muthammana*) for his wife, Sandjar's daughter, who arrived in Baghdād for the wedding in Radjab 518/August-September 1124 (Sibṭ b. al-Djawzī, 113), and he added the great hall (the *bāb al-ḥudjra*) to the Tādj palace (cf. Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 259-60).

A number of prominent officials served al-Mustarshid. These included the *wazīr* Djalāl al-Dīn Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Ṣadaḳa (d. 522/1128) whom, under pressure from the sultan's *wazīr*, ʿUthmān b. Niẓām al-Mulk, the caliph was obliged to remove temporarily in favour of Aḥmad b. Niẓām al-Mulk. In the later years of his caliphate, Abu 'l-Ḳāsim b. Ṭirād al-Zaynabī and Anūshirwān b. Khālid [*q.v.*] served as *wazīr* (Ibn al-Ṭiḳṭaḳā, 523-9; Bundārī, 104, 152; Ibn al-Azraḳ, 80).

Al-Mustarshid is described as having a ruddy complexion with dark-blue eyes and a sparse beard. In his youth, he had practised asceticism, read the entire Ḳurʾān, studied *fiḳh* and *ḥadīth*, and was such a fine calligrapher that, according to Ibn al-Anbārī, he would correct the mistakes made by his scribes (al-Kutubī, ii, 248; Ibn al-Djawzī, ix, 197) Ibn al-Athīr claimed that he had seen al-Mustarshid's handwriting, one of the finest examples of *ruḳʿa* (xi, 17). Al-Mustarshid is mentioned by some sources as belonging to the Shāfiʿī *madhhab* (al-Suyūṭī, 454). He was an accomplished poet (ʿImād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, i, 30; Ibn Wāṣil, 51; al-Kutubī, ii, 249). To him are attributed the grandiose words: "My horses will reach the land of Rūm and the gleam of my blade will extend to the limits of China".

Bibliography: 1. Primary sources: Bar Hebraeus, *Chronology*, tr. Budge, London 1932, i, 248, 256-61; Bundārī, *Zubdat al-nuṣra*, ed. Houtsma, 104, 120, 152, 160, 174-8; Ḥusaynī, *Akhbār al-dawla al-Saldjūkiyya*, ed. M. Iḳbāl, Lahore 1933, 96-9, 101-8; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Bughyat al-ṭalab fī taʾrīkh Ḥalab*, ed. A. Sevim, Ankara 1976, 225-8, 248-9, 255-6; Ibn al-Athīr, *Taʾrīkh al-dawlat al-atābakiyya*, ed. A. Ṭulaymāt, Cairo 1963, 22, 24-6, 28-31, 44-51; idem, x, 356-8, 394-5, 397-8, 420-6, 428-30, 433-5, 440-4, 447-51, 459-61, 470-1, 474-8, 480, xi, 2-3, 6, 9, 14-17; Ibn al-Azraḳ, *Taʾrīkh Mayyāfāriḳīn*, ed. and tr. C. Hillenbrand, in *A Muslim principality in Crusader times*, Leiden 1990, 51, 64, 66-70, 72-3, 80; Ibn al-Djawzī, *Muntaẓam*, ix, 197-9, 204-6, 216-8, 222-3, 231-2, 234-5, 242-3, 245-50, 254-6, 258, x, 2-5, 8-13, 20, 25-7, 30, 35-6, 42-7; Ibn al-Furāt, *Taʾrīkh al-duwal wa 'l-mulūk*, ii, ed. M.F. Elshayyal, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh 1986, 12-3, 26, 78, 92-4, 164-6; Ibn al-Ḳalānisī, *Dhayl taʾrīkh Dimashḳ*, ed. H.F. Amedroz, Leiden 1908, 200, 206, 208-9, 215-7, 224, 230-1, 237-8, 245-9; Ibn Khallikān, tr. de Slane, i, 506, iii, 355-6; Ibn al-Ṭiḳṭaḳā, *Fakhrī*, ed. H. Derenbourg, 406-16, tr. E. Amar, Paris 1910, 519-27; Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarridj al-kurūb fī akhbār Banī Ayyūb*, i, ed. Dj. al-Shayyāl, Cairo 1953, 29-33, 44-5, 47-52, 58-9; ʿImād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, *Kharīdat al-ḳaṣr*, i, Baghdād, 1955, 29-30; iv/1, Baghdād 1973, 630-1; Ḳazwīnī, Ḥamdallāh Mustawfī, *Tārīkh-i Guzīda*, tr. C. Defrémery, *Histoire des Seldjoukides*, in *JA* (October 1848), 345; Kutubī, *Fawāt al-wafayāt*, ii, 248-50; Niẓāmī ʿArūḍī, *Čahār maḳāla*, tr. Browne, London 1921, 37-8; Rāwandī, *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*, ed. M. Iḳbāl, London 1921, 227-8; Sibṭ Ibn al-Djawzī, *Mirʾāt al-zamān*, Ḥaydarābād 1951, viii/1, 70-4, 77, 81, 83, 89-92, 95-102, 109-13, 115-19, 124, 135, 140-1, 145, 147, 152-6; Suyūṭī, *History of the caliphs*, tr. H.S. Jarrett, repr. Karachi 1971, 453-5.

2. Secondary sources: *Cambridge history of Iran*, v, 119-27; *EI*[1], art. *al-Mustarshid* (K.V. Zetterstéen); Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 259-60; Schwarz, *Iran*, 497-8, 926.

(CAROLE HILLENBRAND)

MUSTASHRIḲŪN (A.), orientalists, those who study the Orient.

A. Terminology

Mustashriḳ (not yet mentioned in Lane) is the active participle of the Xth form of the root *sh-r-ḳ* and means either "people studying/seeking for the East/Orient" or "people becoming (like) Easterners/Orientals", Orient and Orientals tending to have a somewhat more emotional connotation than East and Easterners. The word *mustashriḳūn* consequently conveys a broader scope of meaning than the present-day Western term "Orientalists", i.e. "scholars specialised in Oriental studies" does. The term "orientalist" first occurs in English around 1779, in French in 1799; "orientalism" had then the broad meaning of "being oriented towards an oriental culture".

In 19th and early 20th century usage, the term "orientalist" had both a general cultural and a scholarly meaning. Cultural orientalists were those, including painters and writers, who were inspired by the Orient. Scholarly orientalists were specialists in oriental languages and cultures, as distinct from "classicists", specialists in classical languages and cultures (Latin and Greek). Inasmuch as such an orientalist was more than a pure technician of languages, he was a humanist supposed to possess a real profound knowledge of one or more oriental cultures and devote himself to the study of Oriental languages and literatures in past and present as well as other cultural monuments in the fields of art and archaeology. His search for solid knowledge distinguished him from the cultural orientalists, who were in fact devotees of the Orient.

Until the end of the 19th century, the term "Orient" stood especially for the Near East but it also comprised the rest of the Ottoman empire and, in French parlance, North Africa. The "Ancient" East was the Near East up to the spread of Christianity in the region, which introduced the period of the "Christian" East, followed by that of the "Muslim" or "Islamic" East when the region was Islamicised. During the 19th and early 20th century, the concept "Orient" widened in scope to comprise the whole of Asia, retaining the sense of largely unknown cultures challenging Western man to discover them. Up to the Second World War, Orientalism in its broader sense indicated a particular cultural orientation in Europe and North America, and in its narrower sense it meant empirical Oriental studies.

The first International Congress of Orientalists was held in Paris in 1873, and in 1951 an International Union of Orientalists was founded. Since the Congress in Moscow in 1960 the term has been challenged for various reasons, and after the Congress in Paris 1973 the name of the congresses has been changed. Asian cultures are of course only "East" when seen from Europe, and since these cultures are now also studied by specialists coming from the regions themselves and elsewhere, the term "Orient" has become largely metaphorical. At the present time the tendency is to speak of "human sciences in Asia and North Africa", and orientalist scholars are now identified by their culture, period and region of specialisation, and by their specific discipline. Given the nature of the *Encyclopaedia* we mean by *mustashriḳūn* here specifically scholars of Islam and Muslim societies and cultures. "Oriental studies" stands here specifically for that branch of it which is devoted to the study of

Islam and Muslim societies and cultures, that is to say "Islamic studies" in the broad sense of the word.

The notion of "orientalist" in the domain of Islam and elsewhere has changed in several respects since the beginning of the last century. Whereas formerly *mustaṣhriḳūn* were by definition non-Muslim Western scholars of Islam, there are now Western scholars who are Muslim, non-Muslim scholars outside the West, and Muslim scholars in this field both in and outside Muslim countries. And whereas formerly the West and the Muslim world were two different geographical areas, they now interpenetrate and various Muslim communities live in Western countries. At present *mustaṣhriḳūn* in Islamic studies should be understood as comprising all impartial scholars of Islam, Muslim societies and cultures, whether of Western or non-Western, Muslim or non-Muslim origin and whether they work in the West or elsewhere. Cooperation between scholars in the field takes place beyond differences of faith, country of origin and place of work. The sole difference seems to be that Muslim scholars are more aware of the immediate implications of their research for the Muslim community.

Another change in the notion of "orientalist" concerns the area of specialisation. In former times almost all *mustaṣhriḳūn* were professional philologists specialised in Oriental languages, with or without a historical interest. This was a tough course of study with its own tradition and demands of scholarship, hardly leaving room for new paradigms of research. During the past few decades, however, scholars from other disciplines have increasingly engaged in research on Muslim societies and cultures. They include social historians, anthropologists, sociologists and other researchers in the social sciences, and also specialists in the fields of literature, the arts and religion. In this article the term *mustaṣhriḳ*, when used for the past, refers to scholars of Oriental languages, literatures and histories; when used for the present, it also includes representatives of other disciplines contributing to our knowledge of Muslim societies and cultures.

The social function of orientalists has changed too. More than formerly, *mustaṣhriḳūn* have become experts inside Western societies on certain aspects of Islam, Muslim societies and cultures. They perform certain corresponding roles in society; besides research and teaching, they provide information where necessary and mediate in communication when needed. In some cases special tasks may be assigned to them. More than before, society puts pressure on them to make their expertise socially relevant; more than before, they have to comply with the needs of institutions in their society.

If *mustaṣhriḳūn* had an expert knowledge, they have also held certain opinions about Islam; sometimes they have opposed particular Muslim ideas and practices, at other times they have tried to spread their own ideas and practices among Muslims and in many cases they have had personal friends among them. Such personal activities and commitments of *mustaṣhriḳūn* should be seen and judged in the particular context of their own society and in the context of the relationships between that society and particular Muslim societies. To the extent that the search for knowledge takes priority, *mustaṣhriḳ* scholarship increases, but alongside this scholarly knowledge there has always existed a wide margin of private ideas, values and orientations of the *mustaṣhriḳūn* themselves which they have communicated to certain groups in their own society. This non-academic human cultural side of the *mustaṣhriḳūn* has been interwoven with their work and is not without interest. It is striking, for instance, to see to what extent they have been in the first place specialised researchers, with little idea of the political or social implications which their work could have for either their own society or the society studied. Like other scholars, they have mostly been defenceless against possible misuse of the results of their work. The fact of being a scholar in the field of Islam has little to do with insight into present-day Third World problems. Such scholars are not necessarily keen to distinguish the various ways in which Islam has been presented ideologically or used politically for different interests, those of Muslims and of non-Muslims alike. And they are not *per se* aware of situations of social tension in which Islam has been used as a battle-cry, as a symbol of a programme of social and political action, or simply as a utopian formula.

The work done by the *mustaṣhriḳūn*, like any study of other societies and cultures in the past and at present, has different dimensions: (1) the technical expertise acquired by detached scientific treatment of factual data; (2) the researcher's attitude to and possible involvement with his subject-matter in the course of his work; (3) the various motivations (romantic, humanist, religious) and objectives for which such studies are carried out, including particular causes adhered to by the researcher, and his personal experiences, involvements and commitments which are relevant to his research; (4) the social setting in which the research is carried out, its place in society and its relationships with particular Muslim societies; this also includes its organisation and funding and its institutional setting; (5) the extent to which the researcher fulfills a bridge function between two or more cultures, developing distance from his own society and an increasing impartiality in his evaluations and judgements on either society.

The question remains to what extent there has been a direct correspondence between the role which their society has attributed to the *mustaṣhriḳūn* and the kind of knowledge and general ideas which these last have developed about Islam and Muslim peoples. Where have they developed knowledge and ideas, so to say, ahead of their own society and where have they simply complied with its current ideas and behaviour? Where and how did they relativise or criticise norms and values adhered to in Western societies? Some *mustaṣhriḳūn* have, consciously or not, created a distance between their own society and Islam or Muslim people by describing Islam as absolutely different, as a danger or as an object or mission. Others of them have, consciously or not, created a rapprochement between their own society and Islam or Muslim people by describing what human beings, societies and cultures have in common, taking communication and learning from each other as self-evident. More than has been appreciated generally, most *mustaṣhriḳūn* have been much less original in their attitudes than is generally thought of and have merely been spokesmen of their societies in their assessment of the distance between Islam and the West. Except when they have wanted explicitly to study Islam and Muslim societies and cultures independently of current ideas and practices (sometimes emphatically against them), their appreciations of Islam have been heavily dependent on ideas and values current in their own society or community.

B. The period until the 19th century

When the Arabs carried out their conquests in the south, and in the 8th and early 9th centuries in the south-west of Europe, two worlds found themselves

opposed to each other. For centuries they identified themselves as the Christian and Muslim worlds according to where political authority lay. The Turkish conquests of the Arabic speaking lands (except Morocco), Anatolia, and the south-east of Europe up to the mid-16th century created a similar situation. In this case, however, the worlds which confronted each other were not only identified as Christian and Muslim but also increasingly as the European and the "Oriental" domain, the Orient starting at the boundary of Ottoman rule.

The history of the encounter between these two worlds and their relations, specifically around the Mediterranean and in the Balkans (also, further east, on and within the borders of the Russian empire) is complex; the borders of the two worlds have witnessed many kinds of interaction. Here we shall only deal with one aspect of cultural interaction: the development of the knowledge which European scholars acquired of the world represented by Islam, including the Arabic and Turkish languages, before the 19th century, when Islamic studies became firmly established as a distinct field of research in European universities. What knowledge of Islam had been attained, what motivated the search for it, what major obstacles had to be conquered, and what was the European cultural context within which this search for knowledge developed?

1. The Arabic heritage; the mediaeval period

Until the Crusading movement began in the second half of the 11th century, with the conquests of Toledo in 1085, Sicily in 1091 and Jerusalem in 1099, knowledge about Islam and Muslim lands in Latin Europe was limited. Its sources were scattered: incidental reports from Christians living in the Levant or in Spain under Muslim domination, doctrinal positions typical of Islam which had been related by John of Damascus and Byzantine theologians in their refutations of Islam, and what had been reported to the Church of Rome about Muslim dealings with Christians, outside or under the authority of the Roman Church. This knowledge was very limited. It was mixed with elements of religious imagination and coloured by efforts to show that Muslims constituted a danger for Europe and Islam for Christendom not only politically but also religiously. Islam was not the right religion: at best it was a Christian sect, but it was certainly not based on Revelation like Christianity.

Spain

The first instruments of work for the study of Arabic in Europe known to us come from Spain: a 12th century *Glossarium Latino-Arabicum* (with *ca.* 11,000 Latin key words of which one-third have not been translated) and a 13th century *Vocabulista in Arabica* (with *ca.* 4,000 Latin key words and *ca.* 8,000 Arabic index words). They must have served the purpose of translating from Latin into Arabic, largely for purposes of missionary work among Muslims in areas brought under Christian rule by the *Reconquista*.

The first written information about Islam and Muḥammad comes from a certain Moses Sefardi (1062-1110) who knew Arabic astronomical works well. In 1106 he converted to Christianity and took the name Pedro de Alfonso, moving subsequently to England where he became the king's personal physician. This information is contained in the fifth of his *Dialogi in quibus impiae Judaeorum confutantur* (Migne, *PL*, 157). Little is known, however, about the author.

More solid information is contained in the so-called Cluniac Corpus. After the capture of Toledo in 1085, this city was chosen as the principal see of the Roman Church in Spain (1088). Some decades later it became a centre of translation of Arabic scientific and philosophical texts into Latin, in particular thanks to the efforts of Archbishop Don Raymundo (r. 1125-51). When Peter the Venerable (1094-1156), abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Cluny, visited Spain in 1142, the two men may have discussed the project of translating some Islamic texts from Arabic into Latin. In any case, Peter the Venerable then commissioned two scholars of his order working on Arabic astronomy, Robert of Ketton (Chester) and Hermann of Dalmatia, to translate five Islamic texts, including the Ḳur'ān, into Latin; Robert succeeded in finishing the Ḳur'ān translation by 1143. Peter the Venerable himself wrote two texts in addition to these translations, the more descriptive *Summa totius haeresis Saracenorum* and the polemical *Liber contra sectam sive haeresim Saracenorum*. These texts together constitute the so-called Cluniac Corpus or Toledo collection.

Peter the Venerable, known for his anti-Jewish stand over against Bernard of Clairvaux, also differed from him as regards the attitude to be taken to the Muslims. Whereas Bernard actively preached the call to the second Crusade, Peter believed that, rather than war, it was missionary work that would bring victory over Muslims. But to combat Islam one had to know it, and this was the reason that he ordered original Arabic texts to be made accessible in Latin. Robert of Ketton's Ḳur'ān translation was printed in Basel in 1543 (1550^2) thanks to the efforts of Bibliander.

The coexistence of the three monotheistic faiths in mediaeval Spain meant that intellectuals adhering to one faith needed to possess knowledge of the others, not only because it was a demand of culture but also because it was a prerequisite for any claim to superiority on the part of their own faith. Ibn Ḥazm (*ca.* 994-1064) in his *Kitāb al-Fiṣal* and Yehuda Halevi (*ca.* 1085-*ca.* 1143) in his *al-Ḵẖuzarī* (1140) write from a Muslim and Jewish point of view. Peter the Venerable in his *Liber contra sectam sive haeresim Saracenorum*, Raymond Martin (*ca.* 1230-86) in his *Pugio fidei adversos Mauros et Judaeos* (1278), Raymond Lull (*ca.* 1231-1315) in his *Liber de gentili et tribus sapientibus*, and his *Liber de Tartari et Christiani*, and finally Ricoldo da Monte Croce (d. 1321) in his *Disputatio contra Saracenos et Alchoranum* ("*Improbatio Alchorani*") and *Libellus ad nationes orientales*, express a Christian point of view. With other, less important authors, they produced a flood of anti-Islamic writings which, however, betray increasing information about Islam. Raymond Lull, sometimes called the founder of Western orientalism, not only had a religious vocation but also was of a creative philosophical, scientific and poetic turn of mind. Wishing to demonstrate the Christian truth to Muslims by peaceful discussion and rational argument, he founded a school of Arabic for future Christian missionaries at Miramar in Majorca, which existed from 1276 till 1294. The study of Arabic became institutionalised in a more regular way when the Council of Vienna in 1311 at his recommendation laid down that in each of five European universities (Rome, Bologna, Paris, Oxford, Salamanca) two scholars should be appointed to teach Oriental languages, that is to say, Greek and Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic, the first two being the most important. In fact, however, the number of people who knew Arabic well in Europe during the 13th and 14th centuries has been estimated to have been less than twenty.

Role of the Roman Church in Europe with regard to Islam

These efforts to obtain a better knowledge of Islam all originated in the Roman Church, in particular the

Cluniac Benedictine, Dominican and Franciscan orders. Since one of the most important themes in the encounter of the Christian and Muslim worlds, mentioned at the beginning, was the relationship between the Christian and Muslim faiths, views of this very relationship have greatly influenced the way in which people coming from these two worlds have perceived the encounters between them, rationalising them in terms of their respective religions.

In connection with the Crusading movement which started in the second half of the 11th century in Spain, Sicily and the rest of Western Europe (with Urban II's call of 1096), an image of Islam as the great Adversary of Christianity arose in Europe. W.M. Watt describes the following four main features of this image as follows (*The influence of Islam on Medieval Europe*, Edinburgh 1972, 73): "(a) the Islamic religion is falsehood and a deliberate perversion of the truth; (b) it is a religion of violence and the sword; (c) it is a religion of self-indulgence; and (d) Muḥammad is the Antichrist."

The author correctly speaks here of a "distorted" image of Islam, an image which has been scrupulously analysed by Norman Daniel (*Islam and the West*, Edinburgh 1960). It is fair to add that the factual improvements in knowledge of Islam possessed by the authors quoted above always remained within the limits of the four features of the image of Islam just mentioned, sanctioned by the Roman Church and later endorsed by the Reformation.

On a popular level, Muḥammad and his prophetic claims, the Ḳurʾān and certain cultural traits of Arab-Muslim society like polygamy were ridiculed. On an ideological level Islam was depicted as a coherent system of false doctrines, a hostile ideological structure. Both levels together incited the religious collective imagination to an anti-Islamism which had its parallel in a rising anti-Judaism. The Church may have asserted its identity over against Muslims and Jews in this way as it had done earlier over against gnostics and pagans in its first centuries, and Europe may have sought and found its soul, but it may also be contended that the European Christians were mobilised for the wrong cause and with the wrong means. In any case, the Crusading ideology with its centres, propaganda and the missionary efforts based on a distorted image of Islam did not merely constitute the greatest obstacles to true knowledge of Islam and Muslim societies. In Spain the mediaeval Christian syndrome and the underlying attitudes, supported by the Inquisition, led to the human tragedy of the elimination of both Islam and Judaism within three centuries after the military victories of the 13th century by the Christian kings. Both Jews (1492) and Muslims (1502) were put before the alternative of baptism or expulsion, the final solution of the time. This political action was ideologically justified by the distorted image of Islam and Judaism and by the absolute claims of the Church and its institutions, and had been prepared theologically by Augustin's *De civitate dei*, Anselm's *Cur deus homo* and Aquinas' *Summa contra gentiles*.

Arab sciences and philosophy

It was in Spain, too, that another type of studies developed and another kind of knowledge was acquired which may more properly be called the forerunner of Oriental studies in the modern sense of the word. This was the translation activity which started in Toledo after it was taken in 1085, with the encouragement of Don Raymundo mentioned above. This concerned in particular the translation from Arabic into Latin of scientific and philosophical texts sought after in Europe. They were either translations of Greek philosophical, scientific and medical texts (*e.g.*, Aristotle in Arabic translation) or texts, including commentaries, written by Muslim authors (*e.g.*, Ibn Sīnā, 980-1037 [*q.v.*]) whose work became known in Europe *ca.* 1180. A group of scholarly translators devoted themselves to this translation work for more than two centuries, some of them from outside Spain; Jewish scholars played here a role similar to that which Nestorian scholars had played in the earlier 9th and 10th century translation activity in Baghdād from Syriac (Greek) into Arabic.

Outstanding leaders of the translation work in the 12th century were Domingo Gonzalez and the proliferous Italian scholar Gerard of Cremona (1114-87) who is said to have been responsible for the translation of more than 70 works in Arabic. Among the prominent Jewish scholars working in the movement was Abraham ben Ezra (1089-1167). It was especially in the 13th century that philosophical works were translated, partly serving as a basis for the great apologetic treatises of Christianity written at the time, partly stimulating the increasing debate among Christian thinkers about the relationship between faith and reason. Two translators in the service of the Emperor Frederick II (r. 1215-50) were famous for these philosophical translations: Michael Scotus (*ca.* 1200-*ca.* 1236) and Jacob Anatoli (*ca.* 1230-50). In the second half of the 13th century, the names of Hermannus Alemannus and Moses ibn Tibbon (1240-83), the latter working in Syria-Palestine, are well known. In Spain it was the great King Alphonso X of Castile, Alfonso el Sabio (r. 1252-84), who commissioned translation work and founded several institutions of higher learning.

The influence of Arabic philosophy on European thought in the 13th century is a case of "orientalism" in itself. Several European philosophers studied and quoted it: Roger Bacon (*ca.* 1214-92) in his *Opus maius* (he also treated the different religions in his *Moralis Philosophia*, IV), Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253) of the Platonic tradition, Albertus Magnus (*ca.* 1206-1280) and Thomas Aquinas (1226-74) of the Aristotelian tradition, and the Latin Averroist Siger of Brabant (*ca.* 1235-*ca.* 1282). After much debate, Latin Averroism was finally condemned by Bishop E. Tempier of Paris (1277).

Sicily, Syria-Palestine and Europe until 1500

Orientalism in its wider sense, the taste for Oriental culture and the desire to know it and derive values from it, did not arise in Spain where the Roman Church imposed its institutions and doctrines by force, but in other places of encounter between the Christian and Muslim worlds. Sicily, where the Arab Kalbī dynasty had ruled (902-1091), became such a meeting-place after its conquest by Roger I (d. 1101). His son Roger II (r. 1130-54), the latter's grandson Frederick II of Hohenstaufen (r. 1215-50), and later Manfred and Charles of Anjou, not only engaged translators for Arabic-Latin translation work but also themselves possessed a direct knowledge of Arab-Muslim manners and customs, accepting Arab cultural norms and values.

Another place of encounter was Syria-Palestine during the Crusader period (1099-1291). William of Tyre's (*ca.* 1130-84) *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*, describing the period 1094-1184 (the year of the author's death), contains careful observations of Arab Muslim behaviour and may be called an Orientalist's historical work in its own right. Here, too, certain translations of scholarly works from

Arabic into Latin were made. The knowledge which the Franks obtained here first-hand from an essentially superior culture, while meeting Muslims in actual life, gave a more realistic turn to Europe's knowledge of the East; numerous cultural borrowings occurred and trade increased between both sides of the Mediterranean.

Godfrey of Viterbo (12th c.) was now able to give a reasonable historical account of Muḥammad's life in his *Universal Chronicle*. Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, Archbishop of Toledo (early 13th century) provided a fair account of the history of the Arabs, in particular in the West, including Spain in his *Historia Arabum* (or: *Saracenica*). Somewhat later travellers like William of Rubruck (William de Rubruquis, *ca.* 1220-*ca.* 1294, travelled in 1254) and Marco Polo (1254-1324) were to discover other worlds, cultures and religions beyond the realm of Islam. And within Europe itself spiritual travellers along initiatory paths discovered positive features of Islam represented for instance by the figure of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and given an esoteric form in Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzifal* and *Willehalm* as well as in the German version of the *Grail*.

The last two contributions to Arabic studies of this period are again from Spain and can be dated to thirteen years after the fall of Granada (1492). In his *Vocabulista aravigo en letra castellana* (printed 1505), the scholar Pedro de Alcalá (Petrus Hispanus) left a precious account in Latin script of the Arabic vocabulary of the spoken language in Granada at the time. And in the same scholar's *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua araviga* (printed 1505, 2nd ed. corrected and enlarged also 1505) we have the first Arabic grammar written by a European, describing the spoken Arabic of Granada by means of the categories of Latin grammar.

During the 14th and 15th centuries, humanists of the Italian Renaissance studied not only the classical Greek and Latin authors but also paid attention to Hebrew kabbalistic writings and Arabic texts basic to European science, medicine and philosophy. At the time, the Arab cultural heritage was still part of the European conscience, at least in Italy. In the course of the 15th century, however, a change occurs, represented by the great humanist Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463-94) who, though knowing Arabic and Hebrew well, reverted to the classical heritage and left the Arab heritage aside. Over against the "classicists" it was the "orientalists" to whom the task fell of revealing the facts and significance of the Arab Islamic world and its heritage.

2. The Turkish threat; the period 1450-1700

After the failure of the Balkan Crusades and the efforts at unification with the Greek Orthodox Church, the Roman Church's initial reaction to the fall of Constantinople (1453) was one of relative openness, thanks to the efforts of some great intellectuals. Immediately after the fall of Constantinople John of Segovia (*ca.* 1400-58) proposed a conference between Christian clergy and Muslim *fuḳahā'* to open a dialogue on their respective faiths. Nicholas of Cusa (1401-64) had already published his *De pace fidei*, a dialogue between representatives of the major religions in search of what was their truth and unity. His *Cribratio Alcoran* (1460) is a careful examination of the contents of the Ḳur'ān, trying to identify what connects Islam with, and what separates Islam from Christianity on the basis of the text. Moreover, he suggested practical measures to realise the Muslim-Christian conference proposed by John of Segovia. And the new Pope Pius II, the humanist Aeneas Silvius (1405-64), Pope from 1458 onwards, at John's instigation wrote a letter to the Ottoman sultan Meḥemmed II [*q.v.*], the conqueror of Constantinople, in which he appealed for reason and practical common sense in the foreseeable relations between the two worlds confronting each other.

The proximity of the Ottoman empire, a firmly-established state whose power was still increasing until the mid-16th century (Vienna was besieged in 1529) affected the development of knowledge of Muslim societies and Islam in Europe. Whatever the reasons, the Europeans recognised a clear need for true and objective knowledge of this Muslim empire, its administration, resources, religious institutions, and so on; its proximity, moreover, facilitated the acquisition of this directly and indirectly. Besides primarily military and political interests, there were economic interests at stake in establishing and expanding trade relations with Istanbul, Smyrna and the Levant. This need for practical knowledge was supplemented by the stimulus of humanist and Renaissance thought. A new subject of study arose: Islam in its Ottoman context, Islam being now largely identified with the Turcs and their rule. The idea of Islam as a hateful religion and ideological structure was subtly transformed into the idea of Islam as Ottoman power and civilisation. This civilisation was regarded as different from the European one, but there were still more remote civilisations beyond the Ottomans, in Persia, India, China and Japan. This idea of an Islamic civilisation was later to develop into the idea of Islam as a subtle and refined culture expressed in attractive (*1001 Nights*) and even beautiful literature (Arabic and Persian poetry).

Printing presses and their use

Ottoman Turkish was written in Arabic script and the technology first of woodcut and then of loose letter printing imposed itself as an important tool for Oriental studies. The first Arabic printed edition was made in Rome in 1514; it was a Christian liturgical text meant for Oriental Christians. An Arabic Ḳur'ān seems to have been printed in Venice about 1530 but the whole edition must have been destroyed on the order of Pope Paul III (r. 1534-7). Be that as it may, Daniel Bromberg installed an Arabic press in Venice around 1537.

There were several Arabic presses in Rome, the most important being that of Ferdinand de Medici, installed around 1586, which printed the four Gospels in Arabic in 1590, again for use by Oriental Christians, among other texts. In fact, the Roman Church's interest in Arabic printing had to do with intensive efforts to establish contacts and eventually union with the Oriental Churches in the Ottoman empire, just as in mediaeval Spain during the *Reconquista* the study of Arabic had been inspired by missionary activity among the Muslim population living in territories conquered by the Christian kings. In the same perspective of church union, a Maronite College was established in Rome in 1584 (and also an Armenian one) and Maronite clergy and laymen were invited to Rome both to receive instruction and to render services, for instance, in matters of Arabic language. In 1627 Urban VIII founded the College of the Propagation of Faith (*Officium de propaganda fide*) which also encouraged the study of Oriental languages for missionary purposes.

Another famous Arabic press was the one installed by François Savary de Brèves, first in Rome around 1613 and then transferred to Paris in 1615, where it became the *Imprimerie des Langues Orientales*. Franciscus Raphalengius (1539-97) established a commercial press in Holland, while Thomas Erpenius (1584-1624)

installed a private one which was later sold to Elzevir in Amsterdam. On a smaller scale, Arabic texts were printed in Breslau on a press which Peter Kirsten (1575-1640) established before he migrated to Sweden in 1636 (see further, MAṬBAʿA. B. 1. In Europe).

Guillaume Postel and the French context

Following Portugal and Spain, 16th century England and France both enjoyed an immense broadening of their horizons and interests, and people developed a vivid sense for what was new and foreign yet accessible. This happened literally through the voyages of geographical discovery and, probably more than in the Iberian peninsula, through intellectual and spiritual discovery. Guillaume Postel (1510-81) is representative of such a discovering state of mind, within the special context of France, Italy and Austria at the time. Gifted for languages, he studied a number of them and Francis I (1494-1547, king of France from 1515 on), who was eager to attract artists and humanists at his court, became interested in him. Given his pro-Ottoman Levant policies, which had produced a treaty including valuable Capitulations in 1535 [see IMTIYĀZĀT], and in view of the Papal policy of union with Oriental Churches, a policy which he supported, Francis I needed expertise. Postel, who had just finished an extensive journey to Egypt and Constantinople and published his *Grammatica Arabica*, based on the Arab grammarians (1538-9), was appointed Professor of Arabic (1538) at the newly established Collège Royal (1530) which was later to become the Collège de France. Postel published a book on the Ottoman Empire, *De la république des Turcs* (1539-40), in which he presented a highly idealised picture of the King's ally. For various reasons Francis I dismissed Postel from the Collège Royal in 1543, and this marked the beginning of a new period in this man's agitated life. After far-reaching spiritual, intellectual and political adventures, and several brushes with the Roman Inquisition, he ended his life as a *de facto* prisoner in a French convent (1562-81), still moved by great ideas of world conversion and world domination before the nearby apocalyptic end of times. His precious manuscripts went to the University of Heidelberg.

Institutionalisation of Oriental studies: Leiden

An interesting example of a concerted effort to develop Oriental studies in the first half of the 17th century is provided by the history of this field at the University of Leiden, which soon achieved eminence. The university was established in 1575 as a reward for the city's withstanding the Spanish siege of 1574. The Low Countries declared their independence in 1581. Oriented as they were towards the sea and maritime trade, with vital interests in the Ottoman empire and Morocco, the Dutch considered a knowledge of Oriental languages a demand of the time. Franciscus Raphalengius (1539-97) started to teach Hebrew in Leiden in 1586, and in 1593 he added Arabic and prepared his *Lexicon Arabicum* which was published posthumously in 1613. The classicist, historian and Arabist Joseph Scaliger, a pupil of Postel, was appointed professor in 1593 without specific teaching duties. A separate chair of Arabic was created in 1599. After Scaliger, the reputation of Leiden in this field was enhanced by two scholars of great stature. In 1613 Thomas Erpenius (1584-1624), whose main interest was in languages, was appointed Professor of Oriental Languages; in the same year he published his important *Grammatica Arabica* which was to become a classic for two centuries (1636[2]; enlarged edition 1656[3]; 1748[4]). Jacob Golius (1596-1667) was appointed his successor in 1624; in 1653 he published his important *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, based on Arab dictionaries and his own readings, which also became a classical instrument of research. Besides publishing these major works of scholarship, the two men distinguished themselves also with a typical pedagogical concern; both prepared Arabic reading materials for beginners which lasted for nearly two centuries. In this regard, Erpenius prepared the *Locmani Sapientis Fabulae* together with some Arabic maxims (1615) and a voweled text with notes and Latin translation of the *Sūrat Yūsuf* (1617), while Golius published his *Shadhrat al-adab...* in 1629.

But Leiden established its reputation for Oriental studies in another scholarly and practical sense too. Just as Guillaume Postel had been sent out by Francis I to buy Oriental manuscripts in the East, Golius after his appointment spent from 1625 until 1629 in the East, bringing back a harvest of some 300 Arabic, Turkish and Persian manuscripts. Still more importantly, the Dutch representative of the States General at the Porte after 1655, Levinus Warner (1619-65) who had studied in Leiden and lived in Istanbul since 1644, bequeathed his precious collection of about 1,000 manuscripts and his books to the University Library of Leiden. This had already earlier acquired Scaliger's library and Golius' manuscripts, and it subsequently became a kind of Mecca for Arabists.

Examples of scholarly work

Among the scholarly works of the period under consideration which deserve mention is first of all Joseph J. Scaliger's *De emendatione temporum* (1583; enlarged edition 1598; 1629). This was the fruit of extensive Oriental researches and readings, encompassing various Oriental calendars and expounding a kind of world history. A century later Richard Simon (1638-1712) was able to offer his *Histoire critique de la créance et des coutumes des nations du Levant* (1684), in which he presented side-by-side and as objectively as possible the Muslim and Christian communities living in the Near East. Around the same time appeared in Vienna the precious *Thesaurus linguarum orientalum...* of Franz Meninski, in three volumes, a Turkish-Arabic-Persian-Latin dictionary which became a classic.

In this connection, the problem of the edition and translation of the text of the Ḳurʾān must be mentioned. Pope Alexander VII (1655-67) still forbade both its edition and its translation. Thanks to the Protestant theologian Bibliander, the Latin Ḳurʾān translation by Robert of Ketton, dating from 1143, could be printed in Basel in 1543, with a second edition appearing in 1550. In 1647 André du Ryer published an original French translation accompanied by a "Sommaire de la religion des Turques"; this translation was in turn translated into various other European languages. In 1694 A. Hinckelmann published the first Arabic text edition of the Ḳurʾān. It was in 1698 that the learned Catholic scholar Lodovico Maracci published an Arabic text edition and Latin translation of the Ḳurʾān, preceded by a lengthy introduction called the *Prodromus*. This was the standard scholarly edition and translation for at least a century and a half.

Other editions of important texts besides the Ḳurʾān are that of Ibn Sīnā's *Kitāb al-Shifāʾ* and his *Kitāb al-Nadjāt*, published together as early as in 1593, in Rome. Erpenius edited the vowelled *Sūrat Yūsuf* with a Latin translation and notes as an introduction to reading the Ḳurʾān (1617), and also the Arabic New Testament (1616) and Pentateuch (1622). In 1625 his edition and translation of the larger part of the world chronicle of the Coptic historian al-Makīn

(d. 1273), from Muḥammad onwards, together with the *Historia Arabum* (or *Saracenica*) of Rodrigo Jimenez de Rada (*ca.* 1210), saw the light. The British scholar Edward Pocock (1604-91), who travelled extensively in the Near East between 1637 and 1640 to collect manuscripts, was appointed to the new Oxford chair of Arabic in 1638. He edited the great history of Abu 'l-Faradj Gregorius (Bar Hebraeus), *Taʾrīḵh mukhtaṣar al-duwal*, first in part with extensive notes in his *Specimen historiae Arabum* (1650) and then in its totality, which was published posthumously by his son in 1663, who edited himself Ibn Ṭufayl's *Ḥayy ibn Yaḳẓān* (1671). The Arabic New Testament was edited again, after Erpenius' edition of 1616, by the Syrian Christian Salomo Negri (London 1727).

3. The breakthrough of enlightenment; the 18th century

The end of the 17th century saw the appearance of a new series of publications on or related to Islam which breathed another air than most publications mentioned until now. These had stood in the old scheme of the controversy between Muslims and Christians, the declared opposition between the Islamic and Christian religions. Scholars like Erpenius and Pocock had not hidden their hostility to Muḥammad's claims to be a prophet and the idea of Islam as an acceptable religion. This was not only a matter of personal judgement but had to do with the dominant place of Christian theology at the universities. Arabic philology was often used as an aid to the exegesis of the Hebrew Old Testament; a scholar like Albert Schultens (1686-1570), as others before him, even considered Arabic as a dialect of Hebrew. Islam was nearly always compared with and judged in the light of the doctrines of Christianity. In other words, Arabic and Islam had in fact been studied according to norms of Christian theology or even as *ancilla theologiae*.

The breakthrough and emancipation of the study of Islam and Muslim lands in a spirit of rational Enlightenment (*Aufklärung*) happened to take place precisely at a time in which the Ottoman empire, after its last siege of Vienna in 1683, was on the retreat and had to sign the Treaty of Carlowitz (1699) [see KARLOFČA]. This disappearance of the Turkish danger from the European scene, marking the end of the wars of religion, must have meant an easing of tension, not only political but also psychological, cultural and religious. Just as the Turks were no longer a political danger, Islam could no longer be seen as an inherently dangerous religion. Through the voyages to the East, Europe on its part had already started to develop a curiosity and cultural openness in the second half of the 17th century and this could now extend beyond Chinese culture to Islamic culture too.

One of the first publications breathing this new, fresh and open spirit was the thousand pages-long *Bibliothèque Orientale* (1697) edited by Bartholomé d'Herbelot (1625-95), who represented a new type of enlightened "orientalist". It was prepared with royal support and sought to offer the French public all that could be of interest in Arabic, Turkish and Persian works in alphabetical order. Another publication, which opened up a still more imaginative side of Muslim culture was the French translation of the *Arabian Nights* in twelve volumes between 1704 and 1717. It was made by Antoine Galland (1646-1715), from 1709 Professor of Arabic at the Collège de France, who had made several journeys to the Near East and already published in 1694 a book of maxims from Muslim literature illustrating Muslim wit.

The new, rational trend of thought of the times, which had already distanced itself from, if not opposed, traditional Christianity, was also able to study and appreciate other religions with greater openness than before. Leibniz (1646-1716) considered Islam as a natural religion, and in 1720 an anonymous pamphlet circulated under the title "Mahomet no impostor, or a Defence of Mahomet". In 1730 appeared *Vie de Mahomet...* written by Henry Boulainvilliers (1658-1722), in which Muḥammad is described as a heroic figure. Simon Ockley (1678-1720) wrote his *History of the Saracens* (1708-18) in a sympathetic spirit and Edward Gibbon (1737-94) would give an objective historical account of the rise of Islam in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-81). Voltaire (1694-1778) gave such an account in his *Essai sur les moeurs...* (1753). In an indirect way, Islam was used to express critical ideas about one's own society, state and church: Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes* (1721) and Voltaire's *Le fanatisme ou Mahomet le prophète* (1742).

Most important, however, was the study by a specialist, Adriaan Reland (1676-1718), Professor of Oriental Languages at the University of Utrecht, about Islamic religion itself, *De religione Mohammedica libri duo* (1705, 1717²). Here Reland presented Islam as it had been described by Muslim authors themselves, translating the original texts, and he denounced and refuted wrong ideas current about Islam in his time. The book, written in Latin, was translated into French and German and may be called the first enlightened study of Islam as a religion. In the same spirit of reasonable presentation, the lawyer George Sale (d. 1736) published his "Preliminary Discourse" on Islam as a religion, preceding his English Ḳurʾān translation (1734). That this change of perspective, the freedom of research and the emancipation of Arabic and Islamic studies from theological patronage, was not that easy shows up in the work and still more the autobiography (*Lebensbeschreibung*, 1783) of that gifted but non-recognised Arabist Johann Jakob Reiske (1716-74). As Reland was a predecessor of the modern study of the religion of Islam, Reiske, besides being an Arabist according to modern standards, in his *Prodidagmata ad Hagji Chalifae librum memorialem* (written 1747, published 1766) was a predecessor of the modern study of Islamic history.

Another sign of the new open spirit was the kind of thoughtful travel literature which saw the light now, as for instance Volney's (1757-1820) *Voyage en Syrie et en Egypte* (1787).

This open spirit could also lead to a new sensitivity to *belles lettres* and literary beauty. One of the first Orientalists following this path was William Jones (1746-94), highly gifted in languages and from 1783 judge in Calcutta. In 1774 he published his *Poeseos Asiaticae commentarium libri six*, offering a first panorama of the rich field of poetry existing in particular in Muslim countries in Arabic, Persian and Turkish. Once arrived in India, he put himself to Sanskrit and translated several Sanskrit works into English. At the same time, with a clear awareness of practical necessities, he took the initiative to prepare the publication of the *Digest of Hindu and Mohammedan Law*.

Role of persons from the regions concerned

In several ways, people from the regions concerned, nearly always Christians, played a role in the process of acquiring knowledge about Islam and Muslim societies and cultures. The glossaria in Spain were made with the help of Muslim converts to Christianity who, whatever their knowledge of Arabic, knew little

or no Latin. As "new Christians" speaking Arabic they could act as intermediaries between the Christian conquerors and the Muslim population.

In the second half of the 16th century Near Eastern Christians, mostly Maronites but also members of the Uniate Churches, started to play a role too. A certain number went to the new Maronite College in Rome, founded in 1584, to pursue theological studies. Others went to Italy and France to study or act as translators into Arabic. Others again simply came in order to improve their own situation. All too often lacking proper education, Oriental Christians pretended to be able to teach Arabic, give reliable information about Muslim societies and even give instruction about Islam, creating in this way more confusion than providing knowledge.

There were exceptional figures, however. The Moroccan prisoner al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Wazzān al-Zayyāti converted to Christianity, took the name Leo Africanus [*q.v.*] and wrote a book on "Famous Men among the Arabs" and his well-known *Descrittione dell'Africa* (around 1520). In Paris, Erpenius learnt much from a Moroccan called al-Andalusī, who also informed him about Islam. Members of the Maronite al-Simʿānī family catalogued Arabic manuscripts in several libraries in Italy during the 18th century and the catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts in the Escurial Library was published in two volumes (1760-70) by the Maronite Michael al-Ġhazīrī (Casiri, 1720-91). The learned Syrian Christian Nāṣīf al-Yāzidjī (1800-71 [*q.v.*]) wrote a critical commentary on Silvestre de Sacy's edition of al-Ḥarīrī's *Maḳāmāt* (1822), which was published in Arabic with a Latin translation and notes by A.W.F. Mehren in Leipzig in 1848.

New teaching institutions

Besides the chairs of Oriental Languages attached to a growing number of European universities, there was an increasing need for the practical teaching of Oriental languages, in particular for interpreters and translators. Already in 1670 a French school for interpreters had been established in a convent in Pera, and in 1700 the *Ecole des jeunes de langue* was established in Paris for the same purpose. It was directed by Jesuits, as was the *Orientalische Akademie* established in Vienna in 1754 for the same purpose but also preparing young Austrians for the foreign service.

The *Ecole spéciale des langues orientales* was founded in Paris in 1795 for the study of living oriental languages, in view of the increasing need for qualified people to represent French commercial and political interests in Asia and Africa. Teaching concentrated on Arabic, Turkish and Crimean Tatar, Persian and Malayan. The chair of Arabic at the *Ecole spéciale* fell in 1795 to A.I. Silvestre de Sacy (1758-1838), who in 1806 also became Professor of Persian at the Collège de France. With his *Grammaire arabe* of 1810 and his *Chrestomathie arabe* of 1806 and *Anthologie grammaticale* of 1829, he supplanted the older publications by Erpenius and Golius. His impeccable publications in the realm of Arabic philology made Sacy the outstanding Arabist in Europe, inaugurating a new period of the study of the Islamic languages. In 1803 a chair for spoken Arabic was added at the *Ecole spéciale*, and the learned Copt Elias Buḳṭur (Bocthor, 1784-1821) was appointed. He prepared a two-volume *Dictionnaire français-arabe* (spoken Arabic, especially in Egypt) which was published by his successor A.P. Caussin de Perceval Jr. The latter wrote himself a *Grammaire arabe vulgaire* (1824).

As for the British, following William Jones (1746-94) and his creation of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1784), they established in 1800 in Calcutta the Fort William College for the study of Oriental languages and literatures, right on the spot. The College was to last until 1854, providing courses in the most important Indian languages and publishing a number of text editions and translations, dictionaries and scholarly studies. The scholars worked in the spirit of enthusiasm for Indian (including Islamic) culture which already had inspired William Jones and they were willing to learn from the culture in which history had placed them. Over against this line of enthusiastic "Orientalists" who wanted to learn, serve and study the indigenous cultures of the colonies, arose the line of the "Anglicists" who imposed British education, norms and values. Colonial times started to demand their dues.

In Austria, the third major European power to develop relations with Muslims, in particular in the Balkans, another kind of initiative was taken to spread knowledge about Islamic culture. Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (1774-1856), who established the scholarly study of Oriental languages and literatures in Austria, founded the first orientalist journal Europe has known. Between 1809 and 1818 six issues of the *Fundgruben des Orients* appeared, bringing and encouraging knowledge about the world of Muslims and Islam, its motto being the second half of Sūra II, 142/147.

C. The period of the 19th and 20th centuries

1. International scholarship until the Second World War

The 19th century saw the rise of Islamic studies as a scholarly field of studies in its own right. The publication of the voluminous *Description de l'Egypte* between 1809 and 1822, written by a number of French scholars who had done research in Egypt during Bonaparte's campaign there, gave a powerful impetus to Oriental studies in general. This enterprise was an example of what scholars could accomplish through co-operation when they enjoyed good financial support and efficient organisation.

A prerequisite for any research on Islam and Muslim societies was the study of Arabic; descriptive grammars and the compilation of dictionaries prepared the way for critical editions of manuscript texts. Scholars of great repute in this field were Antoine Silvestre de Sacy in Paris, Edward William Lane (1801-76) in England and Egypt, Reinhart P. Dozy (1820-83) and Michael Jan de Goeje (1836-1909) in Leiden, Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801-88) in Leipzig and I.Y. Krachkovsky (1883-1951) in St. Petersburg-Leningrad. A landmark was Gustav Flügel's (1802-1879) publication of the Arabic text of the Ḳurʾān in 1834 with the concordance to it in 1842. This was the prerequisite for a more accurate literary and historical study of the Ḳurʾān. A pioneering study in this respect was Theodor Nöldeke's (1836-1930) *Geschichte des Korans*, originally a dissertation in Latin (1856), the German version of which (1860) was to be followed later by a considerably augmented edition in three volumes, supervised by three other German scholars, which appeared between 1909 and 1938. An increasing number of printed critical editions of Arabic, Persian and Turkish texts from manuscripts followed, first in Europe, and then also in Cairo and elsewhere.

Available manuscript resources were described for instance by Moritz Steinschneider (1816-1907) for Arabic Muslim and Jewish manuscripts, followed by Carl Brockelmann (1868-1956) for Arabic manuscripts in general and Georg Graf (1875-1955) for Christian Arabic manuscripts. Brockelmann's *Ge-*

schichte der arabischen Literatur has now in part been superseded by Fuat Sezgin's invaluable *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* (since 1967). C.A. Storey published his *Persian literature. A bio-bibliographical survey* (of Persian manuscripts) from 1927 onwards, with a new enlarged edition by Yuri Bregel (1972).

Broad historical surveys of literature in these languages were undertaken, for instance, by Von Hammer-Purgstall and Elias John Wilkinson Gibb (1857-1901) for Turkish literature, and by Edward Granville Browne (1862-1926) for Persian literature. Reynold Alleyne Nicholson's (1868-1945) preliminary survey of the history of Arabic literature was followed by Régis Blachère's (1900-73) more systematic but unfortunately unfinished survey.

The study of Islamic history required editions and analysis of historical texts. Important pioneers in this field were Alfred von Kremer (1828-89) for Islamic cultural history, and Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) for the early political history of Islam. Dozy deserves mention for his history of Muslim Spain, published in four volumes in 1861.

It was on the basis of the growing accessibility of the relevant literary and historical sources that Islamic studies proper, that is to say the study of Islam and Muslim societies and cultures, could now come into being. In this respect, scholars like Ignác Goldziher (1850-1921), Hellmut Ritter (1892-1971) and Louis Massignon (1883-1962) paved the way. To them may be added the names of Joseph Schacht (1902-72) for Islamic law, Hamilton Alexander Roskeen Gibb (1895-1971) for the history of Islamic institutions in particular, Gustav Edmund von Grunebaum (1909-72) for the history of Islamic culture and civilisation generally and Arendt Jan Wensinck (1882-1939) for the study of Islam within the perspective of science of religion. A scholar of exemplary modesty, Wensinck was the moving spirit behind two major enterprises of international collaboration in the field of Islamic studies. These are the first edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* [see MAWSŪ^CA. 4.], which appeared in five volumes in an English, French and German edition between 1913 and 1942 (and which inspired the Turkish *İslam Ansiklopedisi* which started to appear in 1940), and the *Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane* which appeared in eight volumes between 1933 and 1989, both published by E.J. Brill in Leiden.

2. Institutionalisation and developments until the Second World War

The immense development of Oriental studies in general and Islamic studies in particular in Europe and North America since the middle of the 19th century cannot be explained only in terms of spiritual motivations and scholarly interest in the non-Western world. It also came about thanks to the availability of funds to develop these studies in new independent institutions and institutional arrangements for research and teaching. Universities became better organised, special chairs were established, scholarly meetings facilitated communication. Certain publishers specialised in books in this field and societies were established specifically to favour Oriental studies.

In France J.B. Colbert had established the *Ecole de jeunes de langues* in Paris in 1700; this functioned as a school for interpreters until its closure in 1873. In 1795 the *Ecole spéciale des langues orientales* was founded, in 1914 renamed *Ecole nationale des langues orientales vivantes* and in 1971 *Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales*; it has now become part of the University of Paris. In 1822 the newly founded *Société asiatique* met for the first time, and the same year it began to publish its *Journal asiatique*.

For a long time, Oriental languages and literatures were not taught at French universities but at special institutions, all of them in Paris; the *Collège de France* from 1530, the institutions mentioned above, and the *Ecole Pratique des hautes Etudes* after 1868. The *Revue du Monde musulman* (1906-26), and its successor the *Revue des Etudes islamiques* (1927-), have been keen to publish on events throughout the contemporary Muslim world with an important part of which France was involved from its occupation of Algeria in 1830 until Algeria's independence in 1962.

The French also established academic research institutes in different countries overseas, for instance the *Institut français d'etudes arabes de Damas*, established in 1930 (replacing an older Institute of 1922) and attached to the University of Paris, which has regular publications until the present time. In 1929 an *Institut d'etudes islamiques* was created as part of the University of Paris. This was to constitute the centre of Islamic studies in France, with numerous students from North Africa attending after the Second World War. The Department of Arabic and Islam at the University of Algiers and similar institutions in Tunis and Rabat had political relevance within the framework of French interests in what was then still French North Africa. Scholars like Robert Montagne (1893-1954), for instance, studied Islam in this framework. French historical and linguistic scholarship on Islam in Spain and North Africa was represented, *e.g.*, by Evariste Lévi-Provençal (1894-1956), Roger Le Tourneau (1907-71), Georges (1876-1962) and William (1874-1956) Marçais. Jean Sauvaget (1901-50), besides his own historical work, wrote a useful bibliographical introduction to the historical study of Islam.

In Germany, Oriental studies developed around the middle of the 19th century as an academic discipline at the newly-founded or organised universities, and it remained firmly linked to the universities, Arabic often being taught as one of the Semitic languages at the Faculties of Theology. In 1845 the *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* was founded, bringing together all German orientalists; it has been publishing the *Zeitschrift der DMG* since 1847. Islamic studies acquired some political relevance in Germany in the context of the rapprochement with the Ottoman empire and during the thirty odd years during which Germany had some Muslim colonies in Africa. Carl Heinrich Becker (1876-1933), for instance, besides his historical work paid attention to contemporary Islam in these regions, at the *Kolonialinstitut* established in Hamburg in 1908. The Nazi period and the Second World War (1933-1945) gave an unforeseen ideological twist to German scholarship. A few German orientalists, mostly of Jewish descent, succeeded in escaping abroad; others perished or survived under heavy stress. After 1945 Oriental studies in both parts of Germany had largely to be built up again.

Islamic studies in Germany have remained very much part of the older German orientalist tradition of solid philological and historical work, lack of social and political commitment and relatively little interest in the realities of the contemporary scene. It is probably in Germany that the orientalists' tradition has achieved the greatest degree of technical perfection in what may be termed scholarly precision engineering, a phenomenon which can be observed elsewhere too. This has happened, however, at a price: a certain isolation through remoteness from other scholarly disciplines, an aloofness from contemporary developments and a certain weakness of scholars to

take a personal stand, disciplined objective scholarship being the cause for which they live, imagination being subordinated to mental discipline. Much less formulation of basic problems of research has taken place here than could have been expected, given the German philosophical tradition, and compared with important changes of paradigm in other scholarly disciplines in the country. Islam as a faith and religion as well as contemporary developments have tended, paradoxically, to be marginalised in Islamic studies as an academic discipline. Several German Islamicists have tried, however, to set Islam and Islamic history in the broader context of cultural history, among them the aforementioned Carl Heinrich Becker and Hans Heinrich Schaeder (1896-1957). A younger generation of German Islamicists has established closer communication with and commitment to living Muslim societies and their future.

Oriental studies in Great Britain in the 19th and 20th centuries have been very much influenced by contact with a number of important Muslim regions within and outside the empire, *e.g.*, Persia. Quite a few British scholars have not been attached to university institutions but have carried out research on their own, sometimes working as civil servants in the colonial administration or diplomatic service but also as independent travellers and authors like W.S. Blunt (1840-1922) and others. As early as 1784, the Asiatic Society of Bengal was founded by Sir William Jones in Calcutta. A parallel society in Bombay was to follow. The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland was founded in London in 1823; it has been publishing its *Journal* since 1834.

Academic studies of Arabic, Persian and Turkish were concentrated in the universities of Cambridge, Oxford and Edinburgh, where old traditions in this field existed. The London School of Oriental Studies, attached to the University of London, was founded after the First World War and renamed the London School of Oriental and African Studies after the Second World War. It brings together a broad range of orientalists' expertise and field experience. Britain, too, founded some academic institutes overseas in Ankara, ʿAmmān, Baghdād and Tehran, which stimulated archaeological and art history research in particular.

The Netherlands' overseas history with Islam came through contacts with Indonesia. The world's first society of Oriental studies, the *Batavian Society for Arts and Sciences*, was founded in Batavia (Jakarta) in 1778 and would publish its own Journal. In Dutch Oriental studies as elsewhere, a distinction can be made between academic Oriental studies for the sake of scholarship and the study and teaching of Islamic law and institutions and Muslim languages and ethnography for the benefit of the colonial administration. The second tradition was combined with the first in the dominating personality of Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje (1857-1936), who for a number of years was an official adviser to the government on Muslim affairs.

For Russia, the Orient started with the presence of the Tatars, Islamicised since the 1260s. The main institutions of Oriental studies were in St Petersburg, then the capital: the Asiatic Museum, founded in 1818, and the Institute for Oriental Languages, established as part of the Asiatic Department of the Ministry of the Exterior in 1823. A faculty of Oriental Languages was founded here in 1854. The city held, and holds, important manuscript collections.

A school of Arabic scholarship was established in Russia by Viktor Romanovich Rosen (1849-1908). His most outstanding Arabist pupil was the aforementioned I.Y. Krachkovsky whose *Among Arabic manuscripts* (Eng. tr. 1953) brought Oriental studies nearer to the general public, even in the West. It is, however, Turkic Islam with which Russia has had the most direct relations and a centuries long common history. The foremost scholar in this field was Vasilii Vladimirovich Barthold (1869-1930), also a pupil of Rosen (see Yuri Bregel, *The bibliography of Barthold's works and the Soviet censorship*, in *Survey*, no. 108 [1979], 91-107).

Russian Oriental studies changed greatly after the revolution of 1917, gradually becoming subjected to ideological constraints. Islamic studies, like Islam itself, were severely curtailed from the later twenties on, as part of the general drive to eradicate religion. In the fields of linguistic, literary and historical studies, however, research went on. After the Second World War the Institute of Oriental Studies was founded in Moscow as part of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the existing Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad became a branch of the Moscow institute.

In most other European countries, too, traditions of Islamic scholarship established themselves during the period under consideration. Prominent in the Italian tradition were Leone Caetani (1869-1935), Ignazio (1844-1935) and Michelangelo (1886-1946) Guidi, Carlo Alfonso Nallino (1872-1938) and Giorgio Levi della Vida (1886-1967). Prominent in the Spanish tradition were Julián Ribera y Taragó (1858-1934) and Miguel Asín y Palacios (1871-1944). Special mention should be made of Arminius Vambéry (1832-1918) in Hungary, Adam Mez (1869-1917) in Switzerland, Tor Andrae (1885-1946) in Sweden and Armand Abel (1903-1973) in Belgium.

In the USA, an interest in Oriental studies appeared on the East Coast in the first decades of the 19th century. The American Oriental Society was founded in 1842 and started to publish its *Journal* in 1880. Universities began to teach Oriental studies in the 19th century, but Islamic studies lagged behind somewhat. After the First World War, Princeton University became the main centre for Middle Eastern and Islamic studies, as they were developed by Philip Hitti (1886-1978); The University Library here was able to acquire a large manuscript collection. Other centres of Oriental studies where Islamic languages were taught were Harvard University, and Universities in Philadelphia, Chicago and Berkeley (UCB). Since the Second World War, the teaching of Islamic languages has been regarded as a vital necessity and programmes of Middle Eastern area studies, including Islamic history, have been developed at a number of American universities, to which European scholars like G.E. von Grunebaum, H.A.R. Gibb and B. Lewis have been attached. The Library of Congress has tried to acquire consistently all publications which have appeared in Muslim countries and has the most important collection of materials on the subject in the world.

Similar Islamic studies, based on philology and history, have been pursued at some Western institutions in Muslim countries. To the French institutions in Damascus and North Africa, mentioned earlier, should be added the Jesuit Université de St.-Joseph in Beirut, recognised in 1881, with its *Faculté orientale* (between 1902 and 1914) and its *Institut de Lettres orientales*, from 1937 on. The Belgian scholar H.J. Lammens (1862-1937) worked here. At the American University of Beirut, which goes back to the Syrian Protestant College, founded in 1863, the Arabic Language and Islamic history have been

taught for a long time. Islamic studies were also pursued at several British institutions in British India, for instance in Lahore. Many text editions were published in Cairo, Ḥaydarābād and other centres of Islamic studies in Muslim countries.

From the beginning a number of independent scholars have carried out research, often in disciplines other than philology, textual source analysis and documentary history represented by the universities at the time. Their work has proved to be crucially important for Islamic studies. Some of them studied non-textual material sources like Arabic epigraphy (Max van Berchem, Swiss, 1863-1921), numismatics and archaeology, and art and architecture (Keppel Archibald Cameron Creswell, British, 1879-1974). Others explored contemporary Muslim societies in ethnographical studies such as those carried out by the above-mentioned Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje in Mecca, Acheh and Gajoland; Edmond Doutté (French, 1867-1926) in Morocco and Algeria; and Edward Westermarck (Finnish, 1862-1939) in Morocco. After the Second World War, anthropological fieldwork developed rapidly and Islamic studies are now unthinkable without the contributions from it and other social sciences.

3. Critical evaluations of *mustaṯrikūn*

Oriental studies generally and, in particular, Islamic studies based on scholarly, and therefore by definition critical philological, literary and historical methods, have been critically evaluated and discussed during the past decades. Specifically, the contribution of Islamic studies to our knowledge of Islam and Muslim societies and cultures, its epistemology and presuppositions, its older ethnocentrism and its ethical implications have been at issue. Criticism has been articulated both by Western scholars, in particular social scientists studying non-Western societies and cultures, and by Muslims on different levels. We shall review some of the main arguments contained in this criticism and show the paradoxical situation in which the *mustaṯrikūn* as bridges between cultures find themselves, even if they are not always aware of this themselves.

i. Scholarly criticism

As has been observed by Maxime Rodinson (*La fascination de l'Islam*, Paris 1980; Eng. tr. *Europe and the mystique of Islam*, Seattle 1987) and others, the rise and development of Oriental studies in Europe shared in 19th century trends of thought, which for decades put their stamp on this kind of studies. One idea current at the time, which in part even accounted for the enthusiasm for Oriental studies, was that in contrast to the West, the spiritual and in particular the religious element predominates in the Oriental cultures. As a consequence, until recently Islamic studies have been tinged with a certain idealism in that much importance has been attached to the influence of religion, specifically Islamic ideas and practices on Muslim societies, while general technological, economic and social factors tended to be neglected. Another idea current in the 19th century was that peoples could be classified according to races, each possessing inherent cultural and psychological characteristics. The dynamics of Islamic history were then largely explained as a struggle between religious movements or a struggle between races, in particular Semitic and Indo-European. A third idea in vogue at the time when Oriental studies developed was that certain characteristics of a particular language like Arabic or a language group like the Semitic languages reflected themselves in specific cultural features of the speakers of that language. In the case of Islam, this meant that Europeans had a marked tendency to interpret Islam and Muslim societies in terms of what were thought to be unchangeable realities of Islamic religion, Semitic and other races, and Semitic and other languages. Even after the Second World War, such ideas were still accepted by some *mustaṯrikūn*.

The fact that Oriental studies at the time consisted largely of the study of languages and texts, meant that *mustaṯrikūn* had difficulties in drawing conclusions about the social and other realities within which the texts originated and functioned. It was possible to reconstruct the chronology of political events mentioned in historical texts but much harder to draw conclusions for instance as to the social history of Muslim societies and the way they functioned and function. While overestimating the role of religion, race and language, *mustaṯrikūn* greatly underestimated, or even refused to acknowledge, the role of, for instance, particular demographic and ethnic structures, and social and economic causes in explaining particular facts or developments. In short, precisely because of their interest in Islam and in what distinguishes Muslim from Western societies, orientalists tended to stress the specificity of things Islamic and to reify Islam as an explanatory cause. They tended to neglect the many things that human beings, societies and cultures have in common and to disregard general causes as explanations of particular developments in Muslim societies.

Furthermore, the very equipment of orientalists, bound or at least accustomed by their education to work on texts, prevented them from interpreting adequately contemporary developments in Muslim societies. Most of them found themselves at too great a distance from the tangible world they studied, including the psychological and social distance to the people created by the political relationships of colonial times. The orientalists in fact did not know much more about contemporary Muslim societies than other Westerners. In their thinking they mostly tended to accept as self-evident the basic assumptions and presuppositions current in their own society. Consequently, it was not so much professional orientalists as travellers and journalists, missionaries and tradesmen, politicians and military experts who, whatever their natural biases, furnished factual observations and practical knowledge of contemporary Muslim societies, with which they were often involved over many years.

The focus of interest and style of research of most *mustaṯrikūn* in the period under consideration was fact-finding and the search for permanent structures. A deeper causal or structural cohesion between the known facts was seldom sought; these facts were rarely interrogated with a view to their social implications; the patterns of meaning which these facts taken together conveyed to the people concerned were seldom investigated. Whenever attention was paid to these people's interpretations of the facts, there was a certain predilection in the West and among some orientalists for the exotic, archaic, and poetic meanings of what were held to be the "religious" elements.

Although orientalists in principle and quite naturally could listen to the people of the culture and society they studied, understand what they needed or wanted to convey and defend their interests, most of them refrained from doing so. Their primary concern was their scholarly work. Moreover, a widely-held official view in the colonial period held that natural resistance to Western political and economic domination at the time was to be attributed to Islam ("Muslim fanaticism", "Panislamism", etc.) rather

than admitting self-critically that it was due to the growing penetration of Western power.

Paradoxically, it was not only the colonies but also the orientalists who tended to become victims of Western domination, which caused normal relations between people to become disrupted, and prevented Muslim people and societies, their culture and religion from being perceived and understood as they understood themselves. The uneven relationship between the Western and the Islamic worlds put the orientalists in a difficult position, since this kind of relationship obstructed true insight rather than promoting it. Some did not realise the complex nature of their situation and, rather than trying to build bridges between peoples and cultures and correct misconceptions at home, they tended to legitimate and defend Western domination without question. Those orientalists who took up the defence of the people on the other side often justified this with a religious or ideological terminology which was hardly comprehensible to others. Most, however, working in the service of Western scholarly institutions to study Islam and Muslim societies, must have seen the course of events as irreversible and the people of the Orient as doomed to lose out to the West.

ii. Muslim critical responses

Soon after the establishment of the scholarly field of Islamic studies in Europe, scholars from Muslim countries too became interested in it. Many cooperated with Western scholars in studying and publishing manuscripts. They attended Western universities, took part in broader research projects, and could be appointed to teach and do research at Western scholarly institutions. While the immense amount of knowledge generated by the *mustashriḳūn* evoked the admiration of Muslims of all persuasions, it also aroused a certain unease because this knowledge was made available in the first place to people in the West. Moreover, was it the right knowledge? A whole literature circulating in Muslim countries alleges that it is not, and insinuates that orientalists have somehow intentionally or because of material interests distorted the reality of Islam and Muslim societies and cultures.

Since the culture and religion under study is theirs, the cooperation of researchers and scholars from Muslim countries has proved to be indispensable as well as self-evident. They have been able to contribute considerably to Islamic studies, in particular when working in Western countries. They have also been able to correct certain mistakes made by *mustashriḳūn* in their handling and interpreting of materials. In the case of precise data, they could initiate scholarly debates which are the essence of research proper.

Muslim criticisms have gone further than that, however, entering into debate concerning certain orientalists' general ideas, underlying attitudes towards Islam and the value judgements they have passed on it. Some have gone as far as to deny at least in part the scholarly validity of the work of all orientalists, using sweeping arguments which can neither be proved nor disproved and must be seen as part of a broader protest against Western domination. The *mustashriḳūn* themselves often seem to have been taken by surprise by what they have seen less as a lack of appreciation of hard work than as an attack on their profession and critical scholarship in general. The ensuing debate has led, however, to greater awareness of problems of a both human and technical nature familiar to cultural anthropologists, since they occur in the study of other cultures and religions in general.

Following E. Rudolph's interpretation, to which the present writer owes much (*Westliche Islamwissenschaft im Spiegel muslimischer Kritik. Grundzüge und aktuelle Merkmale einer innerislamischen Diskussion*, Berlin 1991), critical Arab Muslim responses to orientalism, particularly in Egypt (elsewhere the situation seems to be less turbulent), present the following historical development:

a. Debates between modernist reformers and Europeans writing on Islam (al-Afghānī against Renan, ʿAbduh against Hanotaux).

b. Critical reactions by Muslim reformists and Azhar scholars to non-Muslim secular scholarship in the West concerned with Islam (Rashīd Riḍā against E. Dermenghem, the campaign against A.J. Wensinck's membership in the Royal Academy of the Arabic Language in Cairo). Parallel to this are the violent reactions, often by the same people, to "secular" research pursued by Muslim scholars, *e.g.*, at the University of Cairo (attacks on Ṭāhā Ḥusayn and M.Ḥ. Haykal).

c. Critical reactions to Western scholarship on the Ḳurʾān and historical criticism of *ḥadīth* literature (Muṣṭafā al-Sibāʿī and Muḥammad al-Ghazzālī attacking Goldziher's work), after the Second World War.

d. Accusations that orientalists in general, and certain of them in particular, are engaged in a broader attack on Islam and Muslim societies, in league with Colonialists, Christian Missionaries and Jewish and Gentile Zionists. Such attacks have been launched in the Arab world (*e.g.*, by ʿUmar Farrūkh, Muḥammad al-Bahāy, Anwar al-Djundī, Bint al-Shāṭiʾ, Mālik Bennabī). Orientalism is here seen as an ideological enemy of Islam, and from *ca.* 1960 on the debate about it has been of a clearly ideological nature.

e. More subtle criticism of *mustashriḳūn* through an intellectual analysis of the underlying notions of the Orient, Orientalism and Orientals current in the West, for which orientalists are alleged to be partly responsible or of which they are victims. One of the main proponents of the ensuing debate is Edward W. Said, an Arab but not a Muslim.

Feelings have been the highest when Muslim religious convictions have been hurt by secular Western scholarship. A brief analysis by R. Peters (*Abendländische Islamkunde aus morgenländischer Sicht*, 20. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Erlangen, October 1977) presents critical responses by Arab Muslims to Oriental studies of Islam, in defence of Islamic religion. According to these, the orientalists are divided into two groups. The first group consists of those orientalists who evaluate Islam correctly (*al-munṣifūn*), *i.e.*, they speak positively about Islam or praise it. They suffer, however, from insufficient knowledge and intellectual incapacity.

The second group consists of those who do not appreciate Islam correctly (*ghayr al-munṣifīn*). It consists of four subgroups: Christian clerics (out to convert Muslims to Christianity), Zionists (seeking to weaken Islam in order to strengthen political and ideological Zionism), colonialists (*istiʿmāriyyūn*, in the service of colonial governments), and "free thinkers", Marxists and materialists (who aim to weaken the faith and morale of Muslims and mankind generally, in order to enslave them mentally and morally). This second group is held to constitute a coherent movement which tries to achieve through science what the Crusaders sought to do under the banner of religion: to dominate the Muslims.

Peters lists some typical themes which, according to this literature, *mustashriḳūn* explore in their efforts to defame Islam: the pretended lack of originality of

Islam, textual criticism of Ḳur'ān and historical criticism of *sunna* (*ḥadīth* literature), diversity in Islam, the position of non-Muslim minorities, concentration on periods of decline rather than growth in Islamic history, tendentious accounts of Islamic prescriptions like the *djihād*, etc.

While admitting that on closer analysis certain statements made by orientalists may indeed be seen as insulting to Muslim readers, Peters emphasises that the accusation that the majority of orientalists collaborated with the colonial governments is untrue: as philologists, they were far removed from contemporary politics. He then shows that one of the deeper reasons for the defamation of the orientalists and Oriental studies in general has been the onesidedness of these studies carried out by westerners—allegedly, a unilateral and unselfcritical operation performed by Western scholars on Eastern people who are patients in the original sense of the word ("sufferers"). This is also the deeper reason why Muslim critics identify orientalism with colonialism: both exclude an equal exchange between two parties and imply that the one party simply regards and treats the other as an "object". Perhaps because of their high expectations, Muslim critics feel strongly that *mustashrikūn* misunderstand them profoundly and, as they tend to see it, intentionally. If suspicion deepens into distrust, it may even produce a desire to repay Western culture and religion for what the West is supposed to have tried to do to Islamic culture and religion. As a possible solution, Peters suggests that Western researchers into Islam should be able and willing to collaborate with Muslim researchers.

The reproaches described here have been repeated at various times and on various levels. For instance, A.J. Wensinck's official appointment (1933) by King Fu'ād to the Royal Academy of the Arabic Language in Cairo had to be revoked in 1934 under pressure from Muslim activists in Cairo, since his article on *Ibrāhīm* in the *EI* (1st edition) spoke of the Ḳur'ān as relating the "legend" of Ibrāhīm, not his historical reality (see file by L. Massignon on this matter in the University Library of Leiden). Ideological attacks on *mustashrikūn* have been made precisely by people who do not know what scholarship is, and those who know better have not been able to express themselves often because of political and social pressures.

Muslim intellectuals who have studied in the West articulate their reproaches on another level. A recurrent one levelled at the *mustashrikūn* is their lack of the necessary scientific tools to acquire sufficient or true knowledge about Muslim societies and Islam, for instance, competence in the social sciences. The texts which they read do not allow them to draw the right conclusions about Muslim societies and cultures. A second reproach is that they display a cool objectivity, a lack of sympathy or a hidden antipathy even going so far as hatred towards Islam and Muslim societies. The orientalists allegedly exhibit a lack of modesty and a profound incapacity or unwillingness to understand correctly. A third reproach directed at them is their lack of concern with, let alone commitment to, any real improvement in the situation of the people or any authentic development of the societies they study. Summing up, what Muslim critics object to appears to be, above all, a certain inhumane and incommunicative attitude to be found in the West and among orientalists. While claiming to be true knowledge, in fact their scholarship is used by political and ideological agencies and serves to humiliate Muslims as human beings and denigrate their religion, which to them is the highest value.

The relative naivety of many orientalists about their paradoxical situation and their complex condition as bridge-makers between cultures becomes manifest precisely in their emotional reactions of disappointment and anger about such attacks. They feel that, despite their good intentions, and quite incomprehensibly, their scientific work is not understood, let alone appreciated. It is even intentionally misrepresented by the people they study and about whom they claim to present objective scientific knowledge.

Misunderstandings exist on both sides.

iii. Oriental studies as a risk: the meeting of cultures

From the way in which *mustashrikūn* have defined their work and tended to react to critical responses, it becomes clear that in general scholars in Oriental studies have not been prepared for the problems of cultural interaction they have encountered and in which they became involved. They have had little idea of what could happen when, in the name of Science, they started to publish things which offended values not in their own but in another living society and culture. They have had little idea or concern that they could offend people who had become sensitive to any attacks on what they felt to be their basic norms and values, indeed their identity, and who often saw such attacks everywhere.

From the responses described it also becomes clear that, within Muslim societies at the time, very few people have known or understood what Western scholars and in particular orientalists have been doing. They have understood still less what *mustashrikūn* can know scientifically and what are the limits of their science, where the realm of private opinions begins. Given a lack of ordinary everyday communication, much of the natural suspicion of foreigners who, for some mysterious aims and purposes, want to know a foreign society, has been projected on the orientalist in situations of political tension or conflict.

In the ensuing debate on "orientalism", the very perspective in which orientalists carry out their studies is at stake. Consequently, some kind of fundamental reflection is required and to this Edward W. Said's book *Orientalism*, because of its provocative *J'accuse!* tone, seems only to have opened the door halfway. There is no reason why the notion of the "Orient" should not be replaced by a less ambiguous notion, for instance "peoples and cultures of Asia and Africa". There is no reason either why the philological and historial approaches should not be seen within a broader multi-perspective framework in which, for instance, the social sciences and in particular cultural anthropology but also the study of religion have their part to play. Again, the study of living societies and their aspirations, as well as of the underlying norm and value systems, can gain immensely from the collaboration of scholars who themselves come from such societies and have grown up in the traditions concerned. Again, for the study of contemporary societies it is mandatory that researchers have free access to them, meet people and work together with researchers from the country concerned.

It is also questionable whether in the human and social sciences, including history and comparative religion, any research can claim to be satisfactory when it takes no account of the points of view and the values of the people under study. Any kind of social science research, for instance, which objectifies human beings to fit into a particular scholarly model remains limited within the parameters of the model applied. It cannot claim to offer much knowledge

about a society or culture beyond the limits of the particular model chosen or the experimental situation analysed.

As a consequence, the search for knowledge of Oriental as of all foreign societies and cultures requires insight in given limits and absence of any desire to dominate. The venture of intercultural studies requires that the researcher take the personal step of leaving his own world for a time, and reaching a world of other people, for which real communication is required. In the complex relations between people from different societies and cultures, the orientalists, like the anthropologists, at best belong to the few who, not essentially bound by loyalties to either party, in principle have the capacity to transcend the clash of societies and cultures, and for that matter religions, on a personal level. Failing in mediation is the risk of the profession, but it is something to be learned from.

iv. Muslim studies of other cultures and religions

Just as Western orientalists have shown an interest in Islamic civilisation and religion, Muslim scholars recently have developed an increasing interest in the common history of the Muslim world and the West, for instance, in the various forces which have shaped European history. After some travel accounts in the mediaeval period, European culture was "discovered" first by Ottoman Turks and Arabs and later in particular by students from Muslim countries studying in Europe. This interest has been pursued now by professional researchers. Already in the mediaeval period Muslim thinkers had shown a certain interest in other cultures and religions than Islam, and this interest may arise again (J. Waardenburg, *World religions as seen in the light of Islam*, in *Islam: past influence and present challenge*, ed. A.T. Welch and P. Cachia, Edinburgh 1979, 245-75).

4. Progress in Islamic studies since the Second World War

The advancement of Islamic studies since the Second World War can be indicated briefly on three levels: that of institutions and organisation, that of areas covered, and that of reorientations of a more fundamental nature.

i. Institutions and organisation

There is a trend, cautious in Europe and gradual in North America, for university appointments in Islamic languages and history, as well as in social science research on Muslim societies, to include an increasing number of researchers and scholars from Muslim countries themselves. If, at the beginning of the fifties, they were mainly language informants, at present qualified Muslim scholars may occupy posts at higher levels too. The increasing number of Muslim students in Islamic studies at Western universities means that possibilities of instruction and communication have multiplied not only in teaching but later also in research. Whatever the ideas on orientalists in Muslim countries, direct contact with them in the West has become possible on a scale and in ways unimaginable before the Second World War.

Besides the older Oriental research associations, new organisations have been founded specifically to promote the study of the Middle East and Islam, encouraging fresh approaches and new ways of questioning. Local organisations are increasingly coming under the umbrella of larger organisations which stimulate research and mutual collaboration, for instance the *Union européenne d'Arabisants et d'Islamisants* in Europe, and the *Middle East Studies Association* of North America. Besides larger meetings and congresses, workshops and colloquia of a new kind are organised on specialised subjects, with a restricted number of participants from different countries. A new type of research institute, specifically for Islamic Studies, with good libraries, has emerged, like the Institute of Islamic Studies at McGill University in Montreal. There are also several Centres dedicated to the study of Muslim-Christian relations: in Hartford, Ct., USA; in Birmingham, England; and the Pontifical Institute of Arabic and Islamic Studies in Rome.

There are, however, some worrying developments too. Current budget cuts in most Western countries threaten the standard of Islamic studies. There are several cases where financial assistance from Islamic foundations or Muslim countries has permitted chairs to survive. In the present unemployment situation it would be of great help if translation programmes like that of Ṭabarī's *History* could be set up, funded by Muslim foundations or oil-producing states, where younger academics could usefully be employed.

Great care has to be taken that Western academic institutions continue to guarantee freedom of research and publication in the field of Islamics as in other fields. In some notorious recent cases, for instance, pressure has been exerted by Muslim interest groups in connection with university appointments and publications concerning Islam. In other cases, excessively pedantic programming or the organisation of the study of Islam along rigid ideological lines have thwarted research and the emergence of fresh ideas. Academic Islamic studies ought not to serve particular interests but develop as an autonomous field of teaching and research.

Recent history has increased interest in the Middle East, Islamic movements in the region and Islam in general. The immigration of millions of Muslim workers to Western Europe has stimulated more detailed research about Muslim ways of life in general and in the West in particular.

ii. Some areas of research

By contrast with the period before the Second World War, the need for specialisation among Islamicists and scholars in Oriental studies generally has become imperative. If in former times at least some scholars could still realise something of the ideal of the universal man, at present all *mustashriḳūn* have become specialists. Among them a distinction has developed between those who carry out research on the so-called "hard", infrastructural sectors of Muslim societies (in particular social scientists) and those who study the so-called "softer" sectors of language and literature, art and history, culture and religion (in particular humanistic scholars). A distinction has also emerged between those specialists who work on specific Muslim societies, regions and periods, and those who work on particular cultural expressions like art or religion which are common to all Muslim regions. We indicate now, by way of example, some areas of research which have gained prominence since the Second World War.

First of all, precious bibliographical surveys of Islamic history have been published (Cl. Cahen, J.D. Pearson, J. Sauvaget) and manuscript resources brought together (F. Sezgin). Solid historical research has been going on according to the lines laid down since the rise of Islamic studies (H.A.R. Gibb, G.E. von Grunebaum, H. Laoust, B. Lewis). Within the realm of historical studies, social and economic history have enjoyed rapid development (Cl. Cahen, M. Rodinson) and have also thrown new light on the beginnings of Islam and the history of Islamic thought (W. Montgomery Watt). The volume *Islamologie* (ed.

F.M. Pareja) represents the field and the state of Islamic studies as conceived in the 1950s.

Second, critical philological and literary analysis applied to the Ḳur'ān has led to new questions about its early history and composition (A. Neuwirth, J. Wansborough). Similarly, critical *ḥadīth* research has provided further insight into the history, nature and function of this kind of literature (G.H.A. Juynboll) as well as its meaning and that of the Ḳur'ān as "Divine Word" (W.A. Graham). New questions have been put concerning the early history of Islam (M. Cook, P. Crone). Equally, early Islamic thought has been analysed and certain basic positions identified (J. van Ess). Careful research on the semantics of religious terminology has proved rewarding for our understanding of the Ḳur'ān and other religious texts (T. Izutsu). Semiotic research has opened up basic structures in Islamic discourse and writing (M. Arkoun).

More attention has been given to the notion of the Muslim community (*umma*) both in its ideal forms (L. Gardet) and in social reality (W. Montgomery Watt). This has led to further research both on the legal and social status of women within Muslim societies in the past and at present (G. Ascha, L. Beck-N. Keddie and many others), and on the legal and social status of non-Muslim minorities (A. Fattal, S.D. Goitein, A. Hourani, B. Lewis), and the functioning of religious institutions, in particular religious authorities (*ʿulamāʾ*, Ṣūfī *shaykhs*) (N. Keddie) and religious education (G. Makdisi).

Extensive research has been carried out on Islam outside the heartlands of Islam, e.g., in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent (A. Ahmad, A. Schimmel, W.C. Smith) and Africa (J. Cuoq, J. Spencer Trimingham).

A field which hardly existed before the Second World War, for various reasons, and which has expanded tremendously, is that of contemporary developments in Islam. General surveys have become rare (H.A.R. Gibb, W.C. Smith, W. Ende-U. Steinbach); specialisation has become the rule here too. Attention has continued to be paid to popular Islam (L.R. and H. Kriss) as well as sectarian forms of communal Islam (Klaus E. Müller), devotional practices (C. Padwick) and mysticism (A. Schimmel). Islamic aspects of recent social history (J. Berque) and of political developments (O. Carré, J. Piscatori and many others) in the Arab world and elsewhere have attracted ever more interest. This is also true for the developments of *ṭuruḳ* in modern times (M. Gilsenan, F. de Jong) and of reform and modernisation movements (A. Hussain, M.H. Kerr and others) as well as the Muslim Brotherhood (R.P. Mitchell).

Due to recent developments in Iran and elsewhere, Shīʿī Islam has become an area of renewed interest (first of all H. Corbin, later S.H. Nasr for its gnostic aspects; H. Enayat, K.H. Göbel and others for political thought), as has the more recent history of Iran (N. Keddie, A.K.S. Lambton).

The most noteworthy and innovating contribution to our knowledge of present-day living Islam, however, has probably been made by anthropologists specialised in particular Muslim regions (C. Geertz, E. Gellner, M. Gilsenan and others) or surveying the various Muslim peoples (R.V. Weekes).

An area of research which is developing is that of the study of different religions existing side by side in the same region, for instance the Middle East (A.J. Arberry) and the Indian Subcontinent (W.C. Smith). Questions have been raised about the relationships and interaction between Muslim and other religious communities in history (W.C. Smith) and the development of knowledge in the Muslim world about other religions and the formation of images about them (G. Monnot, J. Waardenburg). The relationships between the Muslim world and Europe have been the subject of historical and comparative studies (M. Canard, G.E. von Grunebaum, A. Hourani, B. Lewis).

The study of Muslim minorities outside the Muslim countries has become a new area of research, especially since the migration of Muslim workers to Europe and the establishment of mainly Turkish and North African communities there (F. Dassetto, T. Gerholm-Yngve G. Lithman, G. Kepel, J.S. Nielsen, H. Safar and others).

iii. New orientations

The question should be raised, to what extent the general scholarly view of Islam has changed in the last decades, not only in the expansion of its subject areas and themes of research but also in the way in which Islam and Muslim societies and cultures as a whole are approached? Or more precisely, has our view of Islam changed intrinsically since the classical times of Goldziher and Snouck Hurgronje, say since the First World War? The answer must be affirmative.

In the first place, breakthroughs have been achieved thanks to the innovations of some prominent scholars: L. Massignon revealing the presence of largely unknown spiritual forces in Islam; G.E. von Grunebaum stressing fundamental analogies between mediaeval cultural expressions in the Muslim, Byzantine and Latin worlds; W.C. Smith affirming first the role of class and the national independence struggle in Muslim presentations of Islam and then Islam's specific kind of faith and its taking shape in various ways; C. Geertz and others calling attention to basic patterns and variations of meaning within Muslim societies; M.G.S. Hodgson writing a new kind of overall history of "the venture of Islam" within world history; and M. Rodinson urging a reconsideration of aims and tools of research in Islamic studies and, on the basis of infrastructural factors, throwing new light on Islamic ideologies developed in history and at the present time.

In the second place, the rise of independent Muslim nation states has brought about an important change in perspective. If older generations of Islamicists customarily regarded contemporary Islam as void of political expression and Muslim societies as developing according to the needs and directives of the West, researchers who started their work after the Second World War, in the fifties, sixties and seventies, have inevitably developed very different views of today's Muslim world, stressing its own internal dynamics.

In the third place, Muslims themselves have asserted their Islamic identity during the last decades in ways that were hardly imagined in the fifties. Such self-assertation in words and deeds, including intense political action, can no longer be interpreted simply as a rebellion against Western law and order. It has its own impetus and since the mid-sixties and still more the late seventies it has had unforeseen effects both political and religious, resisting various current forms of domination. Muslim Islamicists (Fazlur Rahman, Muhammad Arkoun) working in Western universities have given their own interpretations of such developments, M. Arkoun pleading for an applied islamology. Once-aloof Western scholars, too, have become alert to new responsibilities, scholarly and social.

All of this has led to a certain shift in perspective on Islam and the Muslim world at large, with its natural

implications for the development of scholarly research. We may summarise this change of perspective by trying to identify roughly three successive phases since the Second World War which have each implied a new orientation towards Islam.

a. The first phase is that immediately following the colonial period. Scholars in the forties and fifties tended to be very aware of the effects of Western culture in the broadest sense on Muslim societies, which had just been liberated from Western political dominance. The focus of attention was on processes of modernisation, sometimes simply put on a par with "westernisation". Islam was seen as an ancient tradition which seemed to be losing ground under the policies of the rather secular-minded national leaders after independence. Perhaps Von Grunebaum's interpretation of modern Islam as a search for cultural identity (1962) can be seen as representative of this orientation which, in any case, took a positive attitude towards the future of the Muslim world whose own historical and cultural identity it recognised. It thus distinguished itself from the more pessimistic views of scholars of the colonial period such as Snouck Hurgronje, who saw a future only in assimilation to the West.

b. The second phase started when scholars observed that profound and radical economic and social changes were taking place in Muslim countries, often after internal revolutions. Researchers on contemporary Muslim societies became attentive to the use of Islam as a social ideology justifying necessary or desired social changes. Islam, instead of being a hangover from the past, was being used to effect by influential leaders like Gamāl ʿAbd al-Nāṣir. The adjective "Islamic", far from suggesting something antiquated, was serving to connect present-day solutions with hallowed, age-old religious tradition. Scholars came to realise that processes and events in Muslim countries should be studied not only in terms of Western theories but also within their own cultural framework, in which they became more meaningful. The social functions of Islamic ideas and practices, the social basis of changing interpretations of Islam, the social causes for changes in religious institutions, or institutions legitimated by religion, all became subjects of research. Scholars became aware that elements of Islam could convey political, social and religious meanings simultaneously, and that particular ideologisations of Islam, or chosen Islamic ideas and practices, could appeal explicitly to specific groups in particular circumstances. In short, there was a discovery of Islam as a social ideology, and social scientists started to cooperate in building on this discovery in research on Islam.

c. With the self-affirmation of Islam not only as a social but as a religious ideology, a new phase started. This may be dated broadly speaking from the late sixties in the Middle East and it then spread throughout the Muslim world as a whole. As a result, scholarly attention has come to be directed more towards Islam as a religion and faith which is appealed to in different ways according to country and group. While recognised as a religion providing its own absolute norms and values, Islam is then seen not only as an instrument of political action but also as an instance of appeal against various kinds of injustice, economic deprivation and political oppression. In this phase, the contribution of the study of religion is needed to lay bare the religious aspects, amongst others, of present-day appeals to Islam.

To ensure that scholarly standards are maintained and intellectual rigour is preserved when religion is the object of inquiry, the following remarks are in order.

First of all, Islam is not an empirical piece of data in the same way as a text, a practice or even an ideal which is subjected to the scrutiny of scholarly enquiry. The way in which Islam, in research, is conceptualised, what is held to be the reality of Islam, and whether the scholarly concept of religion (and of Islam) used is simply descriptive or also normative, largely depends on the theoretical framework within which a particular scholar is working. The variability of frameworks and point of departure explains the fact of continous discussions taking place amongst orientalists, between Muslims and orientalists, and among Muslims themselves about what is to be understood by Islam.

Second, when we address our research to the interpretations which Muslims themselves have given of Islam as a religion, some hermeneutical warnings are in order. Scholars as well as believers have often tended to reify Islam, forgetting that we have to do not with an "Islam" in itself but alway with an interpreted Islam and that, throughout history, the Muslim community has kept this interpretative process going. Accordingly, special attention should be paid to what Muslim authors, speakers, groups and movements actually mean when they express themselves in particular situations in terms Islamic or with an appeal to Islam. In such research we should free ourselves as much as possible from current interpretations, applications or explanations or Islam, both Western and Muslim.

What can the study of religion contribute to a better grasp of the religious aspects of Islam and Muslim societies and cultures? Islam as a religion, in the strict sense of the word, can probably best be called a network of signs; when such signs are internalised, they become symbols. The Ḳurʾān itself hints at such an interpretation, for Islam, according to it, is supposed to constitute the right human response to the *āyāt* that mankind has been provided with, notably in the Ḳurʾān, in nature, and in history. These *āyāt* are considered to be nexus points of divine revelation and human reflection, and Muslims are enjoined to draw the right conclusions from them and to act accordingly. But even apart from this, a scholar of Islam as a religion will study its elements (Ḳurʾān verses, *aḥādīṯ*, ritual prescriptions, living traditions, etc.) as signs and symbols. His enquiry will concern the various ways in which particular Muslim persons and groups in specific situations have interpreted these elements of Islam and the ways in which they have acted.

Insofar as this scholarly approach runs parallel to a notion of religion present in the Ḳurʾān, it avoids stamping Islamic data with inadequate Western-coined concepts, while remaining scientific. A study of Islam as a network and reservoir of signs and symbols, constantly interpreted and applied by individual members and groups of the community, reveals certain texts and practices as permanent vehicles of meaning; these permit communication between Muslims despite varying circumstances of place and time. By approaching Islam as a communicative, religious sign and symbol system, we avoid the one extreme of searching for an eternal essence of Islam and reifying it as well as the other extreme of denying any spiritual reality to Islam as measured against the material world. The focus of attention from the point of view of the study of religions should be the interpretations and usages which Muslims have made and make of "their" Islam and its elements. This is fruit-

ful to understand, for instance, what particular Muslims mean when they speak of applying the *sharīʿa*, establishing an Islamic state, or going back to the sources of Islam.

5. Needs and suggestions

The community of the *mustashriḳūn* has become ever more varied and, from the inside, this diversity is just the opposite of what their opponents ascribe to them. They are anything but an ideological bloc, and their present discourse is anything but spellbound by a magic Orient. Present-day conflicts and tensions in and around Muslim countries, particularly in the Middle East, make it nearly impossible for serious, hard working scholarship to float away on the clouds of the Orient or anywhere else.

The subject-matter of Islamic studies has become much less clearly identifiable among *mustashriḳūn* now than in former times, when orientalists were less specialised and Muslims ideologised Islam less. For a long time, a more or less stable image of Islam existed in scholarly research, as a historical reality and a set of doctrines and practices (J. Waardenburg, *L'Islam dans le miroir de l'Occident*, 1970³). This image has been broken by the course of history and the progress of specialised scholarly research. At the same time, new religious, ideological, political and other "readings" of Islam have arisen, of very different kinds, so that one may speak also of a growing plurality of interpretations of Islam among Muslims.

One of the most pressing problems on a more theoretical level is the way in which any particular (Muslim) interpretation and application of (elements of) Islam is related to the particular historical and social context in which it occurs. How should the study of specific Muslim societies in the past and at present be linked to the study of the specific ways in which Islam has been interpreted and applied in those societies? And the other way round, how should the study of interpretations of Islam be related to the study of Muslim societies?

A solution to this problem, at least on a theoretical level, seems to be within reach. For one thing, a certain fixed "reifying" or essentialist view of Islam is being replaced by a view of Islam as a subject of an ongoing process of interpretation. Second, a certain rigid "model" view of Muslim societies is being replaced by a view which allows for a much more precise and differentiated observation of them, their social history and their corresponding articulations of Islam.

Another need in Islamic studies and Oriental studies generally is for scholars to acquaint themselves more than before with certain new developments in the human sciences, including the science of religion, which take place across the borders between the disciplines. Too exclusive a devotion to philology, history or anthropology leaves little time for enquiry about what happens in other disciplines and what can be learnt from them. It also increases the risk of Oriental studies being cultivated as in a ghetto apart from and somehow backward compared to other fields of scholarship.

Again, the field of Islamic studies as well as the study of non-Western societies and cultures in general would also greatly benefit if research problems were to be formulated on a somewhat higher level of abstraction than is done in the day-to-day "technical" work. More reflection on problems of method and theory of research would certainly facilitate cooperation between Islamic studies and other fields of scholarship, including science of religion.

Finally, it may be suggested that, now that the classical image of Islam as a more or less closed entity of religion and culture has been broken, efforts be made to place Islamic history, societies and religious expressions within the broader history of mankind, the manifold human societies, and the large number of man's religious expressions. Special attention can be paid to historical interactions, and to similarities and differences by means of comparative research. In order to understand contemporary developments in Muslim societies, it will be useful to place them within the broader context of contemporary developments of Asian and African societies generally.

Bibliography: History of Islamic studies in general: V. Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes publiés dans l'Europe chrétienne de 1810 à 1885*, Liège-Leipzig 1892 ff.; G. Dugat, *Histoire des Orientalistes de l'Europe du XIIe au XIXe siècle*, Paris 1868-70; J. Fück, *Die arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig 1956; F. Gabrieli, *Histoire et civilisation de l'Islam en Europe*, Paris 1983; A.Hourani, *Europe and the Middle East*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1980 (esp. chs. 1 and 2); idem, *Islam in European thought*, Cambridge 1991; *Islamic studies: a tradition and its problems*, ed. M.H. Kerr, Malibu 1983; *Orientalism and the study of Islam in the West*, ed. A. Nanji, Scholars Press, 1991; G. Pfannmüller, *Handbuch der Islam-Literatur*, Berlin-Leipzig 1923; M. Rodinson, *La fascination de l'Islam*, Paris 1980, Eng. tr. *Europe and the mystique of Islam*, Seattle-London 1987; R. Schwab, *La renaissance orientale*, Paris 1950; G. Sievenich and H. Budde (eds.), *Europa und der Orient 800-1900*, Gütersloh-Munich 1989; M.-Th. d'Alverny, *La connaissance de l'Islam en Occident du IXe siècle au milieu du XIIe siècle*. In *Actes Congrès de Spolète 1964*, ii, 577-602.

Mediaeval Period: G.A. Bezzola, *Die Mongolen in abendländischer Sicht (1220-1270). Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Völkerbegegnungen*, Berne-Munich 1974; A. Castro, *The structure of Spanish history*, Princeton 1954; N. Daniel, *Islam and the West. The making of an image*, Edinburgh 1960; idem, *The Arabs and Mediaeval Europe*, London 1975; A. Ducellier, *Le miroir de l'Islam. Musulmans et chrétiens d'Orient au Moyen Age (VIe-XIe siècles)*, Paris 1971; *Images et signes de l'Orient dans l'Occident médiéval*, Marseilles 1982; *Islam et chrétiens*, Toulouse-Fanjeaux 1983; S. Jargy (ed.), *Les Arabes et l'Occident. Contacts et échanges*, Geneva 1982; J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, Princeton 1964; G. Makdisi, *The rise of colleges. Institutions of learning in Islam and the West*, Edinburgh 1981; U. Monneret de Villard, *Lo studio dell'Islam nel XII e nel XIII secolo*, Città del Vaticano 1944; E.A. Myers, *Arabic thought and the Western world in the Golden Age of Islam*, New York 1964; *L'Occidente e l'Islam nel alto medioevo*, 2 vols., Spoleto 1965; Kh.I. Semaan (ed.), *Islam and the Medieval West. Aspects of intercultural relations*, Albany 1980; Ph. Sénac, *L'Image de l'autre. L'Occident médiéval face à l'Islam*. Paris 1983; R.W. Southern, *Western views of Islam in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, Mass. 1962; M. Steinschneider, *Die europäischen Übersetzungen aus dem Arabischen bis Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (1904-5), repr. Graz 1956; J. Vernet, *Ce que la culture doit aux Arabes d'Espagne*, Paris 1985; W.M. Watt, *The influence of Islam on Medieval Europe*. Edinburgh 1972; idem and P. Cachia, *A history of Islamic Spain*, Edinburgh 1965.

Period 1500-1800: J. Balagna Coustou, *Arabe et humanisme dans la France des derniers Valois*, Paris 1989; idem, *L'imprimerie arabe en Occident (XVIe, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles)*, Paris 1984; H. Bobzin, *Über*

Theodor Biblianders Arbeit am Koran (1542/3), in *ZDMG* 136/2 [1986], 347-63; J. Brugman and F. Schröder, *Arabic studies in the Netherlands*, Leiden 1979; N. Daniel, *Islam, Europe and empire*, Edinburgh 1966; G. Dugat, *Histoire des Orientalistes*, i, Paris 1868; A. de Gubernatis, *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire des études orientales en Italie*, Paris-Florence 1876; Dj. Hadidi, *Voltaire et l'Islam*, Paris 1974; H. Laurens, *Les origines intellectuelles de l'expédition d'Egypte. L'Orientalisme Islamisant en France (1698-1798)*, Istanbul-Paris 1987; *Levinus Warner and his legacy. Three centuries of the Legatum Warnerianum in the Leiden University Library*. Leiden 1970; P. Raphael, *Le rôle du Collège Maronite Romain dans l'orientalisme aux XVIIe et XVIIIe Siècles*, Beirut 1950; V. Segesvary, *L'Islam et la Réforme. Etude sur l'attitude des Réformateurs zurichois envers l'Islam (1510-1550)*. Lausanne 1977; C.-F.Ch. Volney, *Voyage en Egypte et en Syrie*, publié par J. Gaulmier, Paris-The Hague 1959; C.F. Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, Halle 1811.

History of Islamic studies in particular countries (19th and 20th centuries):

France: *Cinquante ans d'orientalisme en France 1922-1972*, in *JA*, cclxi (1973), 89-107; D. Reig, *Homo orientaliste. La langue arabe en France depuis le XIXe siècle*. Paris 1988; G. Salmon, *Bibliothèque des arabisants français*, 2 vols., Le Caire 1905-1923.

Germany: E. Bär, *Bibliographie zur deutschsprachigen Islamwissenschaft und Semitistik vom Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts bis heute*. Vol. 1. *Publikationen lebender Gelehrter*, Wiesbaden 1985, Vol. 2. *Verstorbene Gelehrten A-He*, Wiesbaden 1991; E. Littmann, *Ein Jahrhundert Orientalistik: Lebensbilder aus der Feder von Enno Littmann und Verzeichnis seiner Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1955; R. Paret, *The study of Arabic and Islam at German universities: German orientalists since Theodor Nöldeke*. Wiesbaden 1968; H. Preisler and M. Robbe (eds.), *Islamic studies in the German Democratic Republic. Traditions, positions, findings*, in *Asia, Africa, Latin America*, x (East Berlin 1982); H.R. Roemer, *Spezialisierung, Integration und Innovation in der deutschen Orientalistik*, in *WI*, xxviii (1988), 475-497; U. Steinbach, *Neuere Entwicklungen in der deutschen gegenwartsbezogenen Islamwissenschaft*, in *Die Herausforderung des Islam: ein ökumenisches Lesebuch*, ed. R. Italiaander, Göttingen 1987, 260-273.

Israel: J. Carpi, *Books and articles relating to the Middle East published in Israel 1948-1973*, Tel Aviv 1978.

Netherlands: *A bibliography of Dutch publications on the Middle East and Islam 1945-1981*, compiled by A.H. de Groot and R. Peters, Nijmegen 1981; B.J. Boland and I. Farjon, *Islam in Indonesia: a bibliographical survey 1600-1942, with post-1945 addenda*, Dordrecht-Boston 1983; J. Brugman and F. Schröder, *Arabic studies in the Netherlands* (up to *ca.* 1925), Eng. and Arab., Leiden 1979; F. de Jong, *Middle Eastern studies in the Netherlands*, in *MESA Bulletin*, xx (1986), 171-186.

Spain: J.T. Monroe, *Islam and the Arabs in Spanish scholarship, Sixteenth century to the present*, Leiden 1970.

United Kingdom: A.J. Arberry, *Oriental essays: portraits of seven scholars*, London 1960; idem, *British orientalists*, London 1942.

USA: R. Baily Winder, *Four decades of Middle Eastern study*, in *MEJ*, xli (1987), 40-63; B. Lewis, *The state of Middle Eastern studies*, in *The American Scholar*, xlviii (1979), 365-381.

USSR: *Fifty years of Soviet oriental studies: brief reviews*, ed. Institute of the Peoples of Asia, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow 1968; A.I. Ionova, *Soviet studies of Islam in the oriental countries (1970-1982)*, Orientalist Congress Tokyo 1983; I.Y. Kratchkovsky, *Among Arabic manuscripts. Memories of libraries and men*, Leiden 1953; idem, *Die russische Arabistik. Umriss ihrer Entwicklung*, Leipzig 1957; S.D. Miliband, *Biobibliografitseski slovar sovietskič vostokovedov*, Moscow 1975; N.A. Kuznetsova and L.M. Kulagina, *Iz istorii sovietskogo vostokovieleniya 1917-1967*, Moscow 1970; N.A. Smirnov, *Očerk istorii izučeniya Islama v SSSR*, Moscow 1954, Eng. abridgement *Islam and Russia*, London 1956; *Soviet oriental studies today*, ed. Institute of Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow 1980; W. Walther, *Fünf Jahrzehnte sowjetische Arabistik*, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, xxvi (1969), 34-45.

Methodology: A. Abdel-Malek, *The end of Orientalism*, in *Diogenes*, xliv (1963), 103-40; M. Arkoun, *Pour une critique de la raison islamique*, Paris 1984; idem, *L'Islam moderne vu par le Professeur G.E. von Grunebaum*, in idem, *Essais sur la pensée islamique*, Paris 1973, 183-96; E. Burke III, *The first crisis of Orientalism 1890-1914*, in *Connaissances du Maghreb. Sciences sociales et colonisation*, Paris 1984, 213-26; J.-P. Charnay, *Jeux de miroirs et crisis de civilisations. Réorientations du rapport Islam/islamologie*, in *Archives de Sociologie des Religions*, xxxiii (1972), 135-74; A. Laroui, *Les Arabes et l'anthropologie culturelle. Remarques sur la méthode de Gustave von Grunebaum*, in idem, *La crise des intellectuels arabes, traditionalisme ou historicisme?*, Paris 1974, 59-102; R.C. Martin (ed.), *Approaches to Islam in religious studies*, Tucson 1985; J.-J. Waardenburg, *L'Islam dans le miroir de l'Occident*. The Hague-Paris 1970[3]; idem, *Changes in perspective in Islamic studies over the last decades*, in *Humaniora Islamica*, i (1973), 247-60; idem, *Islam studied as a sign and signification system*, in *Humaniora Islamica*, ii (1974), 267-85; idem, *Islamforschung aus religionswissenschaftlicher Sicht*, in *XII. Deutscher Orientalistentag. 24.-29. März 1980 in Berlin*, ed. F. Steppat, Wiesbaden 1982, 197-211; idem, *Humanities, social sciences and Islamic studies*, in *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, i (1990) 66-88; idem, *Social sciences and the study of Islam*, in *Studies on religions in the context of social sciences*, ed. W. Tyloch, Warsaw 1990, 186-204.

Muslim responses: Bibliographies in *al-Fikr al-ʿArabī* (Beirut), xxxiiii (1983), 241-4, and in *ʿĀlam al-kutub* (Riyāḍ), v (1984), 90-147; A. Adnan-Adıvar, *A Turkish account of orientalism. A translation of the Introduction to the Turkish edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam* (sc. *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, since 1940), in *MW*, xliii (1953), 260-82; N. ʿAḳīḳī, *al-Mustashrikūn*, 4th ed. in 3 vols., Cairo 1980; *Manāhidj al-mustashrikīn fi 'l-dirāsāt al-ʿarabiyya al-islāmiyya*, 2 vols., publ. by ALESCO and the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States, Riyāḍ 1985; R. Peters, *Abendländische Islamkunde aus morgenländischer Sicht*, in *Wij en het Midden-Oosten/Middle East Studies: whence and whither*, Nijmegen 1987, 61-72; E. Rudolph, *Westliche Islamwissenschaft im Spiegel muslimischer Kritik: Grundzüge und aktuelle Merkmale einer innerislamischen Diskussion*, Berlin 1991; Ḳ. al-Sāmarrāʾī, *al-Istishrāḳ bayna 'l-mawḍūʿiyya wa 'l-iftiʿāliyya*, Riyāḍ 1403/1983; M.Ḥ. Zaḳzūḳ, *al-Istishrāḳ wa 'l-khalfiyya al-fikriyya li 'l-ṣirāʿ al-ḥaḍārī*, Beirut 1983.

Muslim views of the West: I. Abu-Lughod, *The Arab rediscovery of Europe: a study in cultural encounters*, Princeton 1963; A. Ayalon, *Language and change in the Arab Middle East. The evolution of modern political discourse*, Oxford-New York 1987; M.A. Ḥamdūn, *Islamic identity and the West in contemporary Arabic literature*, Ph. D. diss. Temple University

1976, unpubl.; B. Lewis, *The Muslim discovery of Europe*, New York-London 1982; idem, *Muslim perceptions of the west*, in E. Leites and M. Case (eds.), *As others see us. Mutual perceptions, East and West*, in *Comparative Civilizations Review*, xiii-xiv (1985-6), 3-16; T. Nagel (ed.), *Asien blickt auf Europa. Begegnungen und Irritationen*, Beirut 1990; N. Rahimieh, *Oriental responses to the West. Comparative essays in select writers from the Muslim world*, Leiden 1990; D. Shayegan, *Le regard mutilé. Schizophrénie culturelle: pays traditionnels face à la modernité*, Paris 1989; R. Wielandt, *Das Bild der Europäer in der modernen arabischen Erzähl- und Theaterliteratur*, Wiesbaden 1980.

Publications on Orientalism up to 1980: A. Abdel-Malek, *L'Orientalisme en crise*, in *Diogène*, xliv (1963), 109-42, Eng. tr. *The end of Orientalism*, in *Diogenes*, xliv (1963), 103-40; *Bio-bibliographies d'Iranisants*, in *Acta Iranica*, 4e série, i (1979); Cl. Cahen, *Letter*, in *Diogenes*, xlix (1965), 135-8; E. Dinet and S. ben Ibrahim, *L'Orient vu de l'Occident: Essai critique*, Paris n.d. (*ca.* 1925); F. Gabrieli, *Apologie de l'orientalisme*, in *Diogène*, l (1965), 134-42, tr. *Apology for orientalism*, in *Diogenes*, l (1965), 128-36; idem, *Propos d'un arabisant*, in *Diogène*, lxxxiii (1973), 3-15, tr. *Casual remarks of an Arabist*, in *Diogenes*, lxxxiii (1975), 1-11; B. Lewis, *The pro-Islamic Jews*, in *Islam and history. Ideas, men and events in the Middle East*, New York-London 1973, 123-37; D.P. Little, *Three Arab critiques of Orientalism*, in *MW*, lxix (1979), 110-31; F. Malti-Douglas, *In the eyes of others: the Middle Eastern response and reaction to Western scholarship*, in E. Leites and M. Case (eds.), *As others see us. Mutual perceptions, East and West*, in *Comparative Civilizations Review*, xiii-xiv (1985-6), 36-55; T. Nagel, *Gedanken über die europäische Islamforschung und ihr Echo im Orient*, in *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft*, lxii (1978), 21-39; E.W. Said, *Orientalism*, London and New York 1978, French tr. *L'Orientalisme: L'Orient créé par l'Occident*, Paris 1980, Ger. tr. *Orientalismus*, Frankfurt/M. 1981; idem, *Orientalism reconsidered*, in *Race and Class*, xxvii/2 (1985), 1-15; A.L. Tibawi, *English-speaking orientalists: a critique of their approach to Islam and Arab nationalism*, Geneva 1965; idem, *Second critique of English-speaking orientalists and their approach to Islam and the Arabs*, London 1979; idem, *On the Orientalists again*, in *MW*, lxx (1980), 56-61; B.S. Turner, *Marx and the end of orientalism*, London 1978; A.Z. Validi, *Considérations sur la collaboration scientifique entre l'Orient islamique et l'Europe*, in *REI* (1935), 249-71. Compare the pamphlet by Mohammad el Bahay, *The attitude of missionaries and orientalists towards Islam*, Cairo 1963.

Publications on Orientalism since 1980: M.M. Ahsan, *Orientalism and the study of Islam in the West: a select bibliography*, in *The Muslim World Bibliographical Review*, i (1981), 51-60; S.J. al-ʿAzm, *Orientalism and orientalism in reverse*, in *Khamsin*, viii (1981), 5-26; A. al-Azmeh, *The articulation of Orientalism*, in *Arab Studies Quarterly*, iii (1981), 384-402; M. Benabboud, *Orientalism and the Arab elite*, in *IQ*, xxvi (1982), 3-14; idem, *The Prophet's revelation and 20th century orientalists: the case of W.M. Watt and M. Rodinson*, in *Revue d'Histoire Maghrébine*, xiii (1986), 143-61; J.-P. Charnay, *Les Contre-Orients ou comment penser l'autrui selon soi*, Paris 1980; Th. Hentsch, *L'Orient Imaginaire. La vision politique occidentale de l'Est méditerranéen*. Paris 1988; R. Kabbani, *Europe's myths of the Orient*, Bloomington, Ind. 1986; B. Lewis, *The question of orientalism*, in *The New York Review of Books* (24 June 1982), 49-56 (with response by E.W. Said); *Orientalism, Islam, and Islamicists*, ed. A. Hussain *et alii*, Brattleboro, Vermont 1984; E.W. Said, *Covering Islam: how the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world*, New York 1981; idem, *Orientalism reconsidered* in *Race and Class. A Journal for Black and Third World Liberation*, xxvii/2 (1985), 1-15; E. Sivan, *Edward Said and his Arab reviewers*, in *Jerusalem Quarterly*, xxxv (1985), 11-23. Surveys: *Guide to Iranian studies in Europe*. Part One: *Institutions and teaching programmes in twelve countries of Western Europe*, Leiden 1988.

(J.D.J. WAARDENBURG)

AL-MUSTAʿṢIM BI 'LLĀH, ABŪ AḤMAD ʿABD ALLĀH B. AL-MUSTANṢIR, the last ʿAbbāsid caliph of Baghdād (640-56/1247-58), born in 609/1212-13.

After the death of his father in Djumādā I or II 640/November-December 1242, he was raised to the caliphal throne, but he had neither the talent nor the strength to avert the catastrophe threatening from the Mongols; he allowed himself to be guided by bad counsellors who were not agreed among themselves but working against one another. In 683/1255-6, the Mongol Khān Hūlāgū [*q.v.*] demanded that the Muslim rulers should make war on the Ismāʿīlīs of Alamūt. The caliph did not trouble about this, and in Rabīʿ I 655/March-April 1257 a Mongol embassy came to Baghdād and demanded that al-Mustaʿṣim should either raze the defences of the city and appear in person before Hūlāgū for further negotiations or send a deputy. As the caliph refused to meet these demands, Hūlāgū threatened him with war. After another message, in which al-Mustaʿṣim tried to intimidate Hūlāgū, the latter set out against the ancient city of the caliphs. On the way, he met another embassy, offering him an annual tribute, but this effort to appease the cruel foe was useless and by Muḥarram 656/January 1258, the Mongols were at the gates of Baghdād. Preparations for the siege advanced rapidly and after all attempts to resume negotiations had failed against the relentless Hūlāgū, al-Mustaʿṣim had to surrender on 4 Ṣafar/10 February and the city was sacked. Ten days later, Hūlāgū had the caliph, with some of his relations put to death [see BAGHDĀD], thus ending the line of ʿAbbāsids in Baghdād.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Ṭiḳṭaḳā, *al-Fakhrī*, ed. Derenbourg, 448-58; Kutubī, *Fawāt al-wafayāt*, ed. Cairo, i, 237-9, ed. I. ʿAbbās, ii, 230-5; Ibn Khaldūn, *al-ʿIbar*, iii, 536 ff.; Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. Quatremère, i, 228 ff.; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Ḳazwīnī, *Taʾrīkh-i Guzīda*, ed. Browne, i, 371-3; Weil, *Gesch. d. Chalifen*, iii, 470-8; Le Strange, *Baghdad during the Abbasid caliphate*, see index; A. Müller, *Der Islam*, i, 640, ii, 228 ff.; Muir, *The Caliphate*, new ed., 590 ff.; J.A. Boyle, *The death of the last ʿAbbāsid caliph: a contemporary Muslim account*, in *JSS*, vi (1961), 145-61; G.M. Wickens, *Naṣīr ad-Dīn Ṭūsī on the fall of Baghdad: a further study*, in *JSS*, vii (1962), 23-35; D.O. Morgan, *The Mongols*, Oxford 1986, 151-2.

(K.V. ZETTERSTÉEN)

MUSTAWFĪ (A.), an official in mediaeval Islamic administration who was in charge of official accounts and thus acted as an accountant-general.

The title first becomes generally used in the successor-states to the ʿAbbāsid caliphate. Under the Ghaznavids, the *mustawfī al-mamālik* was responsible to the vizier, and kept accounts of income and expenditure in the *dīwān-i wazīr* (M. Nāẓim, *The life and times of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna*, Cambridge 1931, 132). Under the Great Saldjūḳs, e.g., in the time of Niẓām al-Mulk [*q.v.*], the *mustawfī* was second in importance only to the vizier himself (al-Bundārī,