

dan bahşedilen velayet bilgisini temsil etmektedirler. İbnü'l-Arabî bu velayet mazharlarının hatemi olarak kendisini niteler. Sadreddin Konevî ise Hâtemü'l-evliyânın mirasçısıdır. Kitabın birinci girişinde İbnü'l-Arabî ile Sadreddin Konevî arasındaki manevi ilişki üzerinde, Konevî'nin *Fusûsu'l-hikem Şerhi el-Fukûk* (*Fusûsu'l-hikem'in Sırları*, İstanbul 2002) ve *en-Nefehât (İlâhî Nefhalar*, İstanbul 2002) adlı eserlerine dayanılarak ileri sürülmüştür. Bu ilişki, yazarın da ifade ettiği üzere, sadece şeyh-talebe ya da üstadının fikirlerini yorumlayıp müdevven bir ilim hâline getiren pir-şârih ilişkisiyle sınırlı kalmayıp tasavvufta hakikat-i Muhammediyye olarak adlandırılan bilgi kaynağında ortaklık ilişkisidir. Ancak bu ortaklıktan Konevî'nin aldığı manevi hisse ile onun İbnü'l-Arabî'nin tüm tasavvufî çağın fikirlerini sistematik bir metafizik ilmi hâline getirmesi arasındaki tasavvufî-felsefî boşluk kitapta kapatılmamıştır. Dolayısıyla kitapta tasavvufî söylemden ziyade, felsefî bir söylem hâkim olup tasavvufun eski-yeni, pratik-teorik, iptidai-olgunlaşmış, sübjektiflik-objektiflik çizgisindeki gelişimi, tasavvufun iç dinamiklerinden ziyade kelâm, fıkıh ve felsefeyle etkileşimi paralelinde açıklanmıştır.

Sadreddin Konevî'de Bilgi ve Varlık, modern dönem Türkiye'sinde tasavvuf metafiziği alanında önemli bir akademik boşluğu dolduracak mahiyettedir. Kitap, Nihat Keklik'in *Sadreddin Konevî'nin Felsefesinde Allah-Kâinat-İnsan* (İstanbul 1967) adlı doktora tezinden sonra aynı konuda yapılan ikinci çalışmadır. Nihat Keklik, Konevî'yi köklü felsefe eleştirisinden ötürü "XIII. Asrın Gazzâlî"si ve onun tavrının müdavimi şeklinde eksik değerlendiren, Demirli'nin Konevî'yi Ekberî geleneğin en önemli sûfî-metafizikçisi şeklinde konumlandırması yerindedir. Demirli'nin kitabı öte yandan ilahiyat fakülteleri tasavvuf kürsüsünde yalnızca tarihsel pespektifle yazılan tezlerin dışına çıkıp tasavvuf ve tarihine "felsefî" ve "doktriner" bir boyut getirmesi sebebiyle kendisinden sonraki tasavvuf yazımına önemli bir kapı aralamıştır.

Semih Ceyhan

İSAM

Public Islam and the Common Good

Armando Salvatore and Dale F. Eickelman (editors)

Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2004. xxv+254 pp.

This interesting volume is edited by two experts of Muslim public sphere in the Middle East, and it is the outcome of two summer workshops held in July 2001 and August 2002 (funded by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation

and administered by the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin). The study focuses on the debates about “Public Islam”, intended by the editors as ‘the highly diverse invocations of Islam as ideas and practices that religious scholars, self-ascribed religious authorities, secular intellectuals, Sufi orders, mothers, students, workers, engineers, and many others make to civic debate and public life.’ In this “public” capacity, “Islam”, as much as secular ideologies, makes a difference in configuring the politics and social life of large parts of the globe. Religion makes the difference not only as a template for ideas and practices, but also as a way of envisioning alternative political realities and, increasingly, in acting on both global and local stages, thus reconfiguring the established boundaries of civil and social life (p. xii).

All the authors of the book start their essays from the fundamental works of Jürgen Habermas (*Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*) and José Casanova (*Public Religions in the Modern World*), but they also recognize the idea that the public sphere has been developed to date primarily on the basis of the European and North American experiences, and does not represent the complexity or nuances of developments elsewhere. By focusing on the role of the public sphere in diverse contemporary and historically recognized Muslim majority societies, the authors suggest ways in which understandings of the public sphere can be enhanced and developed to encompass the evolution of societies in the Muslim world. Finally, all the contributions also suggest that there is no singular public Islam, but rather a multiplicity of overlapping forms of practice and discourse that represent the varied historical and political trajectories of Muslim communities and their links and influences with societies elsewhere.

Public Islam and the Common Good is divided in four parts. The first part, *The Public Sphere and Religion in Contemporary Societies*, consists of four essays. The first essay, *Muslim Publics*, written by the editors, is the most interesting chapter as it constructs the theoretical framework for the book. Armando Salvatore and Dale F. Eickelman suggest some points of departure for understanding a variety of historical trajectories and cultural religious traditions that can shape public spheres. They also propose ways of accommodating some of the European-centred main currents of social thought with the variety of ways in which religion continues to play a dynamic, and often constructive, role in shaping public spheres. The following chapter, *Secrecy and Publicity in the South Asian Public Arena*, by Peter van der Veer, examines the emergence of the public sphere in British India as part of colonial modernity and the dialectic of openness and secrecy in two major religious movements

in South Asia today: the *Tablighī Jamā'āt* and the *Vishva Hindu Parishad*. The chapter *Technological Mediation and the Emergence of Transnational Muslim Publics* by Jon W. Anderson and Yves Gonzalez-Quijano studies the emergence of new Muslim publics into particular forms of media and, principally, the internet.

The second part is titled *The Historical Emergence of Publics in the Ottoman Empire* and is composed of two essays. The first intriguing essay, *Coffeeshouses: Public Opinion in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire* by Cengiz Kırılı, is based on reports from spies and informers from the period between 1840 and 1845 (these reports are now housed at the Prime Minister's Ottoman Archives in Istanbul), which contain the gossips, rumours and hearsay about current events that were discussed by the men of Istanbul in coffeeshouses. The chapter by Elizabeth B. Frierson, *Gender, Consumption and Patriotism: The Emergence of an Ottoman Public Sphere*, examines fashion trends and policies through publications for women in late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Ottoman Empire.

The third part, *Religious Authority and the Common Good*, has a first chapter on *The 'Ulema of Contemporary Islam and their Conceptions of the Common Good* by Muhammad Qasim Zaman. Zaman's contribution is actually limited to the analysis of the adaptation of the conceptions of the common good (*al-maslaha al-'amma*) to the contemporary context by two popular authors, the Qatar-based Egyptian scholar, Yūsuf al-Qaradāwī and a judge of the Shari'at Appellate Bench of the Supreme Court of Pakistan and the Vice President of the Deobandī Dār al-'Ulūm of Karachi Muhammad Taqī 'Uthmāni. The following essay, *When Disputes Turn Public: Heresy, the Common Good, and the State in South India* by Brian J. Didier, examines how a religious conflict between an emerging brotherhood and the 'ulamā in the Muslim community of Androth Island in the Indian Union Territory of Lakshadweep became transformed as it was propelled in the public sphere.

The last part, *Ambivalence in the Practice and Public Staging of Islam* contains a chapter by Paulo G. Pinto on *The Limits of the Public: Sufism and the Religious Debate in Syria*, which explains how Sufism has contributed to the production of the public sphere in authoritarian Syria, and the constraints and possibilities for public debate in a group that is dominated by the persona of the *shaykh*. The chapter of Benjamin F. Soares on *Islam and Public Piety in Mali* presents the Islamic presence in the West African state and the debates on doctrine and "correct" ritual practice there; lastly, the chapter *Framing the Public Sphere: Iranian Women in the Islamic Republic* by Fariba Adelhkhah

analyzes the social and political participation of women in Iranian society in the years of Mohammad Khatami.

Despite the fact that there are two essays on the Ottoman Empire and both the introduction and the first chapter frequently quote examples taken from contemporary Turkey, the absence of a specific contribution on “Public Islam” in Turkey is strongly felt. The clashes between secularism and Islam, as well as the long debate on the role of religion, may have provided interesting examples. Also the absence of a specific work on Egypt, probably the most important Arab state, is noticeable. Nevertheless, this volume represents an innovative contribution to the growing literature on the public sphere and particularly that on the study of public Islam in Muslim majority societies. This book can be inspiring for researchers and students both in Islamic studies and the sociology of religion.

Michelangelo Guida

Fatih University

**The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire
1839-1908 Islamization, Autocracy and Discipline**

Selçuk Akřın Somel

Leiden: Brill, 2001. xviii+414 pp.

The challenge of modernism during the nineteenth century was not only experienced in the Ottomans or in Asian countries such as Japan, but also in industrialized nations like North America as well. We can read in a plethora of resources how Americans faced profound challenges in their confrontation with modernity, and how they negotiated these challenges. Lawrence A. Cremen convincingly wrote how American Protestantism intellectually had to make its peace with modernism in culture, especially with modern science, and how it had to socially determine its position toward industrial capitalism and the class inequities that capitalism itself triggered.

Selçuk Akřın Somel has written a substantial work on how Turkish Ottomans faced the challenges of modernization, and how and why they have engaged with all these dramatic changes in the realm of public education during the final phase of the Empire. When we look at the reforms during the Tanzimat period, the program of public education seems, perhaps, the most important one compared to others in terms of establishing regularity, discipline