

ORIENTE MODERNO

RIVISTA D'INFORMAZIONE E DI STUDI
PER LA DIFFUSIONE DELLA CONOSCENZA DELLA CULTURA
DELL'ORIENTE SOPRATTUTTO MUSULMANO

NUOVA SERIE, ANNO XC, 1, 2010

A SCHOLAR IN THE SHADOW:
ESSAYS IN THE LEGAL AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT
OF IBN QAYYIM AL-ŷ AWZIYYAH

Edited by
Caterina BORI and Livnat HOLTZMAN



This volume has been published through the generous support of the Dr. Naim Dangoor Interdisciplinary Program of Universal Monotheism at Bar Ilan University.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---------|
| <i>Preface and Acknowledgements</i> | v |
| <i>List of Contributors</i> | vii-ix |
| INTRODUCTION | |
| Caterina BORI and Livnat HOLTZMAN, <i>A Scholar in the Shadow</i> | 11-42 |
| SOCIETY AND LAW | |
| Birgit KRAWIETZ, <i>Transgressive Creativity in the Making. Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's Reframing within Ḥanbalī Legal Methodology</i> | 43-62 |
| Yehoshua FRENKEL, <i>Islamic Utopia under the Mamluks: The Social and Legal Ideals of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah</i> | 63-83 |
| David FREIDENREICH, <i>Five Questions about Non-Muslim Meat: Toward a New Appreciation of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's</i> | 85-106 |
| GOD AND MAN | |
| Jon HOOVER, <i>God's Wise Purposes in Creating Iblīs. Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's Theodicy of God's Names and Attributes</i> | 107-128 |
| Yasir QADHI, <i>The 'Unleashed Thunderbolts' of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah: An Introductory Essay</i> | 129-143 |
| Abdessamad BELHAJ, <i>Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah et sa contribution à la rhétorique arabe</i> | 145-154 |
| Ovāmir ANJUM, <i>Sufism without Mysticism? Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's Objectives in Madāriġ al-Sālikīn</i> | 155-182 |
| BODY AND SOUL | |
| Irmeli PERHO, <i>Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's Contribution to the Prophet's Medicine</i> | 183-202 |
| Tzvi LANGERMANN, <i>The Naturalization of Science in Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's Kitāb al-Rūḥ</i> | 203-220 |
| Geneviève GOBILLOT, <i>Corps (badan), âme (nafs) et esprit (rūḥ) selon Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah à travers son Kitāb al-rūḥ. Entre théologie rationnelle et pensée mystique</i> | 221-250 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | 251-280 |
| <i>Index</i> | 281-285 |

A SCHOLAR IN THE SHADOW

When strolling through the buzzing Muslim book markets at Friday prayer services, one is immediately struck by the persistent presence of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's (d. 751/1350)¹ writings paraded on the packed shelves of the market bookstalls. Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's books, in multiple sizes and formats, in tacky colorful and flowery covers, as well as in more subdued monochromatic editions, have gained their secure place on the crowded stands of Muslim booksellers. As simple as this may sound, the most likely conclusion to be drawn is that, today, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah sells. The popularity he enjoys on the contemporary Muslim scene is well reflected by the recent copious scholarly production about him in Arabic, and by the current efforts to produce high quality academic editions of his works.² Several reasons account for his success. In general, when compared to his master, the vociferous Ḥanbalī jurist and theologian Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728/1328), Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah emerges as a less demanding reading. Despite the inclusion of both polemics and a high degree of linguistic refinement, Ibn al-Qayyim's writings are generally less aggressive in tone and more accessible in language. In addition, his quiet and at times didactic style may appease the reader in search of spiritual guidance. Yet, spirituality was not Ibn al-Qayyim's only concern. His strong preoccupation with the most diverse aspects of everyday life to be led in strict adherence to the Prophet's teachings is a remarkable feature of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's oeuvre. This attitude is reflected in several writings that discuss practical issues and were targeted to different layers of Ibn al-Qayyim's society. For instance, *Tuḥfat al-mawdūd fī aḥkām al-mawlūd* is a handbook on the care of babies and infants. Ibn al-Qayyim presents this handbook as an entertaining vol-

* The introduction was written by both editors of this volume, except the section *Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah: Notes on His life*, p. 16-27, which was authored by Caterina Bori. We thank Camilla Adang for her comments on an earlier version of this introduction.

1 – The agnomen Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah (the son of the superintendent of the madrasah al-Ġawziyyah, a Ḥanbalī law college in Damascus) is indeed the correct one, used by his contemporaries. In modern literature, however, there is a tendency to shorten this agnomen to Ibn al-Qayyim, in order to allow the fluency of the reading and avoid redundancy. With this in mind, we allowed “Ibn al-Qayyim” to appear whenever the structure of the narrative required, while maintaining “Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah” in most cases.

2 – For a perceptive analysis of some of these materials, read Birgit Krawietz, “Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah: His Life and Works”, *The Mamlūk Studies Review*, 10 (2006) 2, p. 19-64.

ume, unprecedented in its genre³ that speaks to parents, mothers and fathers alike,⁴ and addresses questions such as: Why should a birth be announced? Why is it reprehensible to resent the birth of baby girls? How to feed the baby whose teeth have started growing? When is the appropriate time for the baby to be weaned? What are the rules to follow for naming children? Chapter 16 gives some useful and commendable advice about child rearing. The modernity and good sense that distinguish this and other chapters are surprising. Another work which focuses on practical aspects, *al-Furūsiyyah* (Horsemanship), is a treatise on the various types of sports and military exercises that were an essential training regimen of the ruling elite.⁵ It was therefore a book that was supposed to engage the attention of the Mamluk establishment. Ibn al-Qayyim considered the physical and technical dimensions of horsemanship, as well as the religious and devotional ones. According to him, this view, which emphasizes the religious and spiritual benefits of this military occupation, emerged in the teachings of the Companions of the Prophet who “combined the *furūsiyyah* of horses to that of faith, certitude, rivalry in uttering the *ṣahādah* and abnegation in loving and pleasing God”.⁶ In line with *al-Siyāsah al-šar‘iyyah* of Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim’s *al-Ṭuruq al-ḥukmiyyah* was written especially for judicial administrators.⁷ Another important work, the *Zād al-ma‘ād*, was a huge tribute to the Prophet. In this work, Ibn al-Qayyim intertwines *Sīrah* and Hadith⁸ materials when he discusses matters of daily life in order to provide guidance to believers.⁹ Furthermore, the eschatological concern which pervades his *Kitāb al-rūḥ* may account for the special popularity this books enjoys nowadays.¹⁰

3 – Ibn al-Qayyim, *Tuhfat al-mawdūd bi-ahkām al-mawlūd*, ed. ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Arnā’ūt, Damascus, Maktabat dār al-bayān, 1971, p. 5-6.

4 – Ibn al-Qayyim, *Tuhfat*, p. 5.

5 – Ibn al-Qayyim, *al-Furūsiyyah*, ed. Samīr Ḥusayn al-Ḥalabī, Tanta, Dār al-ṣahābah li-l-turāt bi-Ṭantā, 1991. On the art of horsemanship, cf. David Ayalon, “Notes on the *Furūsiyya* Exercises and Games in the Mamluk Sultanate”, *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 9 (1961), p. 31-62 (reprinted in David Ayalon, *The Mamlūk Military Society*, Collected Studies Series, London, 1979) and Shihab al-Sarraf, “Mamluk *Furūsiyyah* Literature and Its Antecedents”, *The Mamlūk Studies Review*, 8 (January, 2004), 1, p. 141-200.

6 – Ibn al-Qayyim, *al-Furūsiyyah*, p. 27.

7 – Ibn al-Qayyim, *al-Ṭuruq al-ḥukmiyyah fi l-siyāsah al-šar‘iyyah aw al-firāsah al-murḍiyyah fi ahkām al-siyāsah*, ed. Zakāriyā ‘Umayrāt, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmiyyah, 1995. For a perceptive reading of this work, cf. Baber Johansen, “Signs as evidence. The doctrine of Ibn Taymiyya (1263-1328) and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya on Proof”, *Islamic Law and Society*, 9 (2002) 2, p. 168-193.

8 – Following John Burton’s observation, we use “Hadith” (with a capital H) to denote the massive literature of tradition, assembled from thousands of text-units called *ḥadīṯ*s (with a small h). Since “Hadith” is more or less known in English, it is not accurately transliterated, however the technical term *ḥadīṯ*, is. This approach is maintained throughout the book. John Burton, *An Introduction to the Hadith*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1996, ix.

9 – Ibn al-Qayyim, *Zād al-ma‘ād fi ḥady ḥayr al-‘ibād Muḥammad*, ed. ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Mahdī, 4 vols., Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-‘arabī, 2005.

10 – Among the many editions, Ibn al-Qayyim, *al-Rūḥ*, ed. ‘Alī Ṣubḥ al-Madanī, Jedda, Maṭ-

On the whole, the pious concern for the individual's life in this world and in the next that emanates from some of these writings, the aspiration and the effort to painstakingly provide his readers with ideal and meticulous Salafi (when not strictly prophetic) contents, together with his deep moral interest in tracing a path for a traditionalist-oriented Sufi spirituality, are all features which can explain the attraction that Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah exerts today on devout contemporary Muslims.

While substantial innovative research has recently been published by Western scholars about Ibn al-Qayyim's famous master, Ibn Taymiyyah, the same cannot be said for Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, whose broad literary corpus remains almost unexplored. Although some of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's works were recognized as unique and, in some cases, were used as the almost exclusive source for research, Ibn al-Qayyim was almost never credited for them as an independent and substantial thinker. Nobody denies the importance and uniqueness of *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in* (a compendium on the principles of Islamic jurisprudence) or of *al-Ṭuruq al-ḥukmiyyah*. His *Aḥkām ahl al-dīmah* is without any doubt the main late-medieval reference regarding religious minorities in Islamic law. His Sufi manual *Madāriğ al-sālikīn*, which is a commentary on al-Anṣārī al-Harawī's (d. 481/1089) spiritual manual *Manāzil al-sā' irīn*, stands out as an ambitious although didactic work on spirituality. *Ṣifāt al-ʿalīl*, which offers a profound analysis of the problem of predetermination, is by far the most comprehensive work dedicated to the issue of predetermination and free will, while *Rawḍat al-muḥibbīn*, which complements Ibn al-Ġawzī's (d. 597/1200) *Damm al-hawā*, is one of the most important treatises ever written on divine and profane love. Ibn al-Qayyim's contribution to the field of the medicine of the Prophet is long recognized thanks to *al-Ṭibb al-nabawī* (The Medicine of the Prophet), a much-studied work which is actually the last part of the so-far neglected *Zād al-ma'ād*. And the list goes on and on. Yet, a student of Ibn al-Qayyim embarking upon research on the thought of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah will eventually start with a meager handful of studies, then painstakingly hunt for more references to Ibn al-Qayyim mainly in works dedicated to Ibn Taymiyyah. Various reasons have been adduced for this. First, Ibn al-Qayyim's contribution usually tends to be considered as the work of a diligent pupil of Ibn Taymiyyah. This view implies a lack of originality on Ibn al-Qayyim's part that makes him unworthy of proper scientific research. Second, Ibn al-Qayyim's elaborate and, at times, highly technical use of the Arabic language and his extensive quotations from the Quran and the Hadith may have limited the access of Western scholars to his works.¹¹ Yet, this point would not explain the keen interest in Ibn Taymiyyah who is certainly not an easily accessible author. A certain inclination towards the devoted piety that stands in the background of Ibn al-Qayyim's attitude to the world seems to be a necessary condition for appreci-

ba'at al-Madanī-Dār al-Madanī bi-Ġaddah, 2005.

11 – Krawietz, "Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya: His Life and Works", p. 63.

ating him.¹² In addition, the figure of Ibn Taymiyyah is by itself so eccentric, charismatic, original, and captivating, and his writings so voluminous, that next to him a person with a more gentle profile like Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah runs the risk of looking dull. The result is that, to date, Ibn al-Qayyim remains a scholar in the shadow: in the shadow of his loud and difficult master, and in the shadow of distracted Western scholars.

The present volume was originally conceived as an initial attempt to dispel this shadow by shedding some light on Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's contribution to the development of Islamic thought. We initially envisaged three lines of inquiry. The first line was a historical evaluation of his role in the interpretation and reception of Ibn Taymiyyah's theological and legal doctrines. Here, we posed the following questions: What was Ibn al-Qayyim's role in the circle of scholars that surrounded Ibn Taymiyyah? How did Ibn al-Qayyim interact with these scholars? Who were Ibn al-Qayyim's disciples? Is it possible, via Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, to detect a path of transmission which allowed Ibn Taymiyyah's ideas to be transmitted to modernity? If so, did this path begin with Ibn al-Qayyim? How pivotal was he really to that process? In the second line of inquiry, we suggested that, without disregarding Ibn Taymiyyah and the previous Ḥanbalī tradition, a historical and scholarly appreciation of Ibn al-Qayyim's work should be undertaken in the broad fields of theology, jurisprudence, and Sufism. This line of inquiry pays particular attention to identifying an eventual specific methodology characterizing Ibn al-Qayyim's literary output, and to highlighting his sources and preoccupations. Third, we called for an appraisal of the impact of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah on the intellectual debates which occurred within later scholarly circles. We wondered about any reactions to his ideas and doctrines in the centuries following his death up to the emergence of Wahhabism. Some of these questions have been tackled by the authors of this volume, whereas others remain for further research.

Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah: notes on his life

Who was Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah? Because systematic accounts of his life can be found in several recent and less recent contributions, the following discussion provides a brief synopsis of a few relevant, and at times overlooked, points regarding Ibn al-Qayyim's biography.¹³ While introducing Ibn al-Qayyim to the

12 – Krawietz, "Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya: His Life and Works", p. 63-64.

13 – In Arabic, see: Ṭāhir Sulaymān Ḥamūdah, *Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah – ġubūdubu fi l-dars al-luġawī*, Cairo, Dār al-ġāmi'at al-miṣriyyah, [1976]; 'Abd al-'Azīm 'Abd al-Salām Šaraf al-Dīn, *Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah - 'aṣruhu wa-manbaġuhu wa-ārā'uhu fi l-fiqh wa-l-'aqā'id wa-l-taṣawwuf*, Kuwait, Dār al-qalam, 1405/1984 (3rd edition, 1955); Bakr Abū Zayd, *Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, ḥayātuhu ātāruhu mawāriduhu*, Riyad, Dār al-'ašimah li-l-našr wa-l-tawzī', 1412/1991-1992; Yāsīn Ḥaḍīr al-Ḥaddād, *Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah: manbaġuhu wa-marwiyātuhu al-ta'riḥiyyah fi l-sīrah al-nabawiyyah*, Cairo, Dār al-faġr, 2001. In Western languages, see: Henri Laoust, *Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Taqī-d-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Taimīya, canoniste ḥanbalite né à Ḥarrān en 661/1262, mort à Damas en 728/1328*, Cairo, Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1939, p. 489-492; s.v. «Ibn Qayyim al-Djawziyya» (Henri Laoust),

reader, the primary intention here is to provide some critical points of reflection for future research.

Information about Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's life in primary sources can be found essentially in the biographical dictionaries and chronicles.¹⁴ He also appears in polemics written by opponents, and in materials written in support of Ibn Taymiyyah. In addition, some autobiographical statements are found in his writings. When examined all together, these materials help provide a picture of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah in his own historical context and lay the foundation for a deeper understanding of his own input.

Education

Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's biographical notices follow a familiar pattern. They begin with the full name of the author, followed by a list of honorary titles that serve the purpose of consolidating his moral and intellectual credentials. Afterwards, the sources list his masters.

Far from being complete, these lists offer a picture of Ibn al-Qayyim's education and, on a broader level, provide an insight into the textbooks that made up the legal and theological curriculum of a fourteenth-century Syrian Ḥanbalī scholar. Al-Ṣafadī specifies the topics and works that Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah studied and the names of his teachers (*suyūb*).¹⁵ It is therefore quite helpful to look at them closely.

Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's training in practical jurisprudence (*furū' al-fiqh*) drew heavily on the Ḥanbalī school classics, in particular on those texts which were most popular in the context of Syrian Ḥanbalism. Thus, Ibn al-Qayyim studied al-Ḥiraqī's (d. 334/945-46) *Muḥtaṣar* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal's (d. 241/855) opinions. This book is usually considered the first extant text representing an embodiment of Ḥanbalī law. According to Henri Laoust, al-Ḥiraqī's work was assured an unparalleled reputation among Syrian Ḥanbalī legal scholars thanks to *al-Muġnī*, a voluminous commentary of the *Muḥtaṣar* produced by the famous Muwaffaq al-Dīn ibn Qudāmah (d. 620/1223). *Al-Muġnī* is described by Laoust as much more than a commentary: "le Muġnī, loin d'être un simple commentaire, constitue par lui-même un véritable traité original. [...] Accueilli avec extrême faveur, même par les auteurs non-hanbalites, le Muġnī a été souvent considéré comme le dépositaire de l'école".¹⁶ Ibn Qudāmah wrote three

in: *Eḏ*; idem, "Le Hanbalisme sous les Mamloukes Bahrides (658-784/1260-1382)", *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*, 28 (1960), p. 66-68; Birgit Krawietz, "Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya: His Life and Works", *op. cit.*; Livnat Holtzman, "Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah (1292-1350)", in: *Essays in Arabic Literary Biography*, Joseph E. Lowry and Devin J. Stewart (ed.s), Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2009, p. 202-223.

14 – For a list of these materials see Bibliography in this volume, p. 249-278

15 – Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Ḥalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī, *al-Waḥī bi-l-wafāyāt*, ed. Sven Dederling, Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1981, vol. 2, p. 271 and idem, *A' yān al-ʿaṣr wa-a' wān al-naṣr*, ed. ʿAlī Abū Zayd *et al.*, Beirut, Dār al-fikr al-muʿaṣṣir – Damascus, Dār al-fikr, 1998, vol. 4, p. 366-367.

16 – Henri Laoust, *Le précis de droit d'Ibn Qudāma*, Beyrouth, Institut Français de Damas,

abridged versions of his masterpiece. One of these versions, entitled *al-Muqni*^c, was also studied by Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah.¹⁷ With Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim studied some of Ibn Taymiyyah's grandfather's *al-Muḥarrar fi l-fiqh* 'alā madhab al-imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, another piece of obligatory reading in the legal education of Syrian Ḥanbalī *fuqahā'* of the time.¹⁸ With his own father, and again with the *ṣayb al-islām*, Ibn al-Qayyim dedicated himself to the study of inheritance laws. One of Ibn Taymiyyah's brothers, Šaraf al-Dīn (d. 727/1327), is also mentioned as Ibn al-Qayyim's teacher in *fiqh*. It seems, then, that Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah was definitely well acquainted with various members of the Taymiyyan family.

In the realm of legal theory (*uṣūl al-fiqh*), the picture that emerges from the brief descriptions in biographical accounts contrasts with the previous descriptions presented here. Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah is reported to have read portions of *Rawḍat (al-nāẓir wa-ġannat al-munāẓir)* of Ibn Qudāmah, a handbook on *fiqh* methodology. With Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim studied a part of *al-Maḥsul fi ilm uṣūl al-fiqh* by Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 607/1210), an extensive work on the method of jurisprudence. This treatise is considered an authoritative legal manual for jurists of the four schools of the time. Ibn al-Qayyim also studied the *Kitāb al-ikhām fi uṣūl al-aḥkām* by the famous Šāfi'ī (ex-Ḥanbalī) Aš'arī scholar Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī (d. 631/1233). A rationalist scholar, al-Āmidī's contribution to the field of *uṣūl al-fiqh* was regarded as considerable.¹⁹ All in all, these materials suggest that Ibn Taymiyyah introduced his pupil to comprehensive legal treatises which stand out for their tendency to avoid specific forms of sectarianism. This is not surprising, given Ibn Taymiyyah's penchant for promoting legal pluralism, other than exclusivism (i.e. specific *madhab* authority), through the use of *iğtibād*; an attitude that goes hand-in-hand with his pragmatic view of the use of law.²⁰

In the field of theology, however, Ibn al-Qayyim's readings disclose a strong training in Aš'arī *kalām* with a privileged place held by Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī.²¹

1950, p. XL.

17 – Henri Laoust describes this work as a handbook for law practitioners, *qādīs* in particular, and as a work devoid of any historical or speculative ambitions. Cf. Henri Laoust, *Le précis de droit d'Ibn Qudāma*, p. XLI.

18 – Cf. Mağd al-Dīn ibn Taymiyyah (d. 653/1255). For a profile, see Henri Laoust, *Essai*, p. 9 and for the place of *al-Muḥarrar* in local Ḥanbalī education, cf. idem, *Le précis de droit d'Ibn Qudāma*, p. L. Ibn Taymiyya is reported to have written a commentary of his grandfather's work. Cf. Ibn Rağab, *Kitāb al-dayl 'alā ṭabaqāt al-ḥanābilah*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqī, Cairo, Maṭba'at al-sunnah al-Muḥammadiyyah, 1952-53, vol. 2, p. 404 (*Ta'liqah 'alā l-Muḥarrar*).

19 – Cf. Louis Pouzet, *Damas au VIIe-XIIIe siècle : vie et structures religieuses d'une métropole islamique*, Beirut, Dar el-Machreq, 1988, p. 36-37.

20 – Cf. in this regard the remarks of Yossef Rapoport, "Ibn Taymiyya's Radical Legal Thought: Rationalism, Pluralism and the Primacy of Intention", in: *Ibn Taymiyya and His Times*, Yossef Rapoport and Shahab Ahmad (eds), Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2010, p. 191-226.

21 – Cf. Ibn Rağab, *Dayl*, vol. 2, p. 449 and Ibn Kaṭīr, *al-Bidāyah wa-l-nihāyah fi l-ta'riḥ*,

Not surprising, Şafī al-Dīn al-Hindī (d. 715/1315), one of Ibn Taymiyyah's prosecutors in the famous 1306 Damascus trials and a staunch supporter of Aš'arism, was the person who first took Ibn al-Qayyim's education in *uṣūl al-dīn* upon himself. Al-Hindī is said to have taught Ibn al-Qayyim most of al-Rāzī's *Kitāb al-arba' in (fi uṣūl al-dīn)* and of *al-Muḥaṣṣal (Muḥaṣṣal afkār al-mu-taqaddimīn wa-l-muta'abbirīn min al-ulamā' wa-l-ḥukamā' wa-l-mutakallimīn)*. We note with fascination that Ibn al-Qayyim studied parts of the same two books also with Ibn Taymiyyah. In fact, Ibn Taymiyyah reportedly wrote commentaries on portions of both books.²² Therefore, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah appears to have discussed the same subject matter with two mutually hostile scholars who held greatly different views. As a consequence, Ibn al-Qayyim must have examined al-Rāzī's thought in all its pros and cons: a comprehensive scholarly method of approaching controversial issues. Unlike the field of legal theory, in theology Ibn al-Qayyim is reported to have read many of Ibn Taymiyyah's works.

What these sources offer us is a composite picture of Ibn al-Qayyim who emerges as a broadly trained scholar in legal theory, a highly Ḥanbalī-focused *faqīh* in practical jurisprudence and a rigorously Taymiyyan thinker in the principles of religion. One may add that Ibn al-Qayyim's proficiency in the doctrine of the Pious Ancestors (*madhhab al-salaf*) is also often mentioned in biographical accounts as a distinguished feature of his education.²³

As pointed out above, the list of works which Ibn al-Qayyim studied is far from being complete. It reflects what the social and intellectual code embedded in the biographical dictionaries required for the biography to appear as an illustrious scholar, namely with an unquestionable training in the principles of religion and jurisprudence. Yet, Ibn al-Qayyim also possessed a wide scientific knowledge and a solid familiarity with the Greek scientific tradition, as reflected by such works as the *Tuḥfat al-mawdūd fi aḥkām al-mawlūd*, *al-Tibb al-nabawī*, the *Kitāb al-rūḥ* and *Miftāḥ dār al-sa'ādah*. However, this important side of his education remains significantly absent from his biographies.

Career

Only at the end of Ibn al-Qayyim's life did he acquire some visibility. Ibn Kaṭīr reports that he delivered the Friday prayer service at the central mosque in 736/

Cairo, Maṭba'at al-sa'ādah, no editor mentioned, 1932-39, vol. 14, p. 202. The theological relationship between Ibn al-Qayyim and al-Rāzī is the subject of a recent study by Livnat Holtzman, "Debating the Doctrine of *Jabr* (Compulsion): Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya Reads Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī", in: *Neo-Hanbalism Reconsidered: The Impact of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya*, Birgit Krawietz and Georges Tamer (ed.s), Berlin, de Gruyter (forthcoming 2011). See also Tzvi Langermann's "Ibn al-Qayyim's *Kitāb al-Rūḥ*: Some Literary Aspects", in the volume edited by Birgit Krawietz and Georges Tamer, and also Langermann's contribution to this volume

22 – These commentaries are described by Ibn Raġab, as follows: "Šarḥ awwal al-Muḥaṣṣal li-l-Rāzī ... Šarḥ biḍ'at 'ašārah maṣ'alah min al-Arba' in li-l-Rāzī" (*Dayl*, vol. 2, p. 403).

23 – Ibn Haġar, *Durar*, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ilmīyyah, 1998, vol. 3, p. 244 and Ibn Raġab, *Dayl*, vol. 2, p. 448.

1336, but this appears to have been an isolated incident.²⁴ Other than this, in 743/1342 Ibn al-Qayyim obtained a teaching post at the madrasah al-Ṣadriyyah, a Ḥanbalī institution located in the old city, in 743/1342. In addition, he was the imām of the madrasah al-Ġawziyyah, where his father had been an administrative superintendent (*qayyim*). The madrasah al-Ġawziyyah was also located within the city walls, and had become the seat of the Ḥanbalī chief judge since 1266. Hence, this madrasah represented the official face of local Ḥanbalism. Thus, all in all, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah did not develop much of a teaching career either because of his affiliation with Ibn Taymiyyah, or because of his lack of ambition, or perhaps both.²⁵ But, again, there may be aspects of Ibn al-Qayyim's career that are not evident in chronicles and biographical notices. For instance, his medical knowledge and interest in the fields of spiritual and physical healing make one wonder whether Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah had actually himself practiced medicine. He seemed to have been appreciated by important physicians of his time when he mentions an episode in Cairo, where a senior Egyptian physician was impressed by his explanation of how to drain harmful vapors (*abḥirah radī'ah*) from a patient's body by shaving his head.²⁶ The physician complimented the Ḥanbalī scholar on his knowledge, and said that this is indeed a useful information to anyone traveling to the Maghreb.²⁷

Public Disorders

Biographical notices usually offer brief descriptions of Ibn al-Qayyim's personality. These descriptions highlight his intense devotion and love of spirituality, his hunger for books, and incomparable knowledge. In addition, these accounts mention Ibn al-Qayyim's hardships and trials (*mihān*), but do not really describe them in depth.²⁸ This is a point that deserves some attention for, although Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah enjoys a quiet reputation, his early years as a follower of Ibn Taymiyyah were also characterized by a share in the noisy activism that had been so typical of his master's life. In fact, Ibn Taymiyyah's own understanding of Islam implied an active, if not militant, engagement in the society in which he lived. Not surprising, as long as his master was alive, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġaw-

24 – Ibn Kaṭīr, *Bidayāh*, vol. 14, p. 174.

25 – The remarks about the modest career of Ibn al-Qayyim are found also *s.v.*, «Ibn Qayyim al-Djawziyya» (Henri Laoust), in: *Et*² and Krawietz, «Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya: His Life and Works», p. 27.

26 – One of the first medical procedures that Ibn al-Qayyim mentions in his *al-Ṭibb al-nabawī* is the shaving of the patient's head in order to drain toxic vapors from his body. Ibn al-Qayyim interprets Quran 2:196 as permitting the sick man to shave his head during the *ḥaġġ*, although the text does not state so. Ibn al-Qayyim, *al-Ṭibb al-nabawī*, ed. 'Imād Zakī al-Bārūdī, Cairo, al-Maktabah al-tawfiqiyyah, 1421/2001, p. 14.

27 – Ibn al-Qayyim, *Iġātat al-labfān min maṣāyid al-ṣaytān*, ed. Muḥammad Hāmid al-Fiqī, Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifah, n.d. (an imprint of Cairo, Maṭba'at al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa-awlādihī, 1357/1939), vol. 1, p. 17. See also Holtzman, «Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah», p. 212.

28 – Ibn Raġab, *Dayl*, vol. 2, p. 448; al-Ṣafādī, *A'yān*, vol. 3, p. 368. Ibn Haġar, *Durar*, vol. 3, p. 244.

ziyyah was also seen as playing a pivotal role in Ibn Taymiyyah's activism. The confrontational tone of an early work like *al-Kāfiyah al-šāfiyah*, which will be briefly discussed in the next paragraph, should probably be understood against this background. The most detailed account of Ibn al-Qayyim's biggest trouble is found in the chronicle of the Syrian historian al-Ġazarī (d. 739/1338).²⁹ A contemporary and precious witness to the events, al-Ġazarī, is well informed on local matters and a member of the traditionalist circle of Šāfi'ī scholars close to Ibn Taymiyyah. He places Ibn al-Qayyim's mishap in the context of Ibn Taymiyyah's last trial, that regarding the issue of the visitation of the graves (*ziyārat al-qubūr*). According to the historian, it was Ibn al-Qayyim himself who started the disorder (*amala al-ḥitāb min aṣliḥā*). When in Jerusalem, in the year 726/1326, Ibn al-Qayyim preached against visiting the tombs of the Prophet and of other holy men, in particular that of Abraham. He is reported to have exclaimed: "Look! Here I am and from here I shall go back without visiting the tomb of [Abraham] al-Ḥalīl in order not to offend the Prophet".³⁰ He then moved to Nābulus where he admonished his audience in a sermon on the same topic and stated: "The tomb of the Prophet is not to be visited except for his mosque". Al-Ġazarī testifies: "At that point, the people rose up against him, but he was protected by the governor of Nābulus".³¹ Ibn al-Qayyim was then summoned to Damascus where he was tried in the neighborhood of al-Šāliḥiyyah by the Ḥanbalī judge. He retracted his statement and was released. Nevertheless, the unfortunate event set into motion a whole movement of protest against Ibn Taymiyyah who was "the first who spoke about this issue".³² The campaign was led by Šāfi'ī and Māliki scholars, and was also joined by the Ḥanbalī and Ḥanafī judges. As a result, Ibn Taymiyyah was convicted, imprisoned, and died in captivity in 1328; several of his followers were also publicly punished. Among these was Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, who was beaten and paraded on a donkey. He was the only student of Ibn Taymiyyah who was jailed with the *šayḥ al-islām* and released only after the latter's death.³³ Therefore, Ibn al-Qayyim apparently played a special role in this *ḥitāb*. All in all, his two-year confinement in prison shows that he must have been considered a provocative troublemaker by those who disliked Ibn Taymiyyah, his doctrines, and his disruptive activism. Among these, the powerful Chief Judge Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 756/1355) stands out as an obstinate adversary.

29 – Al-Ġazarī, *Ta' rih ḥawādīṭ al-zamān wa-ʿanbā' ihī wa-wafayāt al-akābir wa-l-a' yān min abnā' ihī*, ed. ʿUmar al-Tadmurī, Seyda, al-Maktabah al-ʿašriyyah, 1998, vol. 2, p. 111-114. See also, Šihāb al-Dīn al-Nuwayrī (d. 733/1333), *Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab*, ed. Mufid Qamiḥad *et al.*, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyyah, 1424/2004, vol. 33 (edited by Ibrāhīm Šams al-Dīn), p. 160-162.

30 – Al-Ġazarī, *Ta' rih*, vol. 2, p. 111.

31 – *Ibid.*

32 – *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 112.

33 – Al-Ġazarī, *Ta' rih*, vol. 2, 114 and cf. also Ibn Kaṭīr, *Bidāyah*, vol. 14, p. 23 and 140; Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, vol. 33, p. 162.

The Confrontations with Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī

Biographical notices, and in this case even contemporary chronicles, contain a dearth of information regarding the confrontations between Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī and Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah which occurred between 1345 and 1349. However, we do know that al-Subkī confronted the Ḥanbalī scholar a couple of times on the acceptability of triple divorce and divorce oaths, and on the permissibility of holding a horse race, or a shooting contest (*musābaqah*) without a third competitor (*muḥallil*). By participating in the competition without a share, the third competitor would make the race lawful and invalidate the fortuitous, and therefore unlawful, nature of the race. In this regard, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah adopted the Ibn Taymiyyah's choice of considering the *muḥallil* an unnecessary presence. In both cases Ibn al-Qayyim had to acquiesce to the Šāfi'ī Chief Judge.³⁴ An important precedent to these confrontations occurred in 742/1341. In that year, the Mamluk emir al-Faḥrī (d. 742/1343) attempted to retrieve Ibn Taymiyyah's books which had been locked away since his imprisonment in the Citadel. We are told that the Chief Šāfi'ī Judge acted as a serious obstacle to this operation. According to Ibn Kaṭīr, al-Faḥrī succeeded in getting the books only by threatening al-Subkī. The judge feared for his life – writes Ibn Kaṭīr – and thought he would be dismissed from his prestigious office. In the end, al-Subkī had to give in, the books were released and delivered to Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah and to one of Ibn Taymiyyah's brothers, but the Chief Judge resented the humiliation he had endured.³⁵

Al-Subkī's writings are a good source to evaluate to what extent Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah was an issue of concern for him, even after Ibn Taymiyyah's death. Al-Subkī wrote six refutations of Ibn Taymiyyah. Of this total, two treatises were addressed to Ibn al-Qayyim, while the remaining four were directed against the *šayḥ al-Islām* and composed when Ibn Taymiyyah was still alive, or very shortly after his death.³⁶ These four *rasā'il* focus on legal issues. In particular, they tackle the question of triple and conditional divorce, and the prohibition of visiting the tombs of venerated men.³⁷ In these texts, al-Subkī is clearly worried that the pragmatic nature of the matters in question may be of appeal to the commoners. Al-Subkī feared an overall adoption of the Taymiyyan rulings by the common people. In fact, he writes: "I was informed that he (i.e. Ibn

34 – Ibn Kaṭīr, *Bidāyah*, vol. 14, p. 216, 232.

35 – *Ibid.*, vol. 14, p. 197-198.

36 – The dates of al-Subkī's refutations are specified in his texts except for *al-Durrah al-muḍīyyah fī l-radd 'alā Ibn Taymiyyah*. In addition, the Chief Judge himself states that: "This man, namely Ibn Taymiyyah, I had refuted him in his life regarding both his refusal to travel to visit the Chosen [i.e. the Prophet], and his refusal to accept the validity of divorce oaths" (in the opening of: Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, *al-F' tibār bi-baqā' al-ġannah wa-l-nār*, in: *al-Tawfiq al-rabbānī*, p. 142. See the following footnote for the full reference).

37 – For the texts of Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī contesting Ibn Taymiyyah's position on divorce, cf. the miscellanea, *al-Tawfiq al-rabbānī fī l-radd 'alā Ibn Taymiyyah al-Ḥarrānī*, no editor mentioned, n.p., n.d. p. 97-139. On *ziyārah*, cf. idem, *Šifā' al-saqām fī ziyārat ḥayr al-anām*, Beirut, Dār al-ġīl, 1991.

Taymiyyah) dispatched his messengers (*du'ātāhu*) to various regions of the earth to spread his vicious propaganda (*da'wah*) [meaning here his doctrine on divorce] by which he led astray groups of lay people from among bedouins, fellahs, and people of the foreign lands".³⁸ Al-Subkī's informer then wrote a response to the *ṣayh al-islām*: "in an abridged format that may be understood by those who do not handle the books of jurisprudence and do not engage in disputations". Thereafter, al-Subkī wrote his own response.³⁹ Despite his claim that Ibn Taymiyyah's deviations from the widely accepted religious principles outnumbered his oddities in practical jurisprudence, this latter aspect seemed to worry al-Subkī more, at least when the *ṣayh al-islām* was alive.⁴⁰ The Chief Judge was primarily a legal scholar. As such, he must have perceived theological disputes about atoms and accidents, the eternity of the world and the duration of Hell and Paradise, to name a few, as more abstract and less easily accessible issues to society than practical jurisprudence, which touched upon all aspects of daily life.

Yet, when al-Subkī wrote against Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, theological preoccupations took the lead. Despite the above-mentioned public confrontations which revolved around practical matters, al-Subkī's brief fatwa against the permissibility of horse racing without a *muhallil* looks rather insignificant. In fact, the fatwa does not even quote Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah and it covers only half a page in the bulky corpus of al-Subkī's legal responsa.⁴¹ Probably, at least on paper, horse racing was not a central matter to al-Subkī, but it must have been a good point by which to publicly humiliate Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah. According to Ibn Kaṭīr, al-Subkī was worried that some Mamluks started writing fatwas on racing in accordance with Ibn Taymiyyah's stance, but without acknowledging him.⁴² By publicly refuting Ibn al-Qayyim on this matter, al-Subkī made it clear that the practice of racing without a third competitor belonged to the contested Taymiyyan legacy.

A couple of years before Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's death, the Chief Judge produced two theological refutations of Ibn Taymiyyah's pupil. In the same period, Ibn al-Qayyim penned some of his most important and mature theological output, namely his *Šifā' al-ʿalīl*, *Hādī al-arwāḥ* and *al-Šawāʿiq al-mursalāh*, which were all written after 1345.⁴³ In addition, in those same years the Šāfiʿī

38 – Al-Subkī, *al-Durrah al-muḍiyyah*, in: *al-Tawfiq al-rabbānī*, p. 100.

39 – *Ibid.*

40 – This point is made by Yossef Rapoport, "Ibn Taymiyya's Radical Legal Thought", p. 191. Al-Subkī's list of Ibn Taymiyyah's theological errors can be found in the opening of *al-Durrah al-muḍiyyah*, in: *al-Tawfiq al-Rabbānī*, p. 99-100 and of *al-Sayf al-ṣaqīl fī l-radd ʿalā Ibn Zafīl*, n.p., al-Maktabah al-Azhariyya li-l-turāt, n.d., p. 23-24.

41 – Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, *Fatāwā al-Subkī*, vol. 2, p. 421-422.

42 – Ibn Kaṭīr, *Bidāyah*, vol. 14, p. 216.

43 – Holtzman, "Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah", p. 217-218; Jon Hoover, "Islamic Universalism: Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya's Salafi Deliberations on the Duration of Hell-Fire", *The Muslim World*, 99 (2009), p. 185, 193-194 and id., "Against Islamic Universalism: ʿAlī al-Ḥarbi's 1990 Attempt to Prove that Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya Affirm the Eternity of

Chief Judge harassed the Ḥanbalī scholar. Clearly, al-Subkī saw in Ibn al-Qayyim's scholarly activity an attempt to continue Ibn Taymiyyah's doctrines and this revived his old hostility.

The first theological treatise, *al-I' tibār bi-baqā' al-ġannah wa-l-nār*, was composed in 748/1348. This refutation opposes the idea that Hell and Paradise will one day disappear.⁴⁴ Jon Hoover, who recently studied this work, thinks that in this refutation al-Subkī responds to Ibn Taymiyyah, who dedicated his last work to this crucial eschatological matter.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, the name of the opponent is never specified by al-Subkī. Moreover, one wonders why al-Subkī would have written this treatise against Ibn Taymiyyah in 1348 (twenty years after his death), if it was not for Ibn al-Qayyim bringing the eschatological contention to his attention.⁴⁶ The duration of infernal Fire is in fact discussed in Ibn al-Qayyim's three above-mentioned writings (*Šifā'*, *Hādī* and *al-Šawā' iq al-mursalab*).⁴⁷ A short preface opens *al-I' tibār*. This preface is in reality a note originally written by al-Šams ibn Ṭulūn (d. 953/1546) on the back of the manuscript. The note reports some words of al-Subkī regarding Ibn Taymiyyah. This passage is useful to understand the Chief Judge's anxiety regarding the *šayḥ al-islām*. In fact al-Subkī, after stating that he had argued against Ibn Taymiyyah's opinions on divorce oaths and *ziyārah* throughout the latter's life, declares: "Then he (i.e. Ibn Taymiyyah) died and we would have no reason to mention him after his death – now that is a community that has passed away⁴⁸ – yet he has followers that croak unwarily (*yan' aqūna wa-la ya' ūna*) As for us, we are sick and tired of debating with them and their like".⁵⁰

Hell-Fire", in: *Neo-Hanbalism Reconsidered: The Impact of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya*, Georges Tamer and Birgit Krawietz (ed.s), Berlin, de Gruyter, (forthcoming 2011).

44 – Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, *al-I' tibār bi-baqā' al-ġannah wa-l-nār*, in: *al-Tawfiq al-rabbānī*, p. 141-157.

45 – Hoover, "Islamic Universalism", p. 200, fn. 21 and "Against Islamic Universalism" where Hoover is more willing to accept the idea that al-Subkī may have argued directly against Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah.

46 – In addition, in the 1983 edition of *al-I' tibār*, the treatise is presented as addressed against both Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah. In fact, the treatise opens by stating: "[A book] by which [al-Subkī] refuted Ibn Taymiyyah in what he produced about denying eternal dwelling in Fire according to the famous innovator Ġahm ibn Šafwān and in agreement with him hums Ibn Zafīl al-Zur'ī as he usually does", in: *al-Rasā' il al-subkiyyah fi l-radd 'alā Ibn Taymiyyah wa-tilmīdihī Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah*, ed. Kamāl Abū l-Munā, 'Ālam al-kutub, 1983, p. 195. We would like to thank Jon Hoover for providing us with a copy of this page. This sentence is missing from the edition of *al-I' tibār*, in: *al-Tawfiq al-rabbānī*.

47 – Again cf. the articles by Hoover quoted above.

48 – *Al-ān tilka ummah qad ḥalat* (Q. 2:134, 141). This is a reference to Ibn Taymiyyah's group of close followers and a Quranic citation alluding to the evil perished nations as a sign of God's vengeance.

50 – Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, *al-I' tibār*, in: *al-Tawfiq al-rabbānī*, p. 143. These words of al-Subkī are in fact an exact quotation from his *Fatāwā* where they appear in the middle of a long discussion on *waqf*, cf. *Fatāwā al-Subkī*, vol. 2, p. 210.

These words speak for themselves and find corroboration in al-Subkī's second refutation of Ibn al-Qayyim. This treatise, which is much longer than the previous one, was written shortly after, in the year 749/1348. It is an open denunciation of Ibn al-Qayyim's famous piece of didactic poetry entitled *al-Kāfiyah al-šāfiyah fi l-intiṣār li-l-firqah al-nāğiyah*. Also known as *al-Qaṣidah al-nūniyyah*, or simply *al-Nūniyyah*, *al-Kāfiyah* is a polemical theological poem with a strong anti-Aš'arī slant.⁵¹ *Al-Kāfiyah* is supposedly an early work of Ibn al-Qayyim. In this poem, Ibn al-Qayyim expounds his master's theology. *Al-Kāfiyah*, a Taymiyyan creed in verse, gained wide popularity in time, as the number of commentaries on it attests.⁵² Al-Subkī's refutation is not systematic, but quotes, paraphrases, and comments polemically on parts of the *qaṣidah*. Ibn Taymiyyah is also often mentioned. In his text, al-Subkī argues at length against the choice of Ibn al-Qayyim's polemical language (Ġahmiyyah, Mu'atṭilah, Mu'tazilah, Mušabbihah...) which al-Subkī believes is offensive and "unhistorical": "By Mu'atṭil he means the group of the Aš'arīs and by Muwaḥḥid he means himself and his partisans (*tā' ifatuhu*)" [...]. As for Ġahm, he died many years ago and today nobody of his school is known. By Ġahmiyyah this poet (*nāzim*) points to the Aš'arīs among the Šāfi'īs, the Mālikīs, the Ḥanafīs and the best of the Ḥanbalīs. [...] As for the Mu'tazilah, there are none of them remaining in this country and, if they did remain, they would not dare to appear. Every time this versifier speaks about Ġahm in this ode, he means the person who follows the school of al-Aš'arī".⁵³ Al-Subkī then discusses the problem of the human action and God's predetermination. He dwells on various aspects of the essence of God and His attributes, on the meaning of *ta'wil* and on a few eschatological matters. His response to *al-Kāfiyah* reflects his preoccupation with the spread and transmission of the Taymiyyan doctrines of which Ibn al-Qayyim is certainly considered a spokesman: "It then happened that among his followers (i.e. Ibn Taymiyyah's), there is one who spreads Ibn Taymiyyah's creed, teaches his fatwas, presents them to the people in secret while publicly hiding them. As a consequence, the damage is spreading to the point that, in this period, I came across a rhymed ode of about six thousand verses. In this ode its composer recalls his own creed and that of other people and, because of his ignorance, he alleges that his creed is the creed of the followers of prophetic traditions (*ahl al-ḥadīth*)".⁵⁴ This conspiratorial tone is typical of al-Subkī's attitude towards the *šayḥ al-islām*'s followers.⁵⁵ However, what he is basically saying here is that Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah was achieving popularity, his books were circulating (to the point that he

51 – Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, *al-Kāfiyah al-šāfiyah fi l-intiṣār li-l-firqah al-nāğiyah*, Cairo, Maṭba'at al-taqīm al-'ilmiyyah, 1344H and Taqī al-Din al-Subkī, *al-Sayf al-ṣaqil fi l-radd 'alā Ibn Zaḥrī*, n.p., al-Maktabah al-Azhariyyah li-l-turāt, n.d.

52 – Cf. Abū Zayd, *Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, ḥayātuhu ātāruhu mawāriduhu*, p. 287-289, especially p. 289 for a list of commentaries.

53 – Taqī al-Din al-Subkī, *al-Sayf al-ṣaqil*, p. 29 and 30.

54 – Taqī al-Din al-Subkī, *al-Sayf al-ṣaqil*, p. 24.

55 – *Ibid.* and p. 26, and the above quoted passage from *al-Durrāh al-muḍiyyah*, in: *al-Tawfiq al-rabbānī*, p. 100.

came across Ibn al-Qayyim's rhymed ode), and, as a consequence, Ibn Taymiyyah's doctrines were spreading. Al-Subkī feared both the discredit of the Aš'arīs that may originate from Ibn al-Qayyim's militant ode, and that this piece of theological poetry, refined in language but simple in contents, might find its way among the common people. In fact, al-Subkī explicitly expresses his worry: "If the doctors of the law and the leaders of the community are described in this way, how can their opinion be accepted? What can the value of their fatwas be, according to the Muslims? The only thing this man wants for the commoners is to establish that there is no Muslim but him and his partisans, who keep on being vile and servile."⁵⁶ What al-Subkī fears is the loss of consensus that originates from Ibn Taymiyyah's rejection of the extant forms of religious authority. In particular, the *šayḥ al-islām*'s refusal of his contemporary fellow scholars' consensus (*iğmā'*) as a source for validating legal rules came across, for al-Subkī, as a disrespectful dismissal of the 'ulamā's own authority. In one of his treatises against the contested Taymiyyan positions on divorce oaths and triple divorce, al-Subkī clearly elaborates his position on this point: "Consensus – he writes – is one of the strongest legal proofs. Accordingly, God has protected this community from agreeing upon an error. In fact, their consensus is that which is right. Many scholars upheld that the person who contradicts the consensus of the community is an unbeliever and that the mufti is bound to the condition of not issuing a fatwa according to an opinion which contradicts the opinions of previous scholars. If he issues a fatwa in this way, then the fatwa is to be rejected and the adoption of the opinion therein expressed prohibited".⁵⁷ A power struggle revolving around different ways of articulating religious authority had definitely taken place between al-Subkī and Ibn Taymiyyah. Against this background, the unfortunate circumstance of *al-Kāfiyah*'s popularity must have been a source of great apprehension to the Šāfi'ī Chief Judge.

In conclusion, one can safely say that in the last years of Ibn al-Qayyim's life al-Subkī fought Ibn Taymiyyah's legacy by targeting his pupil, as his harassment of the Ḥanbalī scholar indicates. These confrontations are to be understood against the background of Ibn al-Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's mature years, when his role as a "dangerous successor" of the *šayḥ al-islām* must have become a perceptible reality to al-Subkī. Moreover, in 1342, the books of Ibn Taymiyyah had been recovered and handed to his pupil against the Chief Judge's will; in the same year Ibn al-Qayyim had obtained some visibility with the post at the madrasah al-Šadriyyah, and, finally, after 1345, he composed some of his most important theological works in which he transmitted and elaborated Ibn Taymiyyah's thought. This was enough for al-Subkī to renew his old hostility against the *šayḥ al-islām* and whoever, he thought, represented him.

56 – Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, *al-Sayf al-ṣaqīl*, p. 53.

57 – Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, *al-Durrah al-mudriyyah*, in: *al-Tawfiq al-rabbānī*. p. 104-105.

Ibn al-Qayyim and the Mamluk Authorities

A final, so far unexplored point concerns Ibn al-Qayyim's relationship with the Mamluk authorities. The idea that Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, as his master, led a life in conflict with the Mamluk elite is quite common. This idea probably originates from the conviction that trials and inquisitions in the Mamluk period were instigated by the state apparatus. Yet, for instance, in the case of Ibn Taymiyyah things often went rather differently. Local groups of 'ulamā' and *fuqahā'* usually initiated his trials which could then be supported, or not, by the central authorities. The involvement of the political elite depended on several factors: on the nature of the matter at stake, whether or not it touched the scope of the public sphere and public authority, or whether or not the issue in question provided the ground for wide civil disturbances. The same applies to Ibn al-Qayyim's disorder in Jerusalem and Nablus. The best approach to adopt towards these episodes is to avoid generalization and to place them fully in their historical context with an effort to grasp the social and intellectual dynamics which they reflected.

Two works by Ibn al-Qayyim invite modern scholars to reflect on his relationship with the elite, namely, his treatise on horsemanship, *al-Furūsiyyah*, and his *al-Turuq al-ḥukmiyyah*. To some degree, these two writings both engage the Mamluk and judicial authorities. This engagement was in concert with Ibn Taymiyyah's style, as he envisaged cooperation with the ruling elite as a primary means to implement his reformist views. Both of these works deserve further scholarly attention.

In addition, a curious statement found in al-Ṣafadī corroborates this idea of a general absence of conflict between Ibn al-Qayyim with the Mamluk authorities. Al-Ṣafadī mentions that Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah received large sums of money: "He was fortunate with some Egyptian amirs; they gave him gold and dirhams. The emir Badr al-Dīn al-Bābā granted him the sum of 12,000 thousand dirham and the emir Sayf al-Dīn Baṣṭāk in the Hijaz, gave him two hundred dinars". Unfortunately, we do not know the reason for these generous donations. However, if this was true, one may infer that, all in all, Ibn al-Qayyim must have been appreciated by at least some members of the Mamluk elite.⁵⁸

How to read Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah?

The first concern one comes across when studying Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah is the issue of his reliance on his master. In this regard, the resources modern scholars have at their disposal follow a double direction. On the one hand, new editions and properly researched books aim at presenting Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah as a scholar worthy of being explored on his own merits. Good examples of this trend are the new edition of *Šifā' al-ʿalīl* or books such as Bakr Abū Zayd's comprehensive study on Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah.⁵⁹ On the other hand,

58 – al-Ṣafadī, *A' yān al-ʿaṣr*, vol. 4, p. 368.

59 – Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, *Šifā' al-ʿalīl fi masā'il al-qadā' wa-l-qadar wa-l-ḥikmah wa-l-ta'ālil*, ed.s Aḥmad ibn Šāliḥ ibn ʿAlī al-Ṣamʿānī and ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-

books such as *What Ibn al-Qayyim Asked the Šayḥ al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, and What He Heard from Him* as the title itself suggests, are entirely focused on Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's relationship with Ibn Taymiyyah.⁶⁰ As a result, modern researchers who approach the study of Ibn al-Qayyim tend to see themselves caught between two opposing poles, namely, either they accept that Ibn al-Qayyim was his master's epigone, or they strive to prove Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's "originality", meaning his independence from Ibn Taymiyyah. Both approaches may turn out to be frustrating, whereas an initial examination of Ibn al-Qayyim's biographical representations offers an insight about how scholars can free themselves from this strait-jacket

The image of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah as the most devoted and faithful disciple of Ibn Taymiyyah goes back to Ibn al-Qayyim's earliest biographers and detractors, as we have just seen. All of these sources underscore Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's close association with his master. Fourteenth-century biographical notices portray Ibn al-Qayyim as a unique disciple. According to Ibn Raġab (d. 792/1393), who claims to have studied with him in person for more than a year, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah taught Ibn Taymiyyah's biography to many. This is an interesting remark, for it suggests that a few decades after Ibn Taymiyyah's death his life was already perceived as exemplary and worthy of being studied. On this occasion, even the most famous of Ibn Taymiyyah's biographers, Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī (d. 744/1343), is listed among Ibn al-Qayyim's pupils.⁶¹

"The most erudite *šayḥ* Taqī al-Dīn Ibn Taymiyyah did not leave behind anybody like him [i.e. Ibn al-Qayyim]",

al-Šafadī writes at some point, thereby depicting Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah as his master's deputy.⁶² Elsewhere, and more interestingly, al-Šafadī calls attention to Ibn al-Qayyim's close adherence to "the Taymiyyan way": "He used to follow the path (*ṭarīq*) of the most erudite Taqī al-Dīn ibn Taymiyyah in all the circumstances of his own life, in the doctrines in which he had singled himself out, and in devoting himself to the utmost elucidation of Ibn Taymiyyah's opinions (*al-wuqūf* ^c *inda naṣṣ aqwālihi*)".⁶³

⁶⁰ Aġlān, Riyadh, Dār al-šamī'ī, 1429/2008 and Bakr Abū Zayd, *Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, ḥayātuhu āṭaruhu mawāriduhu*.

⁶¹ – *Su' alāt Ibn al-Qayyim li-šayḥ al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah wa-samā' atubu minhu*, ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad al-Ġummayzī, Riyadh, Dār al-našr wa-l-tawḥīd, 1426/ 2005. And presumably on the same wave length: *Mā rawāhu Ibn al-Qayyim 'an šayḥ al-Islām*, ed. Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ġāmidī, Riyadh, Dār al-qāsim li-l-našr wa-l-tawzī', 2006. We have not been able to consult this latter book.

⁶² – Ibn Raġab, *Dayl*, vol. 2, p. 449.

⁶³ – al-Šafadī, *Waft*, vol. 2, p. 271.

⁶⁴ – Above all, the term *naṣṣ* conveys the idea of providing an expression with its most eloquent, apparent, and unambiguous meaning. Secondly, *naṣṣ* may also suggest the idea of something being dictated, i.e. put in written form. Cf. Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab*, s.v. «ن ص»: *wa-wuḍi'a 'alā l-minaṣṣati ayy 'alā ḡāyati al-faḍīhati wa-l-šubḥati wa-l-zuhūri* and Reinhart Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, s.v. «ن ص».

At first glance, the historian and biographer Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449), himself not very fond of Ibn Taymiyyah, fuels the image of Ibn al-Qayyim as a respectable but extremely Taymiyyah-dependent scholar. Ibn Ḥaǧar goes as far as saying that Ibn al-Qayyim's love for the *ṣayh al-islām* was so overwhelming that he did not allow himself any deviation from his master's opinions, rather he supported them all. According to Ibn Ḥaǧar, we owe to Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah a revision and refinement of Ibn Taymiyyah's works and the spread of Ibn Taymiyyah's knowledge (*huwa alladī haddaba kutubahu wa-našara ʿilmahu*).⁶⁴ This passage clearly confirms Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's role in the transmission of his master's works, a transmission in which Ibn al-Qayyim participated by both extensively quoting Ibn Taymiyyah throughout his own writings, and by actively taking part in the difficult process of collecting, collating and writing down what was left of Ibn Taymiyyah's writings. In a letter to Ibn Taymiyyah's disciples, likely written shortly after Ibn Taymiyyah's death, Šihāb al-Dīn ibn Murri, a Ḥanbalī follower of the *ṣayh al-islām*, also testifies to this when he qualifies Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah as one of the most well-versed in applying the Taymiyyan rational methods (*al-manāhiǧ al-ʿaqliyyah*) and the most well-versed in the ambiguous meanings of the theological investigations. Ibn al-Qayyim stands among those who have the duty to review and edit the writings of the *ṣayh al-islām*.⁶⁵

Ibn Ḥaǧar makes another incisive comment stating that Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's works were sought after (*marǧūb fihā*) among different groups of people. In this way the biographer suggests that, despite Ibn Taymiyyah's bad reputation, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's writings must have enjoyed a certain degree of circulation and appreciation, at least in the first half of the fifteenth century. Finally, he states: "most of Ibn al-Qayyim's writings are from his master's words of which he freely disposes (*yatasarrafu fi dālika*). In this, Ibn al-Qayyim displays a natural strong talent (*wa-lahu fi dālika malakah qawīyyah*)". By so doing, Ibn Ḥaǧar ends up openly acknowledging Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's creative role as a talented exegete of Ibn Taymiyyah.⁶⁶

Hence, 14th and 15th century biographical accounts convey three types of interconnected information. First, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah was known as a scholar familiar with his master's ideas. Second, by virtue of Ibn al-Qayyim's familiarity with and loyalty to Ibn Taymiyyah, he played a crucial role in collecting Ibn Taymiyyah's writings, and spreading and transmitting his ideas. This information complements what we already know of the Maliki scholar Ibn Rušayyiq (d. 749/1348), identified by Ibn Murri as the person who was in charge of transcribing Ibn Taymiyyah's writings.⁶⁷ Third, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah did

64 – Ibn Ḥaǧar, *Durar*, vol. 3, p. 244.

65 – Ibn Murri, *Risālah min Ahmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Murri al-Ḥanbalī (baʿd 728) ilā talāmid ṣayh al-islām Ibn Taymiyyah*, in: *Sirat ṣayh al-islām Ibn Taymiyyah (661-728) bilāl sabʿ at qurʾān*, ed.s Muḥammad ʿUzayr Šams and ʿAlī ʿImrān, Mecca, Dār ʿālim al-fawāʿid, 1420H., p. 100.

66 – Ibn Ḥaǧar, *Durar*, vol. 3, ll. 20-22.

67 – In this regard cf. Caterina Bori, "The Collection and Edition of Ibn Taymiyya's works:

not confine himself to mere “imitation”, but he freely and creatively drew from his master’s knowledge. While this conclusion is not new, it is nonetheless important because it suggests a reading strategy of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, a strategy which does not forcefully try to emancipate him from his master nor deprives him of his own synthesis and creativity. The basic assumption, therefore, is that if one wants to appreciate Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, his relationship with Ibn Taymiyyah must be taken as a fruitful starting point without fearing of compromising Ibn al-Qayyim’s own resourcefulness.

As a consequence, the most productive way of reading Ibn al-Qayyim is through a constant comparison with parallel texts of Ibn Taymiyyah. Furthermore, the comprehensive and often didactic nature of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah’s works presupposes a heavy reliance on other prominent scholars, not just his master.⁶⁸ This reliance on other scholars is never mimetic by nature, but more a product of an erudite study of these scholars’ works. Hence, other sources of inspiration for Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah must also be investigated thoroughly when reading him. One such illuminating example is chapter 19 in *Šifā’ al-‘alīl*. Presented as a debate between a Sunnī, holding Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah’s views, and a Ġabrī, holding Aš‘arī views, chapter 19 is based exclusively on Fahr al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s discussions on the doctrine of *ġabr*.⁶⁹ This is an original piece by Ibn al-Qayyim, with no parallel text in Ibn Taymiyyah’s writings. Ibn al-Qayyim quotes complete paragraphs of al-Rāzī’s theological works, and places them in the mouth of the Ġabrī. Ibn al-Qayyim’s reading of Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) is another case in point. The presence of Ibn Ḥazm in Ibn al-Qayyim’s writings is quite substantial: there are long and meaningful citations from Ibn Ḥazm’s oeuvre in several of Ibn al-Qayyim’s works, in which the latter discusses subjects that Ibn Taymiyyah either never discussed or mentioned only briefly. In these works, the Ḥanbalī scholar offers more than his well-known systematic exegesis of Ibn Taymiyyah, and in a way separates himself from his master’s areas of interest. We find Ibn Ḥazm also in the monographs in which Ibn al-Qayyim discusses profane love (*Rawḍat al-muḥibbin*) and raising children (*Tuḥfat al-mawdūd*), topics which were not priority items on the agenda of the celibate Ibn Taymiyyah.⁷⁰ We find similar circumstances surrounding Ibn al-

Concerns of a Disciple”, in: *Religion and Religious Culture of Muslims, Christians and Jews in the Mamlūk Period*, Johannes Pahlitzsch (ed.), *The Mamlūk Studies Review* 13 (July 2009) 2, p. 47-67.

68 – The case of Ibn al-Qayyim’s drawing upon Ibn Taymiyyah was discussed in Livnat Holtzman, “Human Choice, Divine Guidance and the Fiṭra Tradition: The Use of Hadith in the Theological Treatises of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya”, in: *Ibn Taymiyya and His Times*, Yossef Rapoport and Shahab Ahmad (ed.s), Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2010, p. 163-188. See also: Livnat Holtzman, “‘Does God Really Laugh?’ – Appropriate and Inappropriate Descriptions of God in Islamic Traditionalist Islam”, in: *Laughter in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times*, Albrecht Classen (ed.), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2010, p. 165-200.

69 – A thorough discussion of this text appears in Livnat Holtzman, “Debating the Doctrine of *Jabr* (Compulsion)”, (forthcoming 2011). See footnote 21.

70 – Livnat Holtzman, “Elements of Acceptance and Rejection in Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya’s Systematic Reading of Ibn Ḥazm”, in: Camilla Adang, Maribel Fierro and Sabine Schmidtke

Qayyim's comprehensive reading of Ibn al-Ġawzī's *Ḍamm al-bawā*. This work was discussed in previous research, but is far from being systematically surveyed and understood.⁷¹

In sum, Ibn al-Qayyim's oeuvre demands, by nature, an inter-textual reading based on constant consultations with the works of his predecessors. Such reading helps evaluate the magnitude of his scholarship and reconstructs his methodology, editorial, and didactic considerations.

This Volume

How did modern research benefit from Ibn al-Qayyim's oeuvre? In what scientific areas were Ibn al-Qayyim's works considered substantial, and in what areas were his works overlooked, almost unnoticed? While examining the diverse contributions to this volume and appreciating the gap they are striving to close, these questions inevitably emerge. The following is a somewhat unorthodox presentation of the essays in this volume combined with an attempt to pinpoint previous select scholarly works which either exclusively address Ibn al-Qayyim and his thought, or dedicate substantial parts of their discussion to him. This section follows the structure of this volume and surveys the relevant researches according to the thematic division of SOCIETY AND LAW, GOD AND MAN, and BODY AND SOUL. Several studies that do not fall under any of these schematic categories appear in the "bibliography" section.

Society and Law

In the field of jurisprudence, the only relevant Western studies available today, mention Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's legal theory in the same vein as Ibn Taymiyyah's. That is the case of Mohamed Mohamed Yunis Ali (2000), Baber Johansen (2002), and Abdul Hakim I. al-Matroudi (2006), who established an important theoretical basis for a discussion of Ibn al-Qayyim's legal methodology, although they present his views inter alia, and focus more on Ibn Taymiyyah.⁷² In her contribution to the present volume, Birgit Krawietz makes the first step towards evaluating Ibn al-Qayyim's input in the branch of *uṣūl al-fiqh*, by

(ed.s), *The Life and Works of Ibn Ḥazm*, Handbuch der Orientalistik Series, Brill, Leiden (forthcoming 2011).

71 – Lois Anita Giffen, *Theory of Profane Love among the Arabs: The Development of the Genre*. New York, New York University Press, 1971; Joseph Norment Bell, *Love Theory in Later Hanbalite Islam*. Albany, New York, State University of New York Press, 1979. An MA thesis (in Hebrew) on the literary connection between *Ḍamm al-bawā* and *Rawḍat al-muḥibbin*, is: Avivit Cohen, *Between "the Garden of Lovers" and "the Censure of Profane Love" – A Comparative Study of Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya's and Ibn al-Jawzi's Theory of Love*, Bar Ilan University, October 2010.

72 – For a full reference to Baber Johansen, "Signs as evidence", see footnote 7; Mohamed Mohamed Yunis Ali, *Medieval Islamic Pragmatics- Sunni Legalist Theorists' Models of Textual Communication*, Richmond, Surrey, Routledge, 2000; Abdul Hakim I. Al-Matroudi, *The Hanbali School and Ibn Taymiyyah: Conflict or Conciliation*, London-New York Routledge, 2006.

systematically examining *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in*, Ibn al-Qayyim's compendium of law. In spite of the fact that today *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in* stands among the most studied *uṣūl al-fiqh* compendia by Muslims students of Islamic law, this work received hardly any attention by Western scholarship. Krawietz points out the uniqueness of *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in*, which she defines as a "full-blown treatise for legal counseling", and focuses on its structure which emerges from the sophisticated and creative writing techniques developed by Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah. Krawietz inevitably begins with Ibn Taymiyyah. What do we know about his system of *uṣūl al-fiqh*? Almost nothing, says Krawietz, and she adds that what was long regarded a key-research in the field, namely, Henri Laoust's 1939 study on Ibn Taymiyyah's methodology of law, was in fact overestimated. However, she finds Yossef Rapoport's analysis (in his 2010 article)⁷³ of Ibn Taymiyyah's legal methodology an excellent starting point to discuss Ibn al-Qayyim's legal methodology in general, and his *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in* in particular. According to Krawietz, Ibn Taymiyyah's methodology as outlined by Rapoport, is characterized by the compatibility between revelation and reason, the undermining of the authority of the *madhhab* and a pervasive pragmatism. This methodology, Krawietz claims, also exists in *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in*, but she seeks more than just to pin down the Taymiyyan methodology in *I' lām*. Rather, she examines the arrangement and literary organization of this work, determining that *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in* is not a standard treatise on *uṣūl al-fiqh*, but rather a rich and often mercurial work which was initially conceived as a handbook of *adab al-muftī*, but eventually developed into a manual on legal methodology. The contents and arrangement of *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in* reveal this hybrid character and to classify it as either belonging to the *uṣūl al-fiqh* genre or to the *adab al-muftī* would mean to miss its creative potential. To prove her point, Krawietz starts by describing the contents of the book. *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in* opens with an account of the genesis of the institution of legal counseling (*iftā'*) with particular attention to the role played by the Prophet as a mufti and *qāḍī*. Then, it moves on to discuss the nature and permissibility of analogical reasoning (*qiyās*) and the necessity of practicing *iğtibād* through fatwas. While discussing the muftis' activities, Ibn al-Qayyim devotes a large part of *I' lām* to criticize their ill-intended use of legal stratagems (*hiyal*). All these subject-matters belong to the classical inventory of *uṣūl al-fiqh* topics, but – Krawietz observes – they are presented here within the framework of legal counseling. This feature discloses the initially literary nature of *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in*. To further support her argument, Krawietz delves into a lengthy analysis of the title of the book. According to her, the generic term *al-muwaqqi' in* was deliberately chosen by Ibn al-Qayyim to broadly indicate those people involved in any kind of legal decision-making. It is to these legal scholars, mainly muftis and mujtahids, that the title refers and that *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in* is addressed. And it is these legal experts that Ibn al-Qayyim wants to instruct out of his extreme devotion for Muḥammad by showing them how the age of prophetic *iftā'* already contained all the

73 – See footnote 20.

necessary elements and sources for future muftis and mujtahids. To prove this crucial point, Ibn al-Qayyim chooses a pragmatic solution that sets him apart from previous discussions on prophetic *iğtibād*. Rather than expanding on theoretical issues, Ibn al-Qayyim proceeds to collect, at the end of the book, a large number of prophetic fatwas and *ad hoc* legal decisions (*aqđiyah*) of the Prophet in his capacity as a judge. This collection of a broad spectrum of Muḥammad's own fatwas covers a wide range of topics which Ibn al-Qayyim only seemingly organizes according to the classical *furū' al-fiqh* division in 'ibādāt and mu'āmalāt. This arrangement is a deliberate choice to suggest that every chapter of a *furū' al-fiqh* manual should contain a symbolic core of Prophetic utterances. In reality, Krawietz perceptively remarks, the wide thematic range of these Prophetic decisions (not only legal, but also theological, eschatological and moral) is far more comprehensive than the topics usually dealt with in *furū' al-fiqh* handbooks. At the same time, the detailed parade of prophetic *responsa* at the end of *I' lām* also does not match that typical of *uṣūl al-fiqh* manuals. The reason for this lies, again, in the fact that the main addressees of this work must have been muftis and mujtahids who were called upon to engage with a very wide range of issues.

In the end, Krawietz tackles the crucial issue of how to think of the concept of originality when one approaches the study of a scholar like Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah. Krawietz highlights a crucial methodological point, namely that there seems to be a significant gap between a modern and typically Western idea of originality focusing on independence of thought, and different expressions of originality that may be voiced through other channels. In the case of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in*, it is not so much the contents that make his legal compendium "original", but the way in which this scholar frames and combines his materials. This way reveals in a high degree of literary creativity, a creativity that transgresses the patterns of pre-established literary genres to produce an unprecedented hybrid literary product. What Krawietz proposes is an innovative reading strategy of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah that does not disregard Ibn al-Qayyim's loyalty to his master, but is also not so much concerned with it. Rather, she draws our attention to Ibn al-Qayyim's transgressive literary techniques as the most distinctive mark of his *I' lām al-muwaqqi' in*.

Yehoshua Frenkel commences his discussion from the widened scope of the jurists' roles in Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's design of a utopian Islamic society, a topic also briefly touched upon by Krawietz in her chapter. According to Frenkel, Ibn al-Qayyim used the Prophetic dicta, the praxes of the Salaf, and the historical accounts of the Prophet and his Companions to build a utopian vision, in which the Muslim community's authority will be vested in the hands of the Ḥanbalī 'ulamā'. From this respect, Frenkel remarks, Ibn al-Qayyim held a much more radical view than Ibn Taymiyyah. Frenkel uses a plethora of Taymiyyan and Ġawziyyan sources, and meticulously reconstructs Ibn al-Qayyim's worldview from many small details and textual proofs. Frenkel's first step is to define fundamentals in Ibn al-Qayyim's legal and social thought. According to Frenkel, although Ibn al-Qayyim based his opinions on Quranic verses and Pro-

phetic *ḥadīṭs*, his hermeneutical method was not limited to scripturalism, but he also used “natural reasoning”. Ibn al-Qayyim’s extensive use of juridical terminology is just one feature of his writing covered by Frenkel. Other important features are spirituality and the tendency to mild asceticism, reflected in Ibn al-Qayyim’s descriptions of the glorious Muslim past.

An axial observation which Frenkel makes, is that when describing the Prophet’s life in his magnum opus *Zād al-ma‘ād*, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah does not seem to distinguish between his narrative of the past and his position on contemporary Muslim practices and inter-religious polemics. In other words, *Zād al-ma‘ād* is not a typical *Sīrah* anymore than it is a typical manual for conducting a devout life. Both genres combined to form a book meant to serve as a model of an authentic Islamic way of life, as well as a credible account of the Prophet’s life. Frenkel demonstrates this unique method of narrativity through several illuminating examples (the prohibition to wear the *ṭaylasān*, the shawl-like garment worn by Jews over their head and shoulders; the case of the Prophet’s relationship with the Christians of Nağrān) which reflect Ibn al-Qayyim’s desire to see the Prophet’s standards fully implemented in Mamluk society.

Within the framework of the description of his utopia, which will be led by the ‘*ulamā*’, Ibn al-Qayyim enumerates the many threats to Muslim society, and by doing so he unfolds his view of the Mamluk social structure. The presence of pseudo-Sufis, women, homosexuals, and non-Muslims in the public sphere is among Ibn al-Qayyim’s many concerns about the fate of Muslim society. Frenkel’s discussion, then, maps the Ġawziyyan worldview and defines it as a product of his time and society. The relations between members of different faiths within this society are the main concern of the next contribution to this book, written by David Freidenreich.

In view of the dearth of research on Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah in the field of jurisprudence, it is interesting to see that his name frequently occurs in studies on the Muslim-Jewish polemics. Since Ibn al-Qayyim’s *Hidāyat al-ḥayārā* and *Aḥkām ahl al-dīmmah* stand out as comprehensive works in this field, there is hardly any scholarly contribution discussing the medieval polemics between the Jews and the Muslims that neglects to cite Ibn al-Qayyim. The interest in Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah among scholars of this field presumably starts with Ignaz Goldziher, who incorrectly attributed excerpts from Samaw’al al-Mağribī’s (d. 570/1175) *Iḥām al-yahūd* to Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah,⁷⁴ continues with Moshe Perlmann’s brief 1942 article, which yielded the surprising observation that “Ibn Qayyim is not a plagiarist”,⁷⁵ and ends with Camilla Adang and Sabine Schmid-

74 – Ignaz Goldziher, “Proben muhammedanischer Polemik gegen den Talmud, I: Ibn Hazm”, *Jeschurun* 8 (1872), p. 76-104; reprint id., *Gesammelte Schriften*, herausgegeben von Joseph Desomogyi, Hildesheim, Olms, 1967-1973, vol. 1, p. 1:136-164. Ignaz Goldziher, “Proben muhammedanischer Polemik gegen den Talmud, II: Ibn Kajjim al-Ġauziya”, *Jeschurun* 9 (1873), p. 18-47; reprint id., *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 1, p. 229-258.

75 – Moshe Perlmann, “Ibn Qayyim and Samau’al al-Mağhribi”, *Journal of Jewish Bibliography* 3 (1942), p. 71-74. Note that Perlmann’s article erroneously defines Ibn al-Qayyim as a “Dhahiri author”.

tke's 2010 encyclopedic entry which labels Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's *Hidāyat al-ḥayārā* as a work on polemics with a "wealth of polemical details" that influenced the development of the genre of Islamic polemical works.⁷⁶ However, although Ibn al-Qayyim was familiar to scholars who studied the polemics between Jews and Muslims, his thought never stood in the center of research in that area. Hava Lazarus-Yafeh's *Intertwined Worlds* is a typical example: this work extensively quotes Ibn al-Qayyim without acknowledging his contribution to the field.⁷⁷ On the other hand, Lazarus-Yafeh seemed to be interested in Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's knowledge of the Hebrew Bible, although she did not delve into the subject.⁷⁸ David Freidenreich's contribution to this volume insightfully compensates for these shortcomings, as it focuses on Ibn al-Qayyim's *Aḥkām ahl al-dimmah*, and treats this important work in an unprecedented way.

Freidenreich begins with the observation that *Aḥkām ahl al-dimmah* is much more than a compendium of existing Islamic law regarding non-Muslims. This work demonstrates the interconnection between theology and law; hence one cannot address the contents of the *Aḥkām* without taking into consideration the theological course it takes. Freidenreich's goal is, then, to prove the singularity of the *Aḥkām* through a case-study, *viz.* the laws regarding meat of animals slaughtered by non-Muslims, a widely discussed topic in Islamic legal discourse. Freidenreich observes that a work on the scale of the *Aḥkām* deserves a monographic treatment. His article is indeed the first step in that direction.

Freidenreich methodically leads us through the labyrinthine discussions of non-Muslim meat, starting with the various interpretations given by scholars of different affiliations to Quran 5:5 which states: "the food of those to whom the Book was given is lawful to you, and yours to them". In general, Sunnīs perceived this verse as allowing Muslims to eat meat slaughtered by Jews and Christians, whereas Šīʿīs understood the verse as referring to fruit and grain alone, thus prohibiting Muslims from eating non-Muslim meat. Freidenreich begins with a typical Sunnī treatment of this subject. Apparently, Ibn Taymiyyah authored a fatwa on the subject which serves as an example of such a standard Sunnī discussion.⁷⁹ Ibn al-Qayyim's treatment, however, is the first Sunnī work – observes Freidenreich – that systematically addresses the subject from a different angle, that is, the requirements of Christian and Jewish butchers which enable Muslims to consume their meat. One such requirement is the invoking of

76 – Camilla Adang and Sabine Schmidtke, "Polemics (Muslim-Jewish)", in: *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, Executive Editor Norman A. Stillman, Leiden, Brill, 2010, vol. 4, p. 84. To this one must add the recent article by Jon Hoover: "The Apologetic and Pastoral Intentions of Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's Polemic against the Jews and Christians", *The Muslim World*, 100 (2010), p. 476-489.

77 – Hava Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1992, p. 19, 24-25, 126.

78 – H. Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds*, p. 126. For a critique of Lazarus-Yafeh's dealing with Ibn al-Qayyim's *Hidāyat al-ḥayārā*, see: Livnat Holtzman, "Does God Really Laugh...", p. 192-194.

79 – See footnote 15 in Freidenreich's contribution.

God's name. While a prominent Šī'ī scholar claimed that Jews and Christians could not invoke God's name properly, as they lacked the true knowledge of God, Ibn al-Qayyim ruled in opposition to this ruling, and on his own authority, too. However, this allegedly liberal view of Jews and Christians leads Ibn al-Qayyim into another territory, unfamiliar to any of his predecessors, as he takes the liberty to determine the Islamic theological and practical requirements of the Jewish or Christian butcher's invocation, or as Freidenreich states, "Ibn al-Qayyim's desire to define orthodox Judaism and Christianity in Islamic terms, without regard for what Jews and Christians themselves might say on the subject shapes the *Aḥkām*'s discussion of non-Muslim meat".

God and Man

Both Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah and the entire school of Ḥanbalī thinkers suffered from an unjustified negligence by Western research for many decades. The reasons for this can be summed up as follows: the Ḥanbalī school took the position of the representatives of traditionalist Islam, given their complete reliance on Divine revelation (*naql*). For most Western scholars, Ḥanbalī writings seemed to be like an endless chain of citations from the Quran and Hadith, with few independent insights. In opposition to the Ḥanbalī theologians stood the *mutakallimūn*, who represented rationalistic Islam with their reliance on human reason (*ʿaql*) to prove the principles of religion. Compared to the Ḥanbalī *ʿaqidah* (a creed or confession of faith), the Ašʿarī *kalām* manuals posed what seemed to be a greater challenge to the researcher. Thus, Western scholars focused on the rationalistic argumentations of the Muʿtazilah and Ašʿariyyah, rather than on Ḥanbalī works.⁸⁰ However, it was not only the nature of the theological works of the Ḥanbalīs in comparison to *kalām* works that dictated the belittling attitude to the Ḥanbalī theologians in Western scholarship: since Western scholars ignored the Ḥanbalī sources and relied on biased Ašʿarī texts, the image which they had of the Ḥanbalīs was that of the "anthropomorphists who, in their ultra-conservative traditionalism, were opposed both to the theologians (*mutakallimūn*) and to the mystics of Islam".⁸² In sum, leading Western scholars such as

80 – A history of research on this school is elaborated in: George Makdisi, "Ḥanbalite Islam", in: Merlin L. Swartz (ed.), *Studies on Islam*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1981, p. 216-264.

82 – Makdisi, "Ḥanbalite Islam", p. 219. This description by Makdisi is well borne out by the quite colorful description of the Ḥanbalī mob as it appears in the writings of Goldziher, Macdonald and Lammens. Ignaz Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1925, p. 265-266; id., *Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law*, translated by Andras and Ruth Hamori, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1981, p. 240-241; Duncan B. Macdonald, *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory*, New York, Charles Scribner, 1903, p. 167; Henri Lammens, *L'Islam, Croyances et Institutions*, Beyrouth, Imprimerie catholique, 1943, p. 113-114; id., *Islam, Beliefs and Institutions*, translated by Sir E. Denison Ross, London, Frank Cass, 1987, p. 85-86. A relic of this approach is to be found in William Montgomery Watt, *Islamic Creeds – A Selection*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1994, p. 9.

Goldziher and Macdonald took a stand in the ancient debate between the Ḥanbalīs and Ašʿarīs in favor of the Ašʿarīs, while using the Ašʿarī-biased writings to support their view that Ḥanbalī theological thought evidently does not deserve to be studied.

The change in attitude was marked by the publication of Henri Laoust's 1939 monumental work on Ibn Taymiyyah, followed by a series of studies concentrating on Ḥanbalī thinkers. The most significant insight that Laoust reached in his work was that "Ḥanbalism, while being hostile to the very principle of speculative theology (*kalām*) and to esoteric Sufism ... did not develop in complete isolation. A great number of Ḥanbalī authors were themselves dogmatic theologians or Sufis".⁸⁴ Following Laoust, his former student George Makdisi marked the need to identify the individuality of Islamic thinkers, Ḥanbalī thinkers included.⁸⁵ This new direction, assisted by the publication of a massive amount of Ḥanbalī manuscripts, led scholars to investigate Ḥanbalī theology, mostly Ibn Taymiyyah's. However, from the relatively few articles and books on the subject, it is fair to say that the investigation of Ḥanbalī thought is far from exhausted.

Still, the scientific effort was never invested in the Ğawziyyan theological and spiritual thought. In 1977, Daniel Gimaret published an important article on the prominent theological theory of the human act as reflected in Ḥanbalī writings. The lion's share of the article was dedicated to a thorough discussion of this theory in Ibn Taymiyyah's writings. In spite of his extensive discussion of this theory, Ibn Qayyim al-Ğawziyyah was only mentioned in the article in a footnote. Gimaret basically assumed that if a theological notion is mentioned in *Šifā' al-ʿalīl*, it must have derived from Ibn Taymiyyah's writings.⁸⁶ This example is typical of the treatment Ibn al-Qayyim receives in studies dedicated to theology and Sufism: his theological thought rarely stood in the center of research, and is often discussed in connection with Ibn Taymiyyah's theological works. The only exception is Joseph Norment Bell's 1979 monograph on the theory of love in the writings of the later Ḥanbalīs, which includes a wide-

84 – S.v. «Ḥanābila» (H. Laoust), in: *EĪ*, vol. 3, p. 158. Binyamin Abrahamov reaches a similar conclusion. Binyamin Abrahamov, *Islamic Theology – Traditionalism and Rationalism*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1998 p. viii. See also George Makdisi, "The Ḥanbalī School and Šūfism", *Humaniora Islamica* 2 (1974), p. 61-72; reprinted in: *Boletín de la Asociación Española de Orientalistas* 15 (1979), p. 115-126; reprinted as Part V in: George Makdisi, *Religion, Law and Learning in Classical Islam*, London, Ashgate Variorum, 1991, here at p. 121.

85 – Makdisi, "Ḥanbalite Islam", p. 240. Makdisi published a series of studies on key-figures in the history of the Ḥanbalī school, while addressing Ḥanbalī theological doctrines.

86 – Daniel Gimaret, "Théories de l'acte humain dans l'école ḥanbalite", *Bulletin d'Études Orientales* 29 (1977), p. 155-178, at p. 177 n. 33.

ranging discussion on Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's theory of love as reflected in several of his works. Bell's extensive footnotes to this chapter provide numerous leads for further investigation.⁸⁷

Jon Hoover sets a new and fresh direction in the study of Ġawziyyan theology. In his contribution, Hoover chose to examine Ibn al-Qayyim's theodicy through a long paragraph in *Šifā' al-^ʿalil* which addresses the question of Iblīs. Apart from providing an annotated translation of this text, Hoover examines Ibn al-Qayyim's theological views. Apparently, in *Šifā' al-^ʿalil* Ibn al-Qayyim strives to prove that God created Iblīs out of His mercy and forgiveness. This argument marks his distance from the Aš^ʿarī and the Mu^ʿtazilī positions. However, Hoover is not satisfied with merely presenting Ibn al-Qayyim's stance on the subject, but is more interested in exactly placing his theory on the map of Islamic thought. In this context, he examines whether Ibn al-Qayyim's theodicy resembles that of Ibn Sīnā (d. 428/1037) or al-Ġazālī (d. 505/1111). In his search for Ibn al-Qayyim's sources of inspiration, Hoover goes back to the Taymiyyan theodicy, while examining it in view of much earlier opinions concerning the question of God's wise purpose (*ḥikmah*). Hoover's first step, then, is to place the Taymiyyan theodicy with regard to these previous stances. Examining Ibn Taymiyyah's views, promises Hoover, will cast light on Ibn al-Qayyim's views, and will help us assess how far Ibn al-Qayyim moved beyond his master.

The passage translated by Hoover is unique, because it reveals the ways in which Ibn al-Qayyim elaborates his own theodicy. Ibn Taymiyyah often declares that God creates all things, including evil, for wise purposes, and that makes evil, good. What are these wise purposes? Ibn Taymiyyah occasionally addresses this question, although never within a methodological framework. Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, however, redefines the framework by examining God's motivation in creating evil and expands upon it. In addition, Ibn al-Qayyim's use of the contrast theodicy embedded in Ġazālīan discourse demonstrates that imperfection is needed in order to know perfection. Another important example of Ibn al-Qayyim's own theological elaboration is his rationalized description of evil as emanating from the exigencies of God's names and attributes. Here, Ibn al-Qayyim seems to follow the Avicennan discourse.

The following two contributions demonstrate the wealth of subjects which can be found in only one work by Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah. These articles concern *al-Šawā'iq al-mursalah*, another magnum opus, which has not yet aroused the interest of Western scholarship. Yasir Qadhi's article intends to be a starting point for scholars who wish to study this highly complicated work. Qadhi surveys the history of the manuscript of *al-Šawā'iq* of which only half survived, although it comprises no less than four volumes. This manuscript was published by Muḥammad al-Daḥīl Allāh in 1985. More popular is the abridged version, summarized by Ibn al-Mawṣilī (d. 774/1372), a preacher and bookseller with a solid scholarly background.

87 – For full reference see footnote 70.

Al-Şawā'iq, like other works by Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah, is multi-layered and rich in content. Qadhi discusses the polemical title of *al-Şawā'iq*, and points out its anti-Mu'tazilī and anti-Aş'arī meaning. But instead of focusing on its theological-polemical content, Qadhi prefers to unfold a different feature of this work, namely its hermeneutical theory, although the polemics with the Mu'tazilah and Aş'ariyyah still remain in the background. Here Qadhi enters the field of *ta'wil*, a method of interpretation severely attacked by Ibn al-Qayyim. This attack is the prelude of a massive invective on *kalām*. Ibn al-Qayyim first identifies the pillars of the *kalāmīc* thought, and then refutes them, one by one. Through his refutation, Ibn al-Qayyim reveals his own conviction, of a Taymiyyan origin, according to which there is no apparent contradiction between divine revelation and human reason.

Ibn al-Qayyim's refutation of *ta'wil* also contains a thorough discussion on the figurative meaning of words (*mağāz*) which is highly relevant to three traditional fields of Islamic sciences: theology, Quran exegesis and jurisprudence. *Mağāz* is frequently mentioned in the theological discussions on the meaning of God's attributes. The technique of *mağāz* is either adopted or rejected when the ambiguous verses in the Quran (*mutašābihāt*) are interpreted. *Mağāz* is also used when textual evidence is examined before ruling in a legal case or issuing a fatwa. In *al-Şawā'iq al-mursalah* Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah addresses *mağāz* within the framework of these three areas of scholarship. His discussion of *mağāz* is not merely theoretical, but takes into consideration the pragmatic dimension of this rather philosophical issue. The emphasis on the practical implications is Ibn al-Qayyim's major contribution to Arabic rhetoric. This is the conclusion of Abdessamad Belhaj in his contribution to this volume. Belhaj takes an as yet uncharted path, for Ibn al-Qayyim's concept of *mağāz* was never thoroughly examined. In modern scholarship, discussions of theology are often detached from discussions of language and rhetoric. Belhaj underscores, however, that these areas of learning are in fact interrelated and intertwined. Ibn al-Qayyim's discussions of *mağāz* (figurative meaning) versus *ḥaqīqah* (original meaning) probably evolved from Ibn Taymiyyah's fragmentary treatment of this topic. Nevertheless, Ibn al-Qayyim's methodological chapter in *al-Şawā'iq* far exceeds what Ibn Taymiyyah wrote. Ibn al-Qayyim uses the logical tools developed by Ibn Taymiyyah and builds a magnificent rational argument which exceeds the boundaries of rhetoric and serves as a platform on which he builds his (and Ibn Taymiyyah's) theory of the human act, which is mostly directed against Aş'arī determinism. Belhaj also discusses the legal implications of Ibn al-Qayyim's theory of *mağāz*, and in this respect his article confirms the interconnection between theology and law that is observed by other contributors to this volume.

Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's *Madāriğ al-sālikīn* is his most prominent work, but even so it only recently received a systematic treatment in an unpublished doctoral dissertation.⁸⁸ The *Madāriğ* is a commentary on al-Anşārī al-Harawī's

88 – Gino Schallenbergh, Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's Ḥanbalite Interpretation of Sufi Terminology in the Light of at-Tilimsānī's Commentary of al-Anşārī's *Manāzil as-Sā'irīn*, unpublished Ph.D. diss., Universiteit Gent, Belgium, 2009.

(d. 481/1089) manual on Sufism. By all means, the *Madāriğ* is the most appropriate source to demonstrate Ibn al-Qayyim's personal thought, because Ibn Taymiyyah never wrote a commentary on an important Sufi manual. But to consider the *Madāriğ* as merely a Sufi manual is inaccurate; it is rather a work of both Sufi spirituality and Taymiyyan-Ġawziyyan theology, and as such it is embedded in two supposedly opposing frames of mind: the theological unity of epistemology, and the Sufi duality of knowledge versus gnosis. Ovamir Anjum here presents the *Madāriğ* in an essay which addresses both the structure and the content of this work, and examines Ibn Taymiyyah's and Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah's spirituality.

Anjum tackles the problem of labeling Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah as Sufis by redefining the term "mysticism" which is often interchangeable with Sufism. Anjum begins with a survey of what modern research has yielded so far in this highly complicated field. Anjum sees mysticism as "a mode of cognition" which experiences ecstasy or divine illumination, and turns that experience into discursive knowledge, independent of scriptural knowledge. Through a close reading of several sections in the *Madāriğ* and a survey of this work's contents, Anjum demonstrates that Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah endorsed a form of Sufism devoid of mysticism. Anjum's conclusions rehabilitate George Makdisi's 1973 article on Ibn Taymiyyah's Sufism, which had been refuted by Fritz Meier.⁸⁹

The so-called Ḥanbalism-Sufism contradiction also existed in the personality of al-Anṣārī al-Harawī, who was also an Aṣḥārī. However, as Anjum demonstrates, it would be misleading to think that Ibn al-Qayyim duplicated al-Anṣārī's worldview. On the contrary, in his critical commentary, he often refutes al-Anṣārī's views. Ibn al-Qayyim, as is seen in Frenkel's contribution to this volume, saw the threat which Sufis posed to Muslim society in several phenomena, like monism and antinomianism. Hence, wherever Ibn al-Qayyim detects in the original text by al-Anṣārī monist or antinomianist sayings, he either refutes them, or provides them with a new scriptural interpretation, as we can see in his treatment of the Sufi *fanā'* (annihilation), *maḥabbah* (love), or *wahdah* (union).

Body and Soul

The last section of this volume contains three articles focusing on the two works by Ibn al-Qayyim that already received some attention in modern research: *al-Ṭibb al-nabawī*, which is a part of *Zād al-ma'ād*, and *Kitāb al-rūḥ*.

Ibn al-Qayyim's *al-Ṭibb al-nabawī* belongs to a genre of medical writing which flourished from the 3rd/9th century onward, and was meant to provide an alternative to Greek medicine. Ibn al-Qayyim's *al-Ṭibb al-nabawī* aims to

89 – George Makdisi, "Ibn Taymiyya: A Sufi of the Qādiriyya Order", *The American Journal of Arabic Studies* 1 (1973), p. 118-129; Fritz Meier, "The Cleanest about Predestination: A bit of Ibn Taymiyya", in: *Essays on Islamic Piety and Mysticism*, trans. John O'Kane and Bernd Radtke, Leiden, Brill, 1999, p. 309-334, here at p. 317, n. 9; originally published as id., "Das Sauberste über die Vorberstimmung. Ein Stück Ibn Taymiyya", *Speculum* 32 (1981), p. 74-89.

reconstruct the medical tradition in the times of the Prophet, and as such it contains an abundance of Quranic verses, *ḥadīths*, and historical anecdotes. As in the case of research in the field of Muslim-Jewish polemics, Ibn al-Qayyim's contribution to the genre of Prophetic medicine is often mentioned in modern studies.⁹⁰ However, his *al-Ṭibb al-nabawī* received its first systematic treatment in Irmeli Perho's contribution to this volume.⁹¹

In Perho's article, we learn that Ibn al-Qayyim was highly original in this genre. Perho compares his *al-Ṭibb al-nabawī* with a work bearing the same title by his contemporary, the historian and Hadith scholar, Muḥammad al-Dahabī (d. 748/1348). Apparently, Ibn al-Qayyim's theological tendencies generated a work which is much more than a systematization of medicinal *ḥadīths*. Ibn al-Qayyim is also interested in rationalizing the Galenic medical tradition so that it fits what he sees as unshakeable religious principles. This attempt is, again, deeply rooted in the Taymiyyan principle of the compatibility between divine revelation and human reason. As a branch of science based on human reason and experience, Galenic medicine should not be entirely rejected. Still, Prophetic medicine, whose source is divine revelation, is superior by far. Ibn al-Qayyim, then, portrays the perfect physician as finding his succor in the Galenic tradition, but also "opening his heart" to receive Prophetic knowledge. The image of the doctor who draws from two sources of knowledge, scientific and spiritual, applies to the patient as well. Curing only his body is never efficacious, because his soul also needs to be cured. This holistic worldview allows Ibn al-Qayyim to propose cures such as prayer, whose spiritual content cleanses the soul, while its dynamic set of movements massages the inner organs, thus helping the body to dispose of harmful substances.⁹²

Nevertheless, as Perho points out, Ibn al-Qayyim is more interested in theories than in actual treatments (although his book certainly provides some). Perho demonstrates this through Ibn al-Qayyim's examination of the existent medical theory. Because Ibn al-Qayyim advances a medical theory based on both divine and rational knowledge, it is almost safe to assume that his book was written for those physicians who failed to benefit from prophetic guidelines in treating illnesses. The synthesis of divine and rational knowledge is what makes his contribution to the field so conspicuous. Unfortunately, Ibn al-Qayyim's views, which

90 – The literature on Prophetic medicine is rich. See *s.v.* «Ṭibb» (Emilie Savage-Smith), in: *EF*; Peter E. Pormann and Emilie Savage-Smith, *Medieval Islamic Medicine*, Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press, 2007; Irmeli Perho, *The Prophet's Medicine – A Creation of the Muslim Traditionalist Scholars (Studia Orientalia 74)* Helsinki, The Finnish Oriental Society, 1995; *s.v.* «Medicine and the Qurʾān» (Irmeli Perho), in: *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*.

91 – Perho has a long time interest in the writings of Ibn al-Qayyim. See: ead., "Man Chooses His Destiny: Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya's Views on Predestination", *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 12 (Jan. 2001), p. 61-70.

92 – Cf. Gino Schallenberg, "The Diseases of the Heart – a Spiritual Pathology by Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyya", in: *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk Eras*, 3, Leuven, Peeters, 2001, p. 421-428.

sound perfectly reasonable in the “new age” we live in, were ignored by his contemporaries and successors. In this sense, Ibn al-Qayyim was ahead of his time.

Ibn al-Qayyim’s *Kitāb al-rūḥ*, which combines a traditionalistic overview of eschatological *ḥadīths* with philosophical discussions of the existence of the soul, receives the attention of Tzvi Langermann and Geneviève Gobillot. Their contributions to this volume, which analyze *Kitāb al-rūḥ* from different angles, prove that there is much material to investigate in this relatively small treatise which is one of Ibn al-Qayyim’s early works. As we learn from Langermann’s article, Duncan B. Macdonald was the first and only scholar to date who attempted to characterize *Kitāb al-rūḥ*.⁹³ Most of Macdonald’s findings were summarized in the entry «Nafs» in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.⁹⁴ Macdonald’s assessment of Ibn al-Qayyim’s method in *Kitāb al-rūḥ* hits the mark even today. He states that Ibn al-Qayyim “was not a literalist Ḥanbalite... he gives as his authoritative basis Book, Sunna, Agreement of the Companions – the regular Ḥanbalite *uṣūl* – but adds ‘rational proofs (*adillat al-‘aql*) and *al-ḥiṣrāb*. By the last he evidently means the attitude of the uncontaminated mind, or unprejudiced intuition”.⁹⁵ Macdonald’s perceptive observation finds confirmation in all the contributions to this volume.

Tzvi Langermann chose the *Kitāb al-rūḥ* to observe the “naturalization of science” – a term he borrowed from Abdelhamid I. Sabra – in the 14th century Muslim East. According to Langermann, Ibn al-Qayyim’s persona is a perfect candidate to illustrate the meaning of the “naturalization of science”. Ibn Qayyim al-Ġawziyyah was a man of religion, who simply and naturally studied the sciences of Greek origin, without however being a scientist. Thus, Ibn al-Qayyim settled what might have been perceived as an apparent contradiction. That said, Langermann clarifies that Ibn al-Qayyim resented the Hellenistic thought and sciences, but nonetheless studied science according to the way he understood the Prophetic heritage and tradition, his theological inclinations notwithstanding. The mediators between the Greek scientific heritage and Islamic thought were al-Ġazālī – as Macdonald indicated – and Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, as Langermann remarks. Langermann systematically demonstrates Ibn al-Qayyim’s appropriation of Faḥr al-Dīn’s writings on the problem of the soul, and points out his commitment to rationality and empiricism through several examples from *Kitāb al-rūḥ*. For example, certain prophetic traditions claim that blind and deaf angels reside in the grave, tormenting the dead (*‘adāb al-qabr*). However, Ibn al-Qayyim admits that if we open a grave, none of this will be revealed to us. Langermann emphasizes that the content of Ibn al-Qayyim’s reply is not important. What is important, is his commitment to find a reasonable explanation to such *ḥadīths*.

93 – D. B. Macdonald, “The Development of the Idea of the Spirit in Islam”, *Acta Orientalia* 9 (1931), p. 307-351; reprinted in *The Moslem World*, 22 (1932), p. 25-42, 153-168.

94 – S.v. «Nafs» (E. E. Calverley and I. R. Netton), in: *Et*.

95 – Macdonald, “The Development of the Idea of the Spirit in Islam”, p. 33.

Geneviève Gobillot chose a different angle from which to examine the *Kitāb al-rūh*. She presents a systematic survey of this work. Her chapter focuses on a few specific themes: Borrowing Michel Fromaget's observation of "corps, âme, esprit", Gobillot first examines Ibn al-Qayyim's use of the terms *rūh* (here: spirit) and *nafs* (here: soul), in an attempt to pinpoint the rationale underlying his terminology. Then, she addresses the question of the spirit's pre-existence in connection to the question of *fiṭrah*, specifically, to Ibn al-Qayyim's treatment of Quran 7:127 and of the related prophetic traditions.⁹⁶ Finally, Gobillot offers a comparison between Ibn al-Qayyim's theory of the spirit as expounded in the last chapter of his of *Kitāb al-rūh* and that of al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidī (d. 318-320/936-938) as described in his *Kitāb al-furūq*.⁹⁷ In the course of the discussion, Gobillot systematically examines Ibn al-Qayyim's views on the related theological issues, like predetermination (*al-qadā' wa-l-qadar*) and the duration of Hell-fire. She views Ibn al-Qayyim's thought as a clear product of Ḥanbalī exegetical methodology, which requires an extensive side-by-side use of Prophetic *ḥadīṡ* in order to understand the Quranic message. Gobillot's analysis highlights a double tendency in Ibn al-Qayyim's discussion of the themes mentioned above. On the one hand, the Ḥanbalī scholar shows a subtle understanding of the potentials of the Quranic verses regarding the spirit of God and is familiar with the doctrines of the mystics in this regard. On the other, he tends to subject the treatment of *rūh* and *nafs* to the theological dictates of transcendence and predetermination. Thus, Ibn al-Qayyim positions himself ideologically and makes every effort to demonstrate that the *rūh* of man is created, but not created prior to the body. In this way, the Ḥanbalī scholar is able to avoid both the dangers of the divine nature of Jesus and of those Christian theological trends that admitted a divinization of man, and the dangers of a theory of emanation as elaborated by some Sufi, Šī'ī and Muslim philosophers. Gobillot skillfully demonstrates how Ibn al-Qayyim gets close to self-contradiction in order to hold tight to his theological tenets. Initially, he sets off to demonstrate the perfect assimilation between *nafs* and *rūh*, an assimilation based on synonymy that is functional to prove the created nature of the spirit. In fact, Ibn al-Qayyim holds, *nafs* in Quran 39:42 is described as dying and seized by God and it is, therefore, a created entity. Yet, when it comes to the spirit proceeding from God (*al-rūh minhu*), he tones down the synonymy between the two. So, according to him, *rūh* is now synonym of *nafs* only when it is the *rūh* of any man, but it is a specifically distinct reality when it is the *rūh* of God which is, in turn, the principle

96 – Gobillot contributed several important studies about the *fiṭrah*. Geneviève Gobillot, *La conception originelle (fiṭra), ses interprétations et fonctions chez les penseurs musulmans*, Cahiers des Études Islamologiques de l'I.F.A.O., 18 (2000); ead., "L'Épître du discours sur la *fiṭra* (*risāla fi-l-kalām 'alā-l-fiṭra*) de Taqī-l-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn Taymiya (661/1262-728/1328) - Présentation et traduction annotée", *Annales Islamologiques* 20 (1984), p. 29-53.

97 – Geneviève Gobillot, *Le Livre de la Profondeur des choses d'al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidī*, Lille, Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 1996; *Risalatān mansūbatān li-l-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidī (Deux épîtres attribuées à al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidī)*, ed.s Ḥālid Zahrī et Geneviève Gobillot, Beyrouth, édition critique accompagnée d'un commentaire, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmīyah, 2005.

of man's spiritualization. It is within this context that Gobillot illustrates Ibn al-Qayyim's closeness to and familiarity with the view of some mystics, al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidī in particular. Yet, in order to preserve man from any sort of participation with the divine, the Ḥanbalī scholar leaves the idea of man's spiritualization unaccomplished and proceeds to reduce the heart of man (*qalb*) to the soul (*nafs*), the heart being precisely the symbolic locus where the spiritual communion between man and God takes place, according to al-Tirmidī. In this way, Gobillot shows not only Ibn al-Qayyim's acquaintance with al-Tirmidī's theory on synonymy, but also his heavy, but unacknowledged borrowing from the latter's *Kitāb al-furūq* in order to argue in favor of the theory of differences (*furūq*).

However, like his teacher Ibn Taymiyyah, during the course of his life Ibn al-Qayyim seems to have changed his position on predestination by admitting the cessation of the Fire. While this last point had already been illustrated by Jon Hoover, Gobillot shows that Ibn al-Qayyim read and knew al-Tirmidī and Ibn ʿArabī, who had previously upheld the same view. Thus, despite denigrating them both, the Ḥanbalī scholar also drew upon the doctrines of these two Sufi scholars. Gobillot's study, then, is particularly valuable in that she sheds light on the unexpected use of some of Ibn al-Qayyim's sources, an area that certainly deserves further future investigation.