



HAL
open science

Orientalist Pococke : Brokering Across Borders, Disciplines and Genres

Claire Gallien

► **To cite this version:**

Claire Gallien. Orientalist Pococke : Brokering Across Borders, Disciplines and Genres. The Internationalization of Intellectual Exchange in a Globalizing Europe, 1636–1780, Bucknell University Press, pp.1-30, 2017, 9781611487893. <halshs-01658481>

HAL Id: halshs-01658481

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01658481v1>

Submitted on 21 Mar 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

EDWARD POCOCKE (1604–1691) has long been considered, and remains, an authoritative figure in the world of early-modern orientalism. In 1636, he became the first Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford. Before him, no regular teaching in Arabic was provided in England,¹ and the Bodleian Library contained only a handful of Oriental manuscripts.² There were no printed grammars or dictionaries worth the name, no native speakers to teach the language, and few printed books in Arabic.³ In this context, Pococke soon gained a considerable reputation in England and across Europe for raising the standards of orientalist scholarship and turning Oxford and its library into first-rate institutions of orientalist learning.

Presented as such, his inclusion in a volume dedicated to the figure of the *porteur*,⁴ is all the more surprising—except if we understand that the purpose of this chapter is precisely to take Pococke’s portrait off the wall of the gallery of paintings, not so much in an act of iconoclastic demotion, but rather to replace him in the various networks in which he produced and circulated knowledge. Instead of singularizing him as the hero and the avant-garde of early-modern orientalism, I find it much more fruitful to think of him and of his work as the result of creative mediations with scholars, books, and authors, including Arab ones, from past and present.

Pococke matriculated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, in 1619, where he first learned Hebrew and Greek. Seven years later, he took classes in Syriac and Arabic with the mathematician and Arabist from Heidelberg, Matthias Pasor. Later, he went to William Bedwell for private lessons, which Bedwell offered from his vicarage at Tottenham High Cross, Middlesex.⁵ Pococke would perhaps never have

turned into the great Arabic scholar had he not applied for the position of chaplain to the Levant Company in the cosmopolitan city of Aleppo. His first voyage to the East lasted six years (1630–1636), during which he studied Arabic with a private tutor, as well as Hebrew, Syriac, and Ethiopic; collected manuscripts; and established links with Muslim, Christian, and Jewish scholars in Aleppo. He was summoned back to England in 1636 to take the chair of Arabic established by Archbishop William Laud. It is usually said that Pococke's reputation was great enough for Laud to entrust him with the chair without knowing him in person. Barely a year elapsed before he embarked again for Constantinople, where he was commissioned by Laud to collect more manuscripts and coins for the Bodleian. The orientalist Thomas Greaves was appointed in the interim. While in Constantinople, Pococke expanded the network he had formed in Aleppo.⁶

The second phase of Pococke's career, after his second return to Oxford in 1642, was devoted to publishing, with *Specimen historiae Arabum* (1650) extracted from Abu'l-Faraj's *Tā'rikh mukhtaṣar al-duwal*, followed by *Contextio gemmarum, sive, Eutychie patriarche Alexandrini annales* (1654–1656), which he edited and translated from Arabic into Latin at the request of his friend, the English jurist and scholar of ancient Hebraic law John Selden, and finally Maimonides's commentary on the Mishna, *Porta Mosis* (1655). The number of his publications grew at a faster rate after the Restoration. He translated Grotius's apostolic tract *De veritate religionis Christianae* (1660) into Arabic, edited and translated for his students an Arabic poetry textbook, *Lamiato'l Ajam, carmen Tograi* (1661), and completed his translation of Abū al-Faraj's universal history *Historia compendiosa dynastiarum* (1663).

In the 1670s and 1680s, confronted with a series of editorial failures,⁷ he returned to biblical studies and published *The Catechism of the Church of England*, translated into Arabic (1671) and the *Book of Common Prayer* (1674) in Arabic—both works commissioned for the Eastern Christian communities in the Levant in an attempt to facilitate contacts with the Anglican Church and establish the latter on firmer ground in the region.⁸ He also wrote commentaries on the prophecies of Malachi and Micah (1677), Hosea (1685), and Joel (1691). Pococke likewise supervised the edition and Latin translation of Ibn Tufayl's philosophical tale, *Hayy Ibn Yaqdhan*, undertaken by his son, Edward Pococke the younger (1648–1727) and published in 1671. Pococke senior had worked on an English translation of the text in 1645,⁹ but the Latin version was published under his son's name in an effort to introduce the latter into the orientalist milieu.¹⁰

Pococke's linguistic skills and knowledge, and his close ties to Europe's very few orientalist scholars in the early-modern period, were crucial for his contribu-

tion to the orientalist milieu and for the development of his own career. Indeed, the frontiers between disciplines were porous and, even if it was possible to identify separate disciplines and to locate the emergence of new ones, as in the case of Arabic studies, the development of each of them relied, to a large extent, on interactions with the others, just as the research carried out by one scholar relied on the expertise of the few others who worked in the same or adjacent fields and who could share their knowledge by private or semi-private correspondence and in the published transactions of learned societies.

Pococke was part and parcel of this world of mediated knowledge, and he corresponded with orientalists, theologians, jurists, mathematicians, astronomers, physicians, and philosophers in Oxford, Cambridge, London, Leiden, Paris, Constantinople, and Aleppo. Although he was not a member of the Royal Society, he knew its members from before the society's establishment in 1660; many of them were friends. They deemed Pococke "second to none in knowledge of the oriental tongue"¹¹ and trusted him to provide their community with useful manuscripts, translations, and explanations.¹²

Pococke's contributions to the emergence of orientalist scholarship and to the advancement of modern science have been thoroughly discussed by historians of early-modern orientalism.¹³ Leonard Twells, Pococke's first biographer, also furnished a detailed account, including letters, of the orientalist's transactions with the milieux in which he circulated and worked.¹⁴ In these studies, Pococke emerged as both a cultural intermediary between Europe and the Levant and a go-between in the Republic of Letters, answering queries and lending manuscripts to fellow scholars from other disciplines.

This network and Pococke's reputation as an eminent orientalist proved essential during the Interregnum, when his royalist leanings became suspicious to the republican regime. Parliamentary visitors sent to Oxford in 1647 and 1655 failed to dislodge Pococke because of the strong support of the scientific community.¹⁵ Indeed, Pococke's credit was so great within this community that it surpassed sectarian divides in a period as politically fraught as the Civil War and the Interregnum.

After the Restoration, when Pococke undertook the publication of Arabic texts, he again relied on his connections. It was his close friend Gerald Langbaine, provost of Queen's College, Oxford, and keeper of the archives, who supported his translation of Abū al-Faraj.¹⁶ Samuel Clarke, one of Pococke's most promising students, and later the "Architypographus" (or controller) of the newly established university press,¹⁷ supported and participated in the edition of the poem *Lamiyyat*

al-'Ajam by al-Tughra'i (*Carmen Tograi*). Since the two scholars had been instrumental in the realization of Pococke's Arabic projects, it became more difficult for Pococke to publish works strictly related to Arabic studies after their deaths in 1658 and 1669, respectively. Similarly, upon the death in 1677 of Henry Oldenburg, secretary to the Royal Society, founding editor of the *Philosophical Transactions*, and the main link between its members and orientalist scholars, interest in Arabic waned.¹⁸ This was a time when a missing link could endanger a whole discipline.

Borrowing from the concepts of "interface," "cultural transfer,"¹⁹ and "knowledge brokering,"²⁰ the first part of this chapter examines Pococke's private correspondence and unveils the role of his connections with a close-knit circle of scholars in the elaboration and circulation of orientalist knowledge. This approach will underscore how Pococke was not the only one to act as intermediary and that, as much as he helped scholars by providing them with Eastern material, they took part in shaping his own research. Pococke's orientalist production thus appears as the result of a series of more or less visible deals and collaborations. Period letters give us the opportunity to peep into Pococke's orientalist workshop and bring to light the contingencies the scholar faced in order to maintain collaborative efforts.

Second, via a closer look at his published works, especially those related to his personal interests in Arabic history and literature, we will reconsider the commonly held historiographical representation of a division between old and new orientalism. Historians have seen Pococke as a figure exemplifying the great divide between an ancient type of orientalism, which conceived of Eastern learning as ancillary to biblical studies, and a modern form, which considered Eastern cultures as objects of study in their own right.²¹ Yet little attention has been given to the coexistence of both approaches in Pococke's production or to the need for such a coexistence and the textual devices that permitted it.

Quite persuasively, by focusing on the figure of the *passeur* instead of that of the (single) author, this volume opens up possibilities for a different type of intellectual history to be written. Instead of stringing single intellectual heroes together in a neat timeline, marked by their acts of creation, discovery, initiation, or termination, the figure of the scholar as *passeur* allows us to think of them and their works as mediating between periods (old and new orientalism for the case in point here), people, and disciplines, as scholars who are both separate, unique, and in need of others to operate properly and successfully.

The perspective is important, for historians have tended to pit one form of orientalism against the other, presenting them as irreconcilable because of their different epistemological practices and ends. Accordingly, Pococke's career

becomes revolutionary or reactionary. For Robert Irwin, although Pococke lived in the “first golden age” of Arabic and Islamic studies in England and was its “intellectual star,” it remained true that “Arabic took second place to his study of Hebrew,” and “like most Orientalists in the early modern period, Pococke studied Arabic in order to understand the Bible better.”²² This analysis is problematic since it retrospectively puts the emphasis on divisions among Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic studies and between old and new forms of orientalism, which may make sense for us today, at a time of greater specialization in the humanities, but which were far less meaningful when Pococke was writing. The boundaries between ancient and modern orientalism were more fluid.

In short, we must first appreciate this early-modern perspective on knowledge production if we are to understand how Pococke dealt with the Eastern texts at his disposal. This chapter argues that an approach focusing on the texts themselves—that is, looking at how his texts are organized in terms of content and form—may help us gain a more nuanced appreciation of his career and of the state of early-modern orientalist learning. At the time he was writing, Arabic studies was not an independent discipline *per se*, and its function was to serve the development of other disciplines, including theology, mathematics, and astronomy. It is equally clear from his papers that Pococke’s approaches to literature, in his translation of the poem *Lamiyyat al-Ajam* by al-Tughra’i for instance and to theology, as in his commentary of Genesis,²³ were very similar. The manuscripts of his drafts for the comment on Genesis show the use of the same philological approach to the text as the one Pococke uses in the notes to the *Lamiyyat*. There is no such thing as the sudden birth of a discipline. Rather, modern orientalism was grafted onto, and grew from, an older form of orientalism. Not only was Pococke straddling continents and disciplines, but also his various acts of brokering worked across what has retrospectively been constructed as an epistemological divide.

Reaching Across

Recent developments in global or connected history have foregrounded the figure of intermediaries to replace the “heroes” of the past. Historians have called for a new approach to the relationship between Europe and Asia, leading to the dislocation and the relocation of modern science, and focusing on individuals whose careers led them across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Cultural intermediaries or brokers, including merchants, ambassadors, translators, scholars, and travelers, are the dominant figures of this new branch of historiography.²⁴

By definition, the function of a “broker” is to act as a middleman. The word is applied to a person acting as a go-between or intermediary in any form of transaction; initially mercantile and financial, the term may also apply to culture. Peter Burke has argued that cultural brokers emerged in the early-modern period as a distinct social category and that they acted as “‘information brokers,’ because they put scholars in different places in touch with one another, or as ‘knowledge managers,’ because they tried to organize as well as to collect material.”²⁵ Burke mentions Francis Bacon and Henry Oldenburg as typical knowledge brokers; Pococke could easily be added to the list.

It is important to emphasize the asymmetrical nature of the cultural transfers in which Pococke took part. When he acted as conduit between the eastern Mediterranean and northern Europe (particularly England) for the transfer of knowledge, he primarily served the needs of English scholars, patrons, and librarians and not the needs of Levantine or Ottoman scholars. The latter were not as interested in European scholarship as Europeans were of Eastern scholarship in the same period.²⁶ In spite of this asymmetry, it would be misleading to frame the extraction and transfer of knowledge in purely hegemonic terms. Hegemony implies confidence, but as Pococke’s activities, especially his collecting, amply show, the program on which he embarked was risky,²⁷ arduous, costly, and often frustrating, as when whole shipments of Oriental manuscripts were stolen or foundered at sea.²⁸

Oxford University purchased Pococke’s collection of 420 Oriental manuscripts from his widow in 1692. However, long before this addition, the manuscripts he had collected for others (e.g., Laud) had been transferred to the Bodleian. It is difficult to assess how many manuscripts he collected for others,²⁹ but it appears likely that any scholar interested in a given text or copy would ask Pococke to get it for him, not only because he had lived in the Levant and was familiar with local networks, but also because he was considered as perhaps the only English scholar capable of detecting poor-quality manuscripts and who could avoid being deceived and cheated by local scribes and traders.³⁰

It is no coincidence that between 1635 and 1640—precisely when Pococke made his second voyage to Constantinople—the Arabic collection of the Bodleian grew substantially. In five years, Laud donated 147 Arabic manuscripts, 74 in Persian and Turkish, and 47 in Hebrew,³¹ and Pococke contributed to these additions.³²

Other scholars also contributed to the growth of the Bodleian’s Oriental collections. As mentioned, John Greaves accompanied Pococke on his second voy-

age to the East to make astronomical measurements and to collect manuscripts. However, he was unlucky in his collecting expeditions since, contrary to Pococke, he did not stay in Constantinople but moved to Egypt, where he found fewer manuscripts and of a poorer quality.³³ Greaves thus applied to Pococke again for help in collecting manuscripts. Some of these were seized, others burned in a fire that destroyed Greaves's house in London, but the rest—a total of forty-two manuscripts in Arabic, six in Persian, three in Latin, and one each in modern Greek and Ottoman Turkish—are still preserved under his name at the Bodleian.

The natural philosopher and courtier Sir Kenelm Digby donated thirty-six Arabic manuscripts to the Bodleian between 1640 and 1642.³⁴ It is unclear where he acquired them, but we may surmise that they were part of the loot amassed during his 1628 privateering campaign in the Mediterranean. His collection includes thirty-one Arabic and five Hebrew manuscripts from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, covering a wide range of subjects, including astrology, history, literature, magic, medicine, and religion.³⁵

Finally, Selden's collections of Greek and Oriental manuscripts were bequeathed to the Bodleian in 1659. They contained 117 Arabic and forty-two Persian and Turkish manuscripts and were particularly strong in Qur'anic commentaries and *ḥabādīth* (reports of the teachings, deeds and sayings of the Prophet Muhammad), Arabic lexicography, and poetry. Less strongly represented were manuscripts in Arabic history, mathematics, and astronomy. As Wakefield recalls, Selden sometimes noted the provenance on the manuscripts themselves. Digby is mentioned once, as is John Wandesford, consul of the English merchants at Aleppo. Having never traveled to the East, Selden's collection relied entirely on gifts received and on requests he made.³⁶

Pococke's contribution to the expansion of the library's Oriental collections was by far the most substantial and valuable of his age, all the more since he collected not only for himself but also for others. However, his contribution was not limited to adding hundreds of volumes to the shelves of the Bodleian. His volumes were read, annotated, and sometimes translated and published by his followers in Oxford. For instance, 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī's history of Egypt (MS Pococke 230) was finally translated in full and published in 1788.³⁷

Pococke's collection was useful not only to orientalists but also to the circle of scholars gathered in the fledgling Royal Society.³⁸ He facilitated access to Eastern manuscripts, either by lending them or by telling scholars where they could be found. Thus, when Henry Oldenburg asked John Wallis to look into the manuscript of Abū al-Fidā's treatise on geography (*Taqwīm al-buldan*) for French

traveler and orientalist Melchisédech Thévenot, who was working on an edition and translation of the text, Wallis immediately turned to Pococke. The orientalist replied that the only manuscript in Oxford was the one brought back by John Greaves and that Samuel Clarke's preparation for a new translation was based on the same manuscript. He noted that Cambridge too had a copy, which had also been used by Clarke.³⁹

Pococke was also solicited more punctually for the translation and explanation of technical terms in Arabic by scholars in England and abroad. For instance, Wallis turned to him when he promised more astronomical tables in Arabic and Persian to the Danzig astronomer Johann Hevelius. As contacts for the transcription and translation in Latin of these tables, Wallis named Edward Bernard, Samuel Clarke, Thomas Hyde, and Edward Pococke, "second to none in knowledge of the oriental tongues."⁴⁰ As evidenced in this list of names, each orientalist, though fluent in most Semitic languages, was specialized in one. Thus, Wallis asked Hyde for the translation of Ulug Beg's tables in Persian and turned to Pococke for the translation of other Arabic astronomical tables.

Mary B. Hall has related the case of the German physician Martin Vogel, who was preparing a work on narcotics, and asked Oldenburg to enquire with Pococke, William Seamen, and Paul Rycout about the use of Turkish terms. Oldenburg consulted Pococke and delivered his responses to Vogel.⁴¹ Although they were inconclusive, Vogel wrote to Pococke again one year later for references to narcotics in the work of the twelfth-century Arabic geographer al-Idrīsī,⁴² since he was known to have brought back the manuscript of the *Nuzhat al-mushtāq fi ikhtirāq al-āfāq* from his Levantine voyages.⁴³

Where Pococke lacked expertise on specific points, his knowledge of the field and its players enabled him to redirect enquirers to the right person or to act as go-between, receiving and delivering letters. One example, taken from Boyle's correspondence, concerns the translation of Ibn al-Haytham's treatise on optics. The eleventh-century Arabic mathematician had left a query concerning the location of the point of reflection of an object on a mirror, and in 1669, Huygens sent his solution to the Royal Society. Oldenburg communicated it to the French mathematician François Sluse, and a triangular correspondence ensued in the following years to refine their answers to the problem. Oldenburg included an account of the debate in volume 8 of the *Philosophical Transactions* (1673). It appears that in 1672, when Boyle became interested in the debate and asked to know more, he wrote to the mathematician and Arabist Edward Bernard. As Bernard was not to be reached easily, Boyle then wrote to Pococke to facilitate the literary

exchange. Pococke traveled “into the Country,” delivered Boyle’s letter to Bernard, and received an answer, which he then enclosed in a letter to Boyle.⁴⁴ In this exchange, Pococke served as the missing link so that networks could intersect: he was central to the exchange of knowledge but peripheral to its production.

Pococke’s letters reveal the whole gamut of activities that an orientalist of his eminence could undertake. They also offer a more complex perspective on his career and a decentering of the figure of the author, showing how the orientalist acted as provider, conduit, and recipient of knowledge. The corpus of his letters is scattered in the collections of his correspondents. Others were transcribed by Twells. Finally, some letters are still extant in manuscript form, as in the case of his correspondence with Selden. The exchanges between Selden and Pococke are particularly interesting as they bring to the fore the complex academic network on which orientalist knowledge relied.

In 1642, Selden published the Latin translation of an excerpt of the *Annals* of the Melkite patriarch of Alexandria, Eutychius (877–940),⁴⁵ and required the assistance of Pococke for the full publication. Although Pococke considered Eutychius an unreliable historian, he had needed and still needed Selden’s protection from the republican regime⁴⁶ and consequently agreed to help in supervising the work.⁴⁷ The manuscript letters that remain cover the years 1653–1654, when Pococke was intermittently occupied with the project, and include details on the exchange of manuscripts and information between the two men, for instance when Selden sent him manuscripts belonging to Ravius. Pococke promised to look at them and also informed Selden on the late development of the publication of Golius’s Arabic and Latin *Lexicon* (1653):

I heard by a letter of one Lud. Tronchinus from Leiden that Mr Golius his *Lexicon* is come to the last letter of the Alphabet. But that they feare the Index, and a Compendium which he thinks of sending forth together with that bigger work will take up yet a great deal of time. I wish he would [let] us of this generation see his dictionary itselfe, and we shall not much envy that Index and compendium to posterity.⁴⁸

Golius’s publication was crucial to Pococke and shows that the orientalist of his generation, Pococke included, were still lacking the most basic tools, such as a lexicon, to advance in their studies. The absence of such material was arguably the impetus behind many scholarly interactions.

In all, Pococke was solicited as much as he solicited others for the advancement of his cause and profession. He sought the protection and help of wealthy

and influential patrons, such as Laud, Selden,⁴⁹ and Boyle. With Boyle, he had access to the wider network of traders in the Levant. Indeed, Boyle was not only a founding member of the Royal Society, but also an active member of the Council of Foreign Trade and Plantations from 1661 to 1664 and of the board of directors of the East India Company, and an honorary member of the Levant Company.⁵⁰ In all of these capacities, he too played the part of go-between for Pococke in his transactions with merchants and diplomats in the Levant, and acted as a conduit for manuscripts.⁵¹

But we should not take all of Pococke's publishing projects to be inspired by the advancement of orientalist knowledge. As with Selden, the motive for undertaking the publication of Grotius's *De veritate* was political. Pococke translated the tract into Arabic at Boyle's request because he needed the support of the natural philosopher for the advancement of his own work. Grotius's tract belonged to the irenic tradition and thus was of great interest to Boyle who, in spite of his preference for Protestantism over "Papism," supported the latitudinarian approach of the Church of England in the post-Restoration period and its revival as defender of the Christian faith abroad, especially in the Levant, where traders and chaplains were based.

Boyle's tolerant and progressive views supported the idea that the Bible should be available to everyone in vernacular languages. He contributed to the costs of translating *De veritate* into Arabic, as well as a Turkish catechism and New Testament and a Lithuanian Bible.⁵² In other words, Pococke's translation was supported by the religious and political interests of his patron. In the same way, Pococke called on Boyle when he needed his help, for instance, in advertising his translation of Abū al-Faraj's *Historia dynastiarum*. He then made use of Boyle's reputation in learned circles in order to maximize the publication's success.⁵³ We may conclude from these examples that instead of dividing Pococke's career between a religious and a literary phase, as biographers have tended to do, it is more relevant and historically more accurate to look at the religious and political status of the persons who commissioned and patronized his work.

Last but not least, Pococke relied on local intermediaries among the Christian, Jewish, and Muslim communities in Aleppo and Constantinople to collect, compile, copy, and dispatch manuscripts to England. Expertise and trust were crucial, and Pococke knew of the various tricks employed by scribes and brokers to lull ignorant Europeans into buying poor or fake copies. He was also aware that poor transcriptions would further delay the advancement of knowledge.⁵⁴ Thus, he relied on a limited number of Arabic scholars to whom he was close and on the

acquaintance of English merchant friends, such as William Corderoy and Richard Hill in Aleppo.⁵⁵

A series of five manuscript letters from the scribe and scholar al-Darwish Aḥmad to Pococke are still extant and have been partially translated by P. M. Holt.⁵⁶ These letters are not dated, but Holt proved that three of them must have been written between 1636 and 1637, when Pococke had returned to England, and the other two between 1637 and 1640, when he was in Istanbul. The letters begin with Aḥmad addressing Pococke as “the dear pupil” (*al-tilmīdh al-‘azīz*) and, in his account of the Pococke-Aḥmad connection, Twells emphasized their complicity and friendship.⁵⁷ The letters also contain information on Aḥmad’s activities and the progress he made in collecting and transcribing manuscripts for Pococke.

Aḥmad’s main business was to buy manuscripts for Pococke at the best rate and to copy out others. Some titles were directly requested by Pococke, such as al-Jannābī’s *History*,⁵⁸ others were of Aḥmad’s own choosing. As he promised Pococke, “I will send you every book I see which is suitable for you.” This indicates the level of trust that existed between the two men, Pococke trusting the dervish’s expertise and Aḥmad trusting Pococke to honor his debt, either by sending money (he always mentioned the price paid for each manuscript) or by sending objects and books valued by Aḥmad, such as “something of the rarities of your homeland and [. . .] the printed geography.”⁵⁹ Aḥmad acted as a broker of knowledge for Pococke, sifting through the sources, filtering and extracting what would be of interest to his European friend. He even gave Pococke advice: “When [the manuscripts] reach you, spend some time reading them, for there is much useful matter in them.”⁶⁰

Pococke’s research was framed, to a certain extent, by what Aḥmad deemed worthy of study. For instance, the extraordinary scholarship he displayed in the notes of the *Specimen historiae Arabum* is almost entirely derived from the Arabic sources that Aḥmad collected for him. These include major works of the Arabic classical canon, such as al-Jannābī’s history of the Muslim dynasties, Ibn Khallikān’s biographical dictionary entitled *Wafāyat al-‘ayān*, al-Baydāwī’s commentary of the Qur’an titled *Anwār al-tanzil wa-asrār al-ta’wīl*, and Ṣafadī’s commentary on al-Ṭughrā’ī’s *Lāmiyyat al-‘ajam*.⁶¹ As inspection of the complete list would show, Aḥmad furnished Pococke’s library with encyclopedias, lexicons, history, and literature, which were the foundation of his later production.

Furthermore, when Aḥmad indicated in a letter to Pococke that he was still “working at the writing out of the history of al-Jannābī,” he also added at the end of the sentence: “– some of it, that is.”⁶² This proviso highlights Aḥmad’s role in

the construction of orientalist knowledge, reshaping texts for the scholar's later use. Pococke did not merely receive al-Jannābī's *History*; he viewed it through Aḥmad's eyes. Indeed, the Aleppo scholar not only directed Pococke's research by selecting texts and portions of texts, but he also guided Pococke's encounter with Arabic literature by writing commentaries, for instance his commentary on the *Gulistān*,⁶³ a collection of Persian poetry and stories by Sa'dī.⁶⁴ By doing so, he introduced Pococke to Eastern literature and was instrumental in framing his perceptions of it.⁶⁵

How Newness Entered the World

Historians tend to draw a line between the seventeenth century in England, considered to be the period when orientalist scholarship flourished, and the long eighteenth century, when it declined, until Sir William Jones arrived in Calcutta and revived the profession in the last quarter of the eighteenth century.⁶⁶ Edward Pococke was born when Arabic studies were still in their infancy and contributed to their development until the Civil War put a halt to it. The Restoration is not viewed as propitious either. The Church of England was reestablished and the liturgy fixed, and the study of Arabic and other ancient Semitic languages became less urgent.

Historians have noticed this break in Pococke's career and argued that the failure of *Historia compendiosa dynastiarum* (1663), as opposed to the favorable reception of the *Specimen* (1650) of the same history, can be explained by this general decline in Arabic interest.⁶⁷ However, it is problematic to deduce a general discourse on the state of orientalism from one publication. Editorial successes were contingent, depending to a certain extent on Pococke's personal connections and, as we saw with Clarke and Langbaine, on the presence of patrons and friends.

The conflict of interest between personal undertakings and work commissioned by others must also be taken into account. This separation was highlighted by Pococke in a letter to Selden dated 14 May 1652, in which he explained how he was overwhelmed by diverse activities, including his work on Arabic history, his translation of Maimonides's *Porta Mosis*, and Selden's request that he publish Euty chius's *Annals*. He warned Selden: "I shall Sir divide as well as I can what time I have betwixt that [the translation of Euty chius] and the going forward those small peeces of Maimonides for a while."⁶⁸ He emphasized this separation between "private and publicke intereste" again in a letter to Boyle dated 3 January 1661, after completing the translation of *De veritate*.⁶⁹

These remarks point to the contingencies in the progress of Pococke's career and, more generally, in the development of orientalism. The opposition between theological and literary interests, like that between ancient and modern orientalism, is regularly present. However, various signs lead us to qualify these oppositions. For one thing, classifications have changed over the course of history. What we consider a philosophical tale, in the case of *Hayy Ibn Yaqdhan*, was classed by Pococke as "theology."⁷⁰

Moreover, texts could serve not just one, but multiple purposes. According to Twells, Pococke's prime interest in publishing an Arabic translation of *De veritate* was to convert Muslims to the Christian faith and to instruct Eastern Christians, whose knowledge in matters of religion was perceived as defective and in need of reinforcement if they were to avoid apostasy.⁷¹ As the work was distributed for free, Pococke had to find a patron to cover the cost of printing. He turned to Boyle because he knew of the scholar's interest in Oriental studies⁷² and involvement in missionary activities, and also because Boyle happened to be based in Oxford between 1655 and 1668, which facilitated contacts. The publication also coincided with the development of English commerce and diplomatic influence in the Levant.⁷³ Thus, a conjunction of shared interests and propitious contexts drew Boyle and Pococke together on this project.

However, Pococke did more than just translate Grotius's tract. He also envisaged the publication as an opportunity to advance Arabic studies. The changes he proposed to the text highlighted the quality of his own research. He first took out the crude defamatory comments against Islam that he found scattered through Grotius's introduction, on the pretext that they would displease Muslim readers but also, arguably, with the intention of transforming a polemical tract into a scholarly publication. Moreover, he revised book 6 of *De veritate*, which contained a refutation of Islam. Pococke explained his choice in a letter to Boyle:

In the sixth booke I thought it necessary to put no other things for matter of history then will be acknowledged by the Mahometans. And indeed Grotius himself was of that opinion, and therefore I have left out what is sayd of the pidgeon flying to Mahomets ear; and that the mouse was bred of the Camels dong, and that halfe the Moone came into his sleeve.⁷⁴

Pococke's intention in correcting Grotius's errors was to produce a version of Islam based on scholarship and not on prejudices, even if these amendments were unlikely to have any impact on the biased representations of his contemporaries concerning the Qur'an and Muhammad's "imposture."

This translation was soon followed by *Lamiatol Ajam, Carmen Tograi* in 1661. The edition offered a specimen of the twelfth-century poet al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī Ṭuḡhrā’ī’s *Lamiyyat* with a running translation in Latin. What started as an interest in classical Arabic poetry dating back to his first voyage to Aleppo turned into a project for an Arabic textbook for students. Here Pococke sought help from his former student and now publisher, Samuel Clarke. As with his other publications, Pococke was acting on several fronts: promoting Arabic literature, teaching the next generation of Arabist scholars, and ensuring the financial sustainability of his enterprises.

The book consisted of an introduction by Clarke, in the form of a treatise on Arabic poetry, *Scientia metrica et rhythmica, seu, Tractatus de prosodia Arabica, (On Metrical and Rhythmical Knowledge, or A Treatise in Arabic Prosody)* which has been described as “one of the first European treatises on the metrics of Arabic poetry,”⁷⁵ followed by Pococke’s lecture on Ṭuḡhrā’ī. This lecture in Latin contains a general history of the language and an account of its qualities, including its “elegance” and “usefulness” in facilitating access to ancient biblical texts.

This presentation was followed by a historical account of the development of the language and its literature, in which Pococke not only promoted his topic but also confronted the prejudices of his contemporaries. Indeed, he blamed not the Arabs but the poor quality of translations for the received negative opinion among Europeans concerning Arabic literature. By reading al-Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), and Ibn Bājjah (Avempace) directly in Arabic, they would easily change their minds. Thus, Pococke turned all opportunities he had to good account, starting with his own students and reaching out to a larger community of scholars through both scribal literature and print.

The main text of the *Lamiyyat* consists of a vocalized transcription of the poem with a facing Latin translation. Efforts to turn the poem and notes into a learning tool are evident. The notes occupy 233 pages—to the poem’s 21—and arguably, they constitute the main purpose of the publication. The notes start with a definition of the *qasidah* (or poem), followed by a presentation of the poet Ṭuḡhrā’ī and of the classical form in Arabic poetry called the *lamyyiat*, which takes its name from the last letter *lam* placed at the end of each of its verses. Pococke then goes on to praise the poem’s elegant style, and the learning and perspicuity of its author. These considerations are followed by endnotes in which grammatical points and lexicography are discussed. As usual, Pococke was pragmatic and made the most of every occasion to disseminate knowledge. For instance, at the end of the volume, he added a list of sentences and proverbs with a page reference for where they appear.

Pococke's interest in Arabic proverbs dated back to Aḥmad's lessons in Aleppo when one of the exercises was the transcription and translation of al-Maydānī's proverbs.⁷⁶ Whether for lack of support or interest, Pococke was never able to publish this work. But thirty years later, he found a way to put his personal interest in Arabic literature to profit by including the proverbs of al-Maydānī and other Arab authors in his notes. In this way, published volumes took on a supplementary function in being the conduit of other material, which the book market would have neglected or discarded had it been published separately.

Similarly, Pococke's interest in Arab history dates back to his stay in the Levant when he started collecting manuscripts in Aleppo and Constantinople. His collection was particularly strong in Arabic, where history was the main subject in terms of the number of volumes collected. Pococke brought back twenty-three folios, nine quartos, and four octavos in Arabic history.⁷⁷ But collecting was a collective effort undertaken with Aḥmad and other local scholars who not only provided manuscripts for Pococke but also transcribed copies of them. It was crucial for the preparation of *Al-Mukhtasar fi'l-duwal* by Abū al-Faraj (also known under the Latin name of Bar Hebraeus). As we have seen, this publication appeared in two installments: the *Specimen* (1650) and the *Historia compendiosa dynastiarum* (1663). The *Specimen* is an extract of the *Historia dynastiarum* and contains, first, an account of the Arab tribes and clans before Muhammad, of the Arabic language, and of religious beliefs in the *jabiliyya* period; second, a presentation of the life of the prophet; third, a description of various sects within Islam; and fourth, considerations on the four schools (*madbhabs*) of Islamic jurisprudence. The translation of the specimen comprises thirty-one pages with the original text in Arabic facing Pococke's Latin translation.

However, the most remarkable aspect of the book is the notes, which represent an additional three hundred pages and include developments on all these subjects and, finally, a list of seventy Arab historians used in the preparation of the work, with a biographical note for each one. Pococke's interest lay less in producing a definitive edition of Abū al-Faraj's text—he knew too well of the difficulty of obtaining reliable manuscripts and accurate transcriptions to claim that he had achieved such a feat—than in accumulating and circulating knowledge related to the Arab world. Thus, the main text becomes subsidiary to the notes, which are included to serve Pococke's interest in the advancement of Arabic learning.

Furthermore, this almost miscellaneous type of publication indicates the limited scope of the orientalist book market, and the need to make publications profitable for publishers and booksellers. Pococke produced a package, containing

the translation of a major work of Arabic historiography and a compendium on Arabic history, religion, language, and literature. Had the market been more favorable, they could perhaps have been published separately, as the layout seemed to indicate.⁷⁸ But with the market being restricted, it was probably safer to combine them in one publication. This might not attract more readers, but at least it would bring down printing costs.

It was in his notes that Pococke was at his most innovative and challenging, by bringing in a wealth of new information and sources and by rejecting commonly held beliefs and established knowledge. For instance, his notes open with a philological disquisition concerning the different meanings and derivations of the words “Arab,” “Oriental,” and “Saracen.” He openly criticizes a lack of accuracy in the use of these terms by contemporary scholars and explains why all Arabs are not Saracens (a term used in Europe since the Middle Ages to refer to Muslims) and why Saracens are not Orientals. To justify this last statement, Pococke resorts to lexicology and the rules of word formation by underscoring the fact that the root for Saracens (*sarakoi* in Greek) had nothing in common with the Arabic root *sha-ra-qa*, which means “the rising of the sun.” The result was twofold. Pococke confronted the beliefs and prejudices of his contemporaries, who associated Saracens with Muslims and by doing so reactivated the “barbarian” *topos* inherited from Ancient Rome, when the Arab tribes living outside the limits of the Empire were called Saracens. At the same time, Pococke challenged the very authority of the classics by promoting Arabic sources and implying that for a reliable definition of Arabia or the Arabs, it was better to choose Almotarezzi and Avicenna than Ptolemy and Tacitus.⁷⁹

Pococke also sought to undermine common lore and prejudice against the Arab people and Islam. In Europe, a series of fables undermining the credibility of the Prophet of Islam and confirming his reputation as impostor were used as proof that Christianity did not need Islam as a confirmation and was not to take Islam’s objections to the divine nature of Christ and to Jesus’s crucifixion into account. One example was the legend of the dove that ate from Muhammad’s ear and was said to represent a manifestation of the Holy Ghost. Pococke informed his readers that this fable was in fact absent from Arabic sources and was a pure invention of Christian apologetics, regrettably repeated without critical distance by scholars such as Grotius.⁸⁰ In contrast, the remarkable scope of Pococke’s scholarship and his command of Arabic sources displayed a profound knowledge of Islam and Islamic civilization.⁸¹

The publication of the *Specimen* was decisive. But should we go so far as to call it “a revolution in Arabic studies?”⁸² Viewed retrospectively, Pococke certainly

broke with previous orientalists, except that the break did not survive his death since he was followed by less eminent Arabists who returned to theological interests. The break had more to do with Pococke's personality and ability, and with the fact that a chair in Arabic at Oxford had just been established and offered to him, which in itself was a departure from the past.

It is thus problematic to consider that Pococke revolutionized Arabic studies once and for all. The example provided by the reception of the *Specimen* and its continuation, the *Historia dynastiarum*, is eloquent in this regard. The first was published in 1650 at a critical moment in the Interregnum, and yet it was read and acclaimed by scholars who then encouraged Pococke to publish the full translation of the work. The full version was published in 1663, when peace and the monarchy had been restored in England, and it was dedicated to Charles II. Yet this continuation failed to attract as many readers as the first. Twells imputed this neglect to the inconsistency of the reading public and to the partisanship of the orientalist scholars themselves.⁸³ In fact, the failure was a surprise to no one, not even to Pococke, who had anticipated it:

If you find any Thing in it worth the Publishing, you must be fain to speak for it; for I perceive it will be much slighted: The Genius of the Times, as for these Studies, is much altered since you and I first set about them; and few will be persuaded, they are worthy taking Notice of. My Lord of *London* asked me, if there were any remarkable Passages in the Book? I answered him only in general, that I thought there were many; if you should fall into any Discourse with him about it, I pray, note some Particulars, as I think, you may that of the first Rise of *Mahomet's* Religion, p.100, &c. and that of the Rise and Spreading of the Tartars Empire, and their Incursions, which is in the *Latin*, p.280, &c or any other Passages, that you shall think worthy. And if you speak with any of your Acquaintances concerning the Book, your good Word may help bear up its Credit.⁸⁴

Pococke first indicates that he is under no illusion about the difficulties in trying to sell the book to their contemporaries. By putting the blame on a change in "the Genius of the Times" he comments self-defeatingly on his inability to keep pace with changes of interests. He nonetheless presses his case further by suggesting selling strategies, including the selection of popular episodes and the reliance on the family network to announce the launching of the book. It is unclear why Twells argued that in 1650 Abū al-Faraj was more fashionable to learned readers

than in 1663 and that orientalist zeal damaged the profession. It is clear, however, that in 1663 the person who had played a crucial role in supporting the edition and the circulation of the *Specimen*, Gerard Langbaine, died; without his support and mediation, it became much more difficult for Pococke to publish anything related to Arabic studies or to the Bodleian's Oriental collections. In other words, the failure of the *Historia dynastorium* is not strictly a symptom of the decline of orientalist studies from the Restoration onward but may be explained by personal imperatives and predicaments.

If we think in terms of readership, Pococke's works were similar to the works of his predecessors in the sense that they were destined for scholars and not for the general public. The revolution in Arabic studies happened later on, toward the beginning of the eighteenth century, when Arabists took on the vulgarization and the vernacularization of the field. Good examples of this would be d'Herbelot and Antoine Galland who published the *Bibliothèque orientale* in French in 1697 or George Sale who produced the first direct translation of the Qur'ān into English in 1734. The vernacularization and vulgarization specific to modern orientalism marked a break from earlier forms of orientalist knowledge and were not part of Pococke's preoccupations. Otherwise, his *Specimen* would have been known not only to George Sale, who was perhaps not working for Oxford or Cambridge University but who still adopted a scholarly approach to Islam, but also to figures with no academic background, like the sailor Joseph Pitts. In *A Faithfull Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mahometans* published in 1704, ten years after he returned from captivity in Algiers, Pitts refuted the fable of the entombment of the Prophet in an iron coffin but failed to quote Pococke who had refuted the point in the *Specimen* fifty years before.⁸⁵

The case of Pococke also calls our attention to the problem of historiographical generalization, drawing, from his trailblazing interest in Arabic literature, some general conclusions related to an epistemological turn in the discipline. Similarly, the fact that Pococke was unable to attract the attention of his community and of patrons or subscribers for the publication of his literary translations may have other explanations than the slow evolution of readers' tastes in favor of Arabic literatures. However, this form of inductive reasoning, according to which a general argument about a pre- and post-revolutionary state of the art is reached from one specific example, does not necessarily tally with what may be observed if we analyze the genealogy of production in detail.

Pococke's encounter with Arabic literature dates back to his first and second voyage to the Levant and was arranged by his two successive Arabic teachers, who,

as we have seen, introduced him to one text in particular, al-Maydānī's *Majma' al-anthāl*, or collection of proverbs. This encounter was dictated by the specific needs of a teacher for material that would arouse the curiosity of his student and that would be suitable for translation exercises. The proverbs met these requirements and provided Pococke with the opportunity to learn more about the spirit or genius of a people and to exercise his talents as a translator on short poetic forms. This perspective on Pococke's introduction to Arabic literature forces a revision of the narrative of a revolutionary infatuation. It is also important to underline that Pococke's preference for the proverbs did not lead him or his readers into exotic and entirely foreign territory since the genre was fashionable at the time.⁸⁶

Pococke's failure to publish his translation of the proverbs has been shrugged off by historians as an indication of the reading public's general disregard for Arabic literature. These are hasty conclusions. His interest in the wisdom of the Arabs is not isolated. On the contrary, his research and work are part of a larger European endeavor—Erpenius published the *Proverbia Arabica (Arabic Proverbs)* in 1614, which were later translated by Antoine Galland in *Les paroles remarquables*.⁸⁷ Furthermore, a return to Pococke's situation between 1635, when he completed the manuscript translation, and 1637 when he embarked on his second voyage to the Levant, tells a different story. As we have seen, he left Aleppo in April 1636 and was appointed professor of Arabic in August 1636. Discussions were already underway with Laud and Greaves for a second journey, and Pococke and Greaves embarked for Constantinople in early July 1637. Thus, in a year's time, Pococke took up a new position at Oxford and prepared and undertook a second voyage to the Levant. This left barely any time to prepare the manuscript of al-Maydānī for the press. This indication appears on the first folio of the manuscript translation preserved in the Bodleian Library, where Pococke wrote:

If it please God that I returne not otherwise to dispose of this translation of Proverbes I desire that it may be put in the Archives of [Corpus Christi College] Library. There though very rude and imperfect to be kept for some helpe of those that study the Arabicke language. Hoping that [Mr. Thomas Greaves] or some other may at some time perfect the worke for an edition. Per me Ewardus Pococke. April 10th 1637.⁸⁸

This small note is significant for several reasons. First, it shows that Pococke's engagement with the proverbs was not literary or historical, that he did not intend to provide his readers with a specimen of Arabic prose or derive some knowledge of Arabic civilization from it, but that he viewed the work in practical terms, as

an exercise to practice and improve one's linguistic skills. This does not mean he had no literary intentions in undertaking a first draft or literal translation. On the contrary, he indicated that he had already thought of turning the work into a more accomplished translation. However, he also suggested that this sensitivity to the beauties of Arabic literature was not a personal fad. Nor was he particularly out of place or at the vanguard of research in suggesting the translation of specimens of Arabic literature. He thought of at least one colleague who could pick up where he left off.

Second, the note casts serious doubts on the narrative of the rise and fall of Arabic studies in the early-modern period. Indeed, working on the translation of Arabic proverbs in the early 1630s did not necessarily mean that there was a favorable context in England for the publication of Arabic literature. It did not even entail the presence of an interest in Arabic studies among scholars and learned readers. It may just indicate that the orientalist needed a text to improve his translation skills and that his Arabic teacher thought the proverbs most appropriate since they were short and their style simple. Moreover, the fact that they were not published afterward did not necessarily mean that the field of Oriental studies had inexorably declined, and the curiosity of scholars for Arabic literature was then extinguished.

In the specific case of al-Maydānī's proverbs, there were scholars still interested in the manuscript translation forty years after it had been completed and who insisted it should be published. Edward Bernard sent two letters to Pococke in 1671, in which he urged him to publish his "Chiliads of Arabick Proverbs." Twells also mentioned a letter from Edmund Castell to Pococke in March 1672, in which we learn that Pococke intended to publish the Arabick Chiliads and that he had a specimen of it printed and circulated. Castell received the specimen favorably, pressed Pococke to improve the edition, and promised the purchase of a hundred copies for Cambridge. A greater number was requested for Oxford. In 1673, Bernard addressed a letter to Boyle in which he recommended the volume and promised to send a copy of the specimen.⁸⁹ Other friends in London, including Gale and Haack, were informed of the edition and also promised support. Thus, the ultimate failure of the project remained mysterious even to Twells, who wrote: "But, for Reasons, of which we can give no Account, nothing was done in the Business, rather then, or at any Time afterwards."⁹⁰

Even if the reasons behind this failure remain obscure, the fact that the project was undertaken indicates that in 1672, Arabic studies was not dead and it also reminds us of the necessity to broaden the scope of sources. Many things could

account for a missed opportunity in publication, relating to the life of scholars and the presence of intermediaries in the elaboration of knowledge. One suggestion that can be put forward regarding the failure to publish al-Maydānī's proverbs is drawn from Bernard. Just when he started promoting the work, Bernard was solicited by Fell for a new edition of all of the ancient mathematicians. Bernard's energies were soon diverted to this project. As Hugh de Quehen explained, Bernard had to seek out printed books and manuscripts and to draw up a synopsis of materials for the planned fourteen volumes.⁹¹ And so he may have had little time for al-Maydānī.

Edward Pococke lived in a transitional period between ancient and modern orientalism, marked by a burgeoning interest in Arabic literature and the civilization of the Arabs, and also distinguished by rectifications of the misrepresentations and errors committed by past authorities. However, these actions are all embedded in texts where Arabic serves the purposes of philological, theological, and philosophical research, and where the same method is used to approach literary texts, such as proverbs; theological texts, such as Genesis; and liturgical texts, such as the Psalms.⁹² The shift to modern orientalism appears with the complete vernacularization of knowledge and the integration of orientalist studies into the colonial machine. Pococke lived at a time when the new strands of Arabic studies emerged as deeply intertwined with older forms of orientalist research. Pococke himself was the product of his age more than an isolated creative genius. His condition was that of the cultural broker, crossing continents, in search of manuscripts for himself and for other scholars or patrons, and straddling disciplines, publishing in various fields pertaining to the humanities and responding to the queries of theologians, historians, philosophers, astronomers . . . in short, embodying the type of "internationalized" scholar as defined by Robert Mankin in the introduction to this volume, that is, someone engaged in "various kinds of 'border' crossings concerning national, religious, linguistic, and group identities, as well as the semantic fields depending on them" (p. XX).

Pococke's career represents a caveat against historiographical teleology and retrospective thinking that fails to fully appreciate the bearing of political, economic, and academic contingencies imposed on the construction of knowledge and on the elaboration of texts, imposing certain choices and channeling research. If we are to establish a more detailed and accurate representation of orientalism in the early-modern period, we must take into consideration not only authors but also intermediaries, not only the text but also the paratext, and not

only the published but also the unpublished material. A great deal depends on the second part of each of these coupled notions, and it is only fair to try and redress the balance.

Notes

1. The first chairs of Arabic were established at Cambridge in 1632 and Oxford in 1636. Chair holders had to give weekly lectures in exchange for regular stipends.
2. When the Bodleian opened in 1602, it possessed one Arabic manuscript. In 1626, when Matthias Pasor visited from Heidelberg, there were six, including four Qur'an. Before Pococke was awarded the Laudian chair, there were about two dozen. See Colin Wakefield, "Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library: The Seventeenth-Century Collections," in *The "Arabick" Interest of the Natural Philosophers in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. G. A. Russell (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 128–46, here 130.
3. G. J. Toomer, *Eastern Wisdom and Learning. The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 53.
4. The *passeurs* are defined in the introduction to this volume by Robert Mankin as "neither the mythological ancestors and heroes of the modern world, nor its proletariat, nor its martyrs, pariahs, or transgressive figures" but who combined elements from each of these categories, "[. . .] literary actors, whose actions did not generally crystallize into great acts of authority, [. . .] [whose] acts passed, without terminating or initiating, though they certainly increased the mass of available knowledge" (XX).
5. Bedwell (1563–1632) has been described as "the patriarch of the English Arabists," but he was of an "isolated" kind. P. M. Holt, "The Background to Arabic Studies in Seventeenth-Century England," in *The "Arabick" Interest*, 21.
6. Pococke's circle of indigenous scholars was composed of his Arabic teacher in Aleppo, Sheikh Fath Allāh, and his scribes, among whom was the scholar al-Darwish Aḥmad and the brother of the local Greek Orthodox bishop, Michael Thaljah. Later in Constantinople, he also worked closely with Jacob Roman, a Jewish scholar, who introduced him to the study of Judeo-Arabic and procured a large number of Hebrew manuscripts for him and with the patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucaris, who possessed a rich library of Oriental manuscripts. See Leonard Twells, "The Life of the Reverend and Most Learned Dr. Edward Pococke," in *The Theological Works of the Learned Dr. Pococke*, 2 vols., vol. 1 (London: Printed for the editor, 1740), 11. [hereafter, Twells].
7. Toomer writes of an "increasing scorn for Arabic studies in post-Restoration England and Oxford." Pococke had to forgo the publication of his edition of al-Maydani's proverbs, Maimonides's *Guide for the Perplexed*, and the *Account of Egypt* by 'Abd al-Latīf al-Baghādādi.
8. The *Catechism* was prepared for Robert Huntington, who became chaplain at Aleppo in 1670. Upon arrival, Huntington asked Pococke to send copies of his Arabic Grotius, which Pococke duly dispatched, along with twelve copies of Seaman's Turkish grammar and thirty-six of the *Catechism*. See Falconer Madan, *Oxford Books, Oxford Literature 1651–1680*, vol. 3 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1931), 3:254.

9. The Bodleian owns a manuscript consisting of four loose folios (Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS Pococke 429, ff.1–2, ff.16–7) that correspond to pages of *Hayy Ibn Yaqdhan* translated directly into English. The folios are part of a larger volume containing other manuscripts: f.1r was dated 10 July 1645, suggesting that Pococke started the translation then; ff.1–2 contain the beginning of the tale, whereas ff.16–7 pick up the narrative at a later point. There is a gap in the narration between f.2 and f.16, and f.17 ends in the middle of a sentence, suggesting that Pococke had translated more than these four pages and that the rest is now lost. Based on this evidence, I would argue that Pococke had taken a personal interest in *Hayy* early in his career, that he had translated part, if not all of it, for publication, but was unable to publish it.
10. A “Mr. Vernon” was Pococke’s contact in Paris. Vernon notified him of the delivery of copies of the book to poet Jean Chapelain, natural philosopher Christiaan Huygens, the orientalist d’Herbelot and Pétis de la Croix, to Mr. Ferrand, to Francis Bosquet (Bishop of Lodève and Montpellier), and to Abbot Panciatichi in Florence. Twells 1:67–8 summarizes Vernon’s letters informing Pococke of their reactions.
11. To quote mathematician John Wallis, from a 1668 letter to astronomer Johann Hevelius reproduced in A. Rupert Hall and Marie Boas Hall, ed., *The Correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, 13 vols., vol. 5 (Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965–1973), 235.
12. Mary B. Hall, “Arabick Learning in the Correspondence of the Royal Society,” in *The “Arabick” Interest*, 147–57, discusses Pococke’s help to members of the society.
13. Toomer’s *ODNB* biography highlights the revolutionary nature of Pococke’s contribution in the field of Arabic studies. For further accounts of early-modern orientalism, see *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, ed. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel (Leiden: Brill, 2005) and P. M. Holt, *Studies in the History of the Near East* (London: Frank Cass, 1973); for the Levant Company, Alfred C. Wood, *A History of the Levant Company* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935) and James Mather, *Pashas: Traders and Travellers in the Islamic World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), esp. ch. 6, “Objects of Enquiry,” 160–88.
14. Twells 1:1–84.
15. After Laud’s execution in 1645, the endowment for the Arabic chair lapsed. It was restored not long after, thanks to the intervention of Selden, in his capacity as member of the parliamentary committee for regulating the universities, and Gerald Langbaine. Pococke refused to take the oath of allegiance to the new regime, but he and his position were secured thanks to a petition signed by senior academic figures at Oxford and a delegation of senior scholars, including vice-chancellor John Owen. See Twells, 1:23–55.
16. Langbaine helped Pococke with the publication of *Specimen historiae Arabum* in 1650, the 1655 edition of *Porta Mosis*, and the 1654–1656 edition of Eutyrius’s *Annals*. Pococke also acknowledged that Langbaine spurred him on to publish the *Historia compendiosa dynastiarum*. Langbaine was likewise instrumental in the promotion of orientalist scholarship by John Greaves and Samuel Clarke. See A. J. Hegarty, “Langbaine, Gerard (1608/1609–1658)” in *ODNB*, accessed July 11, 2013, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16006>, and Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England* (1662), new ed., 2 vols., vol. 1 (London: printed for F. C. and J. Rivington, 1811), 239.
17. Ian Gadd, *A History of the Oxford University Press*, 1: *To the year 1780* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 1:82–85. The term “Architypographus of the University” is borrowed from Twells 1:59.

18. Hall, "Arabick Learning," 155–56.
19. The notions of "cultural transfer" and "interfaces" were elaborated in the 1980s by a group of French scholars led by Michel Espagne. Along with the bibliography, see the chapter in this volume by Daniel Brewer.
20. *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770–1820*, ed. Simon Schaffer et al. (Sagamore Beach, MA: Watson Publishing International, 2009); E. Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire. Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 2012), esp. 3–7, 36–38, 190–97; *Les Musulmans dans l'histoire de l'Europe*, t. II: *Passages et contacts en Méditerranée*, eds. Jocelyne Dakhlia and Wolfgang Kaiser (Paris: Albin Michel, 2013).
21. See for instance Toomer's ODNB biography of Pococke.
22. *Ibid.*, 94.
23. See the notes Pococke published with the translation of the poem, and his manuscript comments on Genesis (MS Pococke 426: "Comment by Pococke on Genesis IVI. 14)."
24. See note 19 above and Natalie Zemon Davis, *Trickster Travels: In Search of Leo Africanus, a Sixteenth Century Muslim Between Worlds* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006); Joan-Pau Rubiés, *Travellers and Cosmographers: Studies in the History of Early Modern Travel and Ethnology* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007); Miles Ogborn, *Global Lives. Britain and the World, 1550–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
25. Peter Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge* (2000; Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008), 25.
26. Emilie Savage-Smith, "Islam," in *The Cambridge History of Science*, ed. Roy Porter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 649–69.
27. In 1638, John Greaves urged his fellow traveler Pococke to cross the river from Galata, where European residents lived, to go to the bazars, shops, and private houses in "Stambol" in order to collect manuscripts, which, he insisted, "might be done without Hazard, provided a due Caution were used about such Books as relate to Religion." Twells, 1:15.
28. An episode of the capture of ships and their wares is related in Pococke's letter to Boyle dated 1 October 1672: "I am sorry to hear a report of two Turkey shippes outward bound which should be taken by the Dutch Capers; I fear (if so) that the things which were sent for Alepo may be miscarried." In Michael Hunter, Antonio Clericuzio, and Lawrence M. Principe, eds., *The Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 6 vols., vol. 4 (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001), 322–23. Twells 1:13 relates another episode in which a ship carrying manuscripts from the East sank in a Dutch harbor.
29. The only trace we have of Laud's requests are two letters reproduced by Twells 1:7. The first, dated 30 October 1631, contains Laud's commission of "antient Greek Coins, and such *Manuscripts*, either in *Greek* or the Oriental Languages as in [Pococke's] Judgement may best befit an University Library." The second, dated 21 May 1634, conveys Laud's thanks but mentions no books.
30. A. Nicoll and E. B. Pusey, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum orientalium Bibliothecae Bodleianae, pars secunda* (Oxford: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1835), iv. See also Ian Philip, *The Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 60.
31. C. Wakefield in *The "Arabick" Interest*, 130.
32. Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud* (London: Macmillan; St. Martin's Press, 2nd ed. 1965), 273.

33. Greaves complained that “both at Alexandria and Cairo [. . .] he could find, besides common Things, nothing but a few old Papers, or rotten and imperfect Books.” He pressed Pococke to remedy this failing while he was still in Constantinople, which was according to Greaves “the Sea into which all the lesser Rivers had emptied themselves, all Books of any Value, in other Parts, having been taken up and brought to the Port”; quoted in Twells, 1:15.
34. Michael Foster, “Digby, Sir Kenelm (1603–1665)” in *ODNB*, accessed August 6, 2013, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7629>.
35. Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS. Digby Or. 1–36.
36. C. Wakefield in *The “Arabick” Interest*, 131–32.
37. *Abdollariphi historiae Ægypti compendium*, ed. and trans. Joseph White (Oxford: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1788). Edward Pococke Jr. published half of the *Account* in Latin in 1685, but the publication was curtailed for obscure reasons. In 1746, Thomas Hunt tried to publish the full translation and was similarly unsuccessful. This was finally achieved by the Oxford Arabist Joseph White in 1788. See Toomer, “Pococke, Edward (1604–1691)” and *Eastern Wisdom*, 272–75.
38. As Hall (“Arabick Learning,” 147) pointed out, it may seem strange that leaders of the “new philosophy” should rely on medieval Islamic texts, but “it was the case that science, especially mathematical science, required in order to progress the assimilation of the full content of ancient Greek science, much of which only existed in Arabic translation, while medieval Islamic geographers, mathematicians and astronomers were known to have had access to information not available to the scholarly world of seventeenth-century Europe.” Hall thus isolated three different strands of interest for Arabic learning among natural philosophers: an interest in medieval Islamic texts, in Arabic translations of Greek texts, and in linguistic aids for medical and theological terms.
39. *Correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, 8:372, 388.
40. Hevelius’s request was sent to the society, which immediately took official note of it and forwarded it to Wallis in March 1663. See Thomas Birch, *History of the Royal Society*, 4 vols., vol. 1 (London: Printed for A. Millar, 1756–1757), 39, and the letter from Wallis to Hevelius in *Correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, 5:235.
41. *Correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, 9:210–11, 239; Hall, “Arabick Learning in the Correspondence of the Royal Society,” 154–55.
42. *Correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, 10:76.
43. Two copies of the manuscripts were then available in England, one belonging to Greaves, the other to Pococke. See Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS Pococke 375.
44. *Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 4:322–24.
45. For Selden’s motives in translating Eutychius, see Paul Christianson, “Selden, John (1584–1654)” in *ODNB*, accessed January 4, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25052>.
46. See note 14 above.
47. Selden had persuaded Pococke to make the Latin translation and was paying the cost of printing. Pococke must have felt additional pressure from his friend when the latter understood that his end was coming and wanted to see at least some fruit of their efforts before dying. After Selden’s death in November 1654, a codicil was found in which he entrusted Pococke and Langbaine with the

- publication of the whole edition. The two volumes were finally printed in 1656; see *Oxford Books*, 3:52. It thus appears that even though Pococke saw little scholarly interest in Eutychius's *Annals*, he was bound by trust and friendship to see the publication through.
48. Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS. Selden Supra 109, fol. 341r, 19 August 1652.
 49. See "Letter to Selden, 23 August 1650." Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS. Selden Supra 108, fol. 147r.
 50. Robert E. W. Maddison, *The Life of the Honourable Robert Boyle* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1969), 102.
 51. Boyle was related to English merchants in the Levant who could easily get in touch with local scholars for Pococke; see the letters from Pococke to Boyle dated 3 January and 13 March 1661 in *Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 1:444, 450.
 52. Michael Hunter, "Boyle, Robert (1627–1691)" in *ODNB*, accessed July 18, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3137>. Twells 1:57 describes Boyle's material support for Pococke's translation of *De veritate*.
 53. See Pococke's letter to Boyle dated 2 December 1662 in *Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 2:53.
 54. In a letter to Selden dated 2 July 1652, Pococke discussed details of the transcription for the edition of Eutychius. He informed Selden of errors in parts of the copies initially used, for which he blamed the local scribes, while offering to replace such passages by those found in more accurate copies. Trusting scribes was capital in the construction of knowledge as was being able to exchange copies in order to compare versions. Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS. Selden Supra 109, fol. 368r.
 55. Twells 1:14 mentions these merchants and their role in providing Pococke with Persian versions of the Gospels which would later be used in the edition of the *English Polyglot Bible*. He also stresses their diligence in satisfying Pococke's requests. For some manuscripts that were not to be had or copied in Aleppo, the two merchants sent an intermediary as far as Damascus to fetch them. They were also useful in recommending trustworthy brokers such as the Syrian Christian Abdel Messiah to buy manuscripts for Pococke and proposed to acknowledge receipt of the items in Aleppo and then dispatch them to Constantinople, where Pococke was then living.
 56. Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS. Pococke 432, ff.5–9. For the translation, see Holt, *Studies in the History of the Near East*, "Appendix II. Letters from al-Darwish Aḥmad to Pococke," 42–45. See also Hilary Kilpatrick, "Arabic Private Correspondence from Seventeenth-Century Syria: The Letters to Edward Pococke" *Bodleian Library Record* 23.1 (April 2010): 20–40.
 57. Twells 1:7–8.
 58. Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS Pococke 432, f.6. The two quotes that follow are from the same manuscript folio.
 59. Holt, *Studies*, 48, identified the "printed geography" as *Geographia Nubiensis* (Paris, 1619), "a Latin translation by the Maronites Sionita and Herosnita of a portion of al-Idrisī's *Kitāb Rujjār*."
 60. Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS Pococke 432, f.8.
 61. All references are included in Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS Pococke 432, ff.6–9.
 62. Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS Pococke 432, f.7.
 63. Aḥmad informed Pococke: "I have written a commentary on the Gulistan for you but the copy from which the commentary came was defective and now I have completed it and it will soon come to you" (Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS Pococke 432, f.9; trans. by Holt in *Studies*, 45).

64. The first European translation of the *Gulistān* was published by André Du Ryer in 1634. Du Ryer's translation represents only a selection of tales; yet, the fact that it was circulated in French and in a free style ensured that the meaning was preserved and that the tastes of readers would be gratified. The *Gulistān, ou Empire des Roses*, thus became successful with a first translation of the French appearing in German in 1636 by Ochsenbach, and it inspired Georg Gentius for his Latin translation entitled, *Musladini Sadi Rosarium politicum sive amenum sortis humanae theatrum* (Amsterdam, 1651). For an insightful contribution on Du Ryer's study and appreciation of Persian literature in general and the *Gulistān* in particular, see Richard Francis and Alastair Hamilton, "A Champion of Persian Literature," in *André du Ryer and Oriental Studies in Seventeenth-Century France* (London: The Arcadian Library in association with Oxford University Press, 2004), 73–89. Why Pockocke decided not to go forward with the translation of his own copy may be due to his appreciation of the late translation of Du Ryer but also to his being privy to Gentius's publication plan. Before leaving for Istanbul, where he stayed from 1642 to 1648, Gentius resided in Oxford in 1640. I have traced his residence in Oxford from a letter he wrote on 29 July 1640 in Latin to Selden, who was then in London (MS Selden supra 108 f.89). Interestingly, Pockocke embarked on his return journey from Istanbul in August 1640, stopped in France, and arrived in London in March 1641. It is possible that the two scholars met in Oxford or London or that Pockocke at least knew about and followed Gentius's progress in the translation of the *Gulistān*. This may account for the fact that he did not try to translate the work himself even though Aḥmad had recommended it to him. The Latin translation circulated across Europe and was known in England. Humphrey Prideaux mentions it as a primary source in *The True Nature of Imposture Fully Displayed in the Life of Mahomet* (London: For William Rogers, 1697).
65. Pockocke possessed at least two Arabic commentaries on the *Gulistān* (MS Pockocke 146 and 156), but no copy of the *Gulistān* per se. Uri's catalogue indicates that both copies are codices and that MS 146 is anonymous while 156 was authored by the Arab commentator Ya'qūb ibn Sayyid 'Alī (d. 1524); see Johannes Uri, *Bibliotheca Bodleiana Codicum Manuscriptorum Orientalium* (Oxford: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1787), 90–91, 96. The name of the commentator appears in transliteration on a small slip of paper pasted on f3r of MS Pockocke 156. By comparing the manuscripts, I noted that MS Pockocke 146 and 156 have different handwritings—156 was written in a smaller, more compact script than 146; letters in 146 are more stretched. Unfortunately, I was not able to find the signature of Aḥmad on MS 146. The problem we have in comparing this manuscript with Aḥmad's letters is not only that handwritings change over time but also that letters are written in a casual script, whereas Arabic works are transcribed in calligraphy. Even if not an elaborate one, as in MS 146, the transcription is still formal. The Bodleian's public card index of Arabic manuscripts mentions a third codex, MS Pockocke 25, which is an Arabic commentary on the *Gulistān* by Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Surūrī (1492–1562). None of the three manuscripts bears European annotations.
66. For Jones, see the chapter by M. J. Franklin in this volume.
67. Toomer, "Pockocke, Edward (1604–1691)" in *ODNB*, 2004.
68. Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS. Selden Supra 109, fol. 349r.
69. *Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 1:444.
70. Pasted over f.1r of *Risālah ḥayy ibn Yaqzān*, (Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS. Pockocke 263, ff. 23–71) is a small scrap of paper with the note "Theological work" in Pockocke's hand.

71. Twells, 1:56.
72. Boyle had mastered Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac, but not Arabic. See Charles G. D. Littleton, "Ancient Languages and New Science: The Levant in the Intellectual Life of Robert Boyle," in *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*, 151–71.
73. Wood, *A History of the Levant Company*, chap. 6.
74. Pococke to Boyle, 5 October 1660, *Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 1:427.
75. Alastair Hamilton, "Clarke, Samuel (bap. 1624, d. 1669)" in *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5527>. For the metrical study of the Qurʾān by early-modern orientalists, see Jan Loop, "Divine Poetry? Early Modern European Orientalists on the Beauty of the Koran," *Church History and Religious Culture* 89 4 (2009): 455–88.
76. The manuscript of Pococke's translation of al-Maydānī's proverbs is preserved in the Bodleian as MS Pococke 392. Pococke worked on it with his teacher and friend Aḥmad between September 1634 and September 1635; see P. M. Holt, "The Study of Arabic Historians in Seventeenth Century England: The Background and the Work of Edward Pococke," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19 3 (1957): 448. However, Pococke's acquaintance with Arabic proverbs and his first translations began earlier, under his first tutor Sheikh Faṭḥ Allāh. Twells 1:6 relates that one of his exercises consisted in translating Arabic books, the chief of which being "a vast Collection he there procur'd, of six thousand *Proverbs*, containing the Wisdom of the *Arabians*, and referring to the most remarkable Passages of their History. This he turn'd into Latin, adding some Notes for Explication, with a Design, as he seem'd to tell his Friend *Ger[ard] Vossius*, to publish the Whole after his Return into *England*."
77. Wakefield, "Arabic Manuscripts," 134–35, provides the complete list.
78. The *Specimen* contains two title pages and two publication dates but a running pagination. The "Notes" received their own title page (p. 33) and were dated 1648. Thus, the notes were not added after the drawing up of the main text but were prepared and published prior to it, which confirms the notion that grafts may develop into independent structures.
79. Edward Pococke, *Specimen Historiae Arabum* (Oxoniae: Excudebat H. Hall, impensis Humph. Robinson, 1650), 33–35.
80. Pococke, *Specimen*, 186–87.
81. Pococke quoted, translated, and commented on major historians, such as Abū al-Fidā, al-Jannābī and Aḥmad bin Yusuf, for his notes on the *jahiliyya* and on the life of the Prophet; Ibn Khallikān, for subjects including the origins of the *Muʿtazilah* school of Islamic theology; al-Shahrastānī, for his disquisitions on the various branches of Islam and philosophers, including al-Ghazālī and Ibn Sinā. See Holt, *Studies*, 33–36.
82. Toomer, "Pococke, Edward (1604–1691)," *ODNB*.
83. Twells, 1:60.
84. Letter to Thomas Greaves quoted in Twells, *idem*.
85. Joseph Pitts, *A Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mahometans* (1704; 3rd ed., London: Printed for J. Osborn and T. Longman, 1731), 131. See also Anita McConnell, "Pitts, Joseph (1663?–1739?)," in *ODNB*, accessed September 10, 2013, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22345>.

86. For general background on early-modern proverbs, see Wolfgang Mieder and Alan Dundes, *The Wisdom of Many. Essays on the Proverb* (New York: Garland, 1981), 3–9.
87. Arnoud Vrolijk, “The Prince of Arabists and His Many Errors: Thomas Erpenius’s Image of Joseph Scaliger and the Edition of the *Proverbia Arabica* (1614),” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* LXXIII (2010): 297–325; Abdelwahab Meddeb, “La Sagesse des Orientaux.” Preface to Antoine Galland, *Les Paroles remarquables, les bons mots, et les maximes des Orientaux* (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1999).
88. Bod. Lib., Or. Coll., MS Pococke 392, “Meidanii Proverbia,” f.1.
89. Bernard wrote to Boyle on 13 May 1673: “I make bold to send you a specimen of the Arabic proverbs, which Mr. Scott, bookseller, desired to be made, in order to print the whole, if one hundred copies could be taken off by your friends here (Dr Castell promising for a like number at Cambridge). In the edition I would, if it be agreeable to the mind of the ingenious, that a smart Latin version be put to the Arabic proverbs, and then a verbal for the use of the students in that ample language.” *Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 4:352.
90. Twells, 1:68.
91. Hugh de Quehen, “Bernard, Edward (1638–1697)” in *ODNB*, accessed August 17, 2013, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2240>.
92. See MS Pococke 426 “Comment by Pococke on Genesis I–VI. 14” and MS Pococke 431 “Notes by Pococke on the Psalms.”