

CULTURAL HYBRIDITY: 'NEW MUSLIM INTELLECTUALS' AND THE STUDY OF ISLAM

Introduction

A look at political developments in the Muslim world during the last quarter of a century clearly evinces a return of the religion factor, often paraphrased as 'The Islamic Resurgence'. Much of the literature on the subject attributes this phenomenon to the Arab defeat in the 1967 Arab-Israeli war (as far as the Middle East is concerned).¹ However one should also consider equally cataclysmic events in South Asia (the war between Pakistan and future Bangladesh, the 1977 military coup against Bhutto), and Southeast Asia (an alleged Communist plot against the military in Indonesia and the ensuing overthrow of Sukarno by Suharto in 1965/66; the 1969 race riots between Malays, Chinese and Indians in Malaysia). Apart from this global spread, closer inspection will also show that these dramatic events of the 1960s and 1970s should not be considered as the immediate causes, but rather as catalysts for an 'Islamic Resurgence', increasingly radicalised from the late 1970s onwards.

More important for the present account, the Islamic resurgence must not be regarded from a political (in the conventional sense) point of view alone. There is a distinctly cultural and intellectual dimension to it as well. One way in which this becomes evident is that the Study of Islam is increasingly appropriated by what the literature on contemporary Muslim thought refers to as 'new Muslim intellectuals' – an intelligentsia pairing solid knowledge of the Islamic heritage with an equally intimate familiarity with developments in the Western human sciences.² This has turned them into a kind of cultural 'hybrids' -- others would say 'marginal' or 'liminal' figures, because they work on the interstices of cultural-religious traditions and academic disciplines, occupying their own distinct 'third space'.³

With their assertive intellectualism they not only influence the debate on crucial issues affecting the political climate of the Muslim world, but the academic specialists among them are also contributing significantly to the redefinition of research agendas in Islamic Studies. The implication of this for the field is far-reaching; it means that the study of Islam can no longer be confined to arcane Oriental studies, but must become an integral part of the human sciences. These, in turn, must give up the privileged position that is often still given to the achievements of the

Western academe in the narrow sense. As an aside, I offer the point that this segment of the discourse on the study of Islam nuances the contention, made by Edward Said in his seminal critique *Orientalism*, that Islamic Studies was and still is subject to a hegemonic imperialist project operated by a tandem of Western politicians and scholars.⁴ This is further supported by the parallels found in adjacent fields of Oriental studies, like Sinology and Indology; here intellectual historians like Gare, Kopf, King, and Clarke have shown that the ‘subalterns’ have retained or regained agency as specialists and appropriate at least part of the field.⁵

The intellectual dimension of the Islamic Resurgence has a similar historicity and trans-global spread as the political. The genealogy of this rethinking of the relevance of Islam in the modern world can be traced back to Muslim reformists and modernists of the nineteenth century. It was pondered by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan (1817-1898) in British India, at various places (Afghanistan, Egypt, France, Turkey, Russia) by a wandering *agent-provocateur* of Iranian origin named Jamal al-Din al-Afghani (1839-1893), and then continued by the Egyptian Islamic scholar and future Mufti Muhammad Abduh (1849-1905), the Syrian-born publicist Rashid Rida (1865-1935), and Muhammad Iqbal (1877-1938), the ‘spiritual father’ of Pakistan. Further east, contributions were made by the Indonesian reformer and educator Ahmad Dahlan (1868-1923), founder of the Muhammadiyah, claiming to be the largest mass organisation with tens of millions of adherents.⁶

This early Islamic reformism or modernism had a two-pronged offspring. One strand subscribed to a close adherence to the literal meaning of the two key sources of the Islamic tradition: the Quran and the Traditions of the Prophet (Sunna), and is therefore often referred to as Islamic fundamentalism, scripturalist or Salafi Islam (*Salaf* or ‘pious ancestors’ refers to the first three generations of Muslims). The other line of thought advocates a more substantialist and liberal reading of the sources. By attempting a more thematic approach, thinkers of the latter strand try to tease out the moral import of the Scriptures. An iconic figure of the former tendency was the Egyptian intellectual Sayyid Qutb (1906-1966). Initially making a name as a ‘man of letters’, he later emerged as a leading figure in the Muslim Brotherhood.⁷ When he became one of the key targets in the organisation’s persecution by the Nasser regime in the mid-1950s, his views became increasingly radicalised. Following his execution in 1966, he attained martyr status, and his writings can be regarded as the single most

influential contemporary source for a plethora of extremist Muslim activists and organisations.

This paper, however, deal with the other end of the spectrum. To make the discussion manageable, and not leave it only on an abstract level, I will focus on the work of two of the three thinkers who are the focus of my own research. To underscore the global dimension of ‘new Muslim intellectualism’, I have selected an Algerian intellectual historian working within the French academe, a philosopher from Egypt, and a leading intellectual from Indonesia. Analysing the intellectual roots of such thinkers does not only involve understanding their ideas in isolation, but must also include a mapping of the networks of which they are part. In attempting to do so, I find Peter Mandaville’s concept of ‘travelling theories’, borrowed from Edward Said, very useful.⁸ It is based on the assumption that ideas not just ‘travel’, but in the process they are adapted to the specific circumstances of the new environments in which they find themselves. In the context of the present research this can mean that ‘reformulated interpretations of religion are sometimes enabled [...] to *travel back* to their points of origin’ (Mandaville 2001: 86). I believe this can be applied to the way the Muslim intellectuals in question have quarried both the Western humanities and their own heritage, and synthesize these into creative contributions to a rethinking of the field of Islamic studies.

Hasan Hanafi

The work of the Egyptian philosopher Hasan Hanafi (* 1935) is an instructive illustration of this appropriation and transformation of ideas of various provenances. He is most renowned for his ‘Heritage and Renewal’ Project, an ambitious and simultaneous critique of both the Islamic and Western intellectual heritages designed to culminate in what can be regarded as a form of Islamic Liberation Theology, which Hanafi unfolded in a manifesto called ‘Leftist Islam’.⁹ However, the methodological approach to these projects is firmly grounded in his earlier philosophical investigations of Islamic modernism and Western phenomenology and hermeneutics.

In regards to the Islamic dimension of his work, Hanafi was influenced both by Sayyid Qutb and Muhammad Iqbal. In his youth, Hanafi had been a member of the Muslim Brotherhood and Qutb’s highly personal commentary on the Quran (*In the Shadow of the Quran*) inspired him to try and develop a comprehensive Islamic

method of philosophical investigation.¹⁰ In contrast with Qutb's Theo-centric focus, Hanafi opted for an anthropocentric approach.¹¹ For this he drew on the writings of Muhammad Iqbal, in particular the latter's series of philosophical lectures, published as *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. For his first attempt Hanafi returned to the traditional Islamic scholarly discipline known as *'ilm usul al-fiqh* or 'foundations of Islamic jurisprudence', which – within the constellation of traditional Islamic learning -- held a similar central position as theology used to occupy in the pre-modern West. Hanafi undertook this exercise during his postgraduate years at the Sorbonne in Paris (1956-66), at the advice of the famous scholar of Islam and specialist on Islamic mysticism, Louis Massignon, and it resulted in his principal thesis for a *doctorat d'état*, published under the title *Les Méthodes d'exégèse*.¹²

Hanafi saw himself as executing what he considered the third phase of Islamic modernism, initiated by Iqbal's 'reconstruction' of Islamic thinking. The core of this project consisted in what he called a 'transposition' of the traditional Islamic idiom of the Scriptures and Islamic sciences into a vocabulary that was more in tune with the contemporaneous circumstances in which present-day Muslims find themselves. It was basically a 'translation exercise', in which traditional Islamic concepts and notions were re-expressed in a terminology derived from Western philosophy, because, according to Hanafi, we were living in 'its epoch'.¹³ Consequently, transposition had to be understood as:

the expression of the contents of one culture (the transposed culture)
through the language of another culture (the transposing culture);
transposition is [therefore] essentially a linguistic phenomenon. (ME: 42)

While at the Sorbonne, Hanafi had become a student of the philosopher Paul Ricoeur and the theologian Jean Guitton. Through these two mentors he became acquainted with phenomenology, *Lebensphilosophie*, existentialism, hermeneutics, and Christian theology. After reading widely in Western philosophy, in the course of which he also translated works by Augustine, Lessing, Spinoza and Sartre into Arabic, Hanafi decided to expand his earlier work on Islamic law into a broader phenomenological hermeneutics. For his complementary thesis he refashioned the earlier developed Islamic philosophical methodology into a method for examining the religious phenomenon in general, and then applied it in an additional essay to an

existentialist exegesis of the New Testament.¹⁴ To my knowledge, Hanafi was the first Muslim to engage in Bible criticism since Sayyid Ahmad Khan.

These writings from the 1960s are clearly marked by Husserlian phenomenology, but reworked through the philosophy of Paul Ricoeur, whose ‘generous interpretations’ enabled him to reconcile seemingly oppositional positions found in the ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’ of Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche, structural linguistics, and existentialism. Just as Ricoeur had managed to synthesize these varying strands of thinking into a ‘philosophy of the will’, Hanafi saw them similarly converge in the thought of Iqbal, of which he considered himself to be the heir.¹⁵ In addition, the anthropocentric focus of Hanafi’s work also betrays the influence of Feuerbach.¹⁶

Within these three phenomenological studies, Hanafi employed a threefold division, distinguishing between the dimensions of historical, eidetic and active consciousness; with historical consciousness referring to the specific cultural-historical setting in which the Islamic teachings were received; while eidetic consciousness establishes generalized principles, which then, by means of the active consciousness, unfold into a liberation or emancipation of mankind. The same triple analysis is replicated in his “Heritage and Renewal” project, which he commenced in the 1980s. This more politically oriented and ideologically charged project engaged, in first instance, in a double critique of the Muslims’s subservient attitudes towards their own and Western civilizational heritage. Subsequently, Hanafi envisages these dialectical interrogations to lead to a synthesis, through which contemporary Muslim can stand in a more authentic relation towards this dual legacy.

Mohammed Arkoun

At about the same time, the Algerian historian of Islam, Mohammed Arkoun (* 1928) was also working at the Sorbonne. Although his work too betrays some influence of Paul Ricoeur, the alternative research agenda for Islamic Studies, which Arkoun proposed under the title ‘Applied Islamology’, relies heavily on the social sciences, and the genealogy of Arkoun’s ideas evinces an unexpected intellectual ancestry. The designation ‘Applied Islamology’ is derived from the book *Applied Anthropology* (1971) by the French ethnographer and sociologist Roger Bastide.¹⁷ Contrary to what one would expect, *Applied Anthropology* is a very theoretical work

and the actual practice of 'Applied Anthropology' was pioneered by British scholars, who used their colonies as a vast laboratory, and North-American sociologists who focused on the multicultural dimensions of their own society.

Bastide designed his 'Applied Anthropology' towards the end of his career as a social theory for dealing with the phenomenon of acculturation in cultural 'border situations'. It was inspired by very imaginative approaches in Brazilian social sciences, and by Bastide's own work on Afro-Brazilian religions, with which he became acquainted during his association with the university of São Paulo (1938-54), a vibrant academic environment which had hosted scholars like Lévi-Strauss (whom Bastide succeeded), Gurvitch, and the *Annales* School historians Braudel and Febvre.¹⁸

The red thread running through Bastide's writings is his interest in developing a single conceptual framework for analyzing the dialectics between social structures and religious phenomena. Bastide wanted to conceive an anthropology of religion that would help him understanding man as a 'manipulator of the sacred, and constructor of symbolic worlds'.¹⁹ Here Durkheim's views shine through, in which religion is regarded as embedded (as 'social fact') in the totality of social structures, this in contrast to Marxian and Weberian economic reductionism. However, more than in structures, Bastide was interested in transformation and change, exemplified by phenomena like acculturation and interpenetration of civilizations. That is why he actually preferred Comte's view of cultural evolution, Bergson's 'fluid sense of life', and Lévy-Bruhl's sensitivity to cultural diversity.

Bastide saw acculturation as a dialectics between values and social structures. To understand that dialectical process you needed to find a balance between the cultural concerns of anthropology and sociology's interest in group dynamics. This has led him to regard the disciplines of anthropology and sociology as complementary, since 'civilizational clash and interpenetration do not occur in a vacuum but in clearly determined social contexts.'²⁰

His approach was stimulated by an encounter with 'Luso-tropology'.²¹ This field of scholarly inquiry was an invention of Gilberto Freyre, a social scientist from Recife, famous for his colourful portrayals of Northeastern Brazilian plantation society.²² In this project, Freyre examined both the foreigner's place -- in this case the Portuguese -- in the tropics, and his relations with the indigenous population and imported slaves.²³ Although he used the neologism 'tropology', Freyre was not

undertaking something entirely novel. He traced the first centres of Lusotropical knowledge to sixteenth-century Portugal and its colonial outposts like Goa and Recife, especially to the writings of such authors as Camões and Mendes Pinto. Freyre had no hesitation regarding Camões work as a forerunner to Dewey's pragmatism. In the context of the examination of the genealogy of Applied Islamology, an even more pertinent assertion is that this early Lusotropical thought was the result of the earlier contacts between Christians, Jews and Muslims in the Iberian Peninsula even before the Age of Discovery.

A final aspect to be highlighted in Bastide's examination of Lusotropicology is that it occurred in the context of a chapter entitled 'Defence and illustration of Marginality'. This had been a longstanding interest of Bastide, in the course of which he also examined psychopathological conditions. However, here he was talking about cultural marginality, which he regarded in positive terms, because 'cultural marginals are the leaders of the acculturative gambit'.²⁴ It points up a parallel with my contention that the work of the new Muslim intellectuals holds much potential for enriching the field of Islamic Studies, because of their comparable marginal position on in the interstices of cultures.

For the same reason, it is possible to discern an immediate affinity between Freyre's Lusotropicology and Arkoun's Applied Islamology, because Northeastern Brazil's hybridism resonates with the cosmopolitanism which Arkoun had described in his PhD study on Arab-Islamic humanism in tenth-century Baghdad, and his later research on the cultural interpenetrations in the Mediterranean basin, and concern with the ethnic complexities of what he calls the 'Maghribian space' – that is his native Northwest Africa.

Arkoun introduced his programmatic agenda for 'Applied Islamology' in the 1970s. It was conceived as a double critique of, on the one hand, 'Islamic thinking' or 'Islamic reason', which, in Arkoun's view, was still locked up in the 'cultural configuration of Islam's classical age', and for which he coined the term 'logosphere' (betraying the influence of Derrida's notion of 'logocentrism').²⁵ On the other hand, the Western academic specialisation he refers to as 'classical Islamology', a discipline with the same text-based orientation as the classical Islamic legacy it studies.²⁶ It should be noted, however, that Arkoun is not unappreciative of the achievements of classical Islamology, acknowledging also his own debt to the data it has provided.²⁷ Moreover, he regrets the over-easy polemical assaults it was subjected to on purely

ideological grounds by Said's Orientalism critique. Arkoun was also critical of other scholars with Muslim backgrounds, because – just like the great intellectuals of the Arab Renaissance (*Nahda*) – many of them let themselves be trapped by the continued ideological manipulation of the Islamic legacy by totalitarian regimes in the present-day Muslim world.²⁸

In compiling the concrete research agenda for his project, Arkoun followed a *via negativa*: in order to excavate what Arkoun calls Islam's accumulated 'exhaustive tradition', researchers would have to address what the text-oriented traditions of Islam's classical age and the classical Islamology have either ignored, neglected, rejected out of hand, or failed to examine critically.²⁹ It envisaged the investigation of the dialectics between language, history and thought; a cognitive triangle that had been at work from the revelation of the Qur'an, throughout the earliest Islamic history covering the embryonic Muslim community in Medina, and the formation of the Sunni Caliphate and the Shi'i Imamate.

Apart from a greater awareness of the role of language, Applied Islamology insists also on introducing a distinct anthropological angle into Islamic studies in order to stave off the 'logocentrism' of the established, politically sanctioned official discourses, and highlight the existence of non-written oral legacies within Islamic civilization. This last aspect was also informed by his personal experiences as an ethnic Berber. Moving to what can be considered the core of 'logocentrism': the so-called Islamic sciences, Islamic philosophy, and the rational sciences, Arkoun suggests that the progress made in structural linguistics, the field of semiotics with its study of myth and metaphor, sign and symbol, but also in psychology must be used if Islamology wants to move beyond its current philological preoccupations.

With such a toolbox it also becomes possible to re-establish, for example, connections between poetry and philosophy, two fields which in the Islamic intellectual tradition had become separated. When drawing on the achievements made in the study of language, the 'homologue functions' of both poetry and philosophy can be discerned, since they both try to transfigure reality through linguistic means (using particular lexicons, rhetoric, and style).³⁰

Echoing Freyre and Bastide, Arkoun insists that Applied Islamology is a practical science, consisting of a variety of levels of analysis: linguistic, historical, psychological, sociological, philosophical and theological. It will take a team effort of an international collective composed of what Arkoun calls scholars-thinkers

(*chercheur-penseurs*) to implement such a project.³¹ To illustrate the multidisciplinary character of this exercise, Arkoun has frequently invoked the work of structuralist linguists and anthropologists such as Benveniste and Lévi-Strauss, as well as literary criticism. Arkoun regrets, for example, that Quranic Studies does not have the equivalent of Northrop Frye's *The Great Code*.

Although he rarely mentions Ricoeur, I believe Arkoun has followed Ricoeur's example of entering the field of hermeneutics through the 'narrow gate of structuralism'.³² I read a statement like '[a]ccurate description must precede interpretation; but interpretation cannot be attempted today without a rigorous analysis, using linguistics, semiotic, historical, and anthropological tools',³³ as Arkoun's attempt to rework Islamic Studies along the lines of Ricoeur's charitable or generous interpretation.

At the end of his career, Arkoun widened his interest to religious phenomena in general. This was triggered by his lifelong engagement with inter-religious dialogues and his dissatisfaction with the often apologetic, or polemic, or overly polite and respectful attitudes which govern such meetings. What he found lacking was a critical theology which would engage 'religious reason' with clarity and rigour.³⁴ To this end Arkoun introduced the notion of 'emerging reason'.³⁵ Taken as a 'philosophical subversion of the use of reason itself', its emerging aspect lies in the expectation of a continuous critical assessment of what Arkoun calls the three 'postures of human thought': (1) the religious posture with its theological, ethical and, in the case of Islam, juridical modes of thinking; (2) the scientific-technological modes of thinking dominating present-day globalization discourse; (3) the rationalist or empiricist philosophical postures still in the grip of the postulates of the modernity of the classical age.³⁶ Emerging reason can contribute to finding a '*comparative history of the theologies*' of the three Abrahamic religions, capable of opening up the whole field of human, social, and even exact sciences to theology.³⁷

Conclusion

In the case of Hasan Hanafi, the resulting fusion of emic and etic horizons in his grand plan for a comprehensive Islamic method, which informs both his early work towards a general method for the study of religion and the agenda of his later

'Heritage and Renewal' Project, evinces that Hasan Hanafi can be considered as representing the 'new Muslim intellectual', who finds himself in a liminal position, a 'third space' from where he could develop a hermeneutics of reconciliation, bringing together the insider perspective of Islamic learning and an outsider view provided by the Western philosophy.

This applies also to Arkoun's approach towards the history of Islam. Excavating the unthought from the logosphere and examining the 'border situations' of the culturally hybrid settings of the Mediterranean. Arkoun also shares Hanafi's ambition of applying these findings to the study of the 'religious phenomenon' in general, and thus contribute to an anthropology of religion

As I have mentioned at the start, in assessing the work of these 'new Muslim intellectuals', attention must also be paid to the distribution of ideas through intellectual networks. Not only has this enabled thinkers like Hanafi and Arkoun to draw on a wide variety of intellectual traditions, but the ideas they developed themselves have travelled as well. Interesting in both cases is that Arkoun and Hanafi's views have received a more welcoming reception in Southeast Asia – especially in Indonesia -- than from their respective home audiences. In order to find an explanation for that, as well as to further underscore the importance of taking a global view of the development of contemporary Muslim intellectualism, my project also includes an examination of Indonesia's leading Muslim intellectual of the last decades of the twentieth century, Nurcholish Madjid (1939-2005). Unfortunately, it is not possible to present these findings in the scope of this paper.

¹ For example, Ibrahim M. Abu-Rabi' (2004) *Contemporary Arab Thought: Studies in Post-1967 Arab Intellectual History*. London and Sterling: Pluto Press

² Mona Abaza (2002) *Debates on Islam and Knowledge in Malaysia and Egypt: shifting worlds*. London: Routledge Curzon; Rachid Benzine (2004) *Les nouveaux penseurs de l'islam*. Paris: Albin Michel; John K. Esposito and John O. Voll (2001) *Makers of Contemporary Islam*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press; Suha Taji-Farouki (ed.) (2004) *Modern Intellectuals and the Qur'an*. London: Oxford University Press in association with the Institute for Ismaili Studies; Suha Taji-Farouki and Basheer M. Nafi (eds.) (2004) *Islamic Thought in the Twentieth Century*. London & New York: I.B. Tauris, 2004

³ Cf. Homi Bhabha (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

⁴ Later expanded to the media as well, cf. Edward Said (1981) *Covering Islam: How the Media and Experts Determine How We See The Rest of the World*. London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Together with Anouar Abdel Malek's 1963 essay 'L'Orientalisme en Crise' (*Diogenes* 44, pp. 109-42), these are the most influential texts informing the Orientalism critique of Islamic Studies. It is

somewhat ironic that a Protestant Palestinian and Egyptian Copt have positioned themselves as the leading spokespersons for the emancipation of the Muslim world.

⁵ Cf. J.J. Clarke (1999) *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter between Asian and Western Thought*. London/New York: Routledge; Arran Gare (1995) 'Understanding Oriental Cultures' *Philosophy East and West* 45:3, pp. 309-29; Richard King (1999) *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and 'The Mystic East'*. London/New York: Routledge; David Kopf (1969) *British Orientalism and the Bengal Renaissance: The Dynamics of Indian Modernization 1773-1835*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press

⁶ For Sayyid Ahmad Khan, cf. Christian Troll (1978) *Sayyid Ahmad Khan: A reinterpretation of Muslim theology*. Delhi: Vikat; For Muhammad Iqbal, cf. his (1930) *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. Lahore: Kapur Art Printing Works; and Annemarie Schimmel (1963) *Gabriel's Wing: A Study into the Religious Thought of Sir Muhammad Iqbal*. Leiden: E.J. Brill. For al-Afghani, Abduh, Rida, and their influence in the Arabic-speaking world, cf. Nikki Keddie (1972) *Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī: A Political Biography*. Berkeley: University of California Press; *ibid* (1983) *An Islamic Response to Imperialism: Political and Religious Writings of Sayyid Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī*. Berkeley/London: University of California Press; Elie Kedouri (1966) *Afghānī and 'Abduh: An Essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in Modern Islam*. London: Frank Cass; Malcolm Kerr (1966) *Islamic reform: The Political and Legal Theories of Muhammad 'Abduh and Rashid Rida*. Berkeley: University of California Press; Charles Adams (2000) *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*. London/New York: Routledge [1933]; Hisham Sharabi (1970) *Arab Intellectuals and the West: The Formative Years 1875-1914*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Press; Albert Hourani (1983) *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press. For the Indonesian scene, cf. Harry Benda (1958) *The Crescent and the Rising Sun*. The Hague: W. van Hoeve; B.J. Boland, (1971) *The Struggle of Islam in Modern Indonesia*. The Hague: N.V. Nederlandsche Boek- en Steendrukkerij; Deliar Noer (1973) *The Modernist Muslim Movement in Indonesia 1900-42*. Singapore: Oxford University Press; Michael Francis Laffan (2003) *Islamic Nationhood and Colonial Indonesia: the umma below the winds*. London/New York: Routledge Curzon; Fauzan Saleh (2001) *Modern Trends in Islamic Theological Discourse in 20th Century Indonesia: A Critical Survey*, Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.

⁷ With the 'Islamic Resurgence' there has been an increased interest among scholars of Islam for this thinker, cf. Olivier Carré (2004) *Mysticism and Politics: A Critical Reading of Fī Zilāl al-Qur'ān by Sayyid Qutb (1906-1966)*. Leiden: E.J. Brill; Ahmad S. Moussalli (1992) *Radical Islamic Fundamentalism: The Ideological and Political Discourse of Sayyid Qutb*. Beirut. American University of Beirut; William Shepard (1996) *Sayyid Qutb and Islamic Activism: a translation and critical analysis of Social Justice in Islam*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

⁸ Peter Mandaville (2001) *Transnational Muslim Politics: Reimagining the Umma* London: Routledge; Edward Said (1984) *The Text, the World, and the Critic*. London: Faber and Faber.

⁹ Cf. Hasan Hanafi (1980) *al-Turāth wa 'l-Tajdīd : Mawqifunā Min al-Turāth al-Qadīm* [Heritage and Renewal: Our position towards the old heritage]; *ibid* (1981) *Al-yasār al-islāmī: kitābāt fī al-Nahda al-Islāmīya* ['The Islamic Left: writings on the Islamic Renaissance'] Cairo 1.

¹⁰ Cf. Ronald A.T. Judy (2004) 'Sayyid Qutb's *fiqh al-waqi'i* or New Realist Science' *Boundary 2* 31:2, pp. 113-48.

¹¹ Cf. Hasan Hanafi (1972) 'Theologie ou Anthropologie' in A. Abdel-Malek, A.-A. Belal, H. Hanafi (eds.), *Renaissance du monde arabe*. Algiers: J. Duculot, 1972, 233-64.

¹² Hasan Hanafi (1965) *Les méthodes d'exégèse: essai sur la science des fondements de la compréhension "ilm usul al-fiqh"*. Cairo: République arabe unie, Conseil supérieur des arts, des lettres et des sciences sociales.). Hereafter referred to as *ME*.

¹³ I have explored this in greater depth elsewhere, drawing on theories developed in the relatively new field of Translation Studies: cf. Carool Kersten (2007) 'Bold Transmutations: Rereading Hasan Hanafi's Early Writings on *Fiqh*' *Journal of Comparative Islamic Studies* 3:1 (2007) [forthcoming].

¹⁴ They were later published in Egypt: Hasan Hanafi (1980) *L'exégèse de la phénoménologie : l'état actuelle de la méthode phénoménologique et son application au phénomène religieux*. Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-Arabī. Hereafter referred to as *EP*; *ibid* (1988) *La phénoménologie de l'exégèse: essai d'une herméneutique existentielle à partir du Nouveau Testament*. Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop [1966]. Hereafter referred to as *PE*.

¹⁵ Cf. Paul Ricoeur (1999) *Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press [1967]; *ibid* (2004) *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*. London and New York: Continuum [1974, 1989]; *ibid* (1981) *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*. Translated and edited by John B. Thompson. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press; Don Ihde (1971) *Hermeneutical Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur* Evanston: Northwestern University Press; Richard Kearney (ed.) (1996) *Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action* London: Sage, 1996; Charles W. Reagan (1996) *Paul Ricoeur: His Life and His Work*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press

¹⁶ Cf. Hasan Hanafi (1979) 'Al-Ightirāb al-Dīnī 'inda Feuerbach' [Religious Alienation in Feuerbach] *'Alam al-Fikr* 1, pp. 41-68. Hanafi has discussed this amalgam of philosophical influences in an autobiographical essay, cf. Hasan Hanafi (1989) 'muhawala mabda'iyā li-sirat dhātī' ['Preliminary attempt towards an autobiography'] in *Al-din wa'l-thawra fi Misr 1952-1981* [Religion and Revolution in Egypt 1952-81]. Vol. vi, pp. 207-91.

¹⁷ Mohammed Arkoun (1973) *Essais sur la Pensée islamique*. Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve et Larose, p. 9; cf. Roger Bastide (1973) *Applied Anthropology*. London: Croom Helm Ltd [French original: 1971]

¹⁸ Cf. Richard Price's Foreword in Bastide 1978: vii.

¹⁹ Bastide 1978: ix.

²⁰ Bastide 1978: 383. Cf. also the observation that 'it is never cultures which are in contact but rather individuals' (Bastide 1973: 41).

²¹ Bastide 1973: 87-93. Bastide spells it 'Luso-Tropology'. I prefer to follow Freyre's 'Lusotropicology'. It is alternatively also called 'Lusotropicalism' (personal communication from Abdoolkarim Wakil, Department of Portuguese and Brazilian Studies, King's College London, 19 March 2008).

²² Cf. Gilberto Freyre (1956) *The Masters and the Slaves*. New York: Alfred Knopf [1946, Portuguese original 1931], *ibid* (1963) *The Mansions and the Shanties: The Making of Modern Brazil*. New York: Alfred Knopf [1945]. With these works, Freyre established himself also as an exponent of the Modernist Movement, which was transforming not only the Brazilian art world, but the intellectual scene in the widest sense. An accessible study of Modernism is: John Nist (1967) *The Modernist Movement in Brazil: A Literary Study*. Although it focuses on literature, Nist mentions Freyre in several instances (Nist 1967: 41, 95, 110, 112, 129, 148). For an assessment of Freyre influence in circles of the Brazilian social sciences, cf. David Cleary (1999) *Race, nationalism and social theory in Brazil: Rethinking Gilberto Freyre*. Cambridge (Mass): David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University.

²³ Gilberto Freyre (1961) *Portuguese integration in the tropics: notes concerning a possible Lusotropicology which would specialize in the systematic study of the ecological-social process of the integration in tropical environments of Portuguese, descendants of Portuguese and continuators of Portuguese*. Lisbon: Realização Grafica da Tipografia Silvas, pp. 9-10; 41-2.

²⁴ Bastide 1973: 94.

²⁵ Cf. Mohammed Arkoun (1973) *Essais sur la pensée islamique*; *Ibid* (1975) *La Pensée arabe*; *Ibid* (1984) *Pour une critique de la raison islamique*; *ibid* (1987) 'Réflexion sur la notion de "raison islamique"' (1987); *Ibid* (1993) *Penser l'islam aujourd'hui*; *Ibid* (2004) 'Pour une histoire reflexive de la pensée islamique'.

²⁶ Arkoun 1984: 43. On Arkoun as a 'double critic' cf. Ursula Günther (2004) *Mohammed Arkoun: Ein moderner Kritiker der islamischen Vernunft*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, pp. 4, 18, 107; Mohammed El Ayadi (1993) 'Mohammed Arkoun ou l'ambition d'une modernité intellectuelle' in Collectif (1993) *Penseurs maghrébins contemporains*. Casablanca: Éditions Eddif, p. 59.

²⁷ Arkoun 1973: 8; Arkoun 1984: 60-1 and, *Ibid* (1997) 'The Study of Islam in French Scholarship' in Azim Nanji (ed.) (1997) *Mapping Islamic Studies: Genealogy, Continuity and Change*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 42; *Ibid* (2002) *The Unthought in Contemporary Islamic Thought*. London: Saqi Books, p. 9, 11 n. 1.

²⁸ Arkoun 1997: 43; Arkoun 2002: 15; *Ibid* (2005) *Humanisme et islam: Combats et propositions*. Paris: Vrin, pp. 145-6. On the ideological orientations of the *Nahda* intellectuals, cf. Arkoun 1975: 96ff; Arkoun 1984: 10-11, 27-8.

²⁹ Arkoun 1984: 44, 55. For this Arkoun has introduced the terms 'the unthought' and 'the unthinkable'. This pair has permeated Arkoun's thinking since the mid-1970s. In every culture, an intricate interplay of political and social pressures determines 'what a tradition of thought allows us to think in a particular period of its evolution. [...] A number of ideas, values, explanations, horizons of meaning, artistic creations, initiatives, institutions and ways of life are thereby discarded, rejected, ignored or doomed to failure by the long-term historical evolution called tradition or 'living tradition' according to dogmatic theological definitions. Voices are silenced, creative talents are neglected, marginalized or obliged to reproduce orthodox frameworks of expression, established forms of aesthetics, [...] (Arkoun 2002: 11-2). 'The unthought is made up of the accumulated issues declared unthinkable in a given logosphere' (Arkoun 2002: 12); 'When the field of the unthinkable is expanded

and maintained for centuries in a particular tradition of thought, the intellectual horizons of reason are diminished and its critical functions narrowed and weakened because the sphere of the unthought becomes more determinate [...]’ (Ibid).

³⁰ Arkoun 1984: 12-25.

³¹ Arkoun 1984: 20, 48, 53; 1995: 332-40; 1997: 33.

³² It must be noted that, although Ricoeur’s philosophy has been influential, Arkoun has also criticised Ricoeur for holding an ethnocentric outlook: Arkoun (2000) ‘From Inter-Religious Dialogue to Recognition of the Religious Phenomenon’ *Diogenes* 186 (46:2), pp. 140-1

³³ Arkoun 1997: 43, and also Arkoun 2002: 130; cf. Ricoeur’s observation ‘to explain more is to understand better’ (Ricoeur 1985: 32; Ricoeur 1995: 11).

³⁴ Arkoun 2000 129-34

³⁵ Sometimes Arkoun calls it ‘emergent reason’. Arkoun 2000: 124; Aroun 2002: 22-9

³⁶ Arkoun 2002: 23-4

³⁷ Arkoun 2000: 131-2