Studies in
Late Antiquity and Early Islam
26

The Place to Go: Contexts of Learning in Baghdād, 750–1000 C.E.

Edited by
Jens Scheiner & Damien Janos

THE DARWIN PRESS, INC.
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY
2014

Scheiner, Jens: Der Hadith. In: Brunner, Rainer (ed.), *Einführung in den Islam.* Stuttgart 2015. [Forthcoming].

Scheiner, Jens: »Ich aber wurde als Lehrer gesandt!« Der Prophet Mohammed als *spiritus rector* der Muslime. In: Georges, T./Scheiner, J./Tanaseanu-Döbler, I. (eds.), *Bedeutende Lehrerfiguren von Platon bis Hasan al-Banna.* Tübingen 2015. [Forthcoming].

Scheiner, Jens: Single Ḥadīths or Riwāyas? Quoted Books in Ibn ʿAsākir's *tarjama* of Tamīm al-Dārī. In: Pomeranz, M. *et al.* (eds.), *Festschrift for Wadad al-Qadi.* Leiden 2015. [Forthcoming].

Schoeler, Gregor: *Charakter und Authentie der muslimischen Überlieferung über das Leben Mohammeds.* Berlin 1996.

Spectorsky, Susan: Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal's Fiqh. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102 (1982), pp. 461–465.

Speight, R. M.: Some Formal Characteristics of the Musnad Type of Ḥadīṯ Collection. In: *Arabica* 49 (2002), pp. 376–382.

Tottoli, Roberto: New Sources and Recent Editions of Qiṣaṣ al-anbaiyāʾ works and literature. In: Khoury, Raif G./Monferrer-Sala, Juan P./Molins, Jesús V. (eds.), *Legendaria medievalia. En honor de Concepción Castillo Castillo.* Cordoba 2011, pp. 525–539.

van Ess, Josef: *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra. Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam.* 6 vols. Berlin 1991–1997.

van Ess, Josef: Early Development of Kalām. In: Juynboll, Gautier H. (ed.), *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society.* Carbondale 1982, pp. 109–123; 230–241.

Wensinck, A./Gardet, L.: Art. "Iblīs". In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam. Second Edition (EI²)*, Online version.

7

'We shall neither learn the Qurʾān nor teach it to our children': The Covenant of ʿUmar on Learning*

Clare Wilde
(University of Auckland, Auckland)

The prohibition on learning and teaching the Qurʾān (*wa-lā nataʿallamu l-Qurʾān wa-lā nuʿallimuhū awlādanā*) is among the articles outlined in the clauses of some—although not the earliest—versions of the so-called Covenant, or ordinances, of ʿUmar (*ahd ʿUmar; al-shurūṭ al-ʿUmariyya*).[1] This covenant is commonly understood as the terms of surrender proposed by Christians to the second of the—in Sunnī tradition—'rightly guided' caliphs (*al-khulafāʾ al-rāshidūn*), ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (r. 634–44), although it more likely dates to the reign of the

* I would like to thank Jens Scheiner for his organisation of, and generous invitation to, the "Contexts of Learning in Baghdād from the 8th-10th Centuries" conference held in Göttingen 12–14 September 2011. This paper was greatly improved by stimulating conversations with, and the thoughtful remarks of, the participants, as well as the thorough (and painstaking) editing of the original version. An additional debt is owed to Prof. Scheiner and to Dr Yifat Monnickendam (then a post-doctoral fellow at Johns Hopkins University) for supplying me with articles unavailable in Auckland. Any shortcomings are, of course, solely my own.

[1] I have not yet done a comprehensive survey to compare the wording of all of the recensions of the pact, but was struck by the fact that the prohibition on teaching is found in all four recensions preserved in Qāḍī b. Zabr's (d. 329/940) *Shurūṭ al-naṣārā*, but only the first recension contains both clauses (We shall neither learn the Qurʾān nor teach it to our children: See Cohen, Mark: What was the pact of ʿUmar? A literary-historical study. In: *JSAI* 23 (1999), p. 137; according to the other three recensions of the pact preserved in this tract, the Christians only promise not to teach the Qurʾān to their children: *wa-lā nuʿallimu awlādanā l-Qurʾān*, found on pages 139, 142 and 146 of Cohen's edition.

Umayyad caliph ʿUmar II (d. 101/720).[2] A number of the clauses in these *shurūṭ* demonstrate a clear concern for maintaining a strict distinction between (and, possibly, hierarchy among) Christians and Muslims in their public lives, in those areas in which they did mingle. The covenant addresses public appearance—dress codes and haircuts; forbids the ringing of church bells or repairing churches; and identifies which animals might or might not be ridden, as well as the types of weapons that could be carried.

A modern reader might well interpret such distinctions through the notable failures of twentieth-century 'separate-but-equal' legislation (as, for example, racial segregation in the US context, or Nazi-era mandates): "Islamic law seeks to create a society that makes manifest the supremacy of Islam, and to this end it curtails the public display of non-Muslim religious life even as it allows non-Muslims to practice their own religions".[3] And, at first reading, the provisions of the Covenant of ʿUmar seem in keeping with the spirit of the following quotation attributed to ʿUmar II, in a letter to his governors:

> God honoured, exalted and strengthened His people with Islam, and put humiliation and shame on their opponents. He made them the best nation that was created for men. We will not give to their subjects authority over any one of them, nor over their revenue; lest they stretch out their hands and tongues against them. We will humiliate and disgrace them after God had strengthened and honoured them. We will expose them to deceit and pride; and one is never safe from their treachery [...] They will not fail to corrupt you, they desire your suffering. So do not choose Jews and Christians as friends.[4]

Noth, however, argues that ordinances such as those contained in the *shurūṭ* did not contain much that was inherently oppressive, but merely enshrined already existing practices that intrinsically indicated, or reflected, whether an individual was Muslim or Christian. For example, bearing of arms or riding horses were not typical urban practices. As most Christians lived in cities, they were not likely to have been engaged in them. Arab Muslims, however, who came from the desert, would have ridden horses and borne arms as a matter of the normal course of their lives. Noth's caution that a reading of subservience may be a modern interpretation of ordinances that attempted to emphasize (and maintain, or enforce) distinctions between two groups ought not to be discounted. For, if these distinctions represented attempts to preserve and protect the identity of the socially and politically, but not necessarily numerically, dominant Muslims, this is in marked contrast to today, when

[2] For a comprehensive overview of the manuscript tradition, as well as scholarly discussion of the place of these ordinances in the history of Christian/Muslim interactions, see esp. Cohen, *What was the pact of ʿUmar?*; Noth, Albrecht: Abgrenzungsprobleme zwischen Muslimen und nicht-Muslimen: Die 'Bedingungen ʿUmars (*aš-šurūṭ al-ʿumariyya*)' unter einem anderen Aspekt gelesen. In: *JSAI* 9 (1987), pp. 290–315. Tr. M. Mülhäusler as: Problems of differentiation between Muslims and non-Muslims: Re-reading the 'Ordinances of 'Umar (*al-shurūṭ al-ʿumariyya*)'. In: Hoyland, Robert (ed.), *Muslims and Others in early Islamic Society*. Burlington 2004, pp. 103–124; and the classic but still relevant study of Tritton, A. S.: *The Caliphs and their non-Muslim Subjects*. London 1930 [Reprint London 1970].

[3] Freidenreich, David M.: Christians in early and classical Sunni Law. In: Thomas, David/Roggema, Barbara (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History. Volume 1 (600–900)*. Leiden 2009, p. 106. See the footnotes of this article for articles that focus on this interpretation, among others, of the *shurūṭ* (e.g. Ashtor, E.: The social isolation of ahl adh-dhimma. In: *Pal Hirschler Memorial Book*. Budapest 1949, pp. 74–85, cited in n. 15). Freidenreich's other article *Muslims in Canon Law, 650–1000*. In: Thomas, David/Roggema, Barbara (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History. Volume 1 (600–900)*. Leiden 2009, pp. 83–97 also furnishes valuable context for the present discussion.

[4] Translation and abbreviated reference to original sources found in Tritton, *Caliphs and their non-Muslim Subjects*, 21–22. He cites the following sources (due to his short-hand citation method, the editions may not be the exact ones he used; I was unable to verify each reference; the one I could check—al-Kindī, *Book of Governors and Judges*, p. 60 seemed instead to be at pp. 68–69): Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, Sāwīrus: *History of the Patriarchs*. Ed. Christian F. Seybold as: *Alexandrinische Pariarchengeschichte von S. Marcus bis Michael I (61–767), nach der ältesten 1266 geschriebenen Hamburger Handschrift im arabischen Urtext herausgegeben*. Hamburg 1912, p. 143; Ibn al-Athīr: *Al-kāmil fī l-taʾrīkh*. Ed. C. J. Tornberg. 14 vols. Leiden 1851–76, Ad annum 101; Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh: *Sīrat ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz*. Ed. Ahmad ʿUbayd. Cairo 1927, p. 165; al-Kindī, Abū ʿUmar Muḥammad b. Yūsuf: *Tasmiyat wulāt Miṣr*. Ed. Rhuvon Guest as: *The Governors and Judges of Egypt or Kitâb el ʿumarâ' (el wulâh) wa Kitâb el Quḍâh of El Kindî. Together with an appendix derived mostly from Raf' el iṣr by Ibn Ḥajar*. Leiden 1912, p. 60 [in vol. XIX of the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial series, pp. 68–69 cover years 99–101].

Scheiner, Jens: Der Hadith. In: Brunner, Rainer (ed.), *Einführung in den Islam.* Stuttgart 2015. [Forthcoming].

Scheiner, Jens: »Ich aber wurde als Lehrer gesandt!« Der Prophet Mohammed als *spiritus rector* der Muslime. In: Georges, T./Scheiner, J./Tanaseanu-Döbler, I. (eds.), *Bedeutende Lehrerfiguren von Platon bis Hasan al-Banna.* Tübingen 2015. [Forthcoming].

Scheiner, Jens: Single Ḥadīths or Riwāyas? Quoted Books in Ibn ʿAsākir's *tarjama* of Tamīm al-Dārī. In: Pomeranz, M. *et al.* (eds.), *Festschrift for Wadad al-Qadi.* Leiden 2015. [Forthcoming].

Schoeler, Gregor: *Charakter und Authentie der muslimischen Überlieferung über das Leben Mohammeds.* Berlin 1996.

Spectorsky, Susan: Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal's Fiqh. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102 (1982), pp. 461–465.

Speight, R. M.: Some Formal Characteristics of the Musnad Type of Ḥadīṯ Collection. In: *Arabica* 49 (2002), pp. 376–382.

Tottoli, Roberto: New Sources and Recent Editions of Qiṣaṣ al-anbaiyāʾ works and literature. In: Khoury, Raif G./Monferrer-Sala, Juan P./Molins, Jesús V. (eds.), *Legendaria medievalia. En honor de Concepción Castillo Castillo.* Cordoba 2011, pp. 525–539.

van Ess, Josef: *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra. Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam.* 6 vols. Berlin 1991–1997.

van Ess, Josef: Early Development of Kalām. In: Juynboll, Gautier H. (ed.), *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society.* Carbondale 1982, pp. 109–123; 230–241.

Wensinck, A./Gardet, L.: Art. "Iblīs". In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam. Second Edition (EI²)*, Online version.

7

'We shall neither learn the Qurʾān nor teach it to our children': The Covenant of ʿUmar on Learning*

Clare Wilde
(University of Auckland, Auckland)

The prohibition on learning and teaching the Qurʾān (*wa-lā nataʿallamu l-Qurʾān wa-lā nuʿallimuhū awlādanā*) is among the articles outlined in the clauses of some—although not the earliest—versions of the so-called Covenant, or ordinances, of ʿUmar (*ahd ʿUmar; al-shurūṭ al-ʿUmariyya*).[1] This covenant is commonly understood as the terms of surrender proposed by Christians to the second of the—in Sunnī tradition—'rightly guided' caliphs (*al-khulafāʾ al-rāshidūn*), ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (r. 634–44), although it more likely dates to the reign of the

* I would like to thank Jens Scheiner for his organisation of, and generous invitation to, the "Contexts of Learning in Baghdād from the 8th-10th Centuries" conference held in Göttingen 12–14 September 2011. This paper was greatly improved by stimulating conversations with, and the thoughtful remarks of, the participants, as well as the thorough (and painstaking) editing of the original version. An additional debt is owed to Prof. Scheiner and to Dr Yifat Monnickendam (then a post-doctoral fellow at Johns Hopkins University) for supplying me with articles unavailable in Auckland. Any shortcomings are, of course, solely my own.

[1] I have not yet done a comprehensive survey to compare the wording of all of the recensions of the pact, but was struck by the fact that the prohibition on teaching is found in all four recensions preserved in Qāḍī b. Zabr's (d. 329/940) *Shurūṭ al-naṣārā*, but only the first recension contains both clauses (We shall neither learn the Qurʾān nor teach it to our children: See Cohen, Mark: What was the pact of ʿUmar? A literary-historical study. In: *JSAI* 23 (1999), p. 137; according to the other three recensions of the pact preserved in this tract, the Christians only promise not to teach the Qurʾān to their children: *wa-lā nuʿallimu awlādanā l-Qurʾān*, found on pages 139, 142 and 146 of Cohen's edition.

Umayyad caliph ʿUmar II (d. 101/720).[2] A number of the clauses in these *shurūṭ* demonstrate a clear concern for maintaining a strict distinction between (and, possibly, hierarchy among) Christians and Muslims in their public lives, in those areas in which they did mingle. The covenant addresses public appearance—dress codes and haircuts; forbids the ringing of church bells or repairing churches; and identifies which animals might or might not be ridden, as well as the types of weapons that could be carried.

A modern reader might well interpret such distinctions through the notable failures of twentieth-century 'separate-but-equal' legislation (as, for example, racial segregation in the US context, or Nazi-era mandates): "Islamic law seeks to create a society that makes manifest the supremacy of Islam, and to this end it curtails the public display of non-Muslim religious life even as it allows non-Muslims to practice their own religions".[3] And, at first reading, the provisions of the Covenant of ʿUmar seem in keeping with the spirit of the following quotation attributed to ʿUmar II, in a letter to his governors:

> God honoured, exalted and strengthened His people with Islam, and put humiliation and shame on their opponents. He made

[2] For a comprehensive overview of the manuscript tradition, as well as scholarly discussion of the place of these ordinances in the history of Christian/Muslim interactions, see esp. Cohen, *What was the pact of ʿUmar?*; Noth, Albrecht: Abgrenzungsprobleme zwischen Muslimen und nicht-Muslimen: Die 'Bedingungen ʿUmars (*aš-šurūṭ al-ʿumariyya*)' unter einem anderen Aspekt gelesen. In: *JSAI* 9 (1987), pp. 290–315. Tr. M. Mülhäusler as: Problems of differentiation between Muslims and non-Muslims: Re-reading the 'Ordinances of ʿUmar (*al-shurūṭ al-ʿumariyya*)'. In: Hoyland, Robert (ed.), *Muslims and Others in early Islamic Society*. Burlington 2004, pp. 103–124; and the classic but still relevant study of Tritton, A. S.: *The Caliphs and their non-Muslim Subjects*. London 1930 [Reprint London 1970].

[3] Freidenreich, David M.: Christians in early and classical Sunni Law. In: Thomas, David/Roggema, Barbara (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History. Volume 1 (600–900)*. Leiden 2009, p. 106. See the footnotes of this article for articles that focus on this interpretation, among others, of the *shurūṭ* (e.g. Ashtor, E.: The social isolation of ahl adh-dhimma. In: *Pal Hirschler Memorial Book*. Budapest 1949, pp. 74–85, cited in n. 15). Freidenreich's other article *Muslims in Canon Law, 650–1000*. In: Thomas, David/Roggema, Barbara (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History. Volume 1 (600–900)*. Leiden 2009, pp. 83–97 also furnishes valuable context for the present discussion.

> them the best nation that was created for men. We will not give to their subjects authority over any one of them, nor over their revenue; lest they stretch out their hands and tongues against them. We will humiliate and disgrace them after God had strengthened and honoured them. We will expose them to deceit and pride; and one is never safe from their treachery [...] They will not fail to corrupt you, they desire your suffering. So do not choose Jews and Christians as friends.[4]

Noth, however, argues that ordinances such as those contained in the *shurūṭ* did not contain much that was inherently oppressive, but merely enshrined already existing practices that intrinsically indicated, or reflected, whether an individual was Muslim or Christian. For example, bearing of arms or riding horses were not typical urban practices. As most Christians lived in cities, they were not likely to have been engaged in them. Arab Muslims, however, who came from the desert, would have ridden horses and borne arms as a matter of the normal course of their lives. Noth's caution that a reading of subservience may be a modern interpretation of ordinances that attempted to emphasize (and maintain, or enforce) distinctions between two groups ought not to be discounted. For, if these distinctions represented attempts to preserve and protect the identity of the socially and politically, but not necessarily numerically, dominant Muslims, this is in marked contrast to today, when

[4] Translation and abbreviated reference to original sources found in Tritton, *Caliphs and their non-Muslim Subjects*, 21–22. He cites the following sources (due to his short-hand citation method, the editions may not be the exact ones he used; I was unable to verify each reference; the one I could check—al-Kindī, *Book of Governors and Judges*, p. 60 seemed instead to be at pp. 68–69): Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, Sāwīrus: *History of the Patriarchs*. Ed. Christian F. Seybold as: *Alexandrinische Pariarchengeschichte von S. Marcus bis Michael I (61–767), nach der ältesten 1266 geschriebenen Hamburger Handschrift im arabischen Urtext herausgegeben*. Hamburg 1912, p. 143; Ibn al-Athīr: *Al-kāmil fī l-taʾrīkh*. Ed. C. J. Tornberg. 14 vols. Leiden 1851–76, Ad annum 101; Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh: *Sīrat ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz*. Ed. Ahmad ʿUbayd. Cairo 1927, p. 165; al-Kindī, Abū ʿUmar Muḥammad b. Yūsuf: *Tasmiyat wulāt Miṣr*. Ed. Rhuvon Guest as: *The Governors and Judges of Egypt or Kitâb el ʿumarâ' (el wulâh) wa Kitâb el Quḍâh of El Kindî. Together with an appendix derived mostly from Raf' el iṣr by Ibn Ḥajar*. Leiden 1912, p. 60 [in vol. XIX of the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial series, pp. 68–69 cover years 99–101].

non-Muslims make up only a negligible percentage of the populations of a number of Muslim-majority countries.[5]

For a number of reasons, contemporary western discourse on the nature and makeup of Islamic societies often focuses on the implications of modern manifestations of *sharīʿa* rule for non-Muslim minorities.[6] While such concerns are often voiced in response to an ideal of an exclusively and homogenous 'Muslim' society found in contemporary Islamist discourse, such modern Islamist views arguably bear little resemblance to the heterogeneous nature of Islamic societies in the classical period of Islamic history. The provisions of the Covenant of ʿUmar emerged at a time in which those Christians whose actions were defined (or limited) were not severely marginalized demographically or, arguably, socio-economically, or even politically. The Muʿtazilite polymath al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 255/868–9), in his *Refutation of the Christians*, enumerates Christians' professional and academic accomplishments, the power of the Christian dynasties, as well as the intermarriage of Byzantine women with Arab men among the causes for Christians being considered "more sincere than the Jews, more endeared, less treacherous, less unbelieving and less deserving of punishment".[7]

[5] The populations of 29 of the 57 member states of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation are over 90 % Muslim, according to the 2012 Pew Forum "Religious composition by country" table. Available at URL: `http://www.pewforum.org/files/2012/12/globalReligion-tables.pdf` (1.3.14).

[6] A theme recently popularized by Bat Ye'or (i.e. that of the oppressive and repressive nature of these *shurūṭ* for those non-Muslims under the 'protection'—*dhimma*—of the Islamic polity) in *Le Dhimmi: Profil de l'opprimé en Orient et en Afrique du Nord depuis la conquête arabe.* Paris 1980. Tr. David Maisel as: *The dhimmi: Jews and Christians under Islam.* Cranbury, N.J. 1985; see also Farr, Thomas: Religious Freedom Abroad. In: *First Things* February 2012, available at URL: `http://www.firstthings.com/article/2012/02/religious-freedom-abroad` (1.3.14). See especially the analysis of the US Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) of 'Muslim constitutions', available at URL: `http://www.uscirf.gov/issues/muslim-constitutions` (1.3.14).

[7] Al-Jāḥiẓ, ʿAmr: *Radd ʿalā l-naṣāra.* Ed. J. Finkel. In: idem (ed.), *Thalāth rasāʾil li-Abī ʿUthmān ʿAmr b. Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ.* Cairo 1926; Tr. J. Finkel as: A Risala of al-Jahiz. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 47 (1927), pp. 311–334. Extract reproduced in Bostom, A. G. (ed.): *The Legacy of Islamic anti-Semitism: From Sacred Texts to Solemn History.* Amherst, N.Y. 2008, pp. 317–318.

The confessionally, and ethnically, heterogeneous nature of early Islamic societies can be traced to the lifetime of the Prophet Muḥammad.[8] The Qurʾān itself prescribes and proscribes inter-communal interactions with a variety of nuances.[9] In fact, Jewish-Muslim relations figure early in Islamic narratives of origin, to the very days of the Prophet Muḥammad himself, in the Constitution of Medina—with a markedly different tone from that of the Covenant of ʿUmar, with Jews being included in the *umma*—community—of Muslims/believers.[10] Here, however, is not the place to discuss the nuances of the history of Jewish-Muslim relations vis-à-vis Jewish-Christian, and Muslim-Christian, interactions.[11] Suffice it to mention that, while recent decades have witnessed an interpretive emphasis on those passages that warn against relations with Jews,[12] Christians have, historically, been a larger demographic presence in Muslim-ruled territories than have Jews. In fact, up until the Mongol destruction of Baghdād (in 656/1258), Christians were a significant demographic entity in much of the Arabic-speaking, Muslim-ruled regions.

It should also be noted that, while the Covenant of ʿUmar is worded so as to specify the proper code of behaviour for Christians under Muslim rule, the provisions were extended and adapted, with varying nuances in different times and places, to other non-Muslim communities within the Islamic polity.[13] Another distinctive aspect of the various renditions of

[8] See, e.g. Ferré, A.: Muhammad a-t-il exclu de l'arabie les juifs et les chrétiens? In: *Islamochristiana* 16 (1990), pp. 43–65.

[9] Wilde, Clare/McAuliffe, Jane Dammen: Art. "Religious Pluralism and the Qurʾān". In: McAuliffe, J. D. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, Online version; see also Rubin, Uri: Art. "Jews and Judaism". In: McAuliffe, J. D. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, Online version and Griffith, Sidney H.: Art. "Christians and Christianity". In: McAuliffe, J. D. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, Online version.

[10] Donner, Fred: From Believers to Muslims. Patterns of Communal Identity in the early Islamic Community. In: *al-Abhath* 50–51 (2002–2003), pp. 9–53.

[11] Cohen, Mark: *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages.* Princeton 1994 and Griffith, Sidney H.: *The Church in the Shadow of the Mosque: Christians and Muslims in the World of Islam.* Princeton 2008 provide an excellent overview of these topics.

[12] Bostom, *Islamic Antisemitism*; Lewis, Bernard: Muslim anti-Semitism. In: *Middle East Quarterly* 5 (1998), pp. 43–49; Ye'or, *Le Dhimmi.*

[13] My thanks to Jens Scheiner for sharing with me his recent essay Al-Ḥākim, die Šurūṭ al-ʿUmarīya und die Ahl al-Kitāb. In: Biesterfeld, Hinrich *et al.* (eds.), *Differenz und*

the *shurūṭ* is the variation of ascribed authorship: in some versions, the provisions are depicted as the edicts of Muslim officials, while in other iterations, the Christians are portrayed as proposing the conditions under which they will live in order to earn the protection of the Islamic state. In the hopes of shedding further light on the variety of interpretations that might be brought to a reading of these *shurūṭ*, the following paper focuses on possible circumstances that might situate the provision that lends itself to the prohibition: 'We shall neither learn the Qur'ān nor teach it to our children' (*wa-lā nataʿallamu l-Qur'ān wa-lā nuʿallimuhū awlādanā*).

Particularly given the movement towards translating the Qur'ān by the middle of the 3rd/9th century (the earliest documented Persian translation),[14] and the increased likelihood that not only Arabophone, but also non-Arabophone, Christians would therefore have had the possibility to access the meaning of the text, the prohibition on Christian learning or teaching the Qur'ān was unlikely to have been merely a *pro forma* provision "preventing" (or inscribing) an unusual event. As Arabophone Christians would have had greater access not just to the Qur'ān, but also to Islamic discussions about it, and as some of the recensions of the Covenant of ʿUmar preserve an ordinance that Christians should not speak like Muslims (*lā natakallamu bi-kalāmihim*),[15] the current discussion focuses on Arabophone Christian usage of the Qur'ān (rather than translations such as that, for example, of John of Damascus, who referenced the Qur'ān in Greek in *ca.* 132/750).[16]

Dynamik im Islam. Festschrift für Heinz Halm zum 70. Geburtstag. Würzburg 2012, pp. 37–54; see also Dick, Ignace: Evolution du statut légal et sociologique des chrétiens en syrie. In: *Proche-orient chrétien* 45 (1995), pp. 64–78; also Rose, Richard: Islam and the Development of Personal Status Laws among Christian dhimmis: Motives, Sources, Consequences. In: *The Muslim World* 72 (1982), pp. 159–179.

[14] My thanks to the reviewer of this article for drawing attention to this point. For further details, see Bobzin, Hartmut: Art. "Translations of the Qur'an". In: McAuliffe, J. D. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, Online version.

[15] As preserved in one of Ibn Zabr's recensions of the Covenant of ʿUmar; see Cohen, *What was the pact of Umar?*, 141.

[16] See Greek text and English translation of his *Heresy of the Ishmaelites*, which appears to reference content not known from the ʿUthmānic codex familiar to us—such as a *sūra* entitled "The Camel of God", in Sahas, Daniel J.: *John of Damascus on Islam. The "Heresy of the Ishmaelites".* Leiden 1972, pp. 131–141 (the discourse on the camel appears on pp. 139–141). My thanks to a reviewer of this article for highlighting this point.

Drawing upon the approaches to the Qur'ān found in two (early) Christian Arabic texts, possible reasons for such a prohibition will be explored, as well as why (and perhaps even how) the Qur'ān was being taught to Christian 'children' (including a brief discussion of the intercommunal implications of the regulations developed around the ritual purity of those who handled physical copies of the qur'ānic *muṣḥaf*). For, rather than simply a restrictive or distinction-making ordinance, might Muslim officials have been responding to the use that Christians were making of the Qur'ān? As laws, or regulations, are unlikely to emerge in a vacuum, might, then, the prohibition be a response to abuses of a privilege that had been granted? Indeed, as the texts under examination here indicate, Christians writing in Arabic did know the Qur'ān—although the exact details of how they came to know it, or even the form in which they knew it, are unclear.

7.1 The Texts: Theodore Abū Qurra and an Anonymous Melkite Monk of Jerusalem

One Christian Arabic text that might shed light on the use that Christians did make of the Qur'ān is the account of a debate between the early third/ninth century bishop of Ḥarrān, Theodore Abū Qurra, with Muslim notables on the veracity of the Christian religion.[17] He had been summoned before the caliphal *majlis* by no less a figure than the early ʿAbbāsid caliph al-Ma'mūn (r. 198–218/813–33). The discussion ranges

[17] Abū Qurra, Theodore: *Munazzara.* Ed. I. Dick as: *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah avec les ulémas musulmans devant le calife al-Ma'mūn.* Aleppo 1999. Twenty-six manuscripts of the text, dating from the fourteenth to the nineteenth centuries, and Melkite and Jacobite recensions of it, are known. For the manuscript history of the text, as well as an overview of this genre, see Griffith, Sidney H.: The Monk in the Emir's Majlis. Reflections on a Popular Genre of Christian Literary Apologetics in Arabic in the Early Islamic Period. In: Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava *et al.* (eds.), *The Majlis. Interreligious Encounters in Medieval Islam.* Wiesbaden 1999, pp. 38–39. A student of S. Kh. Samir produced a critical edition of this text: Nasry, Wafik: *The Caliph and the Bishop. A 9th century Muslim-Christian Debate. Al-Ma'mūn and Abū Qurrah.* Beirut 2008.

from points of Christian doctrine that are not compatible with Islamic belief (e.g. the divinity of Christ) to pointed attacks on the weaknesses of Islamic belief (e.g. if God is just, what is the eschatological reward of the Muslim women, if their husbands are promised *ḥūrīs* in paradise?). In this debate, the Muslim notables are vanquished—not only because of Abū Qurra's familiarity with points of Christian doctrine and his ability to explain their validity, but also by his knowledge of the Qur'ān itself and his ability to employ it in defence of Christian doctrines, as well as to critique it. Al-Ma'mūn is said to have uttered: "Abū Qurra is a sea of knowledge; it is impossible for anyone to withstand him in *kalām* or in the knowledge of religions".[18] This debate presumably took place in 215/830, in the vicinity of Ḥarrān (in the south of today's Turkey) as the caliph was on his way to battle Byzantium.[19] Due to its ready availability (and despite its textual infelicities), Ignace Dick's edition of the account was the primary source consulted for the present discussion.

The second text under examination is preserved in a unique manuscript (Sinai Ar. 434, ff. 171r–181v, copied in 533/1139), a microfilm copy (from May 31, 1950) of which is housed in the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. This manuscript contains the response of an anonymous Melkite monk of Jerusalem to three questions posed by a Muslim shaykh. The shaykh has read a "Refutation of the Christians" (presumably akin to the extant works of that title of al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 255/868–9), al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm (d. 245/860) or 'Alī b. Rabbān al-Ṭabarī (d. *ca.* 250/864)), and wants the monk's expert opinion on the following questions raised in the text: the relationship of the eternal being of God to the three persons of the Trinity; the hypostatic union of God and man in the person of Christ; and the proof of this hypostatic union in the actions of Christ. In his response, this monk, who lived in pre-Crusader Jerusalem—and arguably as late as Fāṭimid times (while Swanson dates the text to 3rd/9th century, Haddad argues for a 163/780 dating)[20]—employs both biblical and qur'ānic proof in support of Christian doctrines.

[18] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 80.

[19] On the historicity of the encounter between Abū Qurra and al-Ma'mūn, see Griffith, Sidney H.: Reflections on the Biography of Theodore Abū Qurrah. In: *Parole de l'Orient* 18 (1993), pp. 143–170, esp. 156–158.

7.2 The Qur'ān: Grammatical Textbook or Revelation?

Before examining early Arabophone Christian utilization of the Qur'ān, some discussion on the role of the Qur'ān in classical Islamic educational models is necessary. It was an integral part of Islamic ritual (especially its proper recitation). It also was an essential element of classical Islamic religious sciences, particularly law. But, Islamic ritual and law would have been of little interest to Christians as they had their own rituals that did not involve the Qur'ān and, under Islamic rule, Christians were governed by the rules of their own community. The exegesis of the Qur'ān also figured in Islamic theology—something (as discussed below) that Christians would employ in their apologetic agenda.

Both Sinai Ar. 434 and Theodore's text attest to a multi-confessional milieu, in which it was possible, if not positively encouraged, to obtain more than a passing familiarity with other traditions. Theodore's text alludes to Ṣa'ṣa'a b. Khālid of al-Baṣra who has "studied scripture (*darasa l-kitāb*) and become a devotee of the religion of Islam (*dīn al-islām*) and understood the weakness of the opinion of the Christians".[21] Is Ṣa'ṣa'a's study of "scripture" a generic category, or solely the book of Islam—the Qur'ān? For the same text also describes 'Alī b. Walīd as among those most proficient in the readings of the books (*min man akthara fī qira'āt al-kutub*), the study of the Gospel and the Psalms (*dars al-injīl wa-l-zabūr*), and knowledge of the secrets of religion (*'irf sarā'ir al-dīn*).[22]

[20] Haddad, Robert: *La Trinité divine chez les théologiens arabes 750–1050*, vol. 15 of *Beauchesne Religions*. Paris 1985, p. 38 dates the text to 163/780 (see Hoyland, Robert: *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It. A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam*. Princeton 1997, pp. 504–505). A third/ninth century date is suggested by Swanson, Mark: Beyond Prooftexting. Approaches to the Qur'ān in Some Early Arabic Christian Apologies. In: *The Muslim World* 88 (1988), p. 301 and n. 25.

[21] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 82.

[22] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 92.

And Theodore himself is noted as an "expert in his religion and doctrine (*ʿālim kabīr fī dīnihī wa-madhhabihī*)",[23] a "sea of knowledge, against whom it is impossible for anyone to withstand in *kalām* or the knowledge of religions",[24] and who "shoots arrows from [his opponent's] quiver".[25] The two Christian Arabic texts under examination here are notable for their active and lively engagement with qurʾānic contents and Islamic interpretive traditions thereof—an engagement which, as discussed below, may very well have contributed to an eventual prohibition on Christians' learning and, ultimately, handling of the Qurʾān.

In classical Islamic society, Christian and Muslim elites studied together, under the same masters. Christians—often through the medium of Ṣyriac—translated Greek philosophical works into Arabic. Islamic tradition is replete with notices of Christian scribes, and Christians as translators—not all of which are favourable: al-Yāqūt's biographical dictionary records the following estimation of Mattā b. Yūnus and other Christian translators on the part of a Muslim: "Men, weak and imperfect in one tongue, who translate it into another, in which they are also weak and imperfect."[26] But, was qurʾānic instruction a requisite component of the education of the non-Muslims in this elite literate class?

For, the Qurʾān was also integral to the teaching of Arabic grammar. As the following anecdote from the first ʿAbbāsid century attests, the Qurʾān has been considered integral for the learning of proper Arabic—by Muslims and non-Muslims:

> Certain *dhimmī*s asked Abū ʿUthmān al-Mazinī[27] to read with them the book, the grammar of Sībawayh, offering him 100 dinars for his trouble. Although he was poor, he refused. When a friend remonstrated with him he said in the book are 300 traditions and ever so many verses of the Qurʾān. I will not give a *dhimmī* such mastery over our religion. Shortly after he was summoned into the presence of the Caliph al-Wāthiq to explain a point of grammar, and was given 1000 dinars [...]. I gave God 100 dinars and he has given me 1000.[28]

[23] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 69.

[24] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 80.

[25] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 91. Here, it should be noted that, while al-Maʾmūn praises Theodore for his mastery of *kalām*, such praise could be a double-edged sword, in the light of theological and political trends concerning the suitability of *kalām* vs. *ḥadīth* in approaching the Qurʾān.

[26] Yāqūt b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥamawī: *Irshād al-arīb ilā maʿrifat al-adīb*. Ed. D. S. Margoliouth. 7 vols. London 1907–1931. [also Ed. A. F. Rifāʿī. 20 vols. Cairo 1936–1938.], vol. III, p. 117. Quotation and abbreviated citation given in Tritton, *Caliphs and their non-Muslim subjects*, 170. (I have not been able to check the editions to verify Tritton's translation.)

[27] I.e. Abū ʿUthmān Bakr b. Muḥammad al-Nahwī (d. 248/863).

Accounts such as these demonstrate the importance of the Qurʾān as a tool for mastering Arabic grammar. But, if the primary grammars for the Arabic language contained examples from the Qurʾān, was it licit to use them in teaching non-Muslims the Arabic language? While there are indications of an aversion to such instruction, it was, seemingly, legally permissible to instruct non-Muslims in the Qurʾān as a necessary part of learning correct Arabic.

But, early Christian Arabic texts such as those discussed here indicate that Christians were not shy in referencing the Qurʾān to make their own polemical or apologetic arguments defending their Christian faith, often going so far as to claim that a proper reading of the Qurʾān would understand it to validate Christian messianic claims![29] And, priests were not uncommon as educators. They were also known to be educators of the children of non-Christians; and scripture was a traditional tool in the instruction of linguistic skills—as attested to by a Syrian Orthodox canonist, Jacob of Edessa (d. 708): "There is no harm in priests teaching Jews and Harranian pagans how to read by using the Psalms and other scriptural texts."[30] Might, as Arabic came to be increasingly necessary for daily life, priests have been expanding their teaching repertoire to include the Qurʾān? Might not, then, this prohibition in the *shurūṭ* reflects

[28] Al-Iṣfahānī, Abū l-Faraj: *Kitāb al-aghānī*. 27 vols. Beirut n. d., vol. III, 136 n. [sic]. Translation and abbreviated citation in Tritton, *Caliphs and their non-Muslim subjects*, 167. I have not been able to verify the translation, or if this edition of al-Iṣfahānī's work was that used by Tritton.

[29] A claim that has a parallel in Islamic tradition, at least as early as al-Jāḥiẓ, who expressed the opinion that Muslims, as those in possession of the "true religion" were the best interpreters of the Bible. My thanks to Hans Peter Pökel of the Freie Universität Berlin for bringing this to my attention.

[30] Freidenreich, *Muslims in Canon Law, 650–1000*, 94, n. 38.

an environment not dissimilar to the one of which Jacob speaks—a milieu in which Christian priests, as the traditional educators in a community, had taken upon themselves the task of learning the Qur'ān as a grammatical tool, if not for confessional reasons—and learning it, not implausibly, given al-Mutawakkil's attempted prohibition of Muslims' teaching Christians (235/849)[31]—at the hands of Muslims themselves? And, in this case, while the *awlād* (children) referenced in the *shurūṭ* might certainly be an indicator of the next generation of Christians, could it also be a reference to the larger Christian community, the flock, or "children",—with the religious officials, priests or "fathers" (*abānā*)—presumed to be the educated leaders?

Thus, a reading of early Christian Arabic texts for the use made of the Qur'ān may shed light on the *Sitz im Leben* of this ordinance, regardless of whether it (ever) needed *de jure* enforcement. What might the prohibition on Christians "teaching the Qur'ān" to their "children" indicate about the role of Christians as educators, as well as students? Who was teaching the Qur'ān, to whom, how, why, and what, exactly, was being taught?

7.3 *Muṣḥaf* or Contents?

In this context, two technical aspects of the prohibition on Christian teaching and/or learning the Qur'ān enshrined in the Covenant of 'Umar should also be highlighted: a) the emphasis on the memorisation and teaching of the (contents?) of the Qur'ān, rather than the handling of the *muṣḥaf* and b) the seemingly intra-communal nature of the prohibition (rather than a ban on Muslims teaching Christians, as in the ordinance of al-Mutawakkil in 235/849: *wa-lā yuʿallimuhum muslim*)[32].

[31] An ordinance which, however, seems to have had little real effect—as attested by the inter-confessional academic circles of ʿAbbāsid Baghdād. See, for example, the discussion of Griffith, Sidney H.: *The Reformation of Morals*. Chicago 2002 and the multiple papers of this very conference.

[32] Al-Maqrīzī, Taqī l-Dīn Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. ʿAlī: *Kitāb al-mawāʿiẓ wa-l-iʿtibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭāṭ wa-l-āthār*. 2 vols. Beirut n. d. (the pagination of the new edition of the Dār Sadr from offset matches that of Tritton's citation), vol. II, p. 494; cited in Tritton, *Caliphs and their non-Muslim Subjects*, 167.

Although, presumably, the juridical discussions about the ritual purity of those handling the Qur'ān for ritual purposes did not factor Christians into the equation, classical Islamic discussions on the handling of the *muṣḥaf* should be highlighted, in order to contextualize the first point of this section. Early on (i.e. the discussions of Mālik and Abū Ḥanīfa[33]), the purity of those who handled a *muṣḥaf* was generally treated more severely than that of those who merely recited the Qur'ān (based in part on a report that 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb once began to recite the Qur'ān after having relieved himself without, however, having performed *wuḍū'*). But, as Zadeh and others have indicated, the precise dating of the origin of such traditions concerning who may or may not handle (or recite) the Qur'ān is difficult to ascertain. If, for example, this ordinance of the *shurūṭ* was initiated at a time or place in which there was not yet widespread concern about the proper handling of the *muṣḥaf*, does that indicate that there were simply very few physical copies of the Qur'ān in common circulation, so the likelihood of public handling of it by a Christian was negligible? Or, would it indicate that this prohibition dates to a time in which the *muṣḥaf* had not yet obtained its 'sacred' status? And, if the latter option, might theological debates between Christian and Muslims have contributed to prohibitions first on Christians' learning the contents of the Qur'ān and, eventually, on the handling of physical copies of the text itself by those who would not read it with the 'correct' intention/interpretation?

Given their extensive familiarity with the Qur'ān, it is unlikely that either of the Christian Arabic texts under examination here emerged in a milieu in which Christians were banned from handling the Qur'ān. While the terms '*Qur'ān*' and 'book' (*kitāb*) are frequently referenced in the two Christian Arabic texts under examination here, there is no corresponding extensive discussion of, or allusion to, any *muṣḥaf*. But, committing scripture to memory is a trope common to both texts. *Ḥāfiẓ* is employed by the anonymous monk as an indication of a person who knows the contents of the scripture:

[33] See the sources given in Zadeh, Travis: Touching and Ingesting: Early Debates over the material Qur'an. In: *The Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129 (2009), pp. 449–450, nn. 35–41.

> Whoever does not read the revealed books of God will, out of ignorance, put forth, and thus be confused, by that which he does not know. But as for the intelligent, reasonable, cultured *ḥāfiẓ*, he will understand: for I did not arrive at anything from my own intellect (*ʿaql*), but, rather from the books of God (*kutub Allāh*),[34] my Lord.[35]

Dick's edition of Theodore's debate also employs the concept of the memorisation of scripture. In response to a query from one of his Muslim interlocutors as to whether or not the Messiah was the "Word of God (*kalimat Allāh*) and His spirit", Theodore says, "Yes. And in your scripture (*fī kitābika*), your Qur'ān (*wa-Qur'ānika*), it is so, if you have the Qur'ān by heart (*in kunta taḥfaẓu l-Qur'ān*)."[36] Such remarks suggest that the milieu in which our Christian Arabic texts arose gave primacy to a personal knowledge and familiarity with the contents of scripture, rather than pride of place to a physical object. Further study is required to determine whether this was because, in academic circles, the *muṣḥaf* was a tool for scholarly discussions, rather than an object of ritual significance, or because Christians were exempt from such discussions, as they would not have been using the Qur'ān for ritual practices.

The prohibition on this intra-communal teaching of the Qur'ān may also reflect a pragmatic reality: Christians did not have to rely on Muslims as teachers of the Qur'ān, as they were among the ranks of those scribes commissioned to copy Qur'ān manuscripts (as, for example, was done for the Kūfan jurist ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Layla [d. 148/765]).[37] But, if Christians were, in fact, allowed to transcribe, but not teach, the

[34] This intriguing turn of phrase ("books of God"), which seems not to exclude the Qur'ān, is used multiple times by the anonymous author of Sinai Ar. 434: ff. 171r; 181v; 174r: *kutub Allāh taʿāla*; 175r: *kutub Allāh al-munazzala, kutub Allāh rabbī*. Theodore once uses the phrase, but seems only to mean the Gospels (Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 98); he also references "heavenly books" (*al-kutub al-samāwiyya*): "the Torah, Injīl and other heavenly books". See Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 102.

[35] Sinai Ar. 434, ff. 174v–175r.

[36] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 96.

[37] See the discussion and detailed citation of sources of Zadeh, *Touching and Ingesting*, esp. 453, n. 67; also, Kister, M. J.: "Lā yamassuhu illā 'l-muṭahharūn" ... Notes on the interpretations of a qur'ānic phrase. In: *JSAI* 34 (2008), pp. 309–323.

Qur'ān, were they then considered 'pure' enough to handle the physical copy of the text? The silence in the *shurūṭ* on this point raises further questions to explore. Were Christians allowed to handle the qur'ānic *muṣḥaf* in their professional capacity (as scribes), but prohibited from its study? Could, then, the Qur'ān be handled in a professional—but not educational, let alone ritual—capacity by non-Muslims?

Particularly if one reads the comments about Christian victories in debates with Muslims that are preserved in Christian Arabic texts (such as Abū Qurra's, discussed below) as containing a kernel of truth (rather than merely as a rhetorical device of confessional boasting), this prohibition may well have been directed primarily at Christian *mutakallimūn* (scholars and dialectical theologians). In this reading, perhaps the prohibition was aimed precisely at discouraging or hindering Christian preparations for these *majālis*—particularly when the debates permitted the use of scriptural passages (rather than restricting the discourse to human logical devices, as the session witnessed by the Andalusian visitor to Baghdād, discussed below). The restrictions may first have been a prohibition on Christian *study* of the Qur'ān and, eventually, in some times and places, on Christians' *handling* of the *muṣḥaf*—particularly as literacy among Muslims increased, and the Islamic state no longer had to rely on Christian scribes.

7.4 Christian Approaches to the Inimitable and Uncreated Qur'ān

The Qur'ān's role in the instruction of Arabic grammar coincides with Muslim claims of its "inimitability" (*iʿjāz*; see Q 17:88)—a claim contested by Christian Arabs. For example, a Christian Arab also purportedly familiar with al-Ma'mūn's cocourt ʿAbd al-Masīḥ al-Kindī, claimed that the supposed literary merits of the Qur'ān are not even worthy of the best of the Arab poets.[38] The other major doctrinal definition relating to the Qur'ān is that, as the Word—or Speech—of God, it is "uncreated".

[38] See the discussion, and references, in Griffith, Sidney H.: The Qur'ān in Arab Christian Texts. The Development of an Apologetical Argument: Abū Qurrah in the *maǧlis* of al-Ma'mūn. In: *Parole de l'Orient* 24 (1999), pp. 210–214.

Normative Islam would, eventually, mandate and decree profession of its "uncreatedness", as attested to by the edict of the Caliph al-Qādir bi-llāh, proclaimed by his son, the Caliph al-Qā'im bi-Amr Allāh in 430/1039:

> Know that the word of God is not created. He has spoken and revealed it to His messenger through the voice of Gabriel after Gabriel had heard it from Him and then repeated it to Muḥammad. Muḥammad then repeated it to his companions and his companions repeated it to the community. The repetition of the word of God by created beings does not make it created because that speech is in its essence still the speech of God and it is uncreated. So, in every situation, repeated or memorized or written or heard, it remains that way. Anybody who says it is created in any way is an unbeliever whose blood may be shed after he has been called on to repent [and refused].[39]

Al-Ma'mūn, however, is remembered, among other things, for having attempted to force public officials to profess the "created" nature of the Speech of God through a *miḥna* ("inquisition"). And, Theodore Abū Qurra, in his debate before al-Ma'mūn, appears very well acquainted with these debates. For example, after establishing, on the basis of Q 4:171, that, despite the qur'ānic claim of Jesus' equality with Adam (Q 3:59), Jesus is, in fact, made of the Word of God and his Spirit (Q 4:171), Abū Qurra asks:

> Tell me about God's Word (*kalimat Allāh*), is it creative (*khāliqa*) or created (*makhlūqa*)?
>
> Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh bowed his head silently for a while. He made no reply as he was pondering. If he said 'creative' (*khāliqa*), he would be defeated; yet he was not prepared to say 'created' (*makhlūqa*).[40]

[39] Preserved in Ibn al-Jawzī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī: *Al-muntaẓam fī ta'rīkh al-mulūk wa-l-umam*. Ed. F. Krenkow. Hyderabad 1938, vol. VIII, pp. 109–111. Translated in Calder, N./Mojaddedi, J./Rippin, A. (eds. and trs.), *Classical Islam: A Sourcebook of Religious Literature*. London 2003, pp. 159–162; quotation found on pp. 160–161.

[40] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 73.

Echoing Nicene Christian orthodox teachings on the second person of the Trinity as "one-in-being" with the Father, this is a classic example of using the argument for the uncreated Qur'ān (the position that was under attack by the state-imposed *miḥna*, but which was held by Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, and which became the accepted understanding of the Qur'ān)[41] in support of Christian claims of the divinity of Christ, as the uncreated Word of God. Mindful of the discussions in Muslim circles over the 'created' (vs. uncreated) nature of the Qur'ān—as God's 'speech' or 'word'—Arabophone Christians would attempt to demonstrate the logical difficulty of considering Jesus 'created'—a 'creature'—if, in fact, he (like the Qur'ān) is the 'Word' of God (attested to, at least in Christian interpretations, by Q 4:171). While this exchange depicts Theodore vanquishing his opponents through logic as much as through knowledge of trends in Islamic thought—especially that of dialectical theology (*kalām*), Theodore's debate also portrays the Christian Theodore as having sufficient knowledge of Islamic traditions and interpretive trends to vanquish Muslim interlocutors: "Abū Qurra shoots at me with arrows from my own quiver (*yarmīni bi-sihām min ja'batī*); my weapon is spent (*fa-silāḥī fāna*), while his weapon carries on (*wa-silāḥuhū bāqa*)."[42]

If, as indicated by Theodore's familiarity with the Qur'ān,[43] Christians were studying and, especially, teaching, the Qur'ān—might Christian students of the Qur'ān (who, as non-Muslims, would have been exempt from ordinances such as that of al-Qādir, quoted above) have tended to highlight "heterodox" Muslim interpretations (especially as the doctrine of the uncreated Qur'ān became that of "normative" Islam)? For, both Theodore and the anonymous monk demonstrate an intimate familiarity with the contents of the Qur'ān—albeit with some glosses not in keeping with normative Islamic tradition. One of the more disingenuous (but popular) of such loose qur'ānic readings is provided by the anonymous monk of Jerusalem, in his interpretation of the "mysterious, or

[41] For more information on Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal see Jens Scheiner's paper in this volume (pp. 183–236).

[42] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 91–92.

[43] For extensive discussion of early Christian Arabic uses of the Qur'ān, see Wilde, Clare: *Approaches to the Qur'ān in Early Christian Arabic Texts*. Palo Alto, CA 2014. [Forthcoming].

disconnected, letters" at the beginning of *sūra* 2 (after a discussion of the biblical attestations of Jesus' miracles):

> And the book of the Injīl mentions some of his miracles (*āyāt*) out of very many. And the Qur'ān testifies to that, when it says, '*Al-mīm*. That book in which there is no doubt, a guide to the pious'. And '*al-mīm*' is the beginning of the name "the (al-) Messiah"; the ancient book which he had is that Christian book (*al-kitāb al-qadīm la-qad la-hū dhālika l-kitāb al-masīḥī*), and his book, in which there is no doubt, is a guidance for the pious, his *umma* and whosover obeys him—and it said that God would verify with his Word the truth, that is, the deeds of the Messiah, the Word of God—[the Word] is the verifying truth, so do not deny [the Word].[44]

Islamic tradition has spent much effort speculating on the meaning of the series of disconnected letters that begin some *sūras* of the Qur'ān. (As an example of the range of exegetical opinions, in his *tafsīr* on the beginning of *Sūrat al-Baqara*, no. 2, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210) discusses 21 explanations put forth concerning the 'mysterious' or 'disconnected' letters.)[45] Might Christians have had a heightened awareness of Muslim disagreements over parts of the supposedly inimitable and uncreated text, and, in this instance at least, have found it all too tempting to insert their own gloss thereto?

Similarly, in a number of his arguments, Theodore does not change the wording of the 'Uthmānic *muṣḥaf* known to us—rather, he conveniently glosses over points of difficulty to support his own arguments. But, in other places, he does criticize the received contents of the Qur'ān—careful, though, not to criticize the Prophet's reception of the message, but, rather, putting the blame on the later *umma*—for falsely preserving traditions that the Prophet did not say, or could not have done. Theodore claims, for example, that *sūras* 108 and 111 were not uttered by the Prophet. As with the 'mysterious letters' beginning a number of

[44] Sinai Ar. 434, ff. 178v–179r.

[45] Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī: *Al-tafsīr al-kabīr (Mafātīḥ al-ghayb)*. 32 vols. Beirut 1981, ad loc.

sūras, Q 108 and 111 have been the subject of much exegetical discourse, featuring in discussions of the 'difficult passages' of the Qur'ān.[46] As with the letters at the beginning of *Sūrat al-Baqara*, might Christian Arabs have knowingly employed qur'ānic passages about which Muslims disagreed in their apologetic agenda?

7.5 Doctrine as Social Control?

This leads to the question shaping this discussion—was the prevention of Christians' teaching the Qur'ān to their children also—if not primarily—a matter of cultic preservation—either so that Christians would not be tempted to convert to Islam, or so that Arabophone Christians would not taint Muslim interpretations of Islam? From the Banū Ṭaghlib on, Arabs who were not Muslim were looked on with suspicion. For, under the Umayyads, the Banū Ṭaghlib, although Christian, were treated differently from other—non-Arab—People of the Book (i.e. by paying *sadaqa* rather than *jizya*). And Christian Arabic texts preserve the memory of Christian disdain for the (preserved) text of Islam, and, at times, its prophet and the religion itself.[47] During the time of the translation-movement, of Greek and Syriac texts into Arabic (often at the hands of Christians), when doctrinal details were permitted matters of debate,[48] Christian Arabic texts preserve memories of debates in which Christians vanquished their Muslim counterparts—with both logic and scripture, and even in the presence of the caliph. While many of these accounts are clearly apologetic, and their utility as historical evidence may therefore be suspect, the tenor of some Muslim accounts of these same encounters suggest unease at the seeming parity of the participants, regardless of their confession:

[46] Dick, *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah*, 108–110; see also Wilde, Clare: The Qur'ān: *Kalām Allāh* or Words of Man? A Case of *tafsīr* transcending Communal Borders. In: *Parole de l'Orient* 32 (2007), pp. 1–17.

[47] One of the most striking early examples is that of 'Abd al-Masīḥ al-Kindī (see n. 29, above). From my reading of these texts, discussions of the state apparatus itself, however, are muted—complaints about Muslim treatment of Christians rarely extend to explicit criticism of particular figures of the upper administration.

[48] For the translation-movement see John Watt's article in this volume (pp. 363–388).

> When the meeting was jammed with its participants, and they saw that no one else was expected, one of the infidels said, "You have all agreed to the debate, so the Muslims should not argue against us on the basis of their scripture, nor on the basis of the sayings of their prophet, since *we put no credence in these things*, and we do not acknowledge him. Let us dispute with one another only on the basis of arguments from reason, and what observation and deduction will support."[49]

The above observations of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥumaydī, a 4th/10th century Andalusian visitor to Baghdād, does not, however, reflect the interpretations of the *shurūṭ* by many contemporary scholars focusing on the "trials of dhimmitude", nor the letter of the law of some of the most noted strictures placed on Christian life under Muslim rule, namely the prohibitions of the Caliph al-Mutawakkil. These prohibitions extended to the carrying of the cross in processions; clothing rules that were more restrictive than those of earlier caliphs;[50] dismissals of non-Muslims from government service (as in 247/861, with the dismissal of the Christian keeper of the Nilometer). Al-Mutawakkil's ordinances come on the heels of al-Maʾmūn's reign, and the debates over the createdness of the Qurʾān—when the caliph attempted to assert his role as theologian, but out of which the position of his opponents ultimately emerged triumphant. Might the interpretive license exhibited by Christians (and others) under al-Maʾmūn and other caliphs have contributed to a desire to preserve the Qurʾān from 'improper' (disrespectful?) interpretive approaches? Might the *shurūṭ* ordinance under discussion here have been an attempt to limit disrespectful (non-Muslim) engagement with the Qurʾān?

For, the seemingly casual manner in which Theodore and the anonymous monk cite the Qurʾān is echoed by Paul of Antioch a few centuries later: "If we take arguments from that which is in their book, the Muslims say: 'If you take arguments from one part of our book, you must accept all of it.'"[51] Might this tendency to prooftext, combined with the free attitude of Christian participants in *majlis* sessions as preserved in Theodore's text and the account of the Andalusian visitor to Baghdād, have contributed to the preservation, if not the institution, of the injunction prohibiting Christian teaching of the Qurʾān to their children?

Before concluding, brief mention should also be made of a number of pragmatic concerns that may well be reflected in the ordinance under discussion here: class and/or socio-economic, or legal/political control. Given the position of Christians in the state employ of many Muslim dynasties, and the correlation of the Qurʾān with knowledge of good Arabic grammar in Muslim circles, such a provision would seem—on the face of it—a rather pragmatic means for Muslims to maintain socio-political (and economic, or at least employment?) dominance over Christians, a situation about which ʿUmar II was particularly concerned: "I do not know a secretary or official in any part of your government who was not a Muslim, but I dismissed him and appointed in his stead a Muslim."[52] If, in fact, the Qurʾān was the key to understanding the Arabic language, and grammar was "intimately bound up with the ideological movements of the time and served both as a medium and a tool in the struggle for control of Muslim society",[53] to restrict one segment of society that had, in fact, been in a position of social prominence, from the nuances of linguistic mastery, might be a way to preemptively prevent their obtaining more influence in legal, political—as well as theological—discussions. Additionally, cultic preservation could have been a concern of Christian religious officials who did not want to see their flocks dwindle, and were thus eager to keep knowledge of the religion of their overlords from the masses. And, particularly before taxation regulations were normalized, Muslim officials, too, would have had a pragmatic concern for restricting the ease with which non-Muslims might learn about—and convert

[49] Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥumaydī: *Jadhwat al-muqtabis*. Ed. Muḥammad b. Ṣāwīt al-Ḥanjī. Cairo 1953, pp. 101–102. Emphasis mine.

[50] For a detailed discussion on the clothing rules see: Scheiner, Jens: *Vom „Gelben Flicken" zum „Judenstern"? Genese und Applikation von Judenabzeichen im Islam und christlichen Europa (849–1941)*. Frankfurt 2004, pp. 19–25.

[51] Paul of Antioch: *Risāla*. Ed./Tr. Paul Khoury as: *Paul d'Antioche. Évêque melkite de Sidon (XIIe s.)* Beirut 1965, pars. 45–47.

[52] Translation (with sources) found in Tritton, *Caliphs and their non-Muslim Subjects*, 22. See note 4, above, for the original sources cited by Tritton.

[53] Carter, M. G.: Language Control as People Control in medieval Islam: The Aims of the Grammarians in their Cultural Context. In: *al-Abhath* 31 (1983), p. 65.

to—Islam, as non-Muslims were, theoretically, to provide much of the revenue except the profits of crown lands.

7.6 Conclusion

Rather than attempting to locate a precise instance of institutionalisation or enforcement of a particular element of the *shurūṭ al-ʿumariyya*, the preceding was based on the presumption that ordinances do not arise in a vacuum and attempted to highlight questions that might fruitfully be engaged when attempting to comprehend seemingly restrictive ordinances which, to some contemporary auditors, appear arbitrary, punitive or malicious. If punitive, might it have been in reaction to an abuse of a privilege that had been granted? Rather than arbitrarily restrictive, might certain of the *shurūṭ* best be understood as descriptive? Or, if proscriptive, as a defensive measure undertaken by a minority to ensure its preservation through the establishment, or maintenance, of clear boundaries with larger society? What, then, was it about Christians' teaching—memorizing and, presumably, knowing—the contents of the Qurʾān that would have perturbed those who promulgated these *shurūṭ*? Was it, as Noth argues, a matter of maintaining a distinction between Christians and Muslims? Even if that were the purpose—why would it matter that such boundaries be drawn? What would it imply about the makeup of society as a whole? Professionally, socially, economically, politically, ethnically, even physiologically speaking, that it was hard to distinguish a 'Muslim' from a 'Christian'?

Particularly as the doctrines of the inimitability and uncreatedness of the Qurʾān came to the fore, supported eventually by caliphal edicts, might Christian (and other) irreverence for the authenticity and/or nature of the received text as preserved in the "ʿUthmānic" codex prove threatening both to the established (or tenuous) position of the caliph, as well as to the authority of those who upheld what came to be "normative" Islamic tradition? In addition to the relative (compared to the present day) scarcity of writing materials or literate individuals, and the increasing presence of Muslims who were not native speakers of Arabic, might the challenges to the authenticity and/or authority of the ʿUthmānic

rasm have argued for a preservation of those copies that did exist, and a safeguarding of their reading, and interpretation, in the hands of "proper" authorities? Might, in this reading, the "purity" required of anyone to handle a *muṣḥaf* stem from interpretive and political, as well as ritual, concerns?

In order the more fully to understand the juridical debates over the proper approaches to the Qurʾān (recitation, teaching, and/or physical handling of a *muṣḥaf*), a variety of factors should be considered: social, political, economic, theological, ritual—to name a few. In order to contextualize the restrictions on Christian approaches to the Qurʾān, Christian Arabic texts that exhibit intimate familiarity with the Qurʾān and Islamic interpretive traditions might be mined for the terms they use to reference the Qurʾān: is there any vocabulary indicating the physical form in which a given author or scribe knew the text? Secondly, what the texts indicate about the contents of the Qurʾān itself should also be examined: do Christian Arabic texts contain indications of the continued circulation of (traditions concerning) non-ʿUthmānic codices, or non-normative interpretive traditions (akin to those found in the—Greek—discussions of John of Damascus, cited above?), that would have served as a reason to limit Christian access to the Qurʾān? And, finally, the tone and tenor of Christian Arabic discussions of the Qurʾān should be examined: were there elements of disdain or disrespect that would argue for limiting Christian uses thereof?

From the above, we might conclude that the purpose of Christian study of the Qurʾān was multi-faceted: pragmatic linguistic proficiency to gain employ in the state; appreciation for the beauties of the Arabic language, and a desire to express themselves as eloquently as possible; theological—confessional—religious desire to safeguard and demonstrate the virtues of Christianity with the new tool of a revealed book that corroborated many aspects of their doctrine, and which could be (re-)read to confirm others. It is notable that Christians did not discard or disregard accounts of Jesus' miracles that do not appear in the four canonical gospels, but which do appear in the Qurʾān. Rather, they included accounts such as his enlivening a bird that he shapes out of clay as proof of his divinity. And, at a time in which the Qurʾān had yet to be preserved

in a single, definitive written (let alone recited) form, and before the doctrines of its uncreatedness (or inimitability) were definitively established or widely accepted as 'normative', Christians—in retrospect—might well have posed a threat to regimes that wished to assert the uncreated, inimitable nature of the Qur'ān: how could such a doctrine be convincingly maintained when various interpretations, let alone versions, of the text circulated? As Christians had no faith-based reason to preserve a single version or interpretation, and as their affairs would not have been as much a part of the regulation of Muslim officials (as opposed to the *qāḍīs* under al-Ma'mūn in the *miḥna*, for example), Christian centers of copying and scholarship may well have been known as repositories for non-normative traditions surrounding the Qur'ān, contributing, perhaps, to a desire, *de jure* or *de facto*, to limit their access to it.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥumaydī: *Jadhwat al-muqtabis*. Ed. Muḥammad b. Ṣāwīt al-Ḥanjī. Cairo 1953

Abū Qurra, Theodore: *Munazzara*. Ed. I. Dick as: *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah avec les ulémas musulmans devant le calife al-Ma'mūn*. Aleppo 1999.

Anonymous: *Answers for the Sheikh*. MS Sinai Ar. 434, folios 171r–181v. Copied 533/1139. [=Sinai Ar. 434]

Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī: *Al-tafsīr al-kabīr (Mafātīḥ al-ghayb)*. 32 vols. Beirut 1981.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh: *Sīrat ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz*. Ed. Aḥmad ʿUbayd. Cairo 1927.

Ibn al-Athīr: *Al-kāmil fī l-ta'rīkh*. Ed. C. J. Tornberg. 14 vols. Leiden 1851–76.

Ibn al-Jawzī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAlī: *Al-muntaẓam fī ta'rīkh al-mulūk wa-l-umam*. Ed. F. Krenkow. Hyderabad 1938.

Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, Sāwīrus: *History of the Patriarchs*. Ed. Christian F. Seybold as: *Alexandrinische Pariarchengeschichte von S. Marcus bis Michael I (61–767), nach der ältesten 1266 geschriebenen Hamburger Handschrift im arabischen Urtext herausgegeben*. Hamburg 1912.

al-Iṣfahānī, Abū l-Faraj: *Kitāb al-aghānī*. 27 vols. Beirut n. d.

al-Jāḥiẓ, ʿAmr: *Radd ʿalā l-naṣāra*. Ed. J. Finkel. In: idem (ed.), *Thalāth rasā'il li-Abī ʿUthmān ʿAmr b. Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ*. Cairo 1926. Tr. J. Finkel as: A Risala of al-Jahiz. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 47 (1927), pp. 311–334.

al-Kindī, Abū ʿUmar Muḥammad b. Yūsuf: *Tasmiyat wulāt Miṣr*. Ed. Rhuvon Guest as: *The Governors and Judges of Egypt or Kitâb el 'umarâ' (el wulâh) wa Kitâb el Quḍâh of El Kindî. Together with an appendix derived mostly from Raf' el iṣr by Ibn Ḥajar*. Leiden 1912.

al-Maqrīzī, Taqī l-Dīn Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. ʿAlī: *Kitāb al-mawāʿiẓ wa-l-iʿtibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-l-āthār*. 2 vols. Beirut n. d.

Paul of Antioch: *Risāla*. Ed./Tr. Paul Khoury as: *Paul d'Antioche. Évêque melkite de Sidon (XIIe s)*. Beirut 1965.

Yāqūt b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥamawī: *Irshād al-arīb ilā maʿrifat al-adīb*. Ed. D. S. Margoliouth. 7 vols. London 1907–1931.

Yāqūt b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥamawī: *Irshād al-arīb ilā maʿrifat al-adīb*. Ed. A. F. Rifā'ī. 20 vols. Cairo 1936–1938.

Secondary Sources

Ashtor, E.: The Social Isolation of ahl adh-dhimma. In: *Pal Hirschler Memorial Book*. Budapest 1949, pp. 74–85.

Bobzin, Hartmut: Art. "Translations of the Qur'an". In: McAuliffe, J. D. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, Online version.

Bostom, A. G. (ed.): *The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism: From Sacred Texts to Solemn History*. Amherst, N.Y. 2008.

Calder, N./Mojaddedi, J./Rippin, A. (eds. and trs.): *Classical Islam: A Sourcebook of Religious Literature*. London 2003.

Carter, M. G.: Language Control as People Control in medieval Islam: The Aims of the Grammarians in their Cultural Context. In: *al-Abhath* 31 (1983), pp. 65–84.

Cohen, Mark: What was the pact of ʿUmar? A literary-historical Study. In: *JSAI* 23 (1999), pp. 100–157.

Cohen, Mark: *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages.* Princeton 1994.

Dick, Ignace (ed.): *La discussion d'Abū Qurrah avec les ulémas musulmans devant le calife al-Ma'mūn.* Aleppo 1999.

Dick, Ignace: Evolution du statut légal et sociologique des chrétiens en syrie. In: *Proche-orient chrétien* 45 (1995), pp. 64–78.

Donner, Fred: From Believers to Muslims. Patterns of Communal Identity in the early Islamic Community. In: *al-Abhath* 50–51 (2002–2003), pp. 9–53.

Farr, Thomas: Religious Freedom Abroad. In: *First Things* February 2012, available at URL: `http://www.firstthings.com/article/2012/02/religious-freedom-abroad` (1.3.14).

Ferré, A.: Muhammad a-t-il exclu de l'arabie les juifs et les chretiens? In: *Islamochristiana* 16 (1990), pp. 43–65.

Freidenreich, David M.: Christians in early and classical Sunnī Law. In: Thomas, David/Roggema, Barbara (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History. Volume 1 (600–900).* Leiden 2009, pp. 99–114.

Freidenreich, David M.: Muslims in Canon Law, 650–1000. In: Thomas, David/Roggema, Barbara (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History. Volume 1 (600–900).* Leiden 2009, pp. 83–97.

Griffith, Sidney H.: *The Church in the Shadow of the Mosque: Christians and Muslims in the World of Islam.* Princeton 2008.

Griffith, Sidney H.: *Reformation of Morals.* Chicago 2002.

Griffith, Sidney H.: The Monk in the Emir's Majlis. Reflections on a Popular Genre of Christian Literary Apologetics in Arabic in the Early Islamic Period. In: Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava *et al.* (eds.), *The Majlis. Interreligious Encounters in Medieval Islam.* Wiesbaden 1999, pp. 13–65.

Griffith, Sidney H.: The Qur'ān in Arab Christian Texts. The Development of an Apologetical Argument: Abū Qurrah in the *maǧlis* of al-Ma'mūn. In: *Parole de l'Orient* 24 (1999), pp. 203–233.

Griffith, Sidney H.: Reflections on the Biography of Theodore Abū Qurrah. In: *Parole de l'Orient* 18 (1993), pp. 143–170.

Griffith, Sidney: Art. "Christians and Christianity". In: McAuliffe, J. D. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, Online version.

Haddad, Robert: *La Trinité divine chez les théologiens arabes 750–1050.* Vol. XV of *Beauchesne Religions.* Paris 1985.

Hoyland, Robert: *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It. A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam.* Princeton 1997.

Kister, M. J.: "Lā yamassuhu illā 'l-muṭahharūn" ... Notes on the Interpretations of a qur'ānic phrase. In: *JSAI* 34 (2008), pp. 309–323.

Lewis, Bernard: Muslim anti-Semitism. In: *Middle East Quarterly* 5 (1998), pp. 43–49.

Nasry, Wafik: *The Caliph and the Bishop. A 9th century Muslim-Christian Debate. Al-Ma'mūn and Abū Qurrah.* Beirut 2008.

Noth, Albrecht: Abgrenzungsprobleme zwischen Muslimen und nicht-Muslimen: Die 'Bedingungen ʿUmars (*aš-šurūṭ al-ʿumariyya*)' unter einem anderen Aspekt gelesen. In: *JSAI* 9 (1987), pp. 290–315. Tr. M. Mülhäusler as: Problems of Differentiation between Muslims and non-Muslims: Re-reading the 'Ordinances of ʿUmar (*al-shurūṭ al-ʿumariyya*)'. In: Hoyland, Robert (ed.), *Muslims and Others in early Islamic Society.* Burlington 2004, pp. 103–124.

Pew Forum: "Religious composition by country" table (2013). Available at URL: `http://www.pewforum.org/files/2012/12/globalReligion-tables.pdf` (1.3.14).

Rose, Richard: Islam and the Development of Personal Status Laws among Christian dhimmis: Motives, Sources, Consequences. In: *The Muslim World* 73 (1982), pp. 159–179.

Rubin, Uri: Art. "Jews and Judaism". In: McAuliffe, J. D. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, Online version.

Sahas, Daniel J.: *John of Damascus on Islam. The "Heresy of the Ishmaelites"*. Leiden 1972.

Scheiner, Jens: Al-Ḥākim, die Šurūṭ al-ʿUmarīya und die Ahl al-Kitāb. In: Biesterfeld, Hinrich *et al.* (eds.), *Differenz und Dynamik im Islam. Festschrift für Heinz Halm zum 70. Geburtstag.* Würzburg 2012, pp. 37–54.

Scheiner, Jens: *Vom „Gelben Flicken" zum „Judenstern"? Genese und Applikation von Judenabzeichen im Islam und christlichen Europa (849–1941).* Frankfurt 2004.

Swanson, Mark: Beyond Prooftexting. Approaches to the Qur'ān in Some Early Arabic Christian Apologies. In: *The Muslim World* 88 (1988), pp. 297–319.

Tritton, A. S.: *The Caliphs and their non-Muslim Subjects.* London 1930. [Reprint London 1970].

US Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF): 'Muslim constitutions'. Available at URL: `http://www.uscirf.gov/issues/muslim-constitutions` (1.3.14).

Wilde, Clare: *Approaches to the Qur'ān in Early Christian Arabic Texts.* Palo Alto, CA 2014. [Forthcoming].

Wilde, Clare: The Qur'ān: *Kalām Allāh* or Words of Man? A Case of *tafsīr* transcending Communal Borders. In: *Parole de l'Orient* 32 (2007), pp. 1–17.

Wilde, Clare/McAuliffe, Jane Dammen: Art. "Religious Pluralism and the Qur'ān". In: McAuliffe, J. D. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, Online version.

Ye'or, Bat: *Le Dhimmi: Profil de l'opprimé en Orient et en Afrique du Nord depuis la conquête arabe.* Paris 1980. Tr. David Maisel as: *The dhimmi: Jews and Christians under Islam.* Cranbury, N.J. 1985.

Zadeh, Travis: Touching and Ingesting: Early Debates over the Material Qur'an. In: *The Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129 (2009), pp. 443–467.