

Patricia Crone

From Kavād to al-Ghazālī

Religion, Law and Political Thought in the  
Near East, c.600–c.1100

Bogazici University Library



39001103034529

14

ASHGATE  
VARIORUM

2005

VI

VI Weber, Islamic law, and the rise of capitalism  
*Max Weber & Islam*, ed. Toby E. Huff and Wolfgang  
Schluchter. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1999

247–272

Weber Max  
G213061

Weber, Islamic Law, and  
the Rise of Capitalism

Weber's *Rechtssoziologie* (hereafter RS) is a section of his *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* which has generated relatively little discussion.<sup>1</sup> This is not surprising. Law is a technical subject best left to lawyers, who tend to leave sociology to sociologists, and Weber himself (a lawyer turned sociologist)<sup>2</sup> must be said to have done his best to perpetuate these tendencies by burying his theories in a general handbook as notable for its obscurity as for its erudition.<sup>3</sup> In the first instance the RS is a work for glossators.<sup>4</sup> It also has a certain appeal to exegetes who, in an attempt to find or supply overall coherence to Weber's thought, explicate its theories at a level so exalted that they cease to have much bearing on law.<sup>5</sup> But down-to-earth historians and sociologists of law tend to ignore the RS altogether or, at best, to limit themselves to occasional criticism of its better known propositions and occasional use of the minor insights in which it abounds. It is hard to blame them: to the non-Weberite, the RS is not only a difficult but also a profoundly unilluminating work. Still, it remains one of the most ambitious attempts since Bodin's *Six Books of the Commonwealth* to explore the relationship between law and society,<sup>6</sup> a subject on which neither sociologists nor lawyers tend to have much to offer;<sup>7</sup> and historians of Islamic law are certainly among those in need of typological and developmental schemes for the evaluation of the object of their study.<sup>8</sup> It is thus worth examining what is wrong with the RS and how we might reformulate its questions.

What is wrong with it (its obscurity apart) is essentially that it is formulated as a contribution to the problem of Western "rationality."

G213061

Terk

DOK

**WEBER, Max**

**21.08.2017**

Çarré, O. ; Weber, Max; Turner, B. S.

À propos de la sociologie weberienne de l'Islam (B. S. Turner, Weber and Islam) .-- Maisonneuve et Larose, Paris, 1982 : Le cuisinier et le philosophe: hommage à Maxime Rodinson. Études d'ethnographie historique du Proche-Orient réunies par J-P. Digard , pp. 199-206,

Weber, Max (G213061)

## WEBER'İN İSLAM HAKKINDAKİ DEĞERLENDİRMELERİ\*

Bryan S. TURNER

Çev.: Abdurrahman KURT\*\*

Diğer âlemşümül dinler ve onların ortak medeniyetlerinde ortaya çıkan ve gelişen literatür ile mukayese edildiğinde, sosyoloji, fenomenoloji ve dinler tarihinde İslâm'a dair sistematik araştırmalar ihmal edilmiş bir alandır. Gerçekten İslâm ve İslâm toplumuyla ilgili önemli sosyolojik çalışmalar yok denecek kadar azdır<sup>1</sup>. İslâm bilimcileri, İslâm'ın kendisine ait bir şeyi olmadığı ve onun başka dinlerden türemiş olduğu fikrine dayanarak İslâm'da ilmi bir geleneğin yokluğunu zaman zaman ifade etmektedirler<sup>2</sup>. Diğer bir ihtimal olarak, İslâm'ın ya bir din olmadığı, ya da kendisine has bir durumunun bulunduğu ve bu yüzden günümüze kadar din sosyologlarının ilgileri dışında kaldığı ima edilmektedir<sup>3</sup>. "Religionssoziologie" adlı eseri, İslâm hakkında yeterli bilgilerle ikmal edilmeden önce Weber'in ölmüş olmasının yanında, Marks ve Durkheim'in İslâm'la ilgili çok az, ya da hiç bir şey söylememiş olmaları gerçeği daha spesifik bir sebep olabilir. Bunun için sayısız araştırma projesi, sosyolojiyi Hristiyanlık, ilkel ve Asya dinleri üzerine kuran büyüklerin ortaya çıkardığı sorunlarla ilgilidir; fakat modern sosyolojinin temellerinde oluşan ciddi İslâmi incelemeler geleneği yoktur. Sadece bu durum bile İslâm sosyolojisini önceliği olan önemli bir araştırma haline getirir. Buna ilâveten, Weber'in hem İslâm patrimonializmine (saltanat idaresi) zaman zaman yaptığı atıflarında, hem de İslâm

\* Bu yazı, Bryan S. Turner'in "Weber and Islam" (London, 1974) adlı eserinin 7-14. sayfalarının tercümesidir.

\*\* Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Din Sosyolojisi Araştırma Görevlisi.

- 1 R. Levy'nin The Structure of Islam, Cambridge, 1957; Clifford Geertz'in Islam Observed, New Haven and London, 1968; Maxime Rodinson'un Islam et capitalisme, Paris, 1966 adlı eserleri istisnaları teşkil eder; keza F. Ülgener'in Sombard, Weber ve İslâm hakkında Türkçe olarak yaptığı İktisadi İnhitat Tarihimiz'in Ahlâk ve Zihniyet Meseleleri, İst., 1951 isimli bir çalışması vardır.
- 2 İslâm'ın orjinalitesinin olmaması hususunda krş. Marshall G.S. Hodgson, "Islam and Image", History of Religions, 1964, c. 111, s. 220-260; J.M. Kitagawa'nın yayınladığı The History of Religions, Chicago, 1967, c. 1, s. 177-93 içinde Charles J. Adams'in "The history of religions and the study of Islam" makalesi.
- 3 "Özel durum" teorisinin bir kritiği için krş. Clive S. Kessler, "Islam society and political behaviour: some comparative implications the Malay case", British Journal of Sociology, 1972, c. XXII, s. 33-50.

31 TEM 2008

Weber Max (inc. BRİ)

**MAX WEBER ve İSLAM MEZHEPLERİ****Michael COOK\*****Çev.: Celaledin ÇELİK\*****ÖZET**

"Mezhep" ve "Kilise" kavramları, farklı toplumsal ve dini tarih içinde kazandıkları özel anlamları dikkate alınarak kullanılmaları gereken özel kategorilerdir. Ancak bu kavramlar zaman zaman İslami bağlamda da dikkatsizce ifade edilmektedirler. Michael Cook bu yazısında, Weber'in İslam'la ilgili yazılarında dile getirdiği mezhep ve kilise kavramlarının, İslam dünyasında ortaya çıkan grupları ve özellikle mezhepleri tanımlamada uygun enstrümanlar olarak kullanılmayacağını savunmaktadır. Cook, ayrıca Weberin yazdıklarından hareketle kavramların eleştirel bir tasnifini yapmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Mezhep, Kilise, Cemaat, Max Weber, İslam.

**ABSTRACT****MAX WEBER AND ISLAMIC SECTS**

The concepts of "Sect" and "Church" are private categories that has been gained special meanings in different social conditions and religious history. Therefore the concepts are taken into considerations of these factors. However, these concepts are sometimes used unproperly in Islamic contexts. Michael Cook asserted, in this article that Weber's usage of the concepts of "sect" and "church" are not proper instruments for acknowledging the arosed groups and especially sects in Islamic world. Besides, Cook made critical clasification of the concepts moving from Weber's writings.

**Key Words:** Sect, Church, Community, Max Weber, İslam.

Bu makalenin konusuna iki şekilde yaklaşılması mümkündür. Birinci yaklaşım, başlıktaki birleşimi iki farklı unsurun birlikteliğini temellendireyormuş gibi kavramaktan oluşur. O zaman söze Weber'le başlanır ve yine onun sözleriyle bitirilir. Bu arada mümkün merteye İslam mezhepleri hakkında da sözedilebilirdi. Böyle bir girişim, bilhassa "X ve İslam" konulu başka çalışmalara da kolaylıkla dönüştürülebileceği için cazip olurdu. Burada uygulanan alternatif yaklaşım ise, bu birleşimin boş bir bağlantı olmadığını göstermekte-

\* Michael Cook, "Max Weber und islamische Sekten", **Max Webers Sicht des Islams**, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 1987, 334-341.

\* Yrd.Doç.Dr., Erciyes Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi, Din Sosyolojisi ABD.

5 EKİM 2008

**G213061**

**WEBER, Max**

- 
- 1 DENİZ KUNDAKÇI, Ex contingente necessarium or a philosophical analysis of the connection between Weber and Marx, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Yüksek Lisans, 2010

prisingly, the social impact of capitalism evolved into a central theme of Weber's work when he became Professor for National Economy at Freiburg University in 1894. In his inaugural lecture at Freiburg in May 1895, Weber described the economic decline of the Prussian aristocracy. While Germany's aristocrats were not willing to give up power, the German bourgeoisie was not yet able to take it over (Mann 1992, 413–414). Weber declared himself a representative of this bourgeoisie; a bourgeoisie, however, which was lacking "the political maturity to assume the direction of the state" (Weber 1895, 21). Focusing on the East Elbian agricultural situation, Weber gave a vehemently nationalistic speech with even social-Darwinist undertones. He later confessed that he "aroused horror" among the audience by "the brutality of his views" (Weber, Marianne 1975, 216). Weber perceived the ruling power of the Imperial dynasty and the Prussian aristocracy as an utter anachronism. At the same time, he considered the political leadership of the working class as incompetent and dangerous for the national interests of Germany. His lecture was therefore a call upon Germany's middle class to assume political leadership and to socially and politically unify the country based on secular German nationalism. Yet behind the political issues of the day, his inaugural lecture already contained the central question which, according to Wilhelm Hennis, explains Max Weber's work: the inquiry into the fate of humankind (*Menschentum*) under the conditions of modernity (Hennis 1988, 147).<sup>38</sup>

To a certain extent, the development of Weber's work expresses Germany's changing public discourse based on the continuation of this above-mentioned central question. Since 1880, the theme of a "cultural crisis" gradually replaced the dominance of the social question in Germany's public sphere. Around 1900, the relationship between religion and modern culture became a fashionable topic among intellectuals and a central concern of the social sciences and humanities (Bruch *et al.* 1989, 11–13). Although he did not give up political economy as a field of his studies, Weber's move from a lawyer and national economist to a sociologist reflects this general intellectual development. In biographical terms, this shift from studies on trade, agriculture and national economy to culture and religion was also accompanied by Weber's severe illness. In 1896, Weber received a call to succeed Karl Knies on the chair in political economy at Heidelberg University. Teaching at Heidelberg, Weber showed first signs of mental and physical exhaustion in autumn 1897, leading to several nervous breakdowns. Between 1899 and 1902, he was more or less exempted from teaching, and in October 1903, after having resumed his scholarly work, in particular his methodological studies, Weber finally resigned from his teaching post and remained an honorary professor at Heidelberg (Käsler 1988, 10–13). Until summer 1919, when he took over the chair of Brentano in Munich, Weber did not hold an official teaching post at a German university. In early June 1920, Max Weber fell ill with pneumonia and died on June 14 in Munich.

38. In his lecture, Weber defined political economy as a science concerned with human beings that should be concerned with the "quality of human beings" under specific social, economic and political conditions (Weber 1895, 15).

Weber, Max (G213061)

In the field of the German university, Max Weber represented the "modernist" stream, as his inaugural lecture in Freiburg clearly demonstrated. The status of these typically German cultural elite of university professors was based on educational qualifications, for which reason Fritz Ringer defined them as "mandarins" (Ringer 1969, 5). While the German mandarins in general shared a pronounced "pessimistic attitude toward modern social conditions," the modernists among them distinguished themselves from the conservative majority in their response to the modern transformation. In contrast to the conservatives, the modernists did not believe in any possible escape from the modern condition. Consequently, they dissociated themselves from the Wilhelmian political and social establishment and strongly criticized the predominance of Prussia's agrarian and military aristocracy in German politics. Although not completely at home in the liberal camp, the modernists supported moderate social reform and believed in progressive cultural and educational programs (Ringer 1969, 133).

In a unique way, Weber expressed his modernist attitudes in a blend of scholarly virtues and being a convinced German nationalist and a sharp political commentator. In terms of academic works, the writings after his illness gave him a worldwide reputation and made him a founding father of sociology. In this period his major methodological works appeared, his theory of social action, his sociology of the state, his legal sociology and the three volumes on the sociology of religion. In addition, he engaged in public debates, as partly documented in his political writings (cf. Weber 1994). It is impossible to present here the ambiguities and "explosive contradictions of his work" (Dahrendorf 2006, 576). To a certain extent they might reflect Weber's elusive attempt to mediate between modernity's competing philosophies of romanticism and rationalism. In Max Weber's work and personality, we can find various elements of these contradictory facets of modernity (Breuer 2006, 272). Yet behind the enormous complexities of his work, we can nevertheless detect a number of concepts and models which have influenced modern reasoning on religion more generally. Even more important, they also became part of the conceptual background knowledge of Islamic studies.

#### *The "Spirit of Capitalism:" Max Weber on Religion*

In their difficulties to define religion, it almost became a convention among contemporary sociologists to refer to the opening phrase of Weber's sociology of religion in *Economy & Society*. There, Weber rejects defining religion "to say what it is" (Weber 1978a, 399). Yet Weber only refuses to give a substantive definition of religion. As a matter of fact, his texts provide us with several defining elements close to functionalist explanations of religion. In the context of the theodicy problem, for instance, religion appears as a means of mastering suffering, injustice and the contingencies of fate (1978a, 519). In particular for the underprivileged classes, religions provide salvation and redemption (1978a, 490–492). Structured as collectively shared belief systems, religious ethics represent a "cosmos of obligations" which serve as moral guidance (1978a, 430). In systematizing "all the manifestations of life," religions are a major source for the development

WADE YAYINDIKTAN SONRA GELEN DOKÜMAN

22 Mayıs 2015

**Dietrich Jung, Orientalists, Islamists and the global public sphere: a genealogy of the modern essentialist image of Islam, Sheffield: Equinox 2011. İSAM 208062**

### Max Weber: Patrimonialism as a Political Type

Weber Max (A. Edison)

ISAM DA  
19607

Max Weber (1864–1920) has few peers among European social theorists. His comparative historical studies of the structure, beliefs, and behavior patterns in the major civilizations in the world have influenced political and sociological analysts for more than a century. No one in the social sciences can ignore his formulations, contributions, and original insights in the discussion of concepts such as rationalization, charisma, legitimacy, class, status, power, and bureaucracy. Less well known is his concept of patrimonialism, his version of Oriental despotism. There is no dispute about the genius of Max Weber and his honored place in early twentieth-century European thought, but legitimate differences exist about the essence and major thrust of his writings. Weber's multifarious publications on so many varied subjects illustrate an extraordinary intellectual mastery and an iridescent approach to complex social and political issues. They exemplify scrupulous integrity if not always total limpidity.

Beginning as a student of law in Heidelberg in 1882, whose first teaching appointment was in that field in 1892, Weber also studied economic and social history in Berlin (1884–5), in 1895 was nominated to a professorship of economics in Freiburg, and then in 1897 to a post in political science and to a chair at Heidelberg. Only at the end of his life, after a breakdown, travel abroad (including to the United States), and work as an independent scholar, did he receive in 1919 an appointment in sociology in Munich. In his last years he was active in politics, particularly in the German Democratic Party, acted as an adviser to the German delegation to the Versailles peace conference, and advised on the post-World War I Weimar constitution. He was also cofounder of the German Sociology Society and co-editor of a major sociological journal.<sup>1</sup>

Weber's erudition and scholarship, insights and theories, embraced a remarkable diversity of subjects, themes, and disciplinary approaches.<sup>2</sup> His

grasp, in a relatively short life disturbed by serious personal problems from time to time, extended to all the social sciences, to philosophy, and to the humanities. Mere listing of the subjects on which Weber wrote and lectured is revealing: methodology of the sciences; the nature of scientific inquiry; interpretation of social action; comparative sociology and social structure; ancient and modern religions and their related institutions and beliefs, church, sect, charisma, and mysticism; political sociology and morphology, comparing regimes and societies at different times and places, including subjects such as legitimacy, class, status, party, and administrative organization; the processes of rationality and bureaucratization; leadership and ethical responsibility; democratic politics, contemporary German politics; the mutual interaction between economics and political and legal institutions; development of rationality and capitalism in the West and the lack of similar development in the Orient; sociological foundations of music; structure of political organizations and typology of forms of political domination; and the concept of "ideal types."

Weber formulated significant theories and typologies but combined these with empirical data based on his historical research.<sup>3</sup> His insights sprang from empirical evidence in many historical periods and geographical settings. Among them were medieval commercial associations on which he wrote his doctorate in 1889: agrarian workers in the East Elbe area, Roman agrarian history, Russian politics after the 1905 revolution, Russian peasants, Oklahoma Indians, coins and minting in early China, the condition of workers in large-scale enterprises, and the religions of the world.<sup>4</sup> Whether Weber aimed at a value-free social science is an issue still disputed, if much less mordantly articulated in recent years. More important was his concern to understand and compare different cultures, religions, and societies in space and time, and to analyze conflicts of value. Weber suffered no postmodernist angst about attempting to understand other cultures in terms of the categories of his own culture.<sup>5</sup>

Weber was unassuming about his scholarship; he wrote, for instance, of his "modest hopes of contributing anything essentially new" to the rich discussion of the religion of Israel and Jewry.<sup>6</sup> Commentators have criticized Weber, sometimes with unctuous effrontery in light of the vast range of his writings, for lack of experience and inadequate documentation or inaccuracies on specific issues, and for methodological defects.<sup>7</sup> Yet Weber always candidly acknowledged his reliance on the existing literature written by experts on the subjects of his work. He is said to have replied to an academic critic, who complained that Weber wrote outside of his field, "I'm not a donkey, and I don't have a field."

The richness of Weber's diversity of interests and subjects, the changes in his analytical focus, and the publication, a number posthumously, of uncompleted

at least relative enlightenment following him, is preferable to the feudal lord or to the marauding robber, with the barbarian state of society to which they belong."<sup>17</sup>

However, it should also be kept in mind that unlike many of his contemporaries, Marx did not believe that Asians were racially inferior to Europeans or inherently incapable of achieving modern civilization. Nor did he downplay the horrendous price which Asian peoples would have to pay as a result of colonial rule and the development of capitalism. Moreover, Marx insisted that the static character of Asian societies had an essentially economic basis – the alleged absence of private property in land in these societies and thus the absence of class conflict – rather than being the result of defects in their psyches, cultures or religions, and he could envision the day when Asian peoples would overthrow their colonial masters.

Marx's portrayal of the character and historical trajectory of the non-Western world has engendered considerable debate down to the present day. Marx's analysis of precapitalist Asian societies and their history was obviously rooted in the Oriental despotism model. On the other hand, as I will discuss in Chapters 5 and 6, scholars using Marxian modes of social and historical analysis would from the 1960s onward play a leading role in criticizing that same model, the related portrayal of Islam as a stagnant civilization, and the broader claim that it was only the impact of the West which led to change in these essentially static societies, and in elaborating powerful alternatives. In effect, those scholars would use Marx's methods to challenge some of Marx's own pronouncements.

### **Max Weber and the sociology of Islam**

The central (if often unacknowledged) role which the elaboration of a sharp distinction between the West and the rest of the world played in shaping modern European social thought can also be discerned in the work of Max Weber (1864–1920), widely regarded as one of the founders of modern historical sociology. Weber's influential (if often disputed) analysis of how the "Protestant ethic" had helped foster the "spirit of capitalism" in Europe has frequently been regarded as an attempt to refute Marx's insistence on the primacy of material forces, and the class conflict they produced, in driving social change. Yet as a British sociologist who studied what both men had to say about Islam put it, "the outline, assumptions and implications of their perspectives on Asian-European contrasts are very similar."<sup>18</sup>

For Weber – who drew on contemporary Orientalist scholarship, for which Germany had become a major center by the late nineteenth

century – as for Marx and for many other observers down to our own day, Muslim societies were weak and backward because they lacked many of the key institutions which enabled Western societies to become wealthy and powerful. In feudal Europe property rights were protected by law and autonomous cities could emerge, opening the way for the flourishing of a bourgeoisie and the development of capitalism. In Muslim lands, however, powerful "patrimonial" states dependent largely on the military and the bureaucracy dominated all of social and economic life and most of society's resources, including land. Weber used the term "sultanism" to characterize the political systems of these patrimonial states, whose rulers he saw as rapacious and arbitrary despots unencumbered by any effective limits on their power over their subjects. As a result Islamic societies failed to develop institutions and centers of power independent of the state, including a vigorous urban middle class, autonomous cities or a system of rational formal law (as opposed to the sacred law of Islam), leading to stagnation and social decay.

Weber's views on Islam, like those of Marx on Asian societies in general, drew on the powerful tradition in European thought I discussed in Chapter 2, from Renaissance political thinkers to Montesquieu to Hegel to James Mill and John Stuart Mill and beyond. In this tradition, which as we have seen also drew on contemporary Orientalist understandings of the essential characteristics of Islamic civilization, Muslim and other Asian societies were classified as Oriental despotisms, the very antithesis of modern Western political and social systems. Moreover, in much of nineteenth- and twentieth-century sociological thought those societies were judged deficient because they allegedly lacked many of the features and institutions which modern European societies seemed to possess and which had supposedly enabled Europeans to achieve progress, knowledge, wealth and power. This way of contrasting Islamic societies to an idealized model of European history and society provided a basis for depicting the former as culturally or racially defective and fatally mired in tradition and backwardness.

As I will discuss in more detail in subsequent chapters, the sharp dichotomies on which these contrasts are based – between Western freedom and Oriental servitude, between Western law and Oriental arbitrariness, between Western modernity and Oriental tradition, between private property in land in the West and its absence in the Orient, and so on – have been subjected to intense challenge in recent decades. Scholars of both Europe and the Middle East have argued that neither European nor Middle Eastern societies actually conformed to the patterns of historical development which the nineteenth-century model and its twentieth-century successors ascribed to them. On the European side it has become



# Max Weber & Islam

Toby E. Huff  
Wolfgang Schluchter  
EDITORS



Transaction Publishers  
New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London (U.K.)

Bogazici University Library



39001100715658

14

1999

## Sociologie et Islamwissenschaft:

## Max Weber et Ignaz Goldziher ou la «non rencontre»

Youcef Djedi  
Nantes

## Abstract

Claiming different conceptions of the *Kulturgeschichte*, Max Weber and Ignaz Goldziher have deeply marked their respective disciplines and have even played a leading role against their contemporary cultural and scientific temptations. They had mostly had the merit of safeguarding the full autonomy of the religious reality, mostly against Marxism (Weber) and against the New School of Islamic studies (Goldziher). But these two scholars were also distinguished by their skepticism regarding the new science, that is "sociology", that Weber wanted to strictly define among the *Kulturwissenschaften* and against which Goldziher wanted to protect the *Islamwissenschaft*. However, if Weber had sometimes lost in his approach to Islam, Goldziher, who stayed in a classic conception of categories as basic as those of "asceticism", for example, or "Beruf", had remained away from Weberian concerns of religious relationships with modernity. Obviously these two scholars would have won a lot about each other.

Comment concilier dans un même contexte un Hongrois, juif convaincu, mais presque doublé d'un musulman décidé, et se disant en tout cas volontiers oriental, et un Allemand de culture protestante, n'ayant jamais eu de contact direct ni avec l'Orient ni avec l'islam, «prophète de malheur» et sociologue de la rationalité de l'«habitable d'acier» et du «désenchantement du monde»? Comment réunir dans un même contexte l'un des fondateurs résigné de la sociologie moderne et celui qui s'était méfié jusqu'au bout de cette nouvelle discipline, à la manière du moins dont celle-ci était conçue par son confrère et ami Martin Hartmann, par exemple?

Ce que la rencontre de Max Weber avec Ignaz Goldziher aurait eu sur les études islamologiques de l'époque, d'une part; et sur la sociologie webérienne de l'islam, de l'autre, justifie amplement le traitement de ce point en termes de déploration d'une «non rencontre». Ceci d'autant plus du reste que les deux savants avaient des amis en commun, comme Adolf von Har-

nack, mais surtout Carl Heinrich Becker, lequel saluait justement en ses deux amis des esprits très novateurs. Passages obligés des études sociologiques et islamologiques, Weber et Goldziher sont en effet jusqu'à nos jours les porteurs d'un «charisme» indiscutable dans leurs disciplines respectives. Et leur défense de l'autonomie du fait religieux n'est pas le moindre de leurs mérites, même si, au fond, Goldziher, à la différence de Weber, n'avait jamais poussé ouvertement l'islamologie vers la problématique du destin de l'homme moderne.

D'ailleurs à côté de cet écart, il en existait un autre, plus important encore du point de vue de la *Kulturgeschichte*, pourtant réclamée par les deux savants. Il vient de l'intérêt quasi nul de Goldziher pour la réalité économique, et plus encore pour les rapports de celle-ci et de la vie professionnelle avec les conceptions religieuses. Sa vision «classique» de l'ascétisme est pour le moins irréductible à celle de Weber. En revanche, l'ascèse professionnelle de Goldziher lui-même, dérivée en grande partie d'enseignements coranique est plus qu'édifiante. Enfin, on peut deviner quelle tournure aurait pu avoir la sociologie webérienne de l'islam au contact de Goldziher sur des questions aussi épineuses que celles de la prédestination, par exemple, ou du «rékabisme» de l'islam primitif. Questions sur lesquelles, à l'évidence, Weber's était laissé fourvoyer.

## L'Orient et l'Occident

Juif de l'«Orient» européen, Goldziher avait des origines séfarades de l'«Occident» musulman, qui n'entraient nullement sa fierté d'être hongrois. Et ce «Hongrois d'al-Azhar» [«al-Mağarī al-Azharī»]<sup>1</sup>, comme il aimait s'autographier parfois, se disait volontiers, sur un ton d'humour sérieux, «trop oriental et trop superstitieux» pour terminer une lettre sur une note de mauvais augure<sup>2</sup>. Mieux encore, car bien qu'ayant manifestement

<sup>1</sup>) Bien que nourrissant manifestement une moindre sympathie pour l'islam, tout en se disant être «un civilisé mi-musulman ensauvagé» [*halb-muhammedanischer verwildeter Kulturmensch*], son ami Snouck Hurgronje, avec qui il «islamisait» depuis sa jeunesse, cultivait la même passion pour La Mecque, qui avait joué dans sa formation le même rôle que celui de l'université égyptienne pour lui (cf. ses lettres in VAN KONINGSVELD (P. S.) (ed.), *Scholarship and Friendship in Early Islamwissenschaft: The Letters of C. Snouck Hurgronje to I. Goldziher*. Leiden. Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, 1985, pp. 66-67, 9-100, 147-149. Ci-après: Koningsveld).

<sup>2</sup>) Cf. e. g. sa lettre à Nöldeke in SIMON, *Ignaz Goldziher: His life and scholarship as reflected in his work and correspondence*, Leiden, Brill. 1986, p. 267. Ci-après: SIMON.

**G213061**

14 Aralık 2014

**WEBER, Max**

**DENİZ KUNDAKÇI, Ex contingente necessarium or a philosophical analysis of the connection between Weber and Marx, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Yüksek Lisans, 2010**