

## A book burner or not? History and myth: Revisiting al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād and the controversies over al-Ghazālī in the Islamic West

NORA S. EGGEN (University of Oslo, Norway)

### Abstract

A number of scholars in the medieval Islamic West engaged with the work of Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), and he was both celebrated and criticised. Among the scholars who are allotted with a prominent role in the controversies around his work, is the Ceutan judge and scholar al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād (d. 544/1149). To some extent, his role in the controversies which allegedly resulted in the burning of some of al-Ghazālī’s books, has become a significant element in ‘Iyād’s intellectual and historical biography and in construing him as a somewhat fanatic defender of a particular scholarly tradition, the Mālikī tradition, and a particular political order, the Almoravid dynasty. Although ‘Iyād’s own writings clearly position him within the Mālikī scholarly tradition and although historical evidence clearly suggests that he sided with the Almoravids in the Almoravid–Almohad conflict of the early twelfth century, the image of a fierce fanatic and a book burner seems to stem from a later date. The earliest traceable source for this image is an anecdote in al-Sha‘rānī’s (d. 973/1565) *Lawāqih al-anwār*. In other, later sources additional and partly different images of ‘Iyād are construed, motivated by the controversies over al-Ghazālī. However the basis for these images is likewise neither to be found in ‘Iyād’s own work nor in available historical sources earlier than al-Sha‘rānī.

*Key words:* al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād, Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, Almoravids, Almohads, historiography, intellectual history, book burning

### Introduction

Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī’s (d. 505/1111) work, and in particular his magnum opus *Iḥyā’ ‘ulūm al-dīn*, met a variety of responses in the early twelfth-century Almoravid Islamic West. Several Andalusian and North-African scholars were involved in the discussions about this work, taking different positions.<sup>1</sup> The official attitude towards al-Ghazālī changed from a more favourable view during Yūsuf Ibn Tāshfīn’s reign (r. 453-500/1061-1106) to a mixed and even negative view during ‘Alī Ibn Yūsuf’s reign (r. 500-537/1106-

---

1 Delfina SERRANO RUANO, “Why Did the Scholars of al-Andalus Distrust al-Ghazālī? Ibn Rushd al-Jadd’s *Fatwā* on *Awliyā’ Allāh*,” *Der Islam*, 83.1 (2006): 137-156; Janina M. SAFRAN, “The politics of book burning in al-Andalus,” *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 6.2 (2014): 148-168, 155-162. See also a summarized discussion in Yousef CASEWIT, *The Mystics of al-Andalus: Ibn Barrajan and Islamic thought in the twelfth century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017: 50-56.

1143).<sup>2</sup> According to some sources, the controversies eventually led to official condemnation of the *Ihyā'*, and two rounds of banning and burning, or issuing of orders to burn the book, first under 'Alī Ibn Yūsuf in 503/1109 (alternative dates given are 500/1106, or 509/1116), and then under Tāshfīn Ibn 'Alī (r. 537-539/1143-1145) in 538/1143.<sup>3</sup>

The historical, scholarly and political circumstances of the controversies are far from clear.<sup>4</sup> Neither is the position nor the possible role the celebrated scholar and judge of Ceuta, Abū 'l-Faql 'Iyād Ibn Mūsà, known as al-Qāḍī 'Iyād (d. 544/1149), may have had in it. However, 'Iyād is often mentioned as one supporting the condemnation and burning or even as issuing a *fatwà* on the issue. While scholars have expressed doubts about this being a historical fact,<sup>5</sup> the alleged incidents continue to form a part of the interpretative frame for 'Iyād's life and work.<sup>6</sup> Thus it has become a significant element of the historiography of this particular scholar as well as this particular period of the intellectual history of the Islamic west.<sup>7</sup> In this paper I revisit this historiography to discuss two questions: What do

- 2 Rachid EL HOUR, "The Andalusian Qāḍī in the Almoravid Period: Political and Judicial Authority," *Studia Islamica*, 90 (2000): 67-83, 73. Abū Muḥammad Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 492/1099), Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī's (d. 543/1148) father, was commissioned by Yūsuf Ibn al-Tāshfīn to travel to Baghdad to seek the formal recognition of the 'Abbāsīd caliph. Abū Muḥammad also carried a letter asking al-Ghazālī for a *fatwà* allowing Yūsuf to intervene in al-Andalus. In a *fatwà* and a letter addressed to Yūsuf, al-Ghazālī formally endorsed Yūsuf's legitimate leadership in the West under the title *amīr al-muslimīn wa-nāṣir al-dīn al-qā'im bi-dā'wat amīr al-mu'minīn*. The letter has been edited by E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL in "Le titre souverain des Almoravides et sa légitimation par le califat 'abbaside," *Arabica*, 2 (1955): 265-280; see both documents translated into Spanish in María J. VIGUERA, "Las cartas de al-Gazālī y al-Turtūṣī al soberano almorávid Yūsuf b. Tāshfīn," *al-Andalus*, 42.2 (1977): 341-374, 353-361. Lévi-Provençal remarks (p. 279, with reference to the anonymous chronicle *al-Ḥulal al-mawshīyya*) that in 512/1117-8 a corresponding formal investiture was granted from the same 'Abbāsīd caliph al-Mustazhir (r. 487-512 /1094-1118) to 'Alī.
- 3 Maribel FIERRO, "Opposition to Sufism in al-Andalus," in *Islamic Mysticism Contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*, 174-206, eds. Frederick DE JONG and Bernd RADTKE, Leiden: Brill, 1999: esp. 185-186; 191-196; SAFRAN, "The politics of book burning," 155-162.
- 4 Al-Ghazālī addressed these issues in his *Kitāb al-implā' fī ishkālāt al-ihyā'*, where he refers to people groundlessly forbidding the reading of *Ihyā'* without really having understood it (*bi-mujarradī 'l-hawā' 'alā ghayri 'l-baṣīra*). However, he does not mention any names. (Printed in Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad al-GHAZĀLĪ, *Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn*, 5 vols., Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2001, V: 13-41, 13). See also Kenneth GARDEN, *The First Islamic Reviver: Abū Ḥāmid Al-Ghazālī and His Revival of the Religious Sciences*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014: 149-152.
- 5 The allegation was questioned already by Duncan B. MACDONALD on account of lacking historical evidence as well as chronological inconsistencies ("The Life of al-Ghazzālī, with Especial Reference to His Religious Experiences and Opinions," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 20 (1899): 71-132). Sa'd GHRĀB characterized the allegation as a mere fantasy (*khayāl*) ("Ḥawla iḥrāq al-murābiṭīn li-Ihyā' al-Ghazālī," *Actas del IV Coloquio Hispano-Tunecino*, Madrid: Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura, 1983: 133-163, 154). For a recent sceptic, see Camilo GÓMEZ-RIVAS, "Qāḍī 'Iyād (d. 544/1149)," in *Islamic Legal Thought: A Compendium of Muslim Jurists*, ed. Oussama ARABI, David Stephan POWERS, and Susan Ann SPECTORSKY, Leiden: Brill, 2013: 323-338, 327; Camilo GÓMEZ-RIVAS, *Law and the Islamization of Morocco under the Almoravids: The Fatwās of Ibn Rushd al-Jadd to the Far Maghrib*, Leiden: Brill, 2014: 119.
- 6 Most recently in CASEWIT, *The Mystics of al-Andalus*, 52.
- 7 On the social, intellectual and political life in the Almoravid and Almohad periods in Islamic West, see the excellent recent study: Amira K. BENNISON, *The Almoravid and Almohad Empires*, Edinburgh:

historical sources tell us about the factuality of 'Iyād's alleged involvement in these controversies? And how, when and why was this involvement first construed and established?

The allegations put forward in recent years typically refer directly or indirectly to two secondary sources from the late 1990s.<sup>8</sup> In the following I take these two references as a starting point to revisit the historical and biographical sources on these controversies and incidents, in search for references to 'Iyād. In addition I examine the possible impact of individuals in 'Iyād's own network who voiced opinions on or had relationships with al-Ghazālī.<sup>9</sup> I argue that the details of the matter provide material for a necessary questioning of a simplistic historiography of the intertwined intellectual and political situation in the early twelfth-century Almoravid Islamic West. The material also sheds some light on how this relatively modest scholar from the Islamic West later has been made to play a role in very different geographical, temporal, and cultural contexts.

### Al-Zabīdī's reference to the burning of the *Ihyā'*

The first secondary source on 'Iyād's role in the burning of the *Ihyā'* is Maribel Fierro's reference to Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī's (d. 1205/1790) commentary *Ithāf al-sāda al-muttaqīn bi-sharḥ Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn*.<sup>10</sup> Author of the acclaimed dictionary *Tāj al-'arūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs*, this Indian philologist, who studied in Yemen and ended his life in Egypt, wrote a voluminous commentary on al-Ghazālī's *Ihyā'* in which he gathered different kinds of available material.<sup>11</sup> After praising the *Ihyā'* for its extraordinary way of combining transmitted knowledge with reasoning, and thinking with tradition (*naql* and *nazar*, *fīkr* and

---

Edinburgh University Press, 2016.

- 8 In her articles from 1997 and 1999, Maribel Fierro held that 'Iyād, as well as Ibn Ḥirzihim (d. 559/1165), issued *fatwās* in favour of burning the *Ihyā'* (FIERRO, "Opposition to Sufism," 18 and footnote 53; Maribel FIERRO, "La religión", in *El retroceso territorial de al-Andalus. Almorávides y almohades: Siglos XI al XIII*, 483-495, ed. María Jesús VIGERUA MOLÍNS, Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1997: 483-95, 485, footnote 19). Delfina Serrano Ruano held in a 1999 article, and confirmed in 2006, that 'Iyād was involved in the burning of al-Ghazālī's work (SERRANO, "Why Did the Scholars of al-Andalus Distrust al-Ghazālī?," 138, footnote 10; Delfina SERRANO, "Los Banū 'Iyād (de la caída del imperio almorávid a la instauración de la dinastía nazarí)," in *Biografías almohades I*, 351-406, eds. María Luisa ÁVILA NAVARRO and María Isabel FIERRO BELLO, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1999. Muḥammad Ibn Sharīfa mentioned in his 1982 edition of Muḥammad Ibn 'Iyād's biography of his father, the names al-Zabīdī, Ibn 'Imād and al-Sha'rānī as the sources for the allegations that 'Iyād had banned or burned the *Ihyā'*, and questions their historicity (Muḥammad IBN 'IYĀD, *al-Ta'rīf bi'l-qāḍī 'Iyād*, ed. Muḥammad IBN SHARĪFA, Rabat: Wizārat al-Awqāf wa'l-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyya, 1982: 107, footnote 274).
- 9 'Iyād wrote about his network in his *fahrasa*, *al-Ghunya* (al-QĀDĪ 'IYĀD, *al-Ghunya: Fihrist shuyūkh al-Qāḍī 'Iyād*, ed. Māhir Zuhayr JARRĀR, Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1982, completed one year before he died.
- 10 FIERRO, "Opposition to Sufism," 18 and footnote 53; FIERRO, "La religión," 485, footnote 19.
- 11 Murtaḍā al-ZABĪDĪ, *Ithāf al-sāda al-muttaqīn bi-sharḥ Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn*, 13 vols., Miṣr: al-Maṭba'a al-maymaniyya, 1311 [=1893-4], I: 27. On the *Ithāf*, see Stefan REICHMUTH, *The World of Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī (1732-91): Life, Networks and Writings*, Cambridge: E.J. Gibb Memorial Trust, 2009: 269-334.

*athar*), al-Zabīdī reports almost verbatim an anecdote from al-Shaʿrānī's (d. 973/1565) *Lawāqih al-anwār* via al-Munāwī (d. 1031/1621).

ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Shaʿrānī was an Egyptian Shāfiʿī jurist and *ṣūfī*.<sup>12</sup> His *Lawāqih al-anwār al-quḍsiyya fī manāqib al-ʿulamāʾ waʾl-ṣūfiyya*, also known as *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, is a biographical dictionary. In his introduction to this work, al-Shaʿrānī asserts that *al-taṣawwuf* is a discipline of knowledge in its own right (*ʿilm mustaqill*, p. 12), and that he collected these biographies of the great men of this discipline to counter the condemnation they met (*inkār*, p. 9). Referring to a saying from al-Shāfiʿī, he holds that such condemnation is a sign of hypocrisy (*nifāq*, p. 30); then he goes on to tell a number of stories of different kinds of attacks on scholars of the discipline of *taṣawwuf*, which exemplify such condemnation. One of these stories reports that al-Ghazālī was accused of stepping out of the boundaries of religion (*aftaw bi-takfīr al-imām al-Ghazālī*, p. 34), and that the *Ihyāʾ* was burned. Al-Shaʿrānī does not specify the year of these events, so we do not know whether he is referring to the first, second or both incidents mentioned above. Al-Shaʿrānī states:

Among the group that condemned (*ankara*) al-Ghazālī and issued a *fatwā* about burning his book were al-Qāḍī ʿIyād and Ibn Rushd. When this reached al-Ghazālī, he cursed the judge [ʿIyād], who died suddenly in his bath the same day. It has been said that al-Mahdī [see below] was the one who ordered that he [ʿIyād] should be killed after people in his town accused him of being a Jew on account of him not coming out on Saturdays because he was busy working on the *Shifāʾ*. However, it was because of al-Ghazālī's curse that al-Mahdī killed him.<sup>13</sup>

The Mahdī referred to must be Ibn Tūmart (d. 525/1130), the founder of the Almohad movement in the first half of the twelfth century in the Maghrib, who declared himself or was declared by his followers to be *al-mahdī al-maʿlūm* and *al-imām al-maʿṣūm*.<sup>14</sup> The historical circumstances of the relationship between Ibn Tūmart and al-Ghazālī are not clear, but Ibn Tūmart seems to have had a favourable view of al-Ghazālī and had allegedly studied with him in the East.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-SHAʿRĀNĪ, *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* (= *Lawāqih al-anwār al-quḍsiyya fī manāqib al-ʿulamāʾ waʾl-ṣūfiyya*), ed. Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-SĀYIḤ and Tawfīq ʿAlī WAHBA, 2 vols., Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya, 2005, 1: 34. On al-Shaʿrānī, see Michael WINTER, *Society and Religion in Early Ottoman Egypt: Studies in the Writings of ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Shaʿrānī*, New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1982.

<sup>13</sup> Al-SHAʿRĀNĪ, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, 1: 34.

<sup>14</sup> The sources are not decisive on the question of who declared him Mahdī, but upon his death it was a well-established denomination for him ([IBN TŪMART, *Kitāb aʿazz mā yuṭlab*,] *Le livre de Mohammed Ibn Tounert*, ed. I. GOLDZIEHER, Alger: Imprimerie Orientale Pierra Fontana, 1903: 246, cf. Allen J. FROMHERZ, *The Almohads: The Rise of an Islamic Empire*, London & New York: I.B. Tauris, 2010: 237-238; Mercedes GARCÍA-ARENAL, *Messianism and Puritanical Reform: Mahdīs of the Muslim West*, Leiden: Brill, 2006: 180-184).

<sup>15</sup> Madeleine Fletcher has reviewed the sources for the possible interviews between Ibn Tūmart and al-Ghazālī, but remarks that most importantly “Ibn Tūmart's written legacy reveals that the major elements: rational theology, religious reform and sufism, were principles he shared with al-Ghazālī,” and, as events testify, “In the mind of the Almoravid ruling group, the Almohads were doctrinally

When considered as an historical account, there are obvious discrepancies with regard to al-Sha'rānī's chronology of the events, as al-Ghazālī died in 505/1111, Ibn Tūmart in 525/1130 and 'Iyād in 544/1149. Al-Ghazālī may have heard about the first burning in 503/1109, but it is hardly likely that the then twenty years young 'Iyād in Ceuta had any role in that. The second incident took place in 538/1143, and although it is not possible to date 'Iyād's prophetic work *al-Shifā' bi-ta'rīf huqūq al-muṣṭafā* decisively, it may very well have been composed between 1137 and 1145, when 'Iyād did not have any public duties.<sup>16</sup> However, this second incident took place long after both al-Ghazālī and Ibn Tūmart had died. On the other hand, the account may be understood to refer to the extraordinary visionary powers attributed to Ibn Tūmart, which could suggest an early Almohad source for the story. Although the available Almohad sources do mention the burning, as we will see, they do not present us with these miraculous stories. These are, on the contrary, found in later sources seeking to distinguish al-Ghazālī.

Al-Sha'rānī was a theologian and a jurist, and above all a mystic highly influenced by the in his time already classical *ṣūfī* work *Ihyā'*.<sup>17</sup> He apparently did not consider himself a historian, and his biographical dictionary has been described as inaccurate. Michael Winter holds that to al-Sha'rānī "people and events *per se* had little meaning. For him they became significant only when they could teach a religious or moral lesson."<sup>18</sup> It is thus quite possible that the anecdote he told about 'Iyād has little or no historical value. Moreover, it is not included in one of the bibliographical entries, but in the general introduction. That does, however, not explain how or why 'Iyād's name came to be attached to it. 'Iyād was a well-known scholar in the East: as a historian of the Mālikī intellectual tradition with his biographical dictionary *Tartīb al-madārik*,<sup>19</sup> as a scholar of *ḥadīth* with his commentaries and theoretical works,<sup>20</sup> and not least as the author of the *Shifā'* which reached a variety of

---

associated with al-Ghazālī," (Madeleine FLETCHER, "Ibn Tūmart's teachers: the relationship with al-Ghazālī," *al-Qanṭara*, 18.2 (1997): 305-330, 326). The only remark Fletcher has on 'Iyād in this connection is an unsubstantiated claim (p. 316) that "Cadi 'Iyād of Ceuta, who rebelled against the Almohads, claims that the weirdly harsh judgements Ibn al-'Arabī handed down were the cause of his removal from office. Cadi 'Iyād distills all possible negative aspects of that situation and others, making an implication of homosexuality in quoting his poetry and saying that his *ḥadīths* were not accepted by someone."

16 See Nora S. EGGEN, "In defence of the Prophet, and of scholarly tradition: al-Qādī 'Iyād's *al-Shifā' bi-ta'rīf huqūq al-muṣṭafā* – The Healing in Knowing the Rights of the Chosen One," in *Freedom of Expression in Islam: Challenging Apostasy and Blasphemy Laws*, eds. Christian MOE, Kari VOGT, Lena LARSEN, Khalid Muhammad MASUD, London: I.B. Tauris, forthcoming (2018).

17 WINTER, *Society and Religion*, 7.

18 *Ibid.*, 73.

19 AL-QĀDĪ 'IYĀD, *Tartīb al-madārik wa-taqrīb al-masālik li-ma'rifat al'lām madhhab Mālik*, eds. Muḥammad IBN Tāwīt al-ṬANJĪ (vol. I), 'Abd al-Qādir al-ṢAHRĀWĪ (vols. II-IV), Muḥammad IBN SHARĪFA (vol. V), and Sa'īd Aḥmad A'RĀB (vols. VI-VIII), Rabat: Wizārat al-Awqāf wa'l-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyya, 1983.

20 In the commentary *Mashāriq al-anwār 'alā ṣiḥāḥ al-āthār* 'Iyād offered philological comments on the works of Mālik, al-Bukhārī, and Muslim; in the *Ikmāl al-mu'līm bi-fawā'id Muslim* (= *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*) he commented upon Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ*; and in his handbook on *ḥadīth* transmission, *al-Ilmā' ilā ma'rifat uṣūl al-riwāya wa-taqyīd al-samā'*, he established a terminological and methodological framework of *'ulūm al-ḥadīth*.

significant scholars and was commented upon by dozens of later scholars from a range of schools and affiliations.<sup>21</sup>

The Mālikī *madhhab* was second in influence in al-Shaʿrānī's Mamluk Egypt, and there were clearly tensions between Mālikīs, often traditionalistic Maghribis, and scholars affiliated with other *madhāhib*.<sup>22</sup> Al-Shaʿrānī himself had many Mālikī friends, and he respected them on account of Mālik having been al-Shāfiʿī's teacher.<sup>23</sup> According to Michael Winter, the Mālikī *faqīh* was, however, perceived by many Egyptian *ṣūfīs* as the personified adversary, and al-Shaʿrānī bears testimony to the intensity of these memories through retelling incidents where Mālikīs attacked the *ṣūfīs*. Al-Ghazālī's book having been attacked, or even burnt, by Mālikī *fuqahāʾ* of Spain was a case in point.

Among al-Shaʿrānī's most influential masters was al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), whose works and opinions continued to influence him greatly although he only met him for a short period when he was very young (12 years, a month before al-Suyūṭī died).<sup>24</sup> Al-Suyūṭī had written a commentary on the *Shifāʾ*, concentrating on textual criticism of the *ahādīth* cited in it.<sup>25</sup> ʿIyāḍ's work is also likely to have been known to al-Shaʿrānī as a source for such great Shāfiʿī works as al-Nawawī's (d. 676/1278) *al-Minhāj bi-sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, as well as for Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī's (d. 756/1355) book *al-Sayf al-maslūl ʿalā man sabba al-rasūl* with its many references to ʿIyāḍ's *Shifāʾ*, and his son Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī's (d. 771/1370) *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfiʿiyya al-kubrā*. In the *ṭabaqāt* works on the Shāfiʿī scholars the controversies surrounding al-Ghazālī's work are a recurrent topic. In his bibliographical entry on al-Ghazālī, al-Subkī includes a chapter where he details the criticisms raised by some of the Mālikīs and the responses to those criticisms. ʿIyāḍ, however, is not mentioned.<sup>26</sup>

On the other hand, the Syrian Shāfiʿī al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348) reports in his *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ* from ʿIyāḍ's non-extant *Kitāb muʿjam fī shuyūkh Ibn Sukkara*<sup>27</sup> that Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn al-Ṣadafi (d. 514/1120), also known as Ibn Sukkara, held the view that al-Ghazālī both exaggerated his mystical leanings (*ghalā fī tarīqat al-taṣawwuf*) and strived to spread his *madhhab*.<sup>28</sup> Al-Ṣadafi was an important traditionist as well as a pious scholar who insisted on keeping his seclusion (*ikhtifāʾ*), especially in the later parts of his life. ʿIyāḍ describes in his *fahrasa* how he prevailed on him to be able to sit with him and read intensively with him during a period in Murcia (beginning of 508/mid-1114).<sup>29</sup> By

21 See a comprehensive list in Badrī Muḥammad FAHD, "Kitāb al-shifāʾ bi-taʿrīf ḥuqūq al-muṣṭafā," *al-Manāhil*, 19 (1980): 488-535, 527-534.

22 WINTER, *Society and Religion*, 223-225.

23 See biographical entry in al-QĀDĪ ʿIYĀḌ, *Tartīb al-madārik*, III: 174-195.

24 WINTER, *Society and Religion*, 56.

25 Jalāl al-Dīn al-SUYŪṬĪ, *Manāhil al-safāʾ fī takhrīj ahādīth al-Shifāʾ bi-taʿrīf ḥuqūq al-muṣṭafā lil-qāḍī ʿIyāḍ*, Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Kutub al-Thaqāfiyya; Dār al-Jinān, 1988.

26 Tāj al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-SUBKĪ, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfiʿiyya al-kubrā*, ed. Muṣṭafā ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿATĀ, 6 vols., Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1999, III: 443-456.

27 AL-QĀDĪ ʿIYĀḌ, *al-Ghunya*, 130.

28 Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad al-DHAHABĪ, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, ed. Shuʿayb al-ARNĀʾŪṬ, 23 vols., Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1985, XIX: 329, cf. GHRĀB, "Ḥawla iḥrāq al-murābiṭīn li-*Iḥyāʾ* al-Ghazālī," 153.

29 AL-QĀDĪ ʿIYĀḌ, *al-Ghunya*, 129-136; also Ibn Ḥamāda, *Mukhtaṣar*, printed in al-QĀDĪ ʿIYĀḌ, *Tartīb al-madārik*, VIII: 193-194.

spreading al-Ghazālī's teachings an unwanted uncertainty was incited, al-Dhahabī's citation continues, and "here in the Far West (*'indānā fī 'l-Maghrib*) the ruler implemented an order and the scholars a *fatwā* to burn it and to take distance from it."<sup>30</sup> There is some confusion as to who the original source of the wording is, but as neither al-Ṣadafī nor al-Dhahabī lived in the Maghrib, it may be reasonable to attribute the statement to 'Iyād. However, in the statement 'Iyād did not identify the ruler or scholars in question. Moreover, he neither endorsed nor opposed the action. It appears simply as a descriptive statement, which confirms that the order to burn the book was issued but which does not clarify 'Iyād's potential role in the incident. Nevertheless, it does present us with a possible source for his name being included in the later sources' retelling of the story.

### Refutations of al-Ghazālī in the Islamic West

A number of refutations of al-Ghazālī's teachings are reported to have appeared in al-Maghrib and al-Andalus, and 'Iyād reports in his *fahrasa* that he had read one of them, written by Ibn Ḥamdīn (d. 508/1114).<sup>31</sup> However no text of a refutation (*radd*) has come down to us, nor has documentation of a formal *fatwā* on burning the *Ihyā'*,<sup>32</sup> neither from 'Iyād nor from the *faqīh* and later *qāḍī* Ibn Rusūd al-Jadd (d. 520/1126), whom 'Iyād met in Cordoba, exchanged legal arguments with and considered among his masters.<sup>33</sup> When 'Iyād died, he had left behind many notes including *fatwās*, which his son, Muḥammad Ibn 'Iyād (d. 575/1179-80), collected in the work *Madhāhib al-ḥukkām fī nawāzil al-aḥkām*.<sup>34</sup> Most *fatwās* are from other scholars, as 'Iyād acted more often as the *muftī* than as a *muftī*.<sup>35</sup> He communicated extensively on legal issues, and often in written form, with scholars in the region, although legal consultations at the local legal counsel may have taken place without any written documentation. By the time Ibn 'Iyād wrote the *Madhāhib al-ḥukkām*, the Almohads had replaced the Almoravids, and it is possible that Ibn 'Iyād left out such

30 AL-DHAHABĪ, *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'*, XIX: 329.

31 AL-QĀDĪ 'IYĀD, *al-Ghunya*, 46.

32 SERRANO, "Why Did the Scholars of al-Andalus Distrust al-Ghazālī?" 137-138. An exception to this is a text written against al-Ghazālī by Muḥammad Ibn Khalaf al-Awsī (d. 537/1142) (Dominique URVOY, "Le Manuscrit Ar. 1483 de l'Escorial et la Polemique contre Gazālī dans al-Andalus," *Arabica*, 40.1 (1993): 114-119), but there is no known link between him and 'Iyād.

33 AL-QĀDĪ 'IYĀD, *al-Ghunya*, 54-57.

34 Muḥammad IBN 'IYĀD, *Madhāhib al-ḥukkām fī nawāzil al-aḥkām*, ed. Muḥammad Ibn Sharīfa, Beirut: Dār al-gharb al-islāmī, (1990) 1997, translated into Spanish in Muḥammad IBN 'IYĀD, *Madhāhib al-ḥukkām fī nawāzil al-aḥkām = La actuación de los jueces en los procesos judiciales* (Fuentes arábico-hispanas 22), [transl.] Delfina SERRANO, Madrid: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional, 1998. See Delfina SERRANO, "Legal Practice in an Andalusī-Maghribī Source from the Twelfth Century CE: The *Madhāhib al-ḥukkām fī nawāzil al-aḥkām*," *Islamic Law and Society*, 7.2 (2000): 187-234.

35 Al-Wansharīsī (d. 914/1508) reports only a handful of *fatāwī* from 'Iyād, given either in Ceuta or Granada during his service as a judge there in 531-532/1136-1137. None of these *fatāwī* are relevant to the banning or burning of al-Ghazālī's work (Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā al-WANSHARĪSĪ, *Mi'yār al-mu'rib wa'l-jāmi' al-mughrib 'an fatāwā ahl Ifrīqiyyā wa'l-Andalus wa'l-Maghrib*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥajjī, 13 vols., Fez: Wizārat al-Awqāf wa'l-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyya lil-Mamlaka al-Maghribiyya, 1981).

*fatwà*s which in one way or another may have appeared incriminating to his father's legacy. However, such speculations cannot compensate for the lack of historical evidence.

ʿIyād was no opponent to the pious practices of the mystics, and in his biographical dictionaries he often commended pious relinquishment of worldly life (*al-zuhd fī ʿl-dunyā*). However, *zuhd* was not considered a formal, bookish discipline,<sup>36</sup> and the conflict was not one of pious practices but one of epistemological tools and interpretational privilege. The conflict is apparent in a *fatwà* on the *awliyāʾ* from Ibn Rushd (*al-jadd*), analysed by Delfina Serrano, who holds that the issue pertained to the pertinent questions of the relationship between knowledge and authority.<sup>37</sup> But this *fatwà* also testifies to the fact that Ibn Rushd was among the scholars who engaged vigorously with al-Ghazālī's work. The problem which was laid before Ibn Rushd was the implications for the traditional scholars in al-Ghazālī's epistemological hierarchy, where the "friends of God" (*al-awliyāʾ*) and people of mystic insights (*al-ʿarifūn*) ranked above scholars of theology and law (*al-ʿulamāʾ bi-l-aḥkām*). Ibn Rushd explained the problem in terms of two categories: people who know God (*al-ʿarifūn bi-llāh*) and people who know God's norms (*al-ʿarifūn bi-aḥkām Allāh*). Serrano concludes that Ibn Rushd in this question took a conciliatory position, holding that although on a general basis the mystics are ranked higher when it comes to closeness to God, in their absence, the scholars of theology and law, i.e., scholars like himself, and by extension, one could hold, like ʿIyād, are the best available interpreters of God's commands.<sup>38</sup>

The concept of *awliyāʾ* occurs several times in ʿIyād's biographical dictionary *Tartīb al-madārik* as a descriptive term, probably used in a generic sense of saintly mystics. However, in his introduction to the *Tartīb al-madārik*, ʿIyād establishes an epistemological genealogy: God sent prophets to guide human beings towards knowledge, truth and justice (*ʿilm*, *ṣidq* and *ʿadl*), and Muḥammad ranks as the last of these prophets, while people of knowledge (*ʿulamāʾ*), with the *aʿimmat al-muslimīn* at the forefront, are continuing this work down the centuries.<sup>39</sup> Thus, in the same way as his teacher and colleague Ibn Rushd, ʿIyād allots interpretational priority to the scholars of theology and law (*al-ʿulamāʾ bi-l-aḥkām*) rather than to the people of mystic insights (*al-ʿarifūn*).

### Al-Zabīdī's story of Ibn Ḥirzihim

In the eighteenth-century al-Zabīdī's retelling of al-Shaʿrānī's anecdote, he modifies al-Shaʿrānī's account slightly, first by removing Ibn Rushd's name, then by ascertaining, without further comment, the historically known date of ʿIyād's death. However, al-Zabīdī also refers to the story of Ibn Ḥirzihim (d. 559/1164) from Fez, a near-contemporary to

36 Juan M. Vizcaíno identified the limited number of five works on *zuhd*, out of a total of around 250 works ʿIyād mentions that he studied (Juan M. VIZCAÍNO, "Las obras de *zuhd* en al-Andalus," *al-Qanṭara*, 12.2 (1991): 417-438).

37 SERRANO, "Why Did the Scholars of al-Andalus Distrust al-Ghazālī?" See also FIERRO, "Opposition to Sufism," 193-197 for the conflicts over al-Ghazālī's *ṣūfī* inclinations.

38 SERRANO, "Why Did the Scholars of al-Andalus Distrust al-Ghazālī?" 154.

39 AL-QĀDĪ ʿIYĀD, *Tartīb al-madārik*, I: 1-5.



'Iyāq.<sup>40</sup> 'Alī Ibn Ḥirzihim had taken Ghazālīan knowledge from his uncle Abū Muḥammad Ibn Šālih Ibn Ḥirzihim (d. 505/1112), who had taken it from al-Ghazālī himself when he had travelled to the East, and also from Abū 'l-Faḍl Ibn al-Naḥwī (d. 513/1119 or 20). 'Alī Ibn Ḥirzihim is reported to have dreamt that he had kept a copy of the *Iḥyā'*, in spite of an explicit ban. He showed the book to some of his friends, who said that “the previously mentioned *shaykh*” attacked al-Ghazālī and forbade the reading of his books, and then he, Ibn Ḥirzihim, had to take a beating. In a dream Ibn Ḥirzihim saw al-Ghazālī, who complained about him to the Prophet. Ibn Ḥirzihim told the Prophet that al-Ghazālī had suggested that he, Ibn Ḥirzihim, had falsely attributed some statements to the Prophet, whereupon the Prophet ordered Ibn Ḥirzihim to be beaten.<sup>41</sup> After this incident, Ibn Ḥirzihim is supposed to have repented and continued to defend and promote the *ṣūfī* path.<sup>42</sup> The words “the previously mentioned *shaykh*” probably refer to al-Zabīdī's previous mention of 'Iyāq, and consequently it is al-Zabīdī who here suggests a link to 'Iyāq for condemning the *Iḥyā'*. However, in the much earlier source for Ibn Ḥirzihim's story, Yūsuf Ibn Yahyā Ibn al-Zayyāt al-Tādilī's (d. 617/1231) *al-Tashawwuf ilā rijāl al-taṣawwuf*, such a link is neither stated nor suggested. Here, 'Iyāq is not mentioned at all.<sup>43</sup> Al-Tādilī also tells the story somewhat differently:

I secluded myself in a house to read al-Ghazālī's *Iḥyā' 'ulūm al-dīn* for a portion of a year. When I reached the issues he was criticized for, I pledged to burn the book. But when I slept I saw someone order me to be beaten as a punishment for lying. So I was beaten eighty stripes, and when I woke up I found myself in great pain from the beating.<sup>44</sup>

According to al-Tādilī, Ibn Ḥirzihim then repented, pondered over the issues again, and this time he found them not to contradict the Qur'ān and the Sunna.

### Ibn al-'Imād's reference to the burning of the *Iḥyā'*

The second oft-cited secondary reference to 'Iyāq's alleged role in the condemning and burning of al-Ghazālī's *Iḥyā'*, provided by Delfina Serrano Ruano, is Ibn al-'Imād (d. 1089/1679).<sup>45</sup> This Syrian Ḥanbalī scholar wrote a comprehensive, annalistically arranged biographical history.<sup>46</sup> Most scholarly entries are organized according to year of death, and

40 AL-ZABIDĪ, *Ithāf*, I: 27-28.

41 A similar story is told elsewhere about “a man from Egypt.” See MACDONALD, “The Life of al-Ghazālī,” 109.

42 For instance, contrary to the *amīr* 'Alī b. Yūsuf's order, he saw to it that people gave the *ṣūfī* Ibn Barrajān a worthy funeral in 536/1141 (CASEWIT, *The Mystics of al-Andalus*, 125).

43 Yūsuf Ibn Yahyā Ibn al-Zayyāt al-TADILĪ, *al-Tashawwuf ilā rijāl al-taṣawwuf wa-akḥbār Abī 'l-'Abbās al-Sabī'*, ed. Aḥmad TAWFIQ, Rabat: Kulliyat al-Ādāb wa'l-'Ulūm al-Insāniyya, 1984: 168-173.

44 *Ibid.*, 169.

45 SERRANO, “Why Did the Scholars of al-Andalus Distrust al-Ghazālī?” 138, footnote 10; SERRANO, “Los Banū 'Iyāq.”

46 'Abd al-Ḥayy Ibn Aḥmad IBN al-'IMĀD, *Shadharāt al-dhahab fī akḥbār man dhahab*, ed. 'Abd al-Qādir

in the entry on 544 (=1149), we find ‘Iyād presented in a few paragraphs. Ibn al-‘Imād praises ‘Iyād highly, describing him as among the best men of his age and a staunch defender of the Sunna, to a degree that “he ordered al-Ghazālī’s books to be burnt because of the delusions he gained from them (*li-amri tawahhumihī minhā*)”.<sup>47</sup> The statement does suggest that ‘Iyād had been reading al-Ghazālī’s work and had found them alluring but eventually had come to realize that their appeal was delusional more than instructive, but Ibn al-‘Imād does not refer to any sources for his allegation.<sup>48</sup>

In the entry Ibn al-‘Imād also alludes to the tense personal situation ‘Iyād found himself in, possibly a reference to the turmoil he experienced in the transitional phase between the Almoravid and the Almohad governments. Ibn al-‘Imād quotes a poem also found in Ibn Khallikān’s (d. 681/1282) biographical dictionary, where he writes that a certain (unidentified) legal scholar Abū ‘l-Ḥasan Ibn Hārūn from Malaga wrote a poem acknowledging the unfair treatment ‘Iyād had received: “They wronged ‘Iyād, while he showed forbearance to them, but wrongdoing in this world is ancient [...]”.<sup>49</sup> The fourteenth-century historian Ibn al-Khaṭīb (d. 776/1374) is even more outspoken when describing ‘Iyād’s final journey to Marrākash as one of overpowering (*taghallub*), uprooting (*isti’sāl*) and expelling (*musharradan bihi*).<sup>50</sup> However, neither of these last two, or any of the other available early biographical sources—Ibn Khāqān (d. 529/1134), Ibn Bashkuwāl (d. 578/1183), Ibn al-Abbār (d. 658/1260), Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282), Ibn al-Khaṭīb (d. 776/1374), Ibn Farḥūn (d. 799/139)<sup>51</sup>—conveys any information on ‘Iyād’s possible role in the controversies surrounding al-Ghazālī’s writings. Shihāb al-Dīn al-Maqqarī al-Tilmisānī (d. 1041/1632), who wrote a comprehensive work on ‘Iyād and included the history of scholarly, political, and social life in the West in a broader sense, and who refers to some of the scholarly

---

al-ARNĀ’ŪṬ and Maḥmūd al-ARNĀ’ŪṬ, 10 vols., Damascus & Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1986-1993.

47 Ibid., vi: 226-227.

48 Al-Sha’rānī is not mentioned among the few general sources listed. Ibn Khallikān is mentioned, but although he provides biographies for many of the relevant individuals, he does not mention that ‘Iyād had any hand in the banning or burning of the *Ihyā’* (IBN al-‘IMĀD, *Shadharāt al-dhahab*, i: 111-112).

49 IBN KHALLIKĀN, *Wafayāt al-a’yān wa-anbā’ abnā’ al-zamān*, ed. Yūsuf ‘Alī ṬAWĪL and Maryam Qāsīm ṬAWĪL, Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmiyya, 6 vols., iii: 424-426. The poem is not included in Mac Guckin de Slane’s translation (IBN KHALLIKĀN, *Wafayāt al-a’yān wa-anbā’ abnā’ az-zamān (Deaths of Eminent Men and History of the Sons of the Epoch)*, transl. MAC GUCKIN DE SLANE, 4 vols., Beirut: Librarie du Liban, 1970, ii: 417-419).

50 IBN al-KHAṬĪB, *al-Iḥāṭa fī akhbār Gharnāṭa*, ed. Būziyyānī al-DARĀJĪ, Algiers: Dār al-Amal li’l-dirāsāt, 2009, v: 152-153.

51 IBN KHĀQĀN, *Qalā’id al-‘iqyān wa-mahāsīn al-a’yān*, ed. Ḥusayn Yūsuf KHARYŪSH, Zarqā’ (Jordan): Maktabat al-Manār, 1989, ii: 683-691; IBN BASHKUWĀL, *Kitāb al-ṣila*, ed. Ibrāhīm al-ABYĀRĪ, 3 vols., Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Miṣrī / Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1989, ii: 94; IBN al-ABBĀR, *al-Mu’jam fī aṣḥāb al-qāḍī al-imām Abī ‘Alī al-Ṣadafī*, ed. Ibrāhīm al-ABYĀRĪ, Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Miṣrī / Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1989: 294-298; IBN KHALLIKĀN, *Wafayāt*, iii: 424-426, transl. DE SLANE, ii: 417-419; IBN al-KHAṬĪB, *al-Iḥāṭa*, v: 152-153; IBN FARḤŪN, *al-Dībāj al-mudhahab fī ma’rifat a’yān ‘ulamā’ al-madhhab*, ed. Muḥammad al-Aḥmadī ABŪ ‘L-NŪR, 2 vols., Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, 1972, ii: 46-51.

discords of the period, mentions al-Ghazālī only a few times, all of which are in connection to him having been the teacher of 'Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 543/1148).<sup>52</sup>

### The burning incidents in Almohad historiography

Some early sources from the Islamic West mention the burning incidents and the involvement of various people in different ways. Yūsuf Ibn Ṭumlūs (d. 620/1223) in his book on logic considered, among other topics, the teachings of al-Ghazālī. He said that when al-Ghazālī's work reached al-Andalus, scholars found them to contain things they had never heard about before, about *al-ṣūfīyya* and other issues.<sup>53</sup> Their reaction was, according to Ibn Ṭumlūs, that: "if there is such a thing as *kufr* and *zandaqa* in this world, it surely is to be found in al-Ghazālī's books." Therefore they urged the *amīr* to burn the books which in their view could lead to misguidance (*ḍalāl*). And the books were burnt before anyone really knew what was in them, and everyone throughout the empire (*mamlaka*) was ordered to burn them and punish the people who kept them. What pushed the *amīr* to this was the point of view of the scholars, Ibn Ṭumlūs wrote. According to him the decrees were read from the *minbar*, and the most famous scholar to suffer from this trial was Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī. But then came *al-imām al-mahdī*, Ibn Ṭumlūs continued, and the confusions (*tahayyur*) of the people were corrected and he set them free to read al-Ghazālī's books.<sup>54</sup>

According to the Almohad chronicler 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Marrākushī (d. 647/1250) it was 'Alī Ibn Yūsuf (r. 500-537/1106-1143) who ordered the *Iḥyā'* to be burnt in 509/1115.<sup>55</sup> However, al-Marrākushī remarks that the Almoravids under 'Alī Ibn Yūsuf's reign gave the scholars a large role, too large for his own liking. The ruler would not make any political decision without asking the *fuqahā'*, and so would people in general, whether it was on small or big issues. This gave the *fuqahā'* too much authority and it enabled them to amass wealth, al-Marrākushī complains. He cites some satirical verses accusing the scholars in general, and Abū 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥamdīn (d. 508/1114) in particular, for abusing Mālik's tradition for worldly gain. Al-Marrākushī criticized them for keeping exclusively to their own Mālikī canon to a point where they "forgot to consider God's book and the Ḥadīth of the Prophet." A final point of criticism was that they would excommunicate (*takfir*) anyone who in any way engaged in scholastic theology (*'ilm al-kalām*). As a consequence of this,

52 Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad al-Maqqarī al-TILMISĀNĪ, *Azhār al-Riyād fī akhbār al-Qādī 'Iyād*, ed. Muṣṭafā al-SAQQĀ, Ibrāhīm al-ABYĀRĪ and 'Abd al-Ḥafīz SHIBLĪ, 5 vols., Cairo: Maṭbū'āt Lajnat al-Ta'līf wa'l-Tarjama wa'l-Nashr, [1939-1942], III: 62-62, 91; IV: 247; V: 57.

53 Yūsuf IBN ṬUMLŪS, *al-Madkhal li-ṣinā'at al-mantiq*, ed. Mikā'il ASIN, Madrid: al-Maktaba al-Abīriqa, 1916: 11-12.

54 Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī was not the only one to suffer from the prohibition, and other scholars protested it, most famously 'Alī al-Juhdāmī al-Barjī (d. 509/1115), who was removed from the *shūrā* for opposing the official order (see SAFRAN, "The politics of book burning," 160). However, Ibn al-'Arabī is the only name among these opponents that I have been able to establish as having an immediate connection to 'Iyād.

55 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-MARRĀKUSHĪ, *al-Mu'jam fī talkhīṣ akhbār al-Maghrib*, ed. Khalīl 'Imrān al-MANṢŪR, Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1998: 121-122, transl. in E. FAGNAN, *Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne intitulée al-Bayano l-Mogrib*, Algiers: Imprimerie Oriental P. Fontana, 1901-04: 147-149.

when al-Ghazālī's books were introduced to the West (al-Maghrib), the *amīr al-muslimīn*, 'Alī Ibn Yūsuf, banned them and ordered them to be burned. It is here suggested that it was Ibn Ḥamdīn, chief judge in Cordoba at the time (505-508/1111-1114),<sup>56</sup> who was the main instigator of the first controversy.

Another Almohad chronicler, Ibn al-Qaṭṭān (mid-seventh/mid-thirteenth century), was more decisive in his confirmation that 'Alī Ibn Yūsuf ordered the burning of the *Ihyā'* in 503/1109 on the authority of ('an) a consensus among chief judge Ibn Ḥamdīn and Cordoba's jurists.<sup>57</sup> Ibn al-Qaṭṭān also confirmed that the burning actually took place at the Western gate of the grand mosque with many notables present. Books were torn from the hands of people, among them Ibn al-'Arabī. Ibn Ḥamdīn had been 'Iyāḍ's mentor during his seven-month stay in Cordoba in 507/1113-1114, and 'Iyāḍ reports that he had read Ibn Ḥamdīn's polemic essay refuting al-Ghazālī (*Risālat al-radd 'alā 'l-Ghazālī*, non-extant) while he was there.<sup>58</sup> The Ḥamdīns came from an influential family, and Abū 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥamdīn had a powerful position and, contrary to some perceptions of his weak scholarship, 'Iyāḍ praised his knowledge and scholarly standing.<sup>59</sup>

Ibn al-Qaṭṭān interprets the burning in a political context, calls it an act of people of ignorance (*jahala*) that was meant to secure their government (*mulk*), and says that it was only reversed when the *amīr al-'azīz al-qā'im bi'l-ḥaqq* (Ibn Tūmart) made it available again. In this connection Ibn al-Qaṭṭān tells the reader about Ibn Tūmart's travels East and his meeting with al-Ghazālī. At this meeting in 508/1114, according to Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, al-Ghazālī heard about the reception of his work and prayed for their empire to be torn as his work had been torn. Ibn Tūmart asked him to pray that he should be the instrument for this, al-Ghazālī so did and the prayer was answered, says Ibn al-Qaṭṭān.<sup>60</sup> Obviously, as far as the historicity of the narrative goes, this is a misreading on Ibn al-Qaṭṭān's part, as al-Ghazālī was already dead in 505/1111.

56 Vincent LAGARDÈRE, "La hauète judiciaire à l'époque almoravide en al-Andalus," *al-Qanṭara*, 7.1 (1986): 135-228, 142.

57 Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan Ibn 'Alī IBN AL-QAṬṬĀN al-Marrākushī, *Nuḥum al-jumān li-tartīb mā salafa min akhbār al-zamān*, ed. Maḥmūd 'Alī MAKKĪ, Beirut: Dār al-gharb al-islāmī, 1990: 70-72. Maribel Fierro notices that Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ibn 'Arabī identified his son Abū 'l-Qāsim Ibn Ḥamdīn (judge of Cordoba 508-511/1114-1118 and 513-521/1119-1127) as the one responsible for the burning (FIERRO, "Opposition to Sufism," 186, footnote 40). Muḥyī 'l-Dīn tells a story where a certain Abū 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zayn al-Yābirī in Sevilla one night was reading book of a Abū 'l-Qāsim Ibn Aḥmad (not identified as Ibn Ḥamdīn here) criticising Abū Ḥamid (al-Ghazālī), whereupon Abū 'Abd Allāh was blinded. When he promised never to read the book again, his sight returned to him (IBN al-'ARABI, *Risālat rūḥ al-quḍus fī muḥāsabat al-naḥs wa'l-mabādī' wa'l-ghāyāt fī-mā tataḍammanuhu ḥurūf al-mu'jam min al-'ajā'ib wa'l-āyāt*, ed. 'Izzat HUṢRIYYA, Damascus: Maṭba'at al-'Ilm, 1970: 123).

58 AL-QĀDĪ 'IYĀḌ, *al-Ghunya*, 46.

59 Ibid.; al-QĀDĪ 'IYĀḌ, *Tartīb al-madārik*, viii: 193.

60 IBN AL-QAṬṬĀN, *Nuḥum al-jumān*, 73. This incident is also reported by al-Marrākushī with the variation that Ibn Tūmart was present at the meeting, and al-Ghazālī said that someone present at the meeting would be the most suitable for the task but that he did not address Ibn Tūmart directly (al-MARRĀKUSHĪ, *al-Mu'jam*, 127, transl. FAGNAN, *Histoire de l'Afrique*, 155). The official historian of the Marinid dynasty, which followed the Almohads, Ibn al-Aḥmar (d. 807/1405), told the story with the variant that the tearing apart of the empire took place at the hands of the Christians (Ismā'īl IBN AL-AḤMAR, *Buyūtāt Fās al-kubrā*, Rabat: Dār al-Manṣūr lil-ṭibā'a wa'l-warāqa, 1972: 34-35).

According to the sources, scholars were of different opinions in the matter and the ban was countered by several judicial statements. Janina M. Safran suggests that scholarly disagreement as well as his own professional rivalry was a main impetus for Ibn Ḥamdīn's reactions towards al-Ghazālī's work.<sup>61</sup> Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 543/1148) had returned from the East in 495/1102, when Yūsuf Ibn Tāshfīn was still ruling (r. 453-500/1061-1106), with the official investiture of the Almoravid government from the 'Abbāsīd caliph. He had been appointed chief judge in Seville (528/1134-538/1143),<sup>62</sup> a city which was competing with Cordoba for the supreme status in al-Andalus. There was also professional rivalry between Ibn Ḥamdīn and the younger and quite dynamic Ibn Rushd (*al-jadd*). Ibn Ḥamdīn may have seen the controversies as a way to demonstrate his own position and his unique ties to the ruler. On the other hand, 'Alī Ibn Yūsuf, ruler from 500/1106, may have seized the opportunity to bolster his political legitimacy by the same ties. Thus, as Safran suggests, the first controversy may be understood as "a symbolic enactment of the negotiation of authority between ruler and jurists."<sup>63</sup> However, as Serrano holds, "any direct relationship between the criticisms formulated by the jurists and the royal decree is not to be taken for granted."<sup>64</sup>

The second burning incident was instigated by the new ruler, Tāshfīn Ibn 'Alī (r. 537-539/1143-1145), when he had just risen to power following his father's long reign. The order is documented in a letter dated the first third of Jumādā I 538 (= mid-November 1143) and addresses the scholars, officials, and the people of Valencia.<sup>65</sup> In the letter, Tāshfīn appeals to the religious convictions and feelings of his addressees, although the formula is quite standard for an official letter of admonition, inducing fear of God. The closest to God is the one who loves his servants, and the best in our eyes are clerks and judges who consult the best sources and speak well, Tāshfīn writes.<sup>66</sup> He reminds his addressees of the obligations of prayer, righteousness and *jihād*, then impresses upon "every judge and *mufīṭ*" to follow the Mālikī *madhhab*, and

if you ever come across a book of innovation (*bid'a*) or someone preaching innovations, and especially—may God help you—the books of Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, then follow their trails and stop their influence by burning them as their concealed [message] (*kitmān*) constitutes a threat to the faith (*īmān*).<sup>67</sup>

In contrast to what was reported about his father's order being supported by the scholars of Cordoba, Tāshfīn neither explicitly nor implicitly evokes scholarly authority in the

61 SAFRAN, "The politics of book burning," 157-158.

62 LAGARDÈRE, "La haute judicature," 190.

63 SAFRAN, "The politics of book burning," 159.

64 SERRANO, "Why Did the Scholars of al-Andalus Distrust al-Ghazālī?" 139.

65 Ḥusayn MU'NIS, "Nuṣūṣ siyāsiyya 'an fatrat al-intiqāl min al-murābiṭīn ilā 'l-muwahḥidīn," *Revista del Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islámicos*, 3.1 (1955): 97-140, 110-113, cf. Dario CABANELAS, "Notas para la historia de Algazel en España," *al-Andalus*, 17.1 (1952): 223-232, 225 and 229-230. Mu'nis (p. 109) gives the date 495/1102, which must be a misprint.

66 MU'NIS, "Nuṣūṣ siyāsiyya," 111.

67 *Ibid.*, 113.

Valencia letter; rather he appeals to scholars on the grounds of his own executorial authority. The ban may have been a reaction against the growing support for the Almohads in the Maghrib and al-Andalus, in an attempt to tie scholars, notables and the general public closer to the Almoravid central power. However, and again contrary to the first incident, the sources do not tell us that the burning actually took place. Neither the first nor the second ban stopped the Andalusian scholars from engaging with al-Ghazālī's work.<sup>68</sup> But whereas the first ban was protested by some scholars, the second ban received less attention. The reason for this may be that it was less known or more locally oriented or, as Yousef Casewit remarks, by the 530s/1140s "a new generation of mystics had [...] merged Andalusī mystical teachings with their understanding of the *Ihyā'*," and the politicization of the Ghazālīan issue was of a different kind with the Almohads as the rising power.<sup>69</sup>

### Engagement with al-Ghazālī among 'Iyāḍ's contacts

According to his biographer-son, Muḥammad Ibn 'Iyāḍ, 'Iyāḍ's view of the *Ihyā'* was favourable.<sup>70</sup> On the authority of his paternal cousin Abū 'Abd Allāh, who worked as a secretary for 'Iyāḍ, Ibn 'Iyāḍ tells us about a conversation between 'Iyāḍ and his teacher in Ceuta, Abū Muḥammad Ibn Maṣṣūr (d. 513/1119). 'Iyāḍ was rehearsing the *Ihyā'* with him and remarked that an abridged version bringing out the pure knowledge in it (*mā fi-hi min khāliṣ al-'ilm*) would be most useful. Ibn Maṣṣūr replied that 'Iyāḍ himself would be the most suitable person to write such a book: "If you do not abridge it, nobody in our land will." As far as is known, no such book ever appeared, although some of the ideas from the *Ihyā'* may have been included in some of 'Iyāḍ's own work.<sup>71</sup> In his *fahrasa*, 'Iyāḍ praises Ibn Maṣṣūr highly and says he benefitted from his knowledge.<sup>72</sup> The rehearsing would have taken place in one of the two periods Ibn Maṣṣūr spent in Ceuta, first a period sometime after year 500/1106-7 and second from beginning 512/mid-1118 until he died in Sha'bān 513/November 1119. However, 'Iyāḍ does not mention having read the *Ihyā'* with him.

In his *fahrasa*, 'Iyāḍ does not mention that he read the *Ihyā'*, nor any other of al-Ghazālī's works. However, he does mention that he had contact with a few Shāfi'īs, and that he met a number of people who most probably had read it. He had written communication with Abū 'l-Qāsim al-'Akāfi (d. 549/1154) who wrote to 'Iyāḍ from Mecca authorizing him for all his transmissions and who, according to 'Iyāḍ, had among others taken knowledge from al-Ghazālī in Nishapur.<sup>73</sup> He also met in person with a tradesman, Sahl al-Nīsābūrī (d. 531/1136), with whom he sat while he stopped in Ceuta. 'Iyāḍ writes that Sahl al-Nīsābūrī had told him that he had met and sat with al-Juwaynī as well as his

<sup>68</sup> GARDEN, *The First Islamic Reviver*, 166.

<sup>69</sup> CASEWIT, *The Mystics of al-Andalus*, 53.

<sup>70</sup> IBN 'IYĀḌ, *al-Ta'rīf*, 106-107.

<sup>71</sup> A. J. WENSINCK, *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historic Development*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932: 272-275. See more below.

<sup>72</sup> AL-QĀḌĪ 'IYĀḌ, *al-Ghunya*, 155-156.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 166.

friends al-Qushayrī and al-Ṭūsī [al-Ghazālī] in Nishapur.<sup>74</sup> Unfortunately, no dates are given for any of these encounters, and there is no trace of any transmissions from al-Ghazālī through any of these two contacts.

In the long list of 'Iyād's accomplishments and personal characteristics, Ibn 'Iyād writes that he, being a scholar of *fiqh* and all the different disciplines of *ḥadīth*, had been a legal theoretician (*uṣūliyyan*) as well as a theologian (*mutakalliman*), and that he had taken an interest in *ṣūfī* men and their thoughts as well.<sup>75</sup> As Ibn 'Iyād was writing during the early Almohad days, Delfina Serrano Ruano interprets these statements as apologetic, in view of Almoravid scholars having been accused of prioritizing *furū'* over *uṣūl* and neglecting *kalām*.<sup>76</sup> It is within this framework that Serrano seeks to understand the first anecdote on the *Ihyā'* as well, arguing that with this anecdote, Ibn 'Iyād is trying to counterbalance his father's unfavourable role in the condemnation and burning. However, Ibn 'Iyād does not mention the burning, and the only other source Serrano presents for 'Iyād's having a role in the incident is al-Sha'rānī.<sup>77</sup>

One of the complaints among the Mālikīs about al-Ghazālī was that he allegedly had slandered both Mālik and the great Mālikī-Ash'arī scholar Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1013). In the *Tartīb al-madārik*, 'Iyād counts al-Ghazālī among the scholars who had conveyed misconceptions about Mālik's view of *ijmā' ahl al-Madīna*,<sup>78</sup> saying that some of them went as far as almost defaming Medina itself because they distorted what the Mālikīs actually said regarding their distinction between a Medinan *ijmā'* which was transmitted *kāffa 'an kāffa*, amounting to decisive legal argument (*ḥujja*), and a Medinan *ijmā'* based on *al-ijtihād wa'l-istidlāl*, which was not considered *ḥujja*. According to 'Iyād, al-Ghazālī wrongly assumed that these forms of Medinan *ijmā'* were the only valid *ijmā'* for the Mālikīs, which, he states, was a complete misconception. What 'Iyād does is simply to criticize non-Mālikī scholars, and al-Ghazālī among them, for not having taken matters into proper consideration before passing judgement.<sup>79</sup> However, 'Iyād does not refer to any sources for these allegations, and we do not know whether they stem from 'Iyād's own reading of al-Ghazālī's work or from some of his contemporaries who discussed al-Ghazālī's teachings.

In Jerusalem in 489 or 490/1096 or 1097, al-Ghazālī composed his *al-Risāla al-Qudsiyya*, which was included in the *Ihyā'* (Book 2, *Kitāb qawā'id al-'aqā'id*).<sup>80</sup> A.J. Wensinck suggested that 'Iyād in his theological treatise *al-I'lām bi-ḥudūd qawā'id al-islām*<sup>81</sup> was very influenced by this *risāla*, particularly in the fourty propositions on the

74 Ibid., 209.

75 IBN 'IYĀD, *al-Ta'rīf*, 4-5.

76 SERRANO, "Los Banū 'Iyād," 362-364.

77 Ibid., 364, footnote 54.

78 AL-QĀDĪ 'IYĀD, *Tartīb al-madārik*, I: 47.

79 Ibid., I: 53. See also Umar F. Abd-Allah WYMAN-LANDGRAF, *Mālik and Medina: Islamic Legal Reasoning in the Formative Period*, Leiden: Brill, 2013: 15.

80 HOURANI, "A Revised Chronology of Ghazālī's Writings," 289-302, 295-296.

81 AL-QĀDĪ 'IYĀD, *al-I'lām bi-ḥudūd qawā'id al-islām*, eds. Muḥammad Ṣadiq al-MINSHĀWĪ and Muḥammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'ABD AL-MUN'IM, Cairo: Dār al-Faḍīla, 1995.

*shahādatayn*.<sup>82</sup> I have not found any textual evidence that ‘Iyāḍ read the *risāla* as a separate text, but he may have read it as part of the *Ihyā’*. One of ‘Iyāḍ’s contemporaries and close contacts who met al-Ghazālī was the Sevillian Mālikī scholar Ibn al-‘Arabī (d. 543/1148). During his journey east along with his father, Ibn al-‘Arabī met many of the great scholars. The then less than twenty-year old Ibn al-‘Arabī became for a period of time one of al-Ghazālī’s closest students, and he read the newly composed, or possibly not yet completed, *Ihyā’* in Baghdad in 490/1097.<sup>83</sup> Subsequently, he introduced the *Ihyā’* into the West when he returned to Sevilla in 495/1102, and he may have conveyed some of its content or given the young student ‘Iyāḍ the chance to copy some notes in Ceuta when possibly stopping there on his way from Fez to Seville.<sup>84</sup> Born in 468/1076, Ibn al-‘Arabī was ‘Iyāḍ’s (b. 476/1083) senior by only a few years. Later ‘Iyāḍ met him in Sevilla (during ‘Iyāḍ’s first trip to al-Andalus in 498/1104-5), and again in Cordoba (during ‘Iyāḍ’s seven-months sojourn there in 507/1113-1114), and they continued to have written contact.<sup>85</sup> ‘Iyāḍ mentions that both al-Ghazālī and Abū Bakr al-Ṭurṭūshī (d. 520/1126) were among Ibn al-‘Arabī’s teachers in the East, but he does not mention explicitly that Ibn al-‘Arabī conveyed any of either’s teachings to him.<sup>86</sup> According to Maribel Fierro, both Ibn al-‘Arabī and al-Ṭurṭūshī were initially attracted to al-Ghazālī’s doctrine, and she suggests that there was some influence in their writings, although al-Ṭurṭūshī had been unsuccessful in his attempt to meet al-Ghazālī.<sup>87</sup> ‘Iyāḍ also had personal, written contact with al-Ṭurṭūshī, who was from Tortosa in al-Andalus, but who travelled extensively in the East before settling in Alexandria where he lived most of his life.<sup>88</sup> Ibn al-‘Arabī first met al-Ṭurṭūshī in Jerusalem going East. Then, coming back from Baghdād, Ibn al-‘Arabī met al-Ṭurṭūshī again in Alexandria, and by then al-Ṭurṭūshī had become more critical to al-Ghazālī’s teachings.

<sup>82</sup> WENSINCK, *The Muslim Creed*, 272-275.

<sup>83</sup> Ibn al-‘Arabī states in *al-‘Awāṣim min al-qawāṣim* that he heard the *Ihyā’* in Baghdad in Jumādā II 490 (= May 1097) (Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd Allāh IBN al-‘ARABĪ, *al-Naṣṣ al-kāmil li-Kitāb al-‘Awāṣim min al-qawāṣim*, ed. ‘Ammār Ṭālibī, Doha: Dār al-thaqāfa, 1992: 24). On the relationship between Ibn al-‘Arabī and al-Ghazālī, see Frank GRIFFEL, *Al-Ghazālī’s Philosophical Theology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009: 62-71. George F. Hourani, thinks it most likely that the *Ihyā’* was completed before this date (George F. HOURANI, “A Revised Chronology of Ghazālī’s Writings,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 104.2 (1984): 289-302, 295-297).

<sup>84</sup> The sources do not specify how he travelled from Fez to Seville, but Ceuta was the narrowest and consequently the most common point of transfer between the two coasts (al-MARRĀKUSHĪ, *al-Mu’jam*, 253).

<sup>85</sup> AL-QĀDĪ ‘IYĀḌ, *al-Ghunya*, 66-69; IBN ‘IYĀḌ, *al-Ta’rīf*, 6-10.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>87</sup> In “Opposition to Sufism,” 185-186, FIERRO states that they tried to imitate the *Ihyā’*, but in her Introduction to al-Ṭurṭūshī’s *Kitāb al-Hawādith wa-l-bida’* she is more suggestive of a certain influence ([Abū Bakr al-ṬURṬUŠHĪ], *Abū Bakr al-Ṭurṭūshī (m. 520/1126): Kitāb al-Hawādith wa-l-bida’ = El libro de las novedades y las innovaciones*, traducción y estudio Maribel FIERRO, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto de Cooperación con el Mundo Árabe (Fuentes Árabe-Hispanas 14), 1993: 123).

<sup>88</sup> Al-Ṭurṭūshī never returned to the West (Fierro’s Introduction to [al-ṬURṬUŠHĪ], *Kitāb al-Hawādith wa-l-bida’*, 31).



Ibn al-‘Arabī later wrote at length about his meetings with al-Ghazālī and his teachings in several of his own books. In the *Qānūn al-ta’wīl* he describes their meeting and his own quest for knowledge, while in *al-‘Awāṣim min al-qawāṣim* he takes a more critical approach to al-Ghazālī’s teachings, especially in epistemological issues.<sup>89</sup> The ‘*Awāṣim* testify to the fact that Ibn al-‘Arabī’s criticism was founded on a thorough engagement with al-Ghazālī’s work. In a discussion on the relationship between knowledge (‘*ilm*) and activity (‘*amal*), Ibn al-‘Arabī holds that al-Ghazālī bases his statement on *ṣūfī* thought when he holds that knowledge is the fruit of activity (*anna ‘l-‘ilm min thamarāt al-‘amal*). However, Ibn al-‘Arabī holds, knowledge is from activity before activity (*inna ‘l-‘ilm huwa min al-‘amal qabl al-‘amal*). Although none of the jurists or the theologians reject that the purification and cleansing of the heart is the aim of the *sharī‘a*, Ibn al-‘Arabī holds, the refuted idea is that this purification in itself will impress the disciplines of knowledge upon the heart. The refutation, he says, is a sound opinion as it is well founded both intellectually (*dalīl ‘aqlī*) and in the *sharī‘a*, as well as corroborated by experience (*tajriba*).<sup>90</sup> Ibn al-‘Arabī also criticized al-Ghazālī on account of his philosophical methodology, warned against uncritical reading of his work and specifically the points where he does not refer back to both intellectually acceptable and transmitted knowledge (*naql*).<sup>91</sup> ‘Iyāḍ does not mention in the *Ghunya* that he had read any of these works, but it may be reasonable to assume that he was exposed to these discussions in one way or another and that he perhaps even took part in them.

Al-Ṭurṭūshī later wrote a critique of *Ihyā’ ‘ulūm al-dīn* in the form of a letter to an unidentified Ibn Muzaffar.<sup>92</sup> Al-Ṭurṭūshī held that al-Ghazālī’s reference to philosophy and the secret of destiny (*sirr al-qadr*) shows how he was influenced by the *ikhwān al-ṣafā’* and the *bāṭiniyya* (in spite of his later explicit refutation of their methodology in *al-Munqidh min al-ḍalāl*), and that his teaching on spiritual states (‘*ilm al-aḥwāl*) was too closely associated with the *ṣūfīs*. Even more gravely, al-Ṭurṭūshī accused al-Ghazālī of lying about the Prophet, saying that he “knows of no other book of any knowledgeable standing on the face of the earth which lies about the Prophet more than this.”<sup>93</sup> Al-Ṭurṭūshī then suggests that the *Ihyā’* could be burned, comparing it to the burning of non-conforming leaves (*ṣuḥuf*) of the Qur’ān, as a preventive measure against it landing in hands not able to identify its poison (*sumūmihi al-qātīla*). He remarks that most of the people who love the *Ihyā’* are actually good people (*ṣāliḥūn*), but lacking in knowledge.<sup>94</sup> The statement is worded like an answer to a comment: “With regard to what you have mentioned about burning the book...” (*wa-ammā mā dhakarta min iḥrāq al-kitāb...*). We do not know if the statement is an answer to an actual comment, or if it is here a conventional formula. In the

89 IBN al-‘ARABĪ, *Kitāb al-‘Awāṣim min al-qawāṣim*, cf. SERRANO, “Why Did the Scholars of al-Andalus Distrust al-Ghazālī?” 150-151; GRIFFEL, *Al-Ghazālī*, 66-67. Fierro holds that Ibn al-‘Arabī also refuted al-Ghazālī in his *Sirāj al-murīdīn* ([al-Ṭurṭūshī], *Kitāb al-Ḥawādith wa-l-bida’*, 60).

90 IBN al-‘ARABĪ, *Kitāb al-‘Awāṣim min al-qawāṣim*, 16-18.

91 Ibid., 78, 80 and 92.

92 The letter is edited in GHRĀB, “Ḥawla iḥrāq al-murābiṭīn li-*Ihyā’* al-Ghazālī,” 158-163.

93 Ibid., 160.

94 Ibid., 162-163.

first case, it is possible that al-Ṭurṭūshī had been asked to comment upon something that had already occurred just as much as it could be seeking his advice, or even a formal *fatwā*.

Al-Ṭurṭūshī figures prominently in ‘Iyād’s *Ghunya*. ‘Iyād conducted written communication with him and received written authorization from him for all his transmissions and works (*kataba ilayya yujizunī jamī‘a riwāyātihi wa-taṣānīfih*), but there is no mention of a reading or refutation of al-Ghazālī.<sup>95</sup> However, al-Ṭurṭūshī’s letter to Ibn Muẓaffar sums up the main accusations presented against al-Ghazālī in the West, and these are points that may have come up in his communication with ‘Iyād as well. According to al-Subkī, this criticism predates the criticism of another of ‘Iyād’s contacts, al-Māziri.<sup>96</sup> But al-Subkī held that whereas al-Ṭurṭūshī’s criticism was ridden by absurdities and *wiswās*,<sup>97</sup> al-Māziri raised a scholarly criticism to which al-Subkī replied in detail.

This Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Māziri (d. 536/1141) is the last among ‘Iyād’s contacts whom he reports in the *Ghunya* to have been in contact with al-Ghazālī. Kenneth Garden has argued that both al-Māziri al-Dhakī (d. 510/1116) and Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Māziri were among al-Ghazālī’s critics, the first as an anonymous critic and the second as the writer of the critique *al-Kashf wa’l-anbā’ ‘an mutarjim al-Ihyā’*.<sup>98</sup> According to Garden, ‘Iyād’s entry on al-Māziri al-Dhakī in *Tartīb al-madārik* is the earliest and most detailed account of this Qayrawānī scholar’s experiences in the East, where he found Mālikī teaching in decline.<sup>99</sup> ‘Iyād mentions al-Māziri al-Dhakī’s confrontation with al-Ghazālī, and this may put him among the group that was involved in a failed campaign against al-Ghazālī in Nīshāpūr around the year 500/1106-1107.

The other al-Māziri, Abū ‘Abd Allāh from Ifrīqiyya, was ‘Iyād’s senior by some thirty years, and ‘Iyād describes him as the most insightful of the Mālikī *madhhab* in his time, as well as a scholar of *ḥadīth*, medicine, mathematics and philology. ‘Iyād says he wrote to him from Mahdiyya with an *ijāza* for his book *al-Mu‘lim fī sharḥ Muslim*,<sup>100</sup> which ‘Iyād later expanded upon in his own *Ikmāl al-mu‘lim bi-fawā’id Muslim*. According to ‘Iyād, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Māziri wrote an explanation of *al-Burḥān fī uṣūl al-fiqh*, a work by al-Ghazālī’s teacher al-Juwaynī (d. 478/1085), but ‘Iyād does not mention this work or any critique of al-Ghazālī among al-Māziri’s books.

95 Al-QĀDĪ ‘IYĀD, *al-Ghunya*, 64.

96 Al-SUBKĪ, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi‘iyya*, III: 445.

97 Ibid., III: 451.

98 Kenneth GARDEN, “al-Māziri al-Dhakī: al-Ghazālī’s Maghribi adversary in Nishapur,” *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 21.1 (2010): 89-107, 94. As noted by GARDEN (p. 104, footnote 61), there are a number of different variants of this title: *al-Kashf wa-l-anbā’ (or inbā’) ‘alā (or ‘an) al-mutarjam bi- (or Kitāb) al-Ihyā’*. See also GARDEN, *The First Islamic Reviver*. Apparently, even a third party, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Māziri al-Qurashī al-Iskandarī (d. 530/1135), was a critic of al-Ghazālī, but he is not relevant to the history of ‘Iyād (GHRĀB, “Ḥawla ihrāq al-murābiṭīn li-Ihyā’ al-Ghazālī,” 137).

99 Al-QĀDĪ ‘IYĀD, *Tartīb al-madārik*, VIII: 101-103; cf. GARDEN, “al-Māziri al-Dhakī,” 97-102.

100 Al-QĀDĪ ‘IYĀD, *al-Ghunya*, 65.

## Conclusion

Al-Ghazālī was well known to 'Iyāḍ, as were the controversies surrounding his work. However, except for the few remarks on al-Ghazālī's misunderstanding concerning the Medianan *ijmā'*, 'Iyāḍ does not disclose much detail on his own involvement either with al-Ghazālī's work or in the controversies around his work.<sup>101</sup> The allegations of 'Iyāḍ's direct intervention in the matter appear only in later sources. Al-Sha'rānī's (d. 973/1565) *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* and Ibn al-'Imād's (d. 1089/1679) *Shadharāt al-dhahab fī akhbār man dhahab* appear to be the earliest accounts to suggest that 'Iyāḍ may have had a role in or even an opinion on the condemnation and burning of al-Ghazālī's *Ihyā'* or other of his works. Neither of the two authors provides any sources for their statements about 'Iyāḍ. Moreover, they are separated not only by almost a century, but also by style, tone and the direct wording of their accounts. However, as we have seen, al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348) had introduced 'Iyāḍ's name into the topic, if only as a reporter of the events.

Gómez-Rivas suggests that these allegations should be interpreted as “a gloss on 'Iyāḍ's perceived close ties to the pro-Mālikī Almoravid dynasty and his subsequent fate at the hands of the anti-Mālikī Almohads.”<sup>102</sup> As Safran holds, “The memory of the burning of al-Ghazālī's book proved a powerful way for the Almohads to define their regime in opposition to the Almoravids.”<sup>103</sup> Sa'd Ghrāb also suggests that both the ban and the burning could be politically motivated allegations on part of the Almohads, with no historical basis, although he admits the possibility that the incident did take place.<sup>104</sup> However, the available Almohad sources do not mention that 'Iyāḍ had any role in the incidents, and it is questionable whether the North African ideological and historical context of the twelfth century was of primary concern to either al-Sha'rānī or Ibn al-'Imād, let alone to the even later al-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1790). Al-Zabīdī had many contacts from North Africa: official contacts, scholars, and people of learning and culture, some of whom were linked to the Sufī *zāwiyas*,<sup>105</sup> and by al-Zabīdī's day, 'Iyāḍ had already been fully restored as one of the seven saints of Marrakesh by the second Alaouite ruler, Maulay Ismā'īl Ibn Sharīf (r. 1082-1139/1672-1727).<sup>106</sup>

Although the early historical sources do not present much detail on the subject, the strong objections in the West to al-Ghazālī's work were presumably common knowledge. 'Iyāḍ did refer to al-Ghazālī's misgivings regarding the Mālikī view of Medianan *ijmā'*, but he does not seem to have been among his fiercest critics nor does he mention having read his work in his autobiographical catalogue, the *Ghunya*, 'Iyāḍ's last work to be completed less than a year before he died. Even if 'Iyāḍ had withheld a criticism of al-Ghazālī's work

101 The only other reference to al-Ghazālī in the *Tartīb* is a reference to his book *Ādāb al-ṣuḥba*. Al-QĀDĪ 'IYĀḌ, *Tartīb al-madārik*, IV: 160.

102 GÓMEZ-RIVAS, “Qādī 'Iyāḍ (d. 544/1149),” 327; ID., *Law and the Islamization*, 119.

103 SAFRAN, “The politics of book burning,” 155.

104 GHRĀB, “Ḥawla iḥrāq al-murābiṭīn li-*Ihyā'* al-Ghazālī,” 151, 155.

105 REICHMUTH, *The World of Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī*, 182-189.

106 Mariette ERRAZKI-VAN BEEK, “The Seven Saints of Marrakesh: Tales and Traditions,” *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic*, 9-10 (1994): 211-224.

in order to strengthen his case with the new rulers, there was certainly no reason why he should have refrained from reading and engaging with his work. The concrete incidents of condemnation and burning or the order to burn his work in the early twelfth century were fairly known to the later scholarly community, but not necessarily in detail. Thus, until further historical sources potentially may shed some more light on the issue, ‘Iyād’s alleged role in condemning, outlawing or burning al-Ghazālī’s work *Ihyā’ ‘ulūm al-dīn* must be understood as a mix-up of historical facts, anecdotes and overly interpretative assumptions, chiefly motivated by concerns not related to ‘Iyād’s work, biography or legacy.

## References

- ARABI, Oussama, David Stephan POWERS, and Susan Ann SPECTORSKY (eds.). 2013. *Islamic Legal Thought: A Compendium of Muslim Jurists*. Brill, Leiden.
- ÁVILA NAVARRO, María Luisa, and María Isabel FIERRO BELLO (eds.). 1999. *Biografías almohades I*. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid.
- BENNISON, Amira K. 2016. *The Almoravid and Almohad Empires*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- CABANELAS, Dario. 1952. “Notas para la historia de Algazel en España.” *al-Andalus*, 17.1: 223-232.
- CASEWIT, Yousef. 2017. *The Mystics of al-Andalus: Ibn Barrajan and Islamic thought in the twelfth century*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- al-DHAHABĪ, Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad. *Siyar a’lām al-nubalā’* / ed. Shu’ayb al-ARNĀ’ŪT, 23 vols. Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1985.
- DE JONG, Frederick, and Bernd RADTKE (eds.). 1999. *Islamic Mysticism Contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*. Brill, Leiden.
- EGGEN, Nora S. 2018. “In defence of the Prophet, and of scholarly tradition: al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād’s *al-Shifā’ bi-ta’rīf ḥuqūq al-muṣṭafā* – The Healing in Knowing the Rights of the Chosen One.” In MOE (et al., eds.) 2018 (forthcoming).
- EL HOUR, Rachid. 2000. “The Andalusian Qāḍī in the Almoravid Period: Political and Judicial Authority.” *Studia Islamica*, 90: 67-83.
- ERRAZKI-VAN BEEK, Mariette. 1994. “The Seven Saints of Marrakesh: Tales and Traditions.” *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic*, 9-10: 211-224.
- FAHD, Badrī Muḥammad. 1980. “Kitāb al-shifā’ bi-ta’rīf ḥuqūq al-muṣṭafā.” *al-Manāhil*, 19: 488-535.
- FIERRO, Maribel. 1997. “La religion.” In VIGERUA MOLÍNS (ed.) 1997: 483-495.
- . 1999. “Opposition to Sufism in al-Andalus.” In DE JONG & RADTKE (eds.) 1999: 174-206.
- FLETCHER, Madeleine. 1997. “Ibn Tūmart’s teachers: the relationship with al-Ghazālī.” *al-Qanṭara*, 18.2: 305-330.
- FROMHERZ, Allen J. 2010. *The Almohads: The Rise of an Islamic Empire*. I.B. Tauris, London & New York.
- GARDEN, Kenneth. 2010. “al-Māziri al-Dhakī: al-Ghazālī’s Maghribi adversary in Nishapur.” *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 21.1: 89-107.
- . 2014. *The First Islamic Reviver: Abū Ḥāmid Al-Ghazālī and His Revival of the Religious Sciences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- GARCÍA-ARENAL, Mercedes. 2006. *Messianism and Puritanical Reform: Mahdīs of the Muslim West*. Brill, Leiden.
- al-GHAZĀLĪ, Abū Hāmid Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad. *Iḥyā' 'ulūm al-dīn*, 5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2001.
- GHRĀB, Sa'd. 1983. "Ḥawla iḥrāq al-Murābiṭīn li-Iḥyā' al-Ghazālī." *Actas del IV Coloquio Hispano-Tunecino*. Madrid: Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura, 1983: 133-163.
- GÓMEZ-RIVAS, Camilo. 2013. "Qādī 'Iyād (d. 544/1149)." In ARABI / POWERS / SPECTORSKY (eds.) 2013: 323-338.
- . 2014. *Law and the Islamization of Morocco under the Almoravids: The Fatwās of Ibn Rushd al-Jadd to the Far Maghrib*. Brill, Leiden.
- GRIFFEL, Frank. 2009. *Al-Ghazālī's Philosophical Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HOURLANI, George F. 1984. "A Revised Chronology of Ghazālī's Writings." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 104.2: 289-302.
- IBN al-ABBĀR. *al-Mu'jam fī aṣḥāb al-qādī al-imām Abī 'Alī al-Ṣadafi* / ed. Ibrāhīm al-ABYĀRĪ. Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Miṣrī / Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1989.
- IBN al-AḤMAR, Ismā'īl. 1972. *Buyūtāt Fās al-kubrā*. Rabat: Dār al-Manṣūr lil-ṭibā'a wa'l-warāqa.
- IBN al-'ARABĪ, Muḥammad Ibn 'Abd Allāh. *al-Naṣṣ al-kāmil li-Kitāb al-'Awāṣim min al-qawāsim* / ed. 'Ammār TĀLIBĪ. Doha: Dār al-Thaqāfa, 1992.
- . 1970. *Risālat rūḥ al-quḍus fī muḥāsabat al-naṣṣ wa'l-mabādī' wa'l-ghāyāt fī-mā tataḍammanuhu ḥurūf al-mu'jam min al-'ajā'ib wa'l-āyāt*, ed. 'Izzat ḤUSRIYYA. Damascus: Maṭba'at al-'Ilm.
- IBN BASHKUWĀL. *Kitāb al-ṣila* / ed. Ibrāhīm al-ABYĀRĪ, 3 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Miṣrī / Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1989.
- IBN FARḤŪN. *al-Dībāj al-mudhahab fī ma'rīfat a'yān 'ulamā' al-madhhab* / ed. Muḥammad al-Aḥmadī ABŪ 'L-NŪR, 2 vols. Cairo, Dār al-turāth, 1972.
- IBN al-'IMĀD, 'Abd al-Ḥayy Ibn Aḥmad. *Shadharāt al-dhahab fī akhbār man dhahab* / eds. 'Abd al-Qādir al-ARNĀ'ŪT and Maḥmūd al-ARNĀ'ŪT, 10 vols. Damascus & Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1986-1993.
- IBN 'IYĀD, Muḥammad. *al-Ta'rīf bi'l-qādī 'Iyād* / ed. Muḥammad IBN SHARĪFA. Rabat: Wizārāt al-Awqāf wa'l-shu'ūn al-islāmiyya, 1982.
- . *Madhāhib al-ḥukkām fī nawāzil al-aḥkām* / ed. Muḥammad IBN SHARĪFA. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, (1990) 1997.
- . 1998. *al-Ḥukkām fī nawāzil al-aḥkām = La actuación de los jueces en los procesos judiciales* (Fuentes árabe-hispanas 22), [transl.] Delfina SERRANO. Madrid: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional.
- IBN KHALLIKĀN. *Wafayāt al-a'yān wa-anbā' abnā' al-zamān* / ed. Yūsuf 'Alī ṬAWĪL and Maryam Qāsim ṬAWĪL, 6 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1998.
- . *Wafayāt al-a'yān wa-anbā' abnā' az-zamān (Deaths of Eminent Men and History of the Sons of the Epoch)* / transl. MAC GUCKIN DE SLANE, 4 vols. Beirut: Librarie du Liban, 1970.
- IBN KHĀQĀN. *Qalā'id al-'iqyān wa-maḥāsin al-a'yān* / ed. Ḥusayn Yūsuf KHARYŪSH. Zarqā' (Jordan): Maktabat al-manār, 1989.
- IBN al-KHAṬĪB. *al-Iḥāṭa fī akhbār Gharnāṭa* / ed. Būziyānī al-DARĀJĪ. Algiers: Dār al-Amal li'l-dirāsāt, 2009.
- [IBN TŪMART. *Kitāb a'azz mā yuṭlab.*] *Le livre de Mohammed Ibn Toumert* / ed. I. GOLDZIEHER. Alger: Imprimerie Orientale Pierra Fontana.
- IBN ṬUMLŪS, Yūsuf. *al-Madkhal li-ṣinā'at al-manṭiq* / ed. Mīkā'īl ASĪN. Madrid: al-Maktaba al-Abīriqa, 1916.

- LAGARDÈRE, Vincent. 1986. "La haute judicature à l'époque almoravide en al-Andalus." *al-Qanṭara*, 7.1: 135-228.
- LEVI-PROVENÇAL, E. 1955. "Le titre souverain des Almoravides et sa légitimation par le califat 'abbaside." *Arabica*, 2: 265-280.
- MACDONALD, Duncan B. 1899. "The Life of al-Ghazzālī, with Especial Reference to His Religious Experiences and Opinions." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 20: 71-132.
- al-MAQQARĪ al-TILMISĀNĪ, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad. *Azhār al-Riyāḍ fī akhbār al-Qāḍī 'Iyād* / ed. Muṣṭafā al-SAQQĀ, Ibrāhīm al-ABYĀRĪ and 'Abd al-Ḥafīz SHIBLĪ, 5 vols. Cairo: Maṭbū'āt Lajnat al-ta'līf wa'l-tarjama wa'l-nashr, [1939-1942].
- al-MARRĀKUSHĪ, 'Abd al-Wāhid. *al-Mu'jam fī talkhīṣ akhbār al-Maghrib* / ed. Khalīl 'Imrān al-MANṢŪR. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1998. – Transl. in E. FAGNAN, *Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne intitulée al-Bayano l-Mogrib*. Algiers: Imprimerie Oriental P. Fontana, 1901-1904.
- . *Nuḥum al-jumān li-tartīb mā salafa min akhbār al-zamān* / ed. Maḥmūd 'Alī MAKKĪ. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1990.
- MOE, Christian, Kari VOGT, Lena LARSEN, and Khalid Muhammad MASUD (eds.). [2018, forthcoming]. *Freedom of Expression in Islam: Challenging Apostasy and Blasphemy Laws*. I.B. Tauris, London.
- MU'NIS, Ḥusayn. 1955. "Nuṣūṣ siyāsiyya 'an fatrat al-intiqāl min al-murābiṭīn ilā 'l-muwaḥḥidīn." *Revista del Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islámicos*, 3.1: 97-140.
- al-QĀDĪ 'IYĀD. *al-Ghunya: Fihrist shuyūkh al-Qāḍī 'Iyād* / ed. Māhir Zuhayr JARRĀR. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1982.
- . *al-Ilām bi-ḥudūd qawā'id al-islām* / ed. Muḥammad Ṣadīq al-MINSHĀWĪ and Muḥammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'ABD AL-MUN'IM. Cairo: Dār al-Faḍīla, 1995.
- . *Tartīb al-madārik wa-taqrīb al-masālik li-ma'rīfat a'lām madhhab Mālik*. 8 vols. / ed. Muḥammad Bin Tāwīt al-TANJĪ (vol. I), 'Abd al-Qādir al-ṢAHRĀWĪ (vols. II-IV), Muḥammad IBN SHARĪFA (vol. V), and Sa'īd Aḥmad A'RĀB (vols. VI-VIII). Rabat: Wizārāt al-Awqāf wa'l-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyya, 1983.
- REICHMUTH, Stefan. 2009. *The World of Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī (1732-91): Life, Networks and Writings*. E.J. Gibb Memorial Trust, Cambridge.
- SAFRAN, Janina M. 2014. "The politics of book burning in al-Andalus." *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 6.2: 148-168.
- SERRANO RUANO, Delfina. 2006. "Why Did the Scholars of al-Andalus Distrust al-Ghazālī? Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's *Fatwā* on *Awliyā' Allāh*." *Der Islam*, 83.1: 137-156.
- SERRANO, Delfina. 1999. "Los Banū 'Iyād (de la caída del imperio almorávid a la instauración de la dinastía nazarí)." In ÁVILA NAVARRO & FIERRO BELLO (eds.) 1999: 351-406.
- . 2000. "Legal Practice in an Andalusī-Maghribī Source from the Twelfth Century CE: The Madhāhib al-ḥukkām fī nawāzil al-aḥkām." *Islamic Law and Society*, 7.2: 187-234.
- al-SHA'RĀNĪ, 'Abd al-Wahhāb. *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* (= *Lawāqih al-anwār al-quḍsiyya fī manāqib al-'ulamā' wa'l-ṣūfiyya*) / ed. Aḥmad 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-SĀYIḤ and Tawfīq 'Alī WAHBA, 2 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya, 2005.
- al-SUBKĪ, Tāj al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb. *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi'iyya al-kubrā* / ed. Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Qādir 'ATĀ, 6 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1999.
- al-SUYŪṬĪ, Jalāl al-Dīn. *Manāhil al-safā' fī takhrīj aḥādīth al-Shifā' bi-ta'rīf ḥuqūq al-muṣṭafā lil-qāḍī 'Iyād*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-kutub al-thaqāfiyya; Dār al-Jinān, 1988.
- al-TĀDILĪ, Yūsuf Ibn Yahyā Ibn al-Zayyāt. *al-Tashawwuf ilā rijāl al-taṣawwuf wa-akhbār Abī 'l-*

- ‘*Abbās al-Sabtī* / ed. Aḥmad TAWFĪQ. Rabat: Kulliyat al-Ādāb wa’l-‘Ulūm al-Insāniyya, 1984.
- [al-ṬURTŪSHI, Abū Bakr]. *Abū Bakr al-Ṭurtūšī (m. 520/1126): Kitāb al-Hawādiṭ wa-l-bida’ = El libro de las novedades y las innovaciones* / Traducción y estudio Maribel FIERRO. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto de Cooperación con el Mundo Árabe, 1993 (Fuentes Árabe-Hispanas; 14).
- URVOY, Dominique. 1993. “Le Manuscrit Ar. 1483 de l’Escorial et la Polemique contre Gazālī dans al-Andalus.” *Arabica*, 40.1: 114-119.
- VIGERUA MOLÍNS, María Jesús (ed.). 1997. *El retroceso territorial de al-Andalus. Almorávides y almohades: Siglos XI al XIII*. Espasa Calpe, Madrid.
- VIGUERA, María J. 1977. “Las cartas de al-Gazālī y al-Ṭurtūšī al soberano almorávid Yūsuf b. Tāšufīn.” *al-Andalus*, 42.2: 341-374.
- al-WANSHARISĪ, Aḥmad Ibn Yahyā. *Mi’yār al-mu’rib wa’l-jāmi’ al-mughrib ‘an fatāwā ahl Ifrīqiyyā wa’l-Andalus wa’l-Maghrib* / ed. Muḥammad ḤAJJĪ, 13 vols. Fez: Wizārat al-Awqāf wa’l-Shu’ūn al-Islāmiyya lil-Mamlaka al-Maghribiyya, 1981.
- WENSINCK, A. J. 1932. *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historic Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- VIZCAÍNO, Juan M. 1991. “Las obras de *zuhd* en al-Andalus.” *al-Qanṭara*, 12.2: 417-438.
- WINTER, Michael. 1982. *Society and Religion in Early Ottoman Egypt: Studies in the Writings of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha’rānī*. Transaction Books, New Brunswick.
- WYMANN-LANDGRAF, Umar F. Abd-Allah. 2013. *Mālik and Medina: Islamic Legal Reasoning in the Formative Period*. Leiden: Brill.
- al-ZABĪDĪ, Murtaḍā. *Ithāf al-sāda al-muttaqīn bi-sharḥ Ihyā’ ‘ulūm al-dīn*, 13 vols. Miṣr: al-Maṭba‘a al-Maymaniyya, 1311 [=1893-4].