

signés par quelques grands noms des relations interreligieuses à l'instar du nouveau cardinal Michael Louis Fitzgerald, bien connu des lecteurs de notre revue, l'ouvrage est construit en cinq parties. La première partie cherche à éclairer le contexte dans lequel est apparu le document ACW : celui des bouleversements géopolitiques au Moyen-Orient, celui de la publication du document *Amman Message* (dont l'origine remonte à novembre 2004), celui aussi des nombreuses initiatives prises depuis le concile Vatican II. La deuxième partie met en exergue quelques réponses et réactions au document : la réponse de Rowan Williams, archevêque de Canterbury et des réflexions qu'elle a elle-même suscitées, celles venues d'autres Églises. Mais si cette deuxième partie est aussi consacrée à quelques réflexions provoquées par la publication de ACW (sur l'amour du prochain et l'humilité notamment), elle ne s'étend pas malheureusement sur la réception du document ACW dans le monde islamique. La troisième partie est consacrée à l'usage des Écritures dans le document ACW et plus largement dans les relations interreligieuses, soulignant notamment quelques ambiguïtés malheureuses à l'instar de l'expression « a common word » elle-même. La quatrième partie s'attache à l'étude de la réception du document ACW suivant plusieurs contextes : la Bosnie, la Terre sainte, l'Allemagne. On soulignera l'originalité de l'article de Amir Dastmalchian consacré à la musique comme champ possible de dialogue entre Chrétiens et Musulmans. La cinquième partie, la plus courte, reprend le titre général de l'ouvrage et offre quelques réflexions sur le futur du dialogue islamo-chrétien : des suggestions pour développer une nouvelle phase de discussions suite au document ACW, la nécessité de reconnaître l'importance des différences doctrinales, de désigner des buts communs mais aussi de recourir aux patrimoines théologiques respectifs qui ne sauraient se réduire, selon Yazid Said, à « des pièces de musée ».

Comme le souligne Lejla Demiri dans son introduction, « l'importance de ce volume réside dans le fait que ses contributeurs témoignent d'un engagement envers un engagement académique rigoureux tout en gardant en vue le cadre plus large de l'importance de la théologie, des études religieuses et de l'ACW pour le bien commun » (p. 10). A ce titre, cet ouvrage constitue un outil précieux pour tout étudiant en théologie engagé dans les études interreligieuses.

Rémi CAUCANAS

Wilkinson Taraneh R., *Dialectical Encounters: Contemporary Turkish Muslim Thought in Dialogue*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh 2019, 269 pp.

Researchers such as Christian W. Troll, Rotraud Wielandt, Philip C. Dorroll and myself have for decades observed Turkish theology. Wilkinson's book, a Georgetown doctorate supervised by Daniel A. Madigan, continues this research tradition; since there are many authors still to be studied, and since both theology and Turkish are difficult, a new in-depth study on *İlahiyat* (Muslim Divinity) Faculties is highly welcome. Her guiding question is whether a sense of "individual authority" can be made out. That is to say, whether Muslim theologians can admit that different people understand Islam's normative sources differently. She answers affirmatively by looking at two living authors.

The first is Recep Alpyağıl (b. 1977) of Istanbul University's Theological Faculty. He wants to develop an "authentic" philosophy of religion. His understanding of authenticity seems still on the way to clarification, but what is already clear to him is that it needs to be linked with the concept of "self" (75). Alpyağıl pleads for a non-reductionist philosophy. For him, this means a reflection that includes religion in its canon of themes and sources (78). Alpyağıl's model for that is Paul Ricoeur. What we hear about Alpyağıl's proposals on interpretation and text, on the individual and tradition is not particularly original, but he has some poignant formulations to offer. For example, "Theology is not monolithic (*yek*), as if it were just returning and stopping to stay somewhere. There is indeed much returning and then a stop. But that stopping place is by no means what was there before (*eski yer*): many things have changed!" (79, my translation, see below n° 7).

W.'s second author is Şaban Ali Düzgün (b. 1968), professor of *Kalām* at Ankara University's Theological Faculty. He too wants to enlarge the sources of theological knowledge, this time by integrating, among others, the dynamics of *kaşf*. To explain the concept, W. quotes an encyclopaedia definition (TDV *İslam Ansiklopedisi*); it explains *kaşf* as "the way of acquiring immediate knowledge on theological topics, for which reason and feeling are insufficient" (136, again, my translation, see below n° 7). W. describes Düzgün's proposals as a "theological anthropology" (139f., 155). It is based on the human conscience (142). And what is conscience? Conscience's "authority comes simultaneously from God and from human nature", it is "participatory and cooperative" (142). In the course of her presentation, W. quotes many such reconciliatory syntheses by Düzgün: "human agency is not in competition with divine agency" (175); "Islam is based on the individual" (149, 166, my translation), and still, that individual is no "mythical [sic!] ascetic or isolated monk" but "lives out her piety actively in society" (148).

W. does not limit herself to presenting these two authors (and select ideas of Turkish theologians on atheism, skepticism and deism, ch. 7). W. rather has a key thesis. She pushes against the dualism of tradition vs. modernity. She does not want to follow a scheme of praising Muslims for receiving Western thought and complaining where such reception lacks. Is there no give and take, no legitimate – indeed, necessary – Muslim critique of that dualism and of Western thought? W. shows us that there is, and her non-dualist alternative is that Turkish theology works in "a dialectical threefold schema of engagement" (4, 67 etc.) namely of (α) Turkish/Ottoman, (β) Arabic, and (γ) Western sources. What does she mean by "dialectical"? That all three traditions blend in one and the same author (5).

The thesis is respectable. Eight critical points need however to be advanced. Is the thesis, one wonders, sufficiently

- 1) *new*. There is a movement in Turkey running under the self-designation of "classicism". Authors like Mehmet Paçacı do not call themselves "modernists" any more. (I wrote on this for the first time in 2007 in *Münchner Theologische Zeitschrift*). The classicist turn stresses that contextualising readings of religious norms are not modern/Western but a long-standing – for example, 17th century Ottoman – Muslim practice. Such a turn was to be expected in a new political situation (Ottomanism) and for thinkers that have long appreciated Gadamer ("rehabilitation of tradition").
- 2) *dialectical*. W. uses the word "dialectical" mostly to signify something like "complex". But should a real dialectic not also include a message from Turkey to others in the West (beyond the criticism that Orientalists got Islam wrong)? W. can call classical Turkish authors "shapers of modernity" (230, 239). But how can their Muslim heirs today also be inspiring interlocutors for us?
- 3) *suspicious*. Is the Turkish theologians' third voice (a non-Western, non-Arab source) not often an apologetic trick to de-Arabize and nostrify a certain hermeneutical approach, just like Grimm's tale in which the hedgehog's wife cheats the hare by saying, "I am already here!"? The apologetic tone in some writings, e.g., Düzgün (171), should not be missed; and simply to start by saying the research will omit questions of political agenda (3) excludes an important key to understand her authors.
- 4) *up to date*. The situation of theology in Turkish universities today is no longer that of my own initial research of the early 2000's, which she quotes. Today, theology is no longer necessarily "state-funded" (3). *İlahiyat* is taught at many non-state universities now; indeed, at too many, as even the country's theologians largely admit: there are more chairs than capable chairholders. That lets quality standards sink.
- 5) *systematic*. W. often explains what she understood from her authors by quoting other figures. But when we want to understand what, for example, Düzgün means by *kaşf* or *tawhīd* or conscience, I am not sure whether it helps to tell us how Süleyman Uludağ, Seyyed Hossein Nasr or Paul L. Heck define those concepts (136, 172, 176). I was not really able to understand the views of her two main authors as consistent theologies. Aligning paraphrases and translations is not yet presenting a coherent theory.
- 6) *critical*. When Islam is said to be based on the individual and a concept like conscience (149, 142), is that a convincing interpretation of Islam's sources? Maybe, yes; one might think of the Ḥadīṭ *istaftī qalbaka* "let your heart issue the fatwa". But the interested reader would like W. to ask and answer

such questions. In case W. herself found these authors to be inconsistent, we would also have liked to hear that in her conclusion; and if she provides information like, “Düzgün sees Islam fundamentally less prone to hegemony than Christianity” (149), some commentary would be appropriate.

- 7) *philological*. Greek: Her explanation of *hypolepsis* as an Aristotelian word for ‘assumption’ (109) does not hit the point in literary theory. Here, *hypolepsis* rather means, taking up a text like a thread to be continued creatively now. –German: *Vicdan Böyle Buyurdu* alludes to Nietzsche’s *Thus Spoke/Spake Zarathustra* (254). –Turkish: There are semantic and syntactical problems, including the following. 79: My translation above is freer than W.’s, whose renderings of *yek* as “unity” and of *eski yer* as “where it began” do not convince me. 97, 106: *yorum* is better consistently translated in the given contexts as “interpretation”, not “commentary”, let alone “discussion”. 136: The definition (for which I proposed my own translation above) does not speak about “the mind and senses’ direct acquisition of knowledge on religious topics where (formally revealed) instruction is lacking”. 140f.: “Building Identity” should be “Building Personality” (*kişilik*, not *kimlik*). A recurring problem are the participle constructions in *-diğ-*, where the subject is in the genitive; so, *onların hızlandırdığım* (239) means “that they have accelerated”, not “their” then a word like “contributions” to be added, and then “have accelerated”.
- 8) *concentrated*. Who is the mysterious Adnan (235)? Probably, Aslan. Twice we hear Madigan’s thesis that *kitāb* does not really mean “book” (but rather, something like “prescribing”, 82, 178); and twice we learn that W. was given a copy of Taylor’s *Sources of the Self* in its Turkish version by the translator (58, 150). Congratulations!

W. has presented authors hardly known to the English-speaking world, with creative wording (e.g. her “*tawhīdic* framework”, 171) and interesting insights.

Felix KÖRNER

Zovkić Mato, *Dialogue between Catholics and Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Center for Advanced Studies, Sarajevo 2018, 401 pp.

Mato Zovkić is a priest of the archdiocese of Vrhbosna-Sarajevo. Born in 1937 and ordained priest in 1963, with a doctorate in theology and a degree in Sacred Scripture, he taught New Testament exegesis at the Catholic Theological Faculty in Sarajevo from 1972 to 2009. From 1997 to 2012 he served as a member of the Interreligious Council in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Since 2015 he has been an emeritus professor of the University of Sarajevo.

In the volume under review Zovkić has brought together a number of his writings – articles, papers read at conferences, contributions to books – over a period of twenty years, from 1998 to 2018. Twenty-three of the chapters are in English, and five in German. In these writings the author displays both passion and prudence and, as befits a person with solid academic qualifications, his contributions are well-documented and the references are up to date (unfortunately the chapters are not numbered which makes reference to them more difficult).

Two of the chapters could be classed in the category of general Islamology: “The Infancy and Ministry of Jesus in the Qur’an and the Synoptic Gospels”, and “Translation and Commentary of the Qur’an by Muslim Scholars in America”. Two concentrate on theology: “The State of the Church and Theology in Bosnia and Herzegovina” and “Reception of Vatican II Teaching on the Eastern Orthodox Churches by Croat-Catholic and Serb-Orthodox Theologians”. Most are dealing with Christian-Muslim relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, or with the larger question of the place of religion in society. There is much insistence on the need of reconciliation. The chapter entitled “Forgiving and Asking Forgiveness among Ethnic Communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with its reflections on Srebrenica and other massacres,