

Workshop

May, 16 – 17, 2013

Venue: Max Planck Institute for the History of Science
Boltzmannstraße 22, 14195 Berlin | Conference Hall

Commentary Cultures: Technologies of Medieval Reading

Conveners

Whitney Cox (SOAS, University of London/University of Chicago)
Islam Dayeh (Zukunftsphilologie/Freie Universität Berlin)
Nicolai Sinai (University of Oxford)

Description

The workshop aims to explore commentaries from different cultural and philological traditions within a comparative and interdisciplinary framework. Drawing on the notion that commentaries go beyond merely being “supplementary” or “secondary” texts to the texts they comment upon, we seek to open up a new discussion intended to approach commentaries as original texts in their own right and, accordingly, explore the ways and circumstances in which they were produced, used, received, and circulated across textual communities. Within this scope, we are particularly interested in reflecting on two aspects of commentary texts. The first relates to the textual practices involved in the production and consumption of commentaries, including page layout, structural hierarchy of texts on the page and techniques of referencing between them, marginalia and visual and pictorial elements of commentary texts through an analysis of specific manuscript traditions. The second aspect involves considering commentaries as loci of philological practices and methods; that is, as textual spaces in which we are presented with philological processes such as textual criticism, collating and editing. In this regard, we mainly attempt at conceptualizing commentaries as philological texts that provided the means not only for the analysis and interpretation of certain “classical” or “canonical” texts for a variety of textual communities, but also for the preservation, transmission and circulation of these texts for the same communities.

With a hands-on discussion of commentaries and their manuscript traditions, this intensive two-day workshop brings scholars engaged in the study of interpretative cultures into a fruitful dialogue to explore and discuss commentaries from analytical and theoretical perspectives. Cases studies from Arabic, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Persian, Sanskrit, Japanese, Chinese and European vernaculars as well as other commentarial traditions will be explored.

Zukunftsphilologie

Ein Programm am Forum Transregionale Studien e.V. | c/o Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin | Wallotstraße 19 | 14193 Berlin
T +49 (0)30 8 90 01-256 | F +49 (0)30 8 90 01-200 | zukunftsphilologie@trafo-berlin.de | www.zukunftsphilologie.de

Selected References

- Most, Glenn W. (ed.): *Commentaries/Kommentare*, Göttingen 1999
- Gibson, R.K. and C.S. Kraus (ed.): *The Classical Commentary. Histories, Practices, Theory*, Leiden 2002
- Grafton, Anthony: "Commentary", in *The Classical Tradition* (ed. Grafton, et al), HUP 2010, pp. 225-233

The research program **ZUKUNFTSPHILOGIE** supports research in marginalized and undocumented textual practices and literary cultures with the aim of integrating texts and scholarly traditions from Asia, Africa, and the Middle East as well as from Europe itself, by way of a critical recuperation of the practice of philology. The program takes as its point of departure the increasingly growing concern with the global significance of philology and its potential to challenge exclusivist notions of the self and the canon. ZUKUNFTSPHILOGIE is based at the Freie Universität Berlin and is a research program at the Forum Transregionale Studien. It is supported by funds from the Land Berlin. For further information, please visit: www.zukunftsphilologie.de

Schedule

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Main Venue: Max Planck Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte | Boltzmannstr. 22 | 14195 Berlin

10.00 - 10.15 Whitney Cox, Islam Dayeh and Nicolai Sinai
Introduction

10.15 – 11.00 Daniele Cuneo (University of Cambridge)
Commentary Form as a Codicological Category
Commentary as a Form of Scholarly Discourse

11.00 – 11.45 Michael Facius (Freie Universität Berlin)
Enmeshed in Virtue. Confucian Textual Practice in an Early Modern Japanese
Commentary on the Ming Period 'Six Exhortations'

11.45 – 12.00 Coffee Break

12.00 – 12.45 Murat Umut Inan (Zukunftsphilologie Fellow 2012-2013)
Philological Ruptures from the Ottoman Canon of Mystical Exegesis: Ahmed
Sudi's Commentary on the *Divan* of Hafiz

12.45 – 13.30 Whitney Cox (SOAS/University of Chicago)
Auto-Commentary and its Discontents

13.30 – 15.00 Lunch

15.00 – 15.45 Megan McNamee (MPIWG, Berlin)
Picturing Geometry in the Margins: A Study of the Graphic Annotations Added
to Some Early Copies of Macrobius's Commentary on the Dream of Scipio

15.45 – 16.30 Samer Rashwani (EUME Fellow 2012-2013)
The Arabic Grammar of al-Barkawi (d. 1573) Visualized

Friday, May 17, 2013

10.00 – 10.45 Sascha Freyberg (MPIWG/Freie Universität Berlin)
Some Remarks on the Practice of Philosophical Commentary in the Latin
Middle Ages

10.45 – 11.30 Anja Stadeler (FSGS, Freie Universität Berlin)
Commenting on Obscenities. Lambinus's Horace Commentary (1561)

11.30 – 12.00 Coffee Break

- 12.00 – 12.45 Nicolai Sinai (University of Oxford)
Philological Practices in Qur'anic Exegesis: Q 3:96-7 as a Case Study
- 12.45 – 13.30 Ronny Vollandt (Freie Universität Berlin)
Translation as Commentaries. The Exegetical Dimension of Early Judaeo-Arabic Bible Translations
- 13.30 – 15.00 Lunch
- 15.00 – 16.00 Pietro Omodeo (MPIWG) & Irina Tupikova (Lohrman Observatory, TU Dresden)
Visual and Verbal Commentaries: Reinhold's Renaissance Edition of Ptolemy's Syntaxis, Book One
- 16.00 – 16.30 **Concluding Discussion**

Abstracts and short biographies

Whitney Cox

(SOAS University of London/University of Chicago)

Auto-Commentary and its Discontents

Amidst the spectrum of commentarial practices available within the history of Sanskrit culture, the autocommentary (*svopajñavṛtti*) has received only limited attention by modern scholarship. In this very preliminary presentation of this phenomenon, I will sketch three different approaches to it. In the first and most speculative, I suggest an ideal-typical model for the composition of Sanskrit works of systematic thought (*śāstra*) in which authorial self-commentary may have enjoyed a larger role than it is usually given credit. In a milieu where the basic contributions to discipline were usually couched as either aphorisms (*sūtras*) or as compact verse *précis* (*kārikā*) intended for memorization, an author's presentation of his work must presumably have taken the form of an exposition on his own base-text, one apparently left untextualized. This practical fact of pedagogy and debate accounts for the tradition, still encountered among modern pandits, that any given work was at some point accompanied by an authorial commentary or one by the author's direct pupil.

With this model in mind, I will survey the history of the study of poetics or *alaṃkāraśāstra* as it was revolutionized in Kashmir in the ninth through the twelfth centuries CE. Here, in a field that lacks an authoritative *sūtra* text from which to depart, major theoretical statements took the form of independent monographs, generally crafted in the root text-plus-autocommentary mode, which were subsequently the site for further commentarial scholarship. Notably, this field was marked since medieval times by controversies over the attribution of these conjoint works. Major turning point in the history of Kashmirian poetics have been saddled with claims that the author of the root-text and the accompanying *vṛtti* were not one and the same: these include the *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana (ca. 850), the *Kāvyaprakāśa* of Mammaṭa (ca. 1100), and the *Alaṃkārasarvasva* of Ruyyaka (ca. 1130). Thinking about why this was so lends some perspective on the revolutionary nature of Kashmirian *alaṃkāra*, as well as providing perspective of its reception outside the Valley.

My third and final approach will take the form of close readings of a few passages of the *Mahārthamañjarī* of Maheśvarānanda, an author of the late thirteenth century whose work evinces a particular self-consciousness about the fact of auto-commentary. Maheśvarānanda is part of a wider turn towards self-interpretation in late-medieval times: I will show how his work, which is in dialogue with the Kashmirian poetic tradition, provides a useful staging ground for the larger historical picture I present.

Whitney Cox

Born and educated in the United States (BA University of Virginia; MA, PhD University of Chicago), Whitney Cox is Senior Lecturer in Sanskrit in the Department of the Languages and Cultures of South Asia, SOAS, University of London, UK. Cox's research interests are in the fields of literary, cultural, and intellectual history of the medieval Indian subcontinent, with a special concentration on the Tamil country in the far south.

Proficient in both Sanskrit and Tamil, his work charts the multiple transformations of society, polity, and textual culture during the course of the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries of the common era. Ranging over epigraphy, poetic theory, and Tantric ritual and theological writings in addition to his central concerns with literary production in both languages, Cox's research is centrally concerned with the changing nature of philology itself, both as an object of historical study and as a critically self-reflexive means to understand the interpretative practices of the contemporary world. As such, he engages with scholarship on social theory, the practice of critical editing, and the comparative Eurasian history of textuality and cultural mobility. He is currently completing two book-length studies: a preliminary survey of the changing habits of textual scholarship in twelfth and thirteenth century India and a re-interpretation of a crucial event in the history of the imperial Cōla polity; the second of these is supported by a fellowship from the British Arts and Humanities Research Council. Cox recently completed a year as a Visiting Associate Professor in the Department of South Asian Languages and Civilizations at the University of Chicago.

Daniele Cuneo

(University of Cambridge)

Commentary Form as a Codicological Category

Commentary as a Form of Scholarly Discourse

Within the broader enterprise of investigating the commentary culture of Classical South Asia, this essay is a very personal and provisional attempt to bridge the gap between two different approaches to the technology of commentary. On the one hand, I'll focus on some material embodiments of the South Asian commentarial traditions, i.e. on a number of Sanskrit manuscripts kept at the Cambridge University Library and currently being catalogued and studied within the framework of the Sanskrit Manuscript Project. By cursorily surveying the material at my disposal, I'll try to create a typological taxonomy of the various layouts in which commentaries are written, in order to identify the rationale behind such a plurality of codical possibilities. On the other hand, I'll try to assess the cultural significance and *raison d'être* of commentary as a form of scholarly discourse in the Sanskritic culture. In order to achieve—at least partially—such a daring objective, I'll argue from the vantage point of system of knowledge, i.e. Poetics-cum-Dramaturgy (*alaṃkāra* and *nāṭyaśāstra*), that displays many eccentric and liminal features within the landscape of the other traditional *śāstras* and with regard to their self-understanding as commentarial traditions. In particular, my working hypothesis is that such an aberrancy pivots on the very absence of an actual foundational text to be commented upon and on the consequential, everlasting research of such a meta-speculative inauguration and a matching, positive evaluation of theoretical novelty as such—a feature unparalleled in the other traditional knowledge systems.

Daniele Cuneo

In 2009, Daniele Cuneo received his Ph.D. in Classical South Asian Studies under the supervision of Professor Raffaele Torella at the University of Rome “La Sapienza”.

The topic of his research was Abhinavagupta's commentary on the Nāṭyaśāstra, the seminal text of the Sanskrit dramaturgical tradition, and, in particular, the issue of the emotional core of aesthetic experience. In 2010-2011, he worked as Research Associate (Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter) in the Nyāya Project at the University of Vienna, focusing on the critical edition of the basic text of the Sanskrit tradition of Logics. Since 2011, he is employed as a Research Associate in the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Cambridge, where he works on the AHRC-funded Sanskrit Manuscript Project whose aim is the cataloguing and study of the very extensive manuscript collections kept the Cambridge University Library. His main areas of research are poetry and aesthetics (*kāvya*, *alaṃkāraśāstra* and *nāṭyaśāstra*), logics (*nyāya*) as well as Indian philosophy as a whole, the classical juridical tradition (*dharmaśāstra*)—he recently published an Italian annotated translation of the Mānavadharmaśāstra in collaboration with Professor Federico Squarcini— and the tantric studies. In the last years, he has also developed an interest in Classical Tamil and its cultural tradition, specifically regarding its interactions with the Sanskrit milieu.

Islam Dayeh

(Zukunftsphilologie/Freie Universität Berlin)

Islam Dayeh is co-director and academic coordinator of the research program **Zukunftsphilologie**. Islam Dayeh studied at the University of Jordan (BA in Islamic studies), University of Leiden (MA in Religious Studies) and University of Oxford (MSt in Jewish studies). He completed his PhD dissertation in Arabic philology at Freie Universität Berlin. Dayeh's research interests focus on comparative philology, commentary cultures and text-editing practices in European and Arabic textual traditions. He is currently working on a study of the intellectual cosmos of the Cairene-Damascene exegete, philologist, geometrician, logician and historian Burhan al-Din al-Biqai (1406-1480).

Michael Facius

(Freie Universität Berlin)

Enmeshed in Virtue. Confucian Textual Practice in an Early Modern Japanese Commentary on the Ming Period 'Six Exhortations'

Confucian scholarship rests on a fundamental distinction between Classics and their commentaries. But how did the concept of the commentary translate into actual scholarly, textual, and editorial practice? How did practice constitute the relationship between Classic and commentary and give form to the material and intellectual meshes of Confucian thought and scholarship in East Asia?

The paper takes up these questions by delving into the history of early modern Japanese adaptations and commentaries of the "Six Exhortations", moral guidelines authored by the first emperor of the Ming dynasty in 1397. After placing the exhortations in their historical and intellectual context in the Chinese Confucian tradition, it opens up two lines of inquiry.

First, the paper presents a close analysis of the principal Japanese commentary on the “Six Exhortations”, the “Outline” written by the Confucian scholar Muro Kyūso in 1722. It explores the nested and multilayered structure of the “Outline” through the textual mechanics and technologies employed in its production such as pre- and postfaces, referencing, Kundoku on-the-spot translation/annotation and handling of characters. Secondly, moving outward from the materiality of the text, the paper traces key conceptual links that enmesh the commentary in the concepts and lineages of Confucian thought. It shows how the material structure of the commentary mirrors and reinforces these links, claiming continuity and integration while at the same time betraying signs of translation, localization and appropriation. On a different level, the commentary also was a site where scholarly textual practice intertwined with political and educational purposes.

Finally, the paper investigates implications of the analysis for theorizing premodern knowledge cultures and the ongoing reconceptualization of “Confucianism in East Asia”, arguing that the oft-neglected genre of the commentary is indispensable for understanding claims and mechanisms of the (re)production of tradition, continuity and universality.

Michael Facius received his M.A. in Japanese Studies and Linguistics from Bonn University in 2008. From 2008 to 2012 he was a member of the DFG-funded Research Training Group “Actors of cultural globalization, 1860–1930” at Freie Universität Berlin. Currently he is preparing his doctoral thesis on “Translating China: Globalization and Chinese knowledge in 19th century Japan” for submission. Since 2013, he is member of the DFG-funded Collaborative Research Center “Epistemes in motion”, also at Freie Universität Berlin with a research project on the origins of early modern Japan in a global historical perspective.

Sascha Freyberg
(MPIWG/Freie Universität Berlin)

Some Remarks on the Practice of Philosophical Commentary in the Latin Middle Ages

What we call today ‘scholastic philosophy’ forms one of the paradigms of a commentary culture. Philosophy in the Latin Middle Ages consists of the work of teachers with a background in Christian clergy, especially of the large religious orders, including such figures like Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus and William of Ockham - all were exponents of the metaphysical innovations of their time, whose ‘philosophical’ writings were composed in a pedagogical context which reflects its practices. In fact, the ‘philosophical’ status of these compositions was acquired from their direct commentarial relationship with the texts of the ancient philosophical tradition, especially to the works of Aristotle – which gained *auctoritas* beside the Bible and the church fathers. Out of this constellation new thought about science, philosophy and theology, about rationality and revelation evolved.

The talk aims to present the practice and the functions of philosophical commentary in historical context, in order to show what the presuppositions of the philosophical innovations in the (long) 13th century may have been. There are at least two effects of

the practice of commentary: first, to confront the Christian *litterati* with the arguments of the philosophers and thereby produce interest in philosophy in general - as it has been the case with Ibn Rushd's (Averroes) commentaries on Aristotle, and second, to form a textual space for argument - for isegoria and parrhesia. Thus the following can be asked: (1) to what extent did the practice of commentary lead to the possibility of philosophy itself and (2) against this backdrop, is it possible to describe the role of commentary in philosophy in general?

Sascha Freyberg studied Cultural Studies (Fernuniversität Hagen, B.A. 2007) and Philosophy (Humboldt-Universität Berlin, M.A. 2010). He worked at the Collegium for Advanced Studies 'Picture Act and Embodiment' in Berlin and is currently writing a PhD-thesis about the relationship of experiment and metaphysics at the MPIWG. His research interests are Philosophy of Culture, Semiotics/Media Theory and Historical Epistemology.

Murat Umut Inan

(Zukunftsphilologie Fellow 2012-2013 at the Forum Transregionale Studien)

Philological Ruptures from the Ottoman Canon of Mystical Exegesis: Ahmed Sudi's Commentary on the *Divan* of Hafiz

In my paper I will present and discuss a late sixteenth-century commentary by Ahmed Sudi (d. ca. 1600), an Ottoman scholar of Arabic and Persian who is well known for his philological commentaries on Persian literary classics, on the *Divan* (poetry collection) of Hafiz of Shiraz (d. ca. 1390), one of the most celebrated poets of classical Persian. Following an introduction to his biography, works and scholarly training, first I will analyze the way in which Sudi glosses Hafiz's text focusing on his elucidation of the poet's opening poem. Drawing on my analysis, I will then discuss Sudi's exegetical motivation, methodology, and practices in relation to the exegetical structure of his text. Third and finally, I will compare and contrast Sudi's commentary with those of his predecessors. My main goal in this comparison is to reflect on and discuss how Sudi departs from the preceding exegetical tradition in terms of his exegetical approach and concerns. In this regard, I will mainly argue that as an Ottoman scholar with a philological training Sudi presents his commentary on Hafiz as a critique not only of the canon of mystical exegesis but also of the interpretive formulations and exegetical practices that are associated with it.

Murat Umut Inan holds a BA in Turkish Language and Literature, an MA in Ottoman Language and Literature, both from Boğaziçi University (Istanbul), and a PhD in Near and Middle Eastern Studies from the University of Washington. His dissertation focuses on a late sixteenth-century Ottoman commentary written on the *Divan* of Hafiz of Shiraz by Ahmed Sudi and discusses the ways Sudi's philological commentary departs from the preceding mystical commentaries in terms of textual analysis and interpretation. As a Fellow of Zukunftsphilologie, Inan currently undertakes a postdoctoral research project that elaborates on his dissertation work. The project involves the study and interpretation of Hafez's *Divan* in the Ottoman Empire. It explores, on the one hand, the

ways Hafez's Persian text was edited, glossed, and translated by Ottoman scholars coming from different backgrounds and, on the other, the contexts in which the text was read and interpreted by Ottoman readers across the Empire. Inan's research interests focus on Ottoman and Persian literatures and cultures and on intertextual and intercultural relations in the early modern literary world. The critical issues that inform his current work are literary reception and appropriation, intertextuality, and the politics of textual interpretation.

Megan McNamee

(Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Berlin/
University of Michigan)

Picturing Geometry in the Margins: A Study of the Graphic Annotations Added to Some Early Copies of Macrobius's Commentary on the Dream of Scipio

The prominence of pictures in medieval manuscripts more generally is well known; the essential role they played in mathematical and scientific manuscripts less so. Then, as now, such information was transmitted visually as well as verbally. Graphic aspects (e.g. tables, schemata, figures) dominated the pages of tracts devoted to arithmetic, astronomy, and music. The pictorial imperative was even stronger in the realm of geometry. During the early and central Middle Ages pictures were added to tracts and passages on geometry in which they were not already an organic part. Macrobius's fifth-century Commentary on Cicero's Dream of Scipio, a staple of mathematical and scientific study throughout the middle ages, gave rise to some of the most subtle and compelling examples. A host of anonymous scribes in scriptoria across Europe put pen to parchment to clarify the Commentary. They shed light on the work through insertions of many kinds: headings, translations, definitions, clarifications, synonyms, citations. Whereas the vast majority of the Commentary inspired verbal annotations, the definitions of geometry's so-called elements—points, lines, planes, and solids—gave rise to pictures. This paper examines these graphic additions, their type and placement, in light of the contemporary geometric practices.

Megan McNamee is a doctoral candidate in the Department of the History of Art at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Her research explores notions of perception, cognition, and representation in the Latin-speaking world around the turn of the millennium. She is in the process of completing her dissertation entitled *Picturing Number in the Central Middle Ages*, which investigates the role of the visual in cultivating numeracy in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The project is situated in the monastic school of Fleury and the cathedral school of Reims, and grounded in manuscripts dedicated to scientific and mathematical topics that were made, copied, and used by these communities. This corpus of visual and textual material offers insight into a range of integrated issues: the relations and tensions between word and image, the nature of cognition, and modes of representing both the sensible world and that which was considered to be beyond the reach of the senses. At present, Megan lives in Berlin where she is a Predoctoral Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for the

History of Science. Her research is supported by an ACLS-Mellon Dissertation Completion Fellowship.

Pietro Daniel Omodeo

(Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Berlin)

& Irina Tupikova

(Lohrmann Observatory, Technische Universität Dresden)

Visual and Verbal Commentaries: Reinhold's Renaissance Edition of Ptolemy's Syntaxis, Book One

Immediately following the publication of Copernicus's major work, *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* (Nuremberg, 1543), the renowned Renaissance astronomer Erasmus Reinhold of Saalfeld (1511-1553) issued a Greek-and-Latin edition of the first book of Ptolemy's *Almagest* with commentaries. It was entitled *Ptolemaei Mathematicae constructionis liber primus* (Wittenberg, in 1549). Employing images and textual commentaries, Reinhold aimed to make Ptolemy's work accessible to his students at the University of Wittenberg. As previous editions lacked accurate diagrams, Reinhold both invented technical drawings to clarify the *Almagest* and used them to highlight aspects implicit in Ptolemy's original text. He stressed these aspects in the commentaries still further. Thus, the commentary strengthened fundamental cosmological arguments presented in the first book of the *Almagest*, especially the central position of the Earth in the cosmos and its immobility. The Reinhold edition documents Renaissance commentary practices and their dynamic and transformative character. In our opinion, the publication of Copernicus's heliocentric theory motivated astronomy professors such as Reinhold to reassess Ptolemy's famous counter-arguments and analyze them with renewed interest.

Pietro Daniel Omodeo studied Philosophy and History of Science at the University of Turin (Italy). Since 2010 he has been working on the history of early modern natural philosophy and astronomy at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science (Berlin). He published many contributions on Cusanus, Copernicus, Bruno, Benedetti and other Renaissance scholars relevant for the history of science, and has just accomplished a book on the early reception of Copernicus, "*Copernicus in the Cultural Debates of the Renaissance: Reception, Legacy, Transformation*" (Leiden: BRILL, 2013?), which has been pre-issued as a Preprint of the MPIWG (2012). At present, Omodeo is working on the project "*Kosmologische Wissensformationen der Vormoderne: Tradierung und Wandel in diachroner und transkultureller Perspektive*" ("*Formation of Cosmological Knowledge in the Pre-Modern Era: Transmission and Change in Diachronic and Transcultural Perspectives*") within the Sonderforschungsbereich (Collaborative Research Centre) 980 "*Episteme in Bewegung*" (Episteme in Motion).

Irina Tupikova studied astronomy at the mathematical faculty of St. Petersburg University (Russia). She obtained her PhD degree in Mathematics and Physics and worked as Senior Scientific Advisor at the Institute for Theoretical Astronomy (St.

Petersburg). Since 1996 Tupikova has been working at the Lohrmann Observatory of TU Dresden. She has published extensively on perturbation theory of celestial mechanics, artificial satellite theory and asteroid problem. Thanks to grants and fellowships at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science and the TOPOI Excellence Cluster in Berlin, she has also published on mathematical theory of sundials, measurements of the earth in antiquity and the epistemology of geo-centrism.

Samer Rashwani

(EUME Fellow 2012-2013 at the Forum Transregionale Studien)

The Arabic Grammar of al-Barkawi (d. 1573) Visualized

"Izhar al-Asrar" is a short grammatical treatise written originally with the aim of summarising Arabic grammar for advanced students of "nahw" [Grammar] by the Turkish Ottoman scholar and pedagogue (al-Barkawi d. 1573). This paper tries to examine the journey of this book through its numerous commentaries and glosses with a focal interest on one compendium of extensive commentaries that was appended with a visual reproduction of the original Barkawi's treatise. It is not only the pedagogical aspects of the traditional Muslim teaching system that will be revealed here, but also the correlation between the development of a specific theory of knowledge and its pedagogical dimensions.

Samer Rashwani studied Islamic Studies at Damascus University (BA, 1997). In cooperation with a group of young intellectuals from different countries of the Arab World, he laid the foundation for a new forum of critical Islamic thought (al-Multaqa al-Fikri/Intellectual Forum for Innovation) in 1998. Rashwani moved to Egypt to complete his Qur'anic studies at the University of Cairo, receiving an MA in 2004 and a PhD in 2007 for his dissertation "The Genre of "Defending the Qur'an" from the 3rd to the 5th century A.H. and its role in the Development of Qur'anic Sciences". Rashwani has been a lecturer at the Faculty of Sharia (Universities of Damascus and Aleppo) since 2007.

He has taught several courses in Hadith, Qur'anic studies and methodology. Rashwani has been a EUME Fellow in 2011/2012 and continues his project in 2012/2013 to investigate "The Textual Relevance of the Qur'anic Surah and its Impact on Semantic and Pragmatic Interpretation of the Qur'an". This project is anticipated to revise and redefine the traditional rules of interpreting the Qur'an. It is a continuation of a research venture Rashwani began with his MA thesis "The Methodology of Thematic Interpretation of Qur'an: a Critical Approach", published in Arabic in 2009 and authorized in the curriculum of Qur'anic postgraduate studies in the University of Damascus.

Nicolai Sinai

(University of Oxford)

Philological Practices in Qur'anic Exegesis: Q 3:96-7 as a Case Study

This paper will explore the specifically philological quality of pre-modern Qur'anic exegesis. The focus will be on the interpretive puzzles generated by a brief Qur'anic passage, 3:96-7, and on how various exegetes have attempted to solve these by applying different techniques of textual criticism, paraphrase, and linguistic analysis.

Nicolai Sinai holds a PhD in Arabic Studies from the Free University Berlin (2007) and is Lecturer in Islamic Studies at the University of Oxford and Fellow of Pembroke College. His main field of research is the Qur'an and Qur'anic exegesis, but he also has a strong interest in the history of philosophy and theology in the Islamic world. Nicolai's books include *Fortschreibung und Auslegung: Studien zur frühen Koraninterpretation* (2009), where he explored the phenomenon of inner-Qur'anic interpretation as a process of canon formation, and studied the typologies and strategies of early Muslim exegesis. Nicolai has also produced a German translation and commentary of the 12th century philosopher, Shihāb ad-Dīn as-Suhrawardī's *Philosophy of Illumination* (*Hikmat al-ishrāq: Die Philosophie der Erleuchtung*, 2011).

Anja Stadeler

(Friedrich Schlegel School for Literary Studies, Freie Universität Berlin)

Commenting on Obscenities: Lambinus's Horace Commentary (1561)

The paper is looking at Lambinus's Horace commentary from 1561 and its consecutive editions and focuses on how the commentator is dealing with risqué passages within the Horatian text, which pose problems within the environment the commentary is set in. This is part of the wider question of how commentators in general use the Horatian text as springboards for their own purposes.

Anja Stadeler completed a B.A. in Latin and History at Humboldt University Berlin in 2008 and an MPhil at Cambridge University in 2010. She has worked on research projects within the framework of the CRC "Transformations of Antiquity" and is currently writing up her PhD dissertation on Renaissance commentaries on Horace at the Friedrich Schlegel School for Literary Studies, Free University Berlin.

Gyburg Uhlmann

(Freie Universität Berlin)

Ronny Vollandt

(Freie Universität Berlin)

Translation as Commentaries. The Exegetical Dimension of Early Judaeo-Arabic Bible Translations

In late eleventh/early twelfth century Constantinople, Tobia ben Moshe—the famous Qaraite master translator of Judaeo-Arabic literature into Hebrew—furnishes an interesting observation as to the different approaches of translators and their translation techniques. It is situated in a discussion on the meaning of the Hebrew word *hēleb* ‘fat’ in his *Ozar Neḥmad* on the book of Leviticus, in which Tobia elaborates on different possibilities of translation. Throughout his discussion he carefully distinguishes two contrary translational strategies in his terminology: For the first he exclusively uses the Hebrew verb *paṭar* (comp. Arab. *fassara*), by means of which he commonly refers to the *Tafsīr*, the semi-canonical translation of the Tora by Saadiah Gaon (882-942 CE). The *Tafsīr* is known as a non-literal translation that principally reflects the halakhic interpretations and the exegetical understanding of its author. It is juxtaposed to a different translation type, designated by the Hebrew verb *tirgem* (comp. Arab. *tarjama*) and characterised by an *ad litteram* approach. Distinctive of this second type is that the Hebrew source text is usually translated word-by-word or even morpheme-by-morpheme, comparable to a translational mirror of all linguistic elements in the Hebrew source. As observed by Tobia, the different traditions oscillated between the basic question, whether to capture the precise linguistic form (Arab. *lafẓ*) literally or the underlying meaning (Arab. *ma’nā*) of the biblical text. In discussing their emergence, literary context, and interrelatedness, I will present a tentative typology of early Judaeo-Arabic Pentateuch translations from the 9th -11th centuries, preserved in various Cairo Genizah collections, and their exegetical dimensions. I will illustrate their transmission and *mise-en-texte* by manuscript examples.

Ronny Vollandt

(Research Unit Intellectual History of the Islamicate World, Freie Universität Berlin) Having graduated in 2007 with an M. Phil. in Arabic Language and Literature at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Ronny completed a Ph.D. in Semitic Philology at the University of Cambridge in 2011. He held fellowships at the Centro "Cardinal Bea" per gli Studi Giudaici, Pontificia Università Gregoriana, Rome, as well as the Oxford Centre of Hebrew and Jewish Studies, University of Oxford, Section Hébraïque, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, CNRS, Paris, The Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Berlin and Zukunftsphilologie, Forum Transregionale Studien, Berlin. His research focuses on the Arabic versions of the Bible and biblical exegesis in the Arabic language, more broadly, medieval Christian- and Judaeo-Arabic literature. Ronny Vollandt is at present working on a monograph on Saadiah Gaon's Judaeo-Arabic Pentateuch translation and intends to revise his Ph.D. thesis “Christian-Arabic translations of the Pentateuch from the 9th-13th centuries: a comparative study of manuscripts and translation techniques’ for publication. Within the Research Unit Intellectual History of the Islamicate World his responsibilities include supervising the charting, description, and analysis of Christian-Arabic translation traditions of the Bible. Further, he will compile a comprehensive bibliography on the Bible in Arabic.

13.05.2013