

***İbn Hazm Uluslararası Katılımlı İbn Hazm Sempozyumu – Bildiri ve Müzakere Metinleri – [Ibn Hazm Proceedings of International Symposium on Ibn Hazm]***, edited by Süleyman Sayar & Muhammet Tarakçı, (Istanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 2010), 878 pp., ISBN: 9786055623456

The first international symposium on Ibn Hāzım ever convened, to the best of our knowledge, was held in Spain in 1963 with twenty-five participants. The second such symposium was hosted by the Faculty of Theology, Uludağ University and the Muftiship of Bursa on 26-28 October 2007, in Bursa, Turkey. At the latter symposium, which comprised five sessions, twenty-eight papers and eighteen discourses were presented. The proceedings were published in book form after a delay of three years. Three of the contributions were in English, one was in Arabic, and others were in Turkish. The contributions that were not written in Turkish were published in their original language with a Turkish translation. The work is the fruit of a meticulous editorship and promises to become a significant reference work on Ibn Hāzım. The proceedings are introduced under the headings of philosophy, kalām, fiqh (Islamic jurisprudence), the history of religions, and other fields.

The work begins with an article by Mehmet Özdemir, who presents an account of the environment in Spain at the time of Ibn Hāzım (pp. 29-58).

Under the heading of philosophy, Muḥammad Abū Layla treats the scientific personality of Ibn Hāzım as a thinker and critic (pp. 59-80, in English), whereas Hidayet Peker exclusively stresses his classification of sciences, and he further indicates that Ibn Hāzım, like other medieval Muslim philosophers, classifies intellectual sciences under religious ones. However, he argues that it is useless and deficient to concentrate solely on religious sciences while setting the intellectual ones aside (pp. 103-111). İbrahim Çapak handles the comprehension of logic by Ibn Hāzım within the scope of his views regarding concept, definition, proposition and types of proposition and syllogism (*burhān*). He states that Ibn Hāzım recognized the idea of syllogism, which Aristotle explained as “to reach the unknown through the known”, by naming it *burhān*, and that he distinguished it from analogy, which means to attain a consequence through the similarity be-

tween two things (pp. 113-134). Ibn Hāzım's views on morals are analyzed by Enver Uysal with considerations of issues like the moral aspect of philosophy, the determinative elements of morals and fundamental virtues (pp. 135-153), whereas Aliye Çınar treats the subjects of phases and symptoms of love, separation and morals, within the scope of his *Tawq al-ḥamāmā* (pp. 155-177).

Under the second heading, a section of the proceedings that is dedicated to the science of "Kalām", Murat Serdar examines Ibn Hāzım's understanding of divinity and points out that for Ibn Hāzım, it is impossible to talk about attributes of God because any attribute is an accident present only in composite beings, but it may be possible only to mention His names. Names of God are restricted only to the Qur'ān and the ones identified in prophetic traditions (*sunna*); God cannot be called by names other than these, even though they bear the same meanings (pp. 197-228). As for Ibn Hāzım's comments on Prophethood, Ulvi Murat Kılavuz informs us that according to Ibn Hāzım, just as in al-Ash'arī, women can be *nabī* (prophet) but not *rasūl* (messenger), and accordingly, he considers Sarah, Mary and Āsiya as *nabīs*. Moreover, Ibn Hāzım differs from many Muslim philosophers in that he asserts that miracles or extraordinary situations are peculiar to prophets (pp. 229-244). In another article under the same title, Orhan Ş. Koloğlu treats Ibn Hāzım's refusal of atomism, dubs him one of the rare Muslim philosophers to refuse atomist thought and provides a place for the arguments that Ibn Hāzım developed in opposition to that thought (pp. 245-270). Mehmet Dalkılıç discusses the method of Ibn Hāzım, a Muslim heresiographer apart from all of his other qualities, in regard to the classification of Islamic sects (pp. 271-316). Ibn Hāzım's critical approach toward the Ash'ariyya that was strong and influential in his day, as well as his criticisms in terms of faith-profanity, the names and qualities of God, prophethood, miracle and magic, are analyzed by Çağfer Karadaş, who argues that the criticisms of Ibn Hāzım directed against the Ash'ariyya go beyond critical limits (pp. 317-330).

Under the heading of *Fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence), the Zāhiri school, the first topic that springs to mind when one mentions Ibn Hāzım, is examined by Muharrem Kılıç, who proceeds to explain the historical development of Zāhiri thought prior to Ibn Hāzım, its systematization by Ibn Hāzım, and its loss of importance and departure from the stage of history (pp. 345-366). Vecdi Akyüz summarizes Ibn Hāzım's thoughts on *fiqh* (pp. 367-376), whereas Bilal Aybakan treats

his approach to *ijmāʿ* (consensus of Muslim scholars) and assumes that, according to Ibn Hāzım, to apply *ijmāʿ* was restricted to the period of *ṣaḥāba* (Companions of the Prophet), and it is out of the question regarding an issue that is not explained in the Qurʾān and *sunna* (pp. 377-394). H. Yunus Apaydın points out differences between Ibn Hāzım and other Muslim jurists regarding the views of the former on *ijtibād* (independent reasoning), and he discusses the conditions and methods of *ijtibād* according to Ibn Hāzım's thought (pp. 395-403). Oğuzhan Tan analyzes how Ibn Hāzım explains the concept of *dalil* (proof) in *fiqh* principles, as well as his criticisms on syllogism and his comparisons between syllogism and proof (pp. 405-422). Zekeriya Güler evaluates Ibn Hāzım's criticisms of Ḥanafī scholars of *fiqh* within the scope of *khabar al-wāḥid*, *mursal ḥadīths*, *rijāl* (the science of narrators), the words of *ṣaḥāba* and syllogism, etc. (pp. 423-442).

Ibn Hāzım is a scholar who should also be assessed in terms of the history of religions. The fourth heading was dedicated to this issue. This section of the proceedings begins with a paper by Süleyman Sayar on Ibn Hāzım as a historian of religions. According to Sayar, Ibn Hāzım is a historian of religions whose approach is largely theological. He chose to use a critical method rather than a descriptive one, and he used reason and sacred texts together in his criticisms. When he dealt with religions, he was interested in their fundamental thoughts instead of their history. He was the most important figure in biblical criticism during the early period (pp. 467-489). Nurshif ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Rifʿat introduces Ibn Hāzım's criticisms of rabbinical writings (pp. 491-526; Turkish translation: pp. 527-561); Muḥammad Abū Layla presents his biblical criticism (pp. 563-598; Turkish translation: pp. 599-633); Ali Erbaş covers Magus and the Ṣabians according to Ibn Hāzım (pp. 635-640); Bülent Şenay introduces Ibn Hāzım's treatment of Indian religions and *Barāhima* (pp. 641-650); and finally, Tahir Aşirov relates Ibn Hāzım's view of the Epistles of the New Testament (pp. 651-662).

The final session considers the place of Ibn Hāzım in the "other sciences." The first contribution, by M. Emin Maşalı, treats Ibn Hāzım's view of the Qurʾān and the method of interpretation (pp. 677-696), whereas his view and method of *ḥadīth* are analyzed by Abdullah Karahan (pp. 697-716). Karahan states that Ibn Hāzım accepted *sunna* (prophetic tradition) as a product of revelation exactly like the Qurʾān and attributed a conjunctive quality to the two. He defended the view

that not only the consecutive *ḥadīths* (*mutawātir*) but also the single-narrator *ḥadīths* (*āḥād*) were included in this context. ‘Abd al-Ḥalīm ‘Uways treats Ibn Ḥazm as a historian in his Arabic article (pp. 717-748; Turkish translation: pp. 749-773). According to ‘Uways, there is no historian other than Ibn Ḥazm who is not content with narrating historical events, who reveals his opinions about those who are right or wrong, and who uses historical criticism so extensively. In his analysis of the literary character of Ibn Ḥazm, including his philosophy of language, his conception of rhetoric and his poetic approach, Mehmet Yalar gives some examples from his poems (pp. 777-794). İsmail Güler concentrates particularly on the linguistic theory of Ibn Ḥazm. Beginning with the verse “*And Allah taught Adam the names – all of them*” (Q 2:31), he touches on the question of the origin of language. He states that Ibn Ḥazm defended the position that language is taught to man by God, and he therefore rejects the assumption that it emerged as a result of a convention. According to Ibn Ḥazm, there is no definite answer to the question “Which language did the first man speak?” The first man may have spoken one of the modern languages, but his language could also be extinct. To the question “Which is the language superior to all others?” Ibn Ḥazm responds that prophets speaking their own language were sent to every nation, and therefore, no language is superior to the others. Accordingly, for Ibn Ḥazm, it is impossible to assume that the language of Heaven is Arabic (pp. 795-801).

**Muhammet Tarakçı**

*Uludağ University, Bursa-Turkey*