

olmasından dolayı bazı konuşmalarda anlatım bozuklukları, devrik ve yüklemli cümleler görülmekte ve bu durum verilen cevapların anlaşılmasını yer yer güçleştirmektedir. Doğu ile Batı müziği arasındaki farklılıklar konusunda yapılan katkılar ise kitabı önemli kılan bir husustur. Ayrıca söz konusu konukların kendi müzik türlerinin günümüzde karşılaştığı problemler hakkındaki yaklaşımları kitabı zenginleştirici bir etkiye bulunmuştur. Geçmişten gelen birikimlerin günümüze ve geleceğe aktarılması için çalışmalar yapılması, Osmanlı-Türk müziğinin hem kendi içerisinde hem de bünyesinde barındırdığı etnik müzik türleri arasında bozulan dengesinin yeniden kurulması gerekliliğine sık sık işaret edilmesi müziğin yeniden canlanması için en çok vurgulanan noktalardan biridir. İnsanlık tarihinin büyük kültürel havzalarından bir olan Mezopotamya topraklarında bulunan Türkiye'nin, özellikle müzik söz konusu olduğunda, hem söz konusu mirası sahiplenecek hem de onu bugünle mecedebilecek entelektüel bir birikime sahip olması gerekmektedir ki, kitap da bu konudaki eksikliğin giderilmesi konusunda mütevazı bir katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Cemil Aydın. *The Idea of the Muslim World: A Global Intellectual History.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017. 293 pages.

Yakoob Ahmed

Istanbul University
yakoobahmed@sehir.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-9294-7426
DOI: 10.20519/divan.357715

One can't help but notice that the current world order is changing. In the United States of America the coming to the seat of the presidency of Donald Trump, the increasing perception of Islamophobic rhetoric used in the press and current political language in both the USA and Europe, not overlooking the large scale migration to Europe by peoples from Syria, Libya and other parts of the war-torn world has left many, especially Muslim minorities, concerned about their fate in their respected "Western" host nations of which many Muslims call home. It is not simply in Europe or

the USA that Muslims feel an increased level of uncertainty. The “Muslim world” too is feeling a seismic changing of order ever since 9/11 and the consequent US invasion of Iraq, and more recently the turmoil from the so-called “Arab Spring” of 2010. Much press attention aimed at the Arab world coupled with a Muslim self-perception of political disintegration in the Middle East as being an attack on Islam has intensified the perception in the mind of the Muslim of a genuine crisis and clash between the West and Islam. The emergence of ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria) movement from the shadows of al-Qaeda and the Iraqi Baathist regime has added a more violent dimension in a post-Islamist world. It is not simply in the Arabic-speaking areas where things are changing. The war in Afghanistan that begun with the American invasion in 2001 has yet to reach a peaceful resolution, Muslims in India and even China continue to feel persecuted as minorities, and the situation for the Rohingya Muslims of Myanmar at the hands of the military junta and majority Buddhist population has once again brought into the spotlight the need for Muslim unity and the idea that the “Muslim world” is under attack.

It is within this climate that Cemil Aydın has recently had his book published for a general audience titled *The Idea of the Muslim World: A Global Intellectual History*. I’m sure that the book will interest Islamicists, Ottomanists and general readers. In this book, through six carefully written and researched chapters, Aydın attempts to trace the genealogy of the above-mentioned sentiments back to the late eighteenth century where he argues that the notion of a Muslim world emerged when the colonial European powers exercised much political and intellectual influence that in turn fashioned a reactionary intellectual response by Muslim thinkers for a call for Muslim unity. Just like many before him Aydın’s book takes aim of ideas such as Samuel Huntington’s conceptualisation of a “Clash of Civilisations,” however unlike scholars before, Aydın’s work attempts to trace a historical genealogy by arguing that the idea of a Christian West versus a Muslim world is in fact an illusionary construction of the late eighteenth century. He stresses throughout the book that these imaginations were an invention in part due to the depiction of a Muslim world by European Islamophobes who otherised and racialised Muslims into a collective Muslim world in order to further their own political and imperial ambitions. As a result, the irony Aydın stresses, was that Pan-Islamists and Islamist-Modernist thinkers reacted to this notion of belonging to a Muslim world by embracing and further conceptualising this idea within their own framework thus internalising an impression that had no precedent in Islamic history prior to the modern period. This in turn further confirmed in the minds of European Islamophobes their fears regarding Muslims and

Muslim unity as a threat to colonial hegemony, resulting in a dependency for both Islamophobes and Pan-Islamists on the idea of a Muslim world endorsing a fear of the other by creating a binary that maintained a clash between Islam and the West.

For Aydın, the idea of a Muslim world and subsequently Muslim unity “was a created assumption, ideal and threat, that had no historical reality that existed in the language of Muslim thinkers prior to the eighteenth century, but in fact was an illusion created by opposing forces in an attempt to safeguard their own political interests and ideals.” (p. 5). Aydın continues to explain that from the late nineteenth century onwards threats to Muslim identity had now facilitated a tried and tested method of appealing to Muslim unity, that continued into the early twentieth century from “Pan-Islamist” thinkers such as the “Ottomanist and Pan-Arabist” Shakib Arslan, Muslim revivalist thinker Muhammad Asad, founder of the Muslim Brotherhood Hasan al-Banna and Indian Muslim thinker and founder of the Jamaat-i Islami Abu al-‘Ala Mawdudi. In fact, Aydın’s book asserts that this chain of thought continues in the language of Muslim thinkers even today. Thus, in Aydın’s words, the book attempts to address the “[G]rand narrative of an eternal conflict between the Muslim world and the West, repeated or just assumed by billions, that must be shown as false; recent and contingent, they were inventions of, on the one hand, imperial racism and on the other, Pan-Islamic claims of Muslim reformers who conjured history and beliefs as befitting their political projects.” (p. 229). He feels that “[T]oday’s essentialisation of Islam and the Muslim world must account for historical context that produced the conditions and context of that essentialisation.” (p. 229).

For Aydın, a collective amnesia exists in the minds of many who have taken for granted the norm of a “West” versus the “Muslim World” narrative. One must appreciate how Aydın attempts to demonstrate how inventions of a more modern past persist to not only impact us now, but how they have become assumed to belonging to a pre-modern Islamic history when in fact they are not. Not only that, Aydın has also demonstrated how Muslim entities sometimes competed with one another along with colonial powers to safeguard their own local interests. This revision is indeed worth considering, as there is no doubting that calls for Muslim unity were stewed in a world of much inter-Muslim contestation that at times contradicted the idealised appeal to safeguard the Islamic world and Muslim unity. It seems that Aydın is pointing to the idea that Pan-Islamism and later Islamism are in fact a product of colonialism. Thus, Muslim political resistance was not an act of decoloniality but a confirmation of imperial coloniality.

It is fair to assume that Muslim politics by the nineteenth century onwards in many ways was no doubt defensive. At the same time, it complicated the idea of the nation, nationalism and colonialism, as the idea of the Islamic world forced Muslims to think beyond the emerging frameworks of the nation state. Nonetheless, Aydın's attempts to frame the Muslim identities within more imperial lines deserve some questioning. The idea of the Muslim world was both a threat to the ideals of Empire as well as nation state. In many ways one could argue that this imagining was an attempt not to create a centralised monolithic Muslim Caliphate/Empire, but rather a fluid interconnectivity between different Muslims around the world to reject European colonialism. No doubt this project was not homogenous, but there was a plethora of ideas and thoughts that were being discussed that Aydın could have drawn from. In the end he chose to instead present a rather linear narrative that did the very thing he set out to criticise—essentialisation.

What is evident is that as this book is declaring an intellectual history it presents a rather top-down history from the perspectives of the educated elites and not the vernacular. It would have been interesting to see how Muslims who were not considered as part of the intellectual class by Aydın felt about belonging to the so-called Muslim world. Especially worth of note were the ulema class, who have in general been omitted in belonging to the "intellectual" legacy of Aydın's narrative—Aydın is not the only scholar who is guilty of this. The ulema classes' omission regarding a matter to do with Muslim unity is especially surprising since much vocabulary that enters Islamic discourse goes through a process that involves some form of approval from the ulema class. While Aydın may say he has mentioned ulema members such as the Egyptian mufti of al-Azhar Sheikh Muhammad Abduh or the journalist Sheikh Rashid Rida, these are still the thinkers that are presented as Muslim modernists by a host of authors such as Albert Hourani whose ideas continue to be recycled by academics over and over. Men representing the turban also had vociferous and important positions that should have been worthy of this debate, especially as Aydın attempts to draw distinction between the idea of the *ummah* on the one hand and the political concept of Muslim unity that came from the idea of the Muslim world on the other.

Throughout the works of the ulema both pre-modern and modern, especially in literature regarding Islamic law, jurisprudence and concepts to do with *ummah*, we see that the idea of the *ummah* does have a political epistemology. Works written throughout Islamic history point to an abode of Islam (*Dar al-Islam*)—an imagination of a global connectivity is missing in Aydın's work. The concept of the world of Islam for the Muslim is

an idea about existence, how Muslims view power and authority. Aydın's view of power and authority is also a simplistic one. The very fact of imagining the world of Islam is indeed the rejection of a homogenous world-view that subscribes to a colonial hegemony of what it means to be part of the so-called civilised "Western" world. Works written by Muslims at the time presented a plethora of positions and opinions, in a host of languages that present a dialectic debate that made Muslims aware of belonging to a Muslim world not simply because of territory, but due to history, the implementation of Islamic law, the contribution to Islamicate cultures and contributors as agents not acquiescent peoples. I must also add, that while Aydın has paid special attention to the use of words and names, there is no doubt in my mind that translations of words at time fail to deliver the intended meaning of concepts coined in a language other than English. I wonder if Aydın is suggesting that *İslam Dünyası* (World of Islam or Islamic World) accurately subscribes to his idea of the Muslim World or that *İttihad-i İslam* (Islamic Unity) can be understood as the rather uncomplimentary term now accepted in Western scholarship as Pan-Islamism – another nineteenth century constructed term coined by the Europeans that Aydın was more than comfortable using without question. While it may be true that both Islamophobes and Muslims thinkers alike had a conceptualisation of the world, it is still worth of note how Muslims perceived themselves, in which although at first glance the language used may be fitting to Aydın's main claim, but on closer examination terms in Arabic, Ottoman Turkish or even Urdu present a nuance which do not neatly fit into Aydın's essentialised binary, as language and symbols outside of English cater for alternative readings that Aydın's conceptualisations have not catered for.

Additionally, ideas deconstructing the sense of a global Muslim fraternity are not novel, as works by Peter Mandaville and James Piscatori have both pointed that the "modern" understanding of the *ummah* as either forming a "re-imagination" such as in the case of Mandaville or being a "social-imaginary" as mentioned by Piscatori in a transnational/trans-regional modern world. What makes Aydın's work distinct is that he attempts to trace the imagined and illusionary idea of the Muslim world by historicising the process. And unlike the works of Mandaville and Piscatori, he does not intend to address the idea of *ummah* directly which he implies as an identity of faith—not a political identity. His contention is of the politicisation of the Muslim identity, a trope mentioned before by Ottoman historian Kemal Karpat. Thus, Aydın is attempting to address the political idea of a Muslim world that resulted in the idea of a reactionary Muslim unity.

There is no doubting that Aydın's book will establish a debate for academics and Muslims alike. Moreover, it should push Muslims to ask themselves what does it mean to be a Muslim, what does the *ummah* mean to them, how do they feel as Muslims in an evermore globalising world. In that sense, Aydın's book should do a great service of encouraging debate within "Muslim communities" about their own understanding of political agency. But regarding Aydın's point of challenging essentialised readings of Muslims, I can't help but feel that he has done the very thing he set out to challenge. I am now wondering whether it is possible on the one hand to deconstruct or refute the "essentialised" idea of the Muslim world without concocting an alternative totalizing theory that essentialises Muslims of simply being adherents to Islam, the faith without any political agency whatsoever.

Avner Wishnitzer. *Reading Clocks Alla Turca: Time and Society in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press Publication, 2015. 273 sayfa.

Aytaç Yıldız

Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi
 aytacyildiz@ybu.edu.tr
 ORCID: 0000-0002-6709-5812
 DOI: 10.20519/divan.357716

Ahmet Haşim'in *Müslüman Saati* başlıklı yazısı, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın *Bursa'da Zaman* şiiri ve *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* romanı, zaman mefhumu etrafında kaleme alınmış önemli çalışmalardır. Osmanlı'nın çöküşünün ardından yazılan bu metinlerin altında iki edebiyatçının imzasının olması tesadüf olmasa gerektir. Bu bize, Osmanlı'nın XVIII. yüzyıl başlarından beri yaşadığı medeniyet krizinin, ilk bakışta farkedilemeyecek daha derin boyutları bulunduğunu ve bunun ancak bir sanatçı bakışı ve hissiyatıyla yakalanabileceğini göstermektedir. Haşim ve Tanpınar, modernleşme sürecinin, kendi yaşadıkları devir itibarıyla, bir tür bilançosunu çıkarmaya girişmiş ve bunu farklı formlarda ifadelendirmiştir.