

ticular understandings of Medina under Muḥammad and, for Sunnis, his early successors. Ultimately, it draws upon the biblical ideal of a people ruled by Torah and rejecting polytheism (e.g., Deut 4–6; 28–30; Josh 24; 2 Kgs 22–23; Neh 8–10). Arguably the closest parallel to militant Islamism is the Maccabean revolt against foreign and indigenous Hellenizers to restore Jewish independence, the rule of Torah, and strict monotheism (e.g., 1 Macc 2–4).

Bibliography: ■ Armajani, J., *Modern Islamist Movements: History, Religion, and Politics* (Chichester 2012). ■ Euben, R. L./M. Q. Zaman (eds.), *Princeton Readings in Islamist Thought* (Princeton, N.J. 2009). ■ International Crisis Group, *Understanding Islamism* (Brussels 2005). ■ Roy, O., *The Failure of Political Islam* (trans. C. Volk; Cambridge, Mass. 1994).

Christopher J. van der Krogt

See also → Jihad

Islamophobia

The proper meaning of the term islamophobia, or anti-Muslim sentiments, is contested and there is currently no accepted definition of it (Larsson/Sander). Since the publication of the Runnymede Trust report, *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All* (1997), it has been associated with hostility, fear, and negative stereotypes of Islam and Muslims. The lack of an agreed definition has not prevented NGOs, governmental bodies, and the United Nations, as well as anti-racist think tanks, Muslim organizations, and academics from using it.

Anti-Muslim feelings can easily be related to religious polemics both historically and in the present, though whereas polemical writings are driven by theology, contemporary forms of islamophobia are more often associated with discrimination, racism, and hate crimes. Of course, there is often a weak boundary between racism and a polemic that is fueled by theological dogmas, prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination. For example, online portals such as *WikiIslam* (on this hub, cf. Larsson) and international networks such as *Stop Islamization of Nations* (SION) allow a voice to individuals who find support for their anti-Muslim sentiments or hate in their religious traditions.

Evangelical or Pentecostal Christians who express anti-Muslim opinions often embrace apocalyptic interpretations of the Bible linked to events in Israel-Palestine (Westerlund; Steiner). For example, the Norwegian terrorist Anders Behring Breivik, who killed seventy-seven individuals in a terrorist attack in Oslo and Utøya on July 22, 2011, was motivated by his understanding of the Bible and Christian teachings, together with a more general islamophobic world view (Bangstad).

Bibliography: ■ Bangstad, S., *Anders Breivik and the Rise of Islamophobia* (London 2014). ■ *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All* (London 1997) ■ Larsson, G., “Cyber Islamophobia:

The Case of WikiIslam,” *Contemporary Islam* 1 (2007) 53–67. ■ Larsson, G./Å. Sander, “An Urgent Need to Consider how to Define Islamophobia,” *BStRel* 44.1 (2015) 13–17. ■ Steiner, K., “Vem är min nästa?” *Bilden av islam och muslimer I den kristna nyhetstidningen Världen idag* (Uppsala 2010). ■ Westerlund, D., “Islam in Pentecostal Eyes: A Swedish Example,” in id., *Global Pentecostalism: Encounters with other Religious Traditions* (London 2009) 193–205.

Göran Larsson

Ismachiah

Ismachiah (MT *Yismakyāhū*, “Yahu sustains”; LXX Σαμαχια) is mentioned in 2 Chr 31:13 as a name borne by a temple officer of a third rank.

Daniel Bodi

Ismāʿīlīs

The Ismāʿīlīs are one of the main branches of Shīʿī Islam. They are sometimes referred to as Seveners due to their loyalty to Imāms descended from Ismāʿīl ibn Jaʿfar (d. 755), who according to their reckoning was seventh in the line of succession from the prophet Muḥammad (in distinction to the different lineages followed by the Zaydīs (Fivers) and Twelver Shīʿa). The reception of the Bible by Ismāʿīlī authors, as well as their interpretation of biblical narratives, characters, and themes, drew on precedents set by earlier Muslim groups, especially Shīʿa who preceded the emergence of the Ismāʿīlī movement, and elaborated upon these earlier precedents in significant ways. The Ismāʿīlīs’ development of older conceptions of prophetology, especially those that asserted the direct continuity of the Imāms with Israelite forerunners, impelled them to engage with the rich legacy of biblical and parabiblical materials bequeathed by Jews and Christians, some of which had undoubtedly already been given an Islamic veneer by earlier Shīʿī traditionists and authors. In contemplating the various engagements of Ismāʿīlī authors with the Bible, we must thus take into account both “Bible” as a broad genre of materials concerning the legacy of Israel, and the actual canonical texts of Tanakh and NT transmitted by Jews and Christians, and often readily accessible to Ismāʿīlī thinkers.

The reception of biblical and parabiblical materials in Islamic literature and tradition has never been a passive process. Rather, Muslims have actively adapted biblical characters, symbols, narratives, and themes in accordance with numerous religious, social, intellectual, and political imperatives. Muslim exegetes drew on scriptural and parascriptural material directly or indirectly derived from Jewish and Christian sources to interpret and expand on the narratives of the Qurʾān; the career of the prophet Muḥammad and the emergence of the early Islamic community were shaped in biographical and historical sources according to patterns de-

rived from older traditions of prophethood and sacred history; and Muslim apologetic literature portrayed Muḥammad and the rise of Islam as the fulfillment of biblical prophecy.

That said, it has sometimes been asserted that the first impulse to gather and reinterpret biblical material came from the Shīʿa, who quite early on sought to draw parallels between the prophets of ancient Israel and the lineage of Imāms or inspired guides of the *Ahl al-Bayt* or “People of the House” (the family of Muḥammad), or even link them directly. According to the Shīʿa, the Imāms, charismatic figures from the family of Muḥammad and his son-in-law ʿAlī, held an exclusive claim to be the legitimate leaders of the Muslim community. Their inheritance of the legacy of Muḥammad and ʿAlī, imagined as a testament (*waṣīyya*) bequeathed from the Prophet to his descendants, was sometimes held to have originated with a transmission of authority that could be traced back to the prophets and other recipients of divine favor and guidance among the Israelites, even going back to such antediluvians as Adam and Seth (cf. Rubin 1979). The relationship asserted between prophets of the different epochs could also be typological: the idea of a basic analogy between the prophets of Israel and Muḥammad and his successors was encouraged by such early traditions as the Ḥadīth of *manzilat Hārūn*, in which the prophet is cited as telling ʿAlī that “you are to me like Aaron was to Moses.” Though this tradition is interpreted in a number of different ways (cf. Mis-kinzoda 2015), some groups of Shīʿa took the prophet’s words rather literally, and were thus inspired to consider the larger pattern into which the prophets and their supporters in each epoch might have fit.

Thus, seemingly building on the basic analogy established in the *manzilat Hārūn* tradition, the most fundamental aspect of Ismāʿīlī interpretation of the legacy of Israel as a concept is the assemblage of complementary pairs of prophets into what has been called a “hierohistorical” scheme of divine revelation to humanity. The classic Ismāʿīlī understanding of the historical *daʿwa* or perennial prophetic mission holds that God has repeatedly sent complementary pairs of prophets to summon believers, establish a law based in revelation, and guide the resulting community – usually portrayed as a faithful minority in a sea of unbelief – to salvation. Most depictions of the succession of prophets across the *adwār* or cycles of history presuppose that the pairedness or syzygy (*izdīwāj*) between prophets is necessary because one is the “speaker” (*nāṭiq*) who brings revelation, while his “silent” (*sāmī*) counterpart plays a supporting role as his legatee (*wāṣī*) and “foundation” (*asās*), as well as the first guide of his community (*imām*).

The prophetic succession typically consists of seven pairs: Adam and Seth, Noah and Shem, Abra-

ham and Ishmael, Moses and Aaron, Jesus and Peter, and Muḥammad and ʿAlī, culminating in the coming of the *Qāʾim* or messianic Imām of the future and his counterpart, an event that precipitates the realization of a new golden age and the salvation of the faithful. A rudimentary version of this doctrine appears already in the *Kitāb al-Rusūm wa-l-izdīwāj wa-l-tartīb* (Book of Regulation, Pairing, and Ranks) of ʿAbdān (d. 899), one of the oldest extant works of the Ismāʿīlī movement. Organizing history into a larger pattern according to the progression of prophetic missions over time allowed Ismāʿīlī commentators to deploy biblical narratives to solve fundamental problems of doctrine. For example, Ismāʿīlīs, like other Shīʿa, had to address such phenomena as seeming interruptions in the divine guidance of humanity, delays in the arrival of prophets or Imāms, and so forth, and episodes from the history of Israel sometimes allowed instructive analogies to be drawn between the experience of the original scripturaries and that of the present-day Shīʿī faithful. For example, *ghayba*, concealment of the anticipated Imām, could be readily compared to Moses’ disappearance on Sinai during the revelation of the Torah or Jesus’ absence after his apparent crucifixion.

The hierohistorical doctrine could be further elaborated in intriguing ways. For example, the *Kitāb Shajarat al-yaqīn* (once wrongly attributed to ʿAbdān himself, now linked to a mysterious tenth-century author called Abū Tammām who may have belonged to the Qarmaṭī Ismāʿīlī school) describes an evil counterpart to *izdīwāj*, a sequence of paired nemesis figures who sought to oppose and undermine the prophetic missions. The countervailing sequence of “devils” and “satans” (*abālisa* and *shayāṭīn*) is familiar from Jewish and Christian biblical and parabiblical tradition: Azrael (likely Azazel, the name of the Devil in his pre-fallen state) and Cain, Nimrod and Āzār (Abraham’s idolatrous father), Pharaoh and Haman, Judas and Tatian (the name sometimes given in Islamic lore to Caiaphas, high priest of the Jews), and so forth. Elsewhere in his work Abū Tammām describes the heresies introduced by numerous candidates for the title of “satan” within the Muslim fold. The hierohistory assembled by the earliest Ismāʿīlīs could thus be expanded for theological and heresiological purposes.

Themes relating to the history of Israel appear in diverse ways in the writings of those thinkers associated with circles of what is sometimes termed “philosophical Ismāʿīlism” in Iran. These authors created a distinct synthesis of *falsafa* (the fusion of Aristotelianism and Neoplatonism widely popular in the Islamic world at this time) and Ismāʿīlī doctrines of prophethood and imamology. Thus, treatises such as Abū Ḥatīm al-Rāzī’s *Aʿlām al-nubuwwa* and al-Sijistānī’s *Ithbāt al-nubuwwa* drew on older conceptions such as the *adwār* or prophetic cycles,

integrating them into a larger, philosophically coherent defense of the necessity of prophecy. Not only did contemporary religious and philosophical concerns continue to be projected into the biblical past (or rather, used to bridge the gap between past and present through a perennially immanent historical frame), but Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī in particular drew on the Bible as a source of revelation of equal validity to the Qurʾān, if it was interpreted correctly. Thus, his *Aʿlām al-nubuwwa* cites verses from both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament dozens of times, about a third as often as the Qurʾān. Closely related to this milieu is the famous corpus of documents called the *Epistles of the Brethren of Purity* (*Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-ṣafāʾ*), produced by a circle of Ismāʿīlīs operating clandestinely in Baṣra in the tenth century. Biblical themes and characters are well represented in the *Epistles*; for example, as Alí-de-Unzaga has shown, the *Epistles'* treatment of the topos of Moses' intimate conversations with God during his sojourn on Sinai to receive the Torah (*munājāt Mūsā*) draws on older exegetical, philosophical, and mystical elaborations on this "divine colloquy" and develops it in new ways.

The significant interest in biblical themes and characters among Ismāʿīlīs reaches its greatest fruition in the literature of the Fāṭimid Caliphate, established in Tunisia in 909 CE and abolished by Saladin in Cairo in 1171. At its height, the Fāṭimid Empire came to eclipse that of the ʿAbbāsids, as they created a rich cosmopolitan culture of stunning intellectual and material wealth and sophistication during their dominion over the eastern Mediterranean and North Africa. The Fāṭimids provide us with our richest and most diverse corpus of Ismāʿīlī literature, providing compelling evidence of the variety of ways in which Ismāʿīlīs drew upon biblical and parabiblical tradition, appropriated "Israelite" motifs, and claimed actual or figurative continuity between their Imāms and the prophets of Israel.

Fāṭimid authors such as Jaʿfar ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman and al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān were masters of the exegetical technique known as *taʾwīl*. In its classic Shīʿī mode, *taʾwīl* resembles the exegetical method of the Qumran sectarians commonly termed *peshet*, attested in a number of important documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Like the Qumran sectarians' use of *peshet*, Fāṭimid authors used *taʾwīl* to draw parallels between biblical and qurʾanic references and persons and events of their own time, enabling them to portray their community's experience as foreshadowed in scripture and thus representing the fulfillment of prophecy – making them, essentially, the real protagonists of sacred history and true inheritors of the legacy of both the Israelite prophets and Muḥammad, ʿAlī, and the *Ahl al-Bayt*. Strikingly, because the Ismāʿīlīs saw *taʾwīl* as the only instrument through which the Qurʾān could prop-

erly be interpreted, this allowed Fāṭimid exegetes to approach the Bible directly as a legitimate source of revealed knowledge as well; to the initiated, *taʾwīl* could provide the key to Jewish and Christian as well as Muslim scripture. In the earliest period of Ismāʿīlī history, the extension of the community's exegetical embrace to the scriptural materials of the *Ahl al-Kitāb* had a particularly countercultural aspect to it; the Ismāʿīlīs went against the grain in rejecting the conventional Muslim view of the Bible as corrupt and not worthy of the status of legitimate revelation, setting themselves apart from the mainstream and establishing their reputation as possessors of special esoteric knowledge by doing so.

Even after the downplaying of the more radical aspects of Ismāʿīlī teaching after the reforms implemented by the Fāṭimid Caliph-Imām al-Muʿizz (r. 953–975), Ismāʿīlī thinkers continued to engage with the scriptural traditions of Jews and Christians for various purposes. The most obvious example of this phenomenon is the *dāʿī* al-Kirmānī (d. after 1020), the greatest Fāṭimid intellectual figure of the era of the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Ḥākim (r. 996–1021), whose use of biblical, Jewish, and Christian material is so copious that it attracted scholarly notice even before any of his works had actually been published (Walker 1999: 55). While it was once held that the Fāṭimid engagement with the scriptural and parascriptural traditions of the *Ahl al-Kitāb* primarily aimed at appealing to Jews and Christians to induce them to convert, as Hollenberg's more recent work on Jaʿfar ibn Manṣūr al-Yaman demonstrates, the goal of *taʾwīl* exegesis of the Bible was likely not proselytization but rather exploitation of this non-Islamic material to communicate specific messages to a Muslim audience, especially Ismāʿīlī initiates.

As is often the case in Islamic tradition, the surviving evidence is skewed toward sources that informed and educated the learned elites who wrote and transmitted them. It is natural to infer that the use of *taʾwīl* to interpret biblical and parabiblical material and to assert the continuity of the Fāṭimid Ismāʿīlī Imāmate with the Israelite prophetic legacy was aimed at that primary audience of insiders. However, a recently discovered anonymous manuscript, seemingly unique, appears to preserve evidence of the way *taʾwīl* could be used to communicate a more broadly popular message and even be exploited to propagandize Sunnis and urge their support of the Ismāʿīlī Shīʿī cause. British Library manuscript Or 8419 presents a succession of different historical moments, demonstrating the symmetries between the careers of the prophets of Israel, the ministry of Muḥammad, and the fate of the Imāms of the *Ahl al-Bayt* in the present; *taʾwīl* exegesis of the Qurʾān is executed in such a way as to communicate the unambiguous message that although

the prophets and Imāms have always been persecuted and opposed by evildoers – especially the Jews – God eventually redeems his faithful from their enemies. The text predicts an imminent overthrow of the dominion of Sunnī authorities – pejoratively termed “the Jews of our community” – with the prophesied appearance of the Mahdī, the anticipated messianic figure who is to usher in a final golden age before the End of Days. While the text does not draw on scriptural or parascriptural materials of obvious Jewish or Christian provenance, the reliance on the biblical symbols, characters, and themes found in the Qurʾān is absolutely central to this text’s promulgation of its messianic message, for example its striking comparison of the coming of the Mahdī and the ensuing violence against Sunnīs who followed corrupt and oppressive leaders with the killing of the idolatrous worshippers of the Golden Calf. As Pregill has conjectured, the work – produced during early Fāṭimid times – aimed to propagandize Sunnīs by casting the Fāṭimid Caliph-Imām as the heir to both the prophetic tradition of ancient Israel and the legacy of the prophet Muḥammad and his family.

In Fāṭimid Cairo the incursion of symbols from the prophetic past into present reality could occur in startlingly concrete ways. During the later years of his reign, al-Ḥākim reversed the policy of general toleration of *dhimmīs* that had previously prevailed in the Fāṭimids’ cosmopolitan, multi-ethnic empire, under which Jewish and Christian communities had persisted, if not thrived. Al-Ḥākim imposed ever-more odious sanctions upon the *dhimmīs*, interpreting the sumptuary regulations traditionally associated with the “Pact of ‘Umar” in an extremely stringent way. Christians were compelled to wear large, unwieldy crosses around their necks, as a punishment for their slanderous claim that God had allowed his prophet Jesus to be crucified; for their part, Jews were forced to wear a large bell, or, according to another account, a heavy carved wooden head of a calf, a reminder of their ancestors’ ancient transgression at Sinai (Walker 2009: 209).

On the whole, a perception of history in which past and present, the exegesis of scripture and the experience of the community, are brought together into a timeless ‘now’ in which messianic deliverance is made palpably immanent, is one of the most distinctive aspects of Ismāʿīlī tradition. The use of *taʾwīl* and the emphasis on both the prophetic past and messianic future (which may also be interpreted as a messianic present, as among the early Fāṭimids), would recur among later groups, and not only among Shīʿa. Thus, Faḍlallāh Astarābādī (d. 1394), founder of the Ḥurūfī movement, employs a form of *taʾwīl* interpretation to promote his unique prophetological and messianic doctrines in his magnum opus *Jāvidān-nāmeḥ-yi kabīr* (“Great Book

of Eternity”). Like Ismāʿīlīs such as Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and al-Kirmānī, he makes copious use of biblical and parabiblical sources in doing so, valorizing the patriarchs and prophets of Israel as previous recipients of the gnostic truths he promulgated and validating the scriptures of the *Ahl al-Kitāb* as genuine repositories of divine guidance.

Bibliography: ■ Ali-de-Unzaga, O., “The Conversation between Moses and God (*munāḡāt Mūsā*) in the Epistles of the Pure Brethren (*Rasāʾil al-Iḥwān al-Safāʾ*),” in *Al-Kitāb: La sacralité du texte dans le monde de l’Islam* (ed. D. de Smet et al.; Acta Orientalia Belgica, Subsidia 3; Leuven 2004) 371–87. ■ Daftary, F., *The Ismāʿīlīs: Their History and Doctrines* (Cambridge 2007). ■ Hollenberg, D., *Beyond the Quran: Early Ismaili Taʾwīl and the Secrets of the Prophets* (Columbia, S.C.) [Forthcoming]. ■ Kraus, P., “Hebräische und syrische Zitate in ismāʿīlitischen Schriften,” *Islam* 19 (1931) 243–63. ■ Madelung, W./P. E. Walker, *An Ismaili Heresiography: The “Bāb al-shayṭān” from Abū Tammām’s Kitāb al-shajara* (Leiden 1998). ■ Madelung, W./P. E. Walker, “The *Kitāb al-Rusūm waʾl-izdijāj waʾl-tartīb* Attributed to ‘Abdān (d. 286/899),” in *Fortresses of the Intellect: Ismaili and Other Islamic Studies in Honour of Farhad Daftary* (ed. O. Ali-de-Unzaga; London 2011) 103–65. ■ Miskinzoda, G., “The Significance of the *ḥadīth* of the Position of Aaron for the Formulation of the Shīʿī Doctrine of Authority,” *BSOAS* 78 (2015) 67–82. ■ Poona-wala, I. K., “Ismāʿīlī taʾwīl of the Qurʾān,” in *Approaches to the History of Interpretation of the Qurʾān* (ed. A. Rippin; Oxford 1988) 199–222. ■ Pregill, M. E., “Measure for Measure: Prophetic History, Qurʾānic Exegesis, and Anti-Sunnī Polemic in a Fāṭimid Propaganda Work (BL Or. 8419),” *JQS* 16 (2014) 20–57. ■ Rubin, U., “Prophets and Progenitors in the Early Shīʿa Tradition,” *JSAI* 1 (1979) 41–65. ■ Straface, A., “*Abālisa* and *shayṭān*: A Qarmaṭian-Ismāʿīlī Interpretation: The Case of the *Kitāb Shajarat al-yaqīn*,” in *Sources and Approaches across Disciplines in Near Eastern Studies* (ed. V. Klemm/N. al-Shaʿar; Leuven 2013). ■ Walker, P. E., *Ḥamid al-Dīn al-Kirmānī: Ismaili Thought in the Age of al-Ḥākim* (Ismaili Heritage Series 3; London 1999). ■ Walker, P. E., *Caliph of Cairo: Al-Ḥakim bi-Amr Allah, 996–1021* (Cairo/New York 2009).

Michael E. Pregill

Isolation, Loneliness

- I. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament
- II. New Testament
- III. Judaism
- IV. Christianity
- V. Islam
- VI. Literature
- VII. Visual Arts
- VIII. Music
- IX. Film

I. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

The Hebrew terms *bad*, *bādād*, *yāḥīd*, and *ḥādal* are used to express isolation and loneliness in the HB. These may refer to the physical isolation of an individual or the mental state of feeling abandoned. Throughout the HB the covenant relationship between Israel and God reinforces the importance of belonging to a community. This is emphasized in