

FRANKFURTER ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR ISLAMISCH-THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN

FRANKFURTER ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ISLAMISCH-THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN

herausgegeben von / edited by

Ömer Özsoy

im Auftrag des Zentrums für Islamische Studien Frankfurt/Gießen
on behalf of the Center for Islamic Studies Frankfurt/Gießen

Koordination / Managing Editor

Udo Simon

Redaktionsteam / Editorial Staff

Mahmoud Bassiouni

Serdar Güneş

Hureyre Kam

Armina Omerika

Ertuğrul Şahin

Nimet Seker

Betreuung dieser Ausgabe / in charge of this issue

Armina Omerika

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat / Advisory Board

Taha Abd al-Rahman, Rabat
Jameleddine Ben Abdeljelil, Ludwigsburg
Katajun Amirpour, Köln
Ednan Aslan, Wien
Thomas Bauer, Münster
Gerhard Endreß, Bochum
Farid Esack, Johannesburg
Joseph van Ess, Tübingen
Andreas Görke, Edinburgh
Hassan Hanafi, Kairo
Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu, Ankara
Mehmet Hayri Kırbaşoğlu, Ankara
Felix Körner, Rom

Rüdiger Lohlker, Wien
Angelika Neuwirth, Berlin
Johanna Pink, Freiburg
Stephan Reichmuth, Bochum
Ulrich Rudolph, Zürich
Thomas Schmidt, Frankfurt
Nicolai Sinai, Oxford
Abdolkarim Soroush, Berlin
Burhanettin Tatar, Samsun
Erdal Toprakyaran, Tübingen
Rotraud Wielandt, Bamberg
Ulrich Winkler, Salzburg

FRANKFURTER ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR ISLAMISCH-THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN

4 | 2018

Geschichte und Geschichtlichkeit



EBVERLAG

Bibliografische Information der
Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
verzeichnet diese Publikation in
der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie;
detaillierte bibliografische
Daten sind im Internet über
<http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Dieses Buch, einschließlich aller seiner
Teile, ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen,
Mikroverfilmungen sowie die
Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in
elektronischen Systemen bedürfen der
schriftlichen Genehmigung des Verlags.

Redaktionsanschrift/
Editorial Address: Institut für Studien der Kultur und
Religion des Islam
Goethe-Universität Frankfurt
Senckenberganlage 31
60325 Frankfurt am Main
Fax: 069/798-32753
E-Mail: simon@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Assistenz: Younes Boudjelthia und Armin Begić

Umschlaggraphik: Ermin Omerika

Gesamtgestaltung: Rainer Kuhl

Copyright: © EB-Verlag Dr. Brandt
Berlin, 2019

ISBN: 978-3-86893-327-7

E-Mail: post@ebverlag.de

Internet: www.ebverlag.de

Druck und Bindung: Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany

Inhalt / Contents

Artikel / Articles

Armina Omerika

Geschichtlichkeit und Geschichtsbilder im modernen
islamischen Denken 7

Rüdiger Lohlker

Geschichtstheologie zwischen Offenheit und Geschlossenheit 37

Soumaya Louhichi

The Ideological Exploitation of ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd II in Contemporary
Arab-Islamist Narrative 57

Katajun Amīrpur

“Jeder Tag ist ‘Āšūrā’, jeder Ort ist Karbalā’”
Zur schiitischen Sicht der frühislamischen Geschichte 99

In Übersetzung / In Translation

Michael Kemper

Ismail Gasprinskij’s “Russisches Muslimentum” (1881) 125

Ismail Bej Gasprinskij

Das russische Muslimentum: Gedanken, Anmerkungen und
Beobachtungen 139

Debatte / Debate

Hans Zirker

Das Bild der zwei Wege im Koran – mit exegetischen Problemen:
Sure 90:10 und 1:6f. 171

Murat Kayman

Spiel ohne Ball? Zum Positionspapier "Islamische Theologie
in Deutschland" 179

Enes Karić

Auf eine Entscheidung zur muslimischen Greenwich-Zeitrechnung
wartend 193

Rezensionen / Book Reviews

ElSayed M. A. Amin: Reclaiming Jihad. A Qur'anic Critique of Terrorism
von *Hazim Fouad* 199

Klaus von Stosch / Mouhanad Khorchide (Hg.): Streit um Jesus.
Muslimische und christliche Annäherungen
von *Martin Bauschke* 204

Amir Dziri (Hg.): Gottesvorstellungen im Islam. Zur Dialektik von
Transzendenz und Immanenz
von *Hureyre Kam* 209

Nilüfer Göle: Europäischer Islam. Muslime im Alltag
von *Naime Çakir* 216

Christiane Gruber / Avinoam Shalem (Hg.): The Image of the
Prophet between Ideal and Ideology. A Scholarly Investigation
von *Ayşe Başol* 222

Rezensionen / Book Reviews

ElSayed M. A. Amin. *Reclaiming Jihad. A Qur'anic Critique of Terrorism*. Leicester: The Islamic Foundation, 2014, 228 Seiten. ISBN 978-0860375937, Euro 26,53.

The atrocities conducted by ISIS have triggered many responses from Muslims who are opposed to the instrumentalization of their religion in order to justify political violence. Several books have been published so far but not many seem to have caught the eyes of academics working on these topics. This review tries to partially fill the gap by discussing the book *Reclaiming Jihad. A Qur'anic Critique of Terrorism* by ElSayed M. A. Amin.

In his most recent book, Amin tries to investigate in how far modern understandings of terrorism are referred to in the Qur'ān and which conclusions can be drawn from understanding terrorism from a qur'ānic perspective. After having received years of juristic training from the institutions of al-Azhar from the age of ten onwards, the author obtained his PhD in Islamic Studies from the University of Birmingham and is currently back at al-Azhar, working as an Assistant Professor for Islamic Studies in English. His dual academic background is mirrored in the impressive list of references, where he quotes extensively both from classical as well as contemporary scholarly sources on Islam in English and Arabic.

As his methodology Amin chooses to compare the interpretations of the verses and terms thought to be related to terrorism and their relation to jihad and deterrence in altogether eight Qur'ān commentaries (*tafāsīr*), four of which can be considered to be classical – al-Ṭabarī (d. 922); al-Rāzī (d. 1209); al-Qurṭubī (d. 1272) and al-Alūsī (d. 1853), while the other were written by modern scholars – 'Abduh/Riḍā (d. 1905/1935); Darwaza (d. 1985); Quṭb (d. 1966) and al-Sha'rāwī (d. 1998).¹ Besides pointing out that paying attention to the living circumstances of the exegetes is crucial in order to make sense of their works, he also compares their findings with the opinions of contemporary Muslim and non-Muslim intellectuals and exegetes towards the issues addressed. This contextual and comparative

¹ Four other classical *tafāsīr* – al-Jaṣṣās (d. 981); Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 1148); Ibn Kathīr (d. 1373); al-Suyūṭī (d. 1505) – and one modern – al-Mawdūdī (d. 1979) – are also referred to, if they appear to enrich the debate around certain issues.

analysis is a laudable approach, since it prevents some sort of “surah ping-pong”,² in which the participants try to make their case by randomly quoting surahs pertaining to peace and violence, respectively.

In the first chapter Amin engages in the arduous task of comparing different definitions of terrorism before coming up with his own definition as a basis for his analysis. He defines terrorism from a Muslim perspective as:

“(...) the premediated, physical or non-physical attempt by individuals, groups or states to infringe upon the religion, life, intellect, property or honour of innocent people, regardless of their faith, race or nationality. It consists of all types of unjust dissemination of panic, harm, threat or killing, including brigandage, striking terror among travellers, and causing harm to the environment and public utilities, carried out for non-Islamic and illegitimate causes (p. 42).”

Starting from a linguistic perspective, he notes that the contemporary Arabic words for terrorism (*irhāb*) and terrorist (*irhābī*) do not correspond to the qur’ānic usage of the same semantic fields. The alleged verse calling for terrorism (Q 8:60), in which we find the verbal form of “to terrorize; to frighten off” (*turhibūna*), is explained at length in chapter two. Amin concludes that the verse orders Muslims to be armed for deterrence and was sent down at a time when the Muslim community lived under the constant threat of an imminent attack. So rather than a call for aggression towards non-Muslims, it is meant as a principle to prevent hostilities from breaking out in the first place. Although his explanation of the verse is well-argued and convincing, the notion that mutual armament leads to stability can be questioned when looked at the doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) during the Cold War; at least from the perspective of peace studies.

But if Muslims are only allowed to defend themselves, what about the principle of offensive jihad (*jihād al-ṭalab*)? Is it not that Muslims have to be peaceful as long as they are in the minority, but are obliged to militarily extend the realm of Islam as soon as they have the capabilities to do so? These questions are dealt with at length in chapters three and four.

After an examination of the classical *tafāsīr*, Amin frankly assesses that the classical exegetes did indeed unanimously declare offensive jihad to be a duty upon Muslims. The verses calling for restraint and mere defensive jihad were in their view abrogated by the sword verse (Q 9:5 and 9:36),

² Amirpur, “Iranische Geistliche als Vorbild”, p. 237.

which justified launching a war without prior aggression in order to fight unbelief (*kufr*) and idolatry (*shirk*), both of which were equated with injustice (*ẓulm*) and distress (*fitna*). As for the modern era, this interpretative legacy is taken up in different ways. While moderate contemporary exegetes like al-Būṭī (d. 2013), Abū Zahra (d. 1974) or al-Zuḥaylī challenge the views of the classical *mufasssīrūn*, the extremists like Sayyid Quṭb (d. 1966) or ‘Abd al-Salām Faraj (d. 1982) adapt and refine their arguments. The moderate view historicizes the classical exegetical conclusions, placing them into the context of medieval state relations, when wars between empires were rather the norm than the exception. The spread of Islam by solely peaceful means would have been an unrealistic, if not suicidal endeavour. The contemporary international relations, however, are based on the premise that peace is the normal state between nations. Also, modern means of communication allow for the dissemination of the Islamic message without military means. All of this renders the principle of abrogation regarding offensive jihad null and void. The extremists, on the other hand, reinterpret the classical doctrine of jihad as a permanent revolutionary struggle, owing much of their theoretical framework to modern Western political ideologies.

As the author notes, this division between moderates and extremists is mirrored in Western scholarship on Islam. According to the author, while scholars like John L. Esposito see the moderates as authoritative voices of contemporary Islam, people like Bernard Lewis hold this to be true with regard to the extremists. For Amin though, the moderate view is clearly the dominant one. This he sees reflected not only in the rejection of violent extremist groups by the majority of Muslims, but also in the unequivocal statements against the extremists’ interpretations and their selective readings of the classical sources issued by transnational Muslim institutions such as the International Union of Muslim Scholars or the Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs. The author quite rightly observes and regrets that such statements receive scarce attention in both Western academic literature and the media, as compared to the statements by extremists groups. This is part of the problem and indirectly fuels the negative image of Islam as a religion which promotes terrorism. However, his claim that the revisions by the former militant Egyptian Islamic Group (*al-Jamā‘a al-Islāmiyya*) have been largely ignored by Western academics has to be partially refuted, since numerous articles and essays by renowned scholars have dealt with this

topic,³ albeit their number surely does not match the amount of works on militant Islamist groups.

While it is easy to imagine that a Western non-Muslim reader might agree with almost everything which has been said so far, the last chapter might appear to be disturbing to some extent. Here, the author delivers an in-depth discussion of the term *ḥirāba*, which is a serious crime in Islamic law, and examines it in its relation to terrorism. *Ḥirāba* in its abstract sense means ‘waging war against Allah and his Messenger’ and is derived from its verbal form in the Qurʾān 5:33 (*allaḍīna yuḥāribūna llāha wa-rasūlahu*, “those who wage war against Allah and His Messenger”). The concrete meaning of the term has been much disputed amongst Sunni scholars of law. Amin, however, derives his own definition from these discussions:

“*Ḥirāba* is the premediated act of a sane and mature individual (or group of individuals) aimed at frightening, robbing, killing or transgressing against non-combatants’ dignity, carried out from a position of power (*shawkah*). The targets in *ḥirāba* may be Muslims or non-Muslims, in any setting, be it a village, a city, at sea or in the air (p. 138).”

Through the obvious resemblance with his definition of terrorism, the author concludes that terrorism is a crime, which is to be sanctioned by the punishments laid down by the law for *ḥirāba*. These are mentioned in the same verse and include execution, crucifixion, the amputation of a hand and a foot on opposite sides, or banishment from the land. The demand for the application of such penalties from a representative of al-Azhar should not come as a surprise, given its traditionalist outlook, which regards certain punishments as stipulated in the Qurʾān (*ḥudūd*) as being non-negotiable.⁴ But this view obviously clashes with some central notions of international human rights, especially the right to bodily integrity. To be fair, it needs to be mentioned that calls for severe punishments for terrorists, can also be found in the Western context, particularly in popular discourse especially after a terrorist attack.⁵ Torturing alleged terrorists and killing them via drone strikes without due process is surely also something to be

³ See for example Meijer (2009) or Hamzawy/Gebrowsky (2010). For a comprehensive account published after Amin’s book see Jackson (2015).

⁴ In fact, the Grand Shaykh of al-Azhar Aḥmad al-Ṭayyib has called for exactly the same punishments for members of ISIS. (Al-Azhar Calls for ‘Killing, Crucifixion of ISIS Terrorists’ 2015).

⁵ Velencia, “Most Americans Say”.

kept in mind in this context. Still, the inability to unequivocally oppose the application of corporal punishment in the era of human rights stymies Amin's epistemological efforts to present a context-based historical reading of some of the qur'ānic stipulations.

On the whole, Amin has thoroughly made a case for his argument that the Qur'ān does not endorse modern day terrorism, but on the contrary, regards it as a serious crime to be penalised by the most severe punishments. The academic nature of this book provides for its strength and its weakness at the same time. While it tackles some ardent questions regarding the legitimate use of force and the modern day relevance of classical *tafāsīr*, some of its arguments would need to be simplified and its didactics adjusted in order to reach a wider audience.

Hazim Fouad (Bremen)

Bibliography

- “Al-Azhar Calls for ‘Killing, Crucifixion of ISIS Terrorists’”. *Al Arabiya*. 04/02 (2015). <http://english.alarabiya.net/en/News/middle-east/2015/02/04/Al-Azhar-calls-for-killing-crucifixion-of-ISIS-terrorists-.html> (accessed: 26.7.2016).
- Amirpur, Katajun: “Iranische Geistliche als Vorbild? Warum nicht! Wenn Großsayatollahs fortschrittlicher denken als Vertreter deutscher Islamverbände”. In: Thorsten Gerald Schneiders (ed.). *Islamverherrlichung. Wenn die Kritik zum Tabu wird*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 2010, p. 237–252.
- Hamzawy, Amr and Sarah Grebowski. “From Violence to Moderation. Al-Jama‘a al-Islamiya and al-Jihad”. In: *Carnegie Papers* 20 (2010). <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/Hamzawy-Grebowski-EN.pdf> (accessed: 26.7.2016).
- Jackson, Sherman. *Initiative to Stop the Violence. Sadat's Assassins and the Renunciation of Political Violence*. Yale: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Meijer, Roel. “Commanding Right and Forbidding Wrong as a Principle of Social Action: The Case of the Egyptian al-Jama‘a al-Islamiyya”. In: Roel Meijer (ed.). *Global Salafism. Islam's New Religious Movement*. London: C. Hurst & Co., 2009, p. 189–220.
- Velencia, Jenie. “Most Americans Say Torturing Suspected Terrorists Is Justifiable”. *The Huffington Post*. 30.03.2016. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/torture-suspected-terrorists-polls_us_56fba2ce4b0a06d5804284f (accessed: 26.7.2016).

Klaus von Stosch / Mouhanad Khorchide (Hg.). *Streit um Jesus. Muslimische und christliche Annäherungen*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2016, 282 Seiten. ISBN 978-3-506-78256-4, Euro 34,90.