

nebilir. Ancak bütün bunlara rağmen yine de bazı kavramlar Türkçe'ye bence yanlış tercüme edilmiştir. Mesela, "religious pluralism" kavramı "dinî çeşitlilik" olarak değil, "dinî çoğulculuk" olarak tercüme edilmeliydi. "Dinî çeşitlilik" ifadesi daha ziyade "religious plurality" kavramına karşılık gelmektedir. "Reformed epistemology", "düzeltilmiş epistemoloji" değil, "reformcu epistemoloji" şeklinde; "love", "aşk" değil "sevgi" olarak; "contingent being", "şartlı varlık" değil, "mümkün varlık" olarak tercüme edilmeliydi. Tanrı'nın aşkından değil, sevgisinden bahsedilmesi daha uygundur (s. 90). Diğer taraftan "agnostic", "bilinemezci" şeklinde değil de "agnostik" olarak; "anthropomorphism" "insan biçimcilik" değil, "antrapomorfizm" olarak karşılansa çok daha isabetli olurdu. Zira bu kavramlar kısmen Türkçe'ye yerleşmiş durumdadır.

Bütün bunlara rağmen, nitelikli eserlerin oldukça az olduğu akademik din felsefesi sahasında, özellikle Batı'da bu alanda olup-bitenleri anlama mecburiyetinde olan lisansüstü çalışmalar yapan öğrencilere bu tercüme eserin oldukça faydalı olacağı kanaatindeyim.

Adnan Aslan
İSAM

The History of an Islamic School of Law: The Early Spread of Hanafism

Nurit Tsafir

Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004. XV + 199 pp.

Islamic schools of law, which were, and still are, means of expression of identity in Muslim societies; although they have been so for more than a millennium, only recently have the Islamic schools of law drawn the attention of a few modern studies in recent times. *The Early Spread of Hanafism* therefore contributes to our understanding of this phenomenon in Muslim history. The book is mainly based on *tabaqat* literature, including the *al-Jawāhir al-Mudiyya* by al-Qurashi and *Akhbār al-qudāh* by al-Wakī'. The time span is from around the middle of the second century A.H. until the end of the third century A.H. (from the mid-eighth century to the end of the ninth century A. D.). Although the title and sub-title give the impression that the study includes the early history of the Hanafi school, in fact, it does not explore one of two main centers of Hanafi school, namely northeastern Iran (Khorasan) and Transoxania (*Māwarā' al-Nahr*); instead the book focuses only on other

areas of the Abbasid Empire. Referring to Madelung in this respect appears to be nothing but an excuse, as the history of the early spread of the Hanafi school in Iran and Turan actually requires more attention, not only because Hanafism prevailed in this region long after it had lost its prominent position in other regions, but also because the predominance of the Hanafi school in Khorasan and Transoxania predated its hold even in Iraq, the birthplace of this school. As the author correctly emphasizes throughout this study, there was usually a close relationship between the Hanafi School and the Abbasid policies; after the latter gained power it carried out centralization policies, especially during the first Abbasid century, by allying itself with the Hanafi School in the field of law. This fact, when taken together with the early spread of the Hanafi School throughout Khorasan, the birthplace of the Abbasid revolution, requires a much more thorough analysis regarding the Abbasid link with Hanafism in this early period.

This book consists of seven chapters, the first of which gives N. Tsafirir's theoretical observations, while the remaining six chapters focus on six geographical areas; Iraq takes the lion's share, and then western Iran, the Jazira, Syria, Egypt and the Maghrib. The final chapter is a concluding chapter.

In the theoretical chapter, N. Tsafirir develops two terms, namely full-Hanafis and semi-Hanafis, with a view to making sense of anomalies and inconsistencies present in the language of *tabaqat* literature, particularly when the information in a Hanafi source is not congruent with the non-Hanafi sources. The main source of this study, namely the *el-Jawāhir* of al-Qurashi, identifies certain early figures as Hanafis, whereas non-Hanafi sources tell us that they were not exclusively so. In this respect, N. Tsafirir argues that in this early period we have to make a distinction between exclusive or full-Hanafis and those who had contact with the Hanafi circles or Hanafi doctrine; the latter are thus called "semi-Hanafis". It seems that the author, although correctly detecting the problematic remarks of the Hanafi *tabaqat* discourse, does not give due attention to a complicated theoretical point. As C. Melchert argues, even though it is overemphasized, in the century that followed the one in which the founding figures of the schools of law existed, one should not talk about the schools of law in the sense of *madh-hab*, rather, this should be used for times after the late third/ninth and early tenth centuries onwards. The word full-Hanafi, therefore, requires much greater reservations than the author of the book has used. On the other hand, Tsafirir's distinction between Hanafis and semi-Hanafis seems to work, and to a certain degree explains the problem

identified; this in turn requires revising Melchert's sweeping analysis that we cannot talk about the schools of law before the fourth/tenth century. If there were those who formed a community, supporting each other both through doctrinal and professional means, as shown in this study, then there was certainly group solidarity that paved the way to the later professional schools of law. After all Melchert, too, in his study of the schools of law neglects the Khorasanian and Transoxanian Hanafis, who seemed to have developed a group sense at a rather early date.

The book detects the spread of Hanafism by observing two groups in a given place through the biographical dictionaries; the first aspect observed is the investigation of the scholarly circles in order to determine the Hanafi affiliated scholars and groups. Here certain indications are taken as the sign of the existence of Hanafi communities in a city or town. In addition to the direct appellation of "Hanafi", the author also argues that those who were called *Jahmis* or *Murji'is* were usually Hanafis. Related to this is the fact that a scholar's support of the Mihna was taken as a sign of their affiliation with the Hanafi community. However, Tsafirir admits that not all the supporters of the Mihna were Hanafis; there were Hanafis who opposed the Mihna and sided with Ahmad b. Hanbal. Again, opposition to the latter, namely Ibn Hanbal, or Ibn Hanbal's criticism of a scholar was also another sign. It is observed that the cessation of the Mihna was a turning point on the part of Hanafis and caused them to lose ground to the traditionalists in the capital, Baghdad. It is observed that the Hanafis after the Mihna started to lose Abbasid support, and the Hanbalis and Shafi'is filled the gap.

The second point Tsafirir examines in order to identify the Hanafis is the office of *qadi*. Here the author observes that after the Abbasids seized power they carried out a policy of centralization by appointing *qadis* and initially they leaned towards Hijazi scholars, but from the last quarter of the third century A.H. they began to nominate Hanafi-affiliated scholars as *qadis*. A century later, in the main centers of the Abbasid Empire, with a few exceptions, the *qadis* who held office were generally Hanafi.

According to Tsafirir, local support or local affiliation was an important factor in introducing Hanafi teaching or appointing Hanafi *qadis* in a certain region. For example, in Basra, Hanafi teaching was introduced by two scholars, Zufar and Yūsuf b. Khālid al-Samtī, both of whom had a familial connection with the Arab tribes of Basra. In Maghrib too, the Hanafi doctrine was introduced by Asad b. Furāt; although he was a semi-Hanafi, soon after the doctrine was introduced it became adopted by local scholars

and was an equal rival with the Māliki school there until the turn of the third/ninth century. However, local support was not enough to secure the position of the Hanafī doctrine; for example, in Syria, despite some local support, the Hanafī school never had a strong presence, due to the fact that Syria was the centre of Abbasid opposition and the Hanafī School was seen as the natural ally of Abbasids. It is also indicated in this study that the Hanafī teaching did not in fact receive strong support in the birthplace of Abū Hanīfa, namely Kufa, until the late second century A.H. It is obvious that alliance with the Abbasid government could only be secured in this period. However, the author does not explore the reasons behind the Abbasids' preference for the Ahl ar-Ra'y judges in the final quarter of the second century A.H. It seems that Abdullah b. al-Muqaffa's advice to the Abbasid caliphs that they secure a central law in order to achieve centralization was to be realized only after Abū Yūsuf and Muhammad's legal writings emerged as complete compendiums, hence as manuals for the *qadis*. Nevertheless, this study totally ignores the doctrinal aspect of the spread of Hanafī School of law and only focuses on the historical-biographical evidence. The question of which aspect of the legal school or the legal doctrine developed by Abū Hanīfa and his followers attracted Abbasid politicians is never raised in this book. Similarly, this study does not focus on the question of the nature of the legal doctrine that was introduced by the Hanbalis and Shafiis who emerged as alternatives after the Hanafī School lost the Abbasid support in the central part of Empire.

Murtaza Bedir
Sakarya University

Sadreddin Konevî'de Bilgi ve Varlık

Ekrem Demirli

İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2005. 368 sayfa.

Ekrem Demirli'nin on bir kitaptan oluşan Sadreddin Konevî Külliyyâtı'nı Türkçe'ye kazandırdıktan sonra yazdığı bu eser, *Sadreddin Konevî'de Marifet ve Vücûd* adlı doktora tezinin (Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü 2003) kitaplaştırılmış hâlidir.

XIII. yüzyılın muhakkik sūfisi ve İbnü'l-Arabî'nin talebesi Sadreddin Konevî'nin (ö. 672/1273) bilgi ve varlık anlayışı temelinde tasavvuf meta-