

sought him out at Medina during the *ḥadīdī* (probably of 198), preferring him as *imām* to the Ḥasanid 'Abd Allāh b. Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh and to the Ḥusaynid 'Alī b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan, who refused to become involved personally in an armed conflict, in accordance with the usual attitude of the Ahl al-Bayt. Once in 'Irāk, Ibn Ṭabāṭabā encountered the opposition of Naṣr's collaborators, who seem to have abandoned him and offered him as compensation the sum of 5,000 *dīnārs*, which he refused. Returning towards the Ḥijāz, Ibn Ṭabāṭabā stopped at 'Ānāt, where he succeeded in contacting Abu 'l-Sarāyā, who was engaged in organizing the revolt. While the 'Alid was with difficulty gathering together a few inadequately armed citizens at Kūfa, where he had immediately gone, Abu 'l-Sarāyā was arming a small group of Zaydis around the tomb of al-Ḥusayn, and arrived on the day appointed in the suburb of Kūfa chosen in advance. The two groups went together towards the town, where Abu 'l-Sarāyā pronounced a *khutba* which included all the Mu'tazili principles, the ideological basis of the Zaydi revolts; then he obtained, with some difficulty, the investiture of his leader (in the '*Umda: amīr al-mu'minīn*') on 10 Djumādā I 199/27 December 814, as had been predicted by a *ḥadīth* going back to Zayd b. 'Alī.

The revolt went through various phases; it began with some victories due in part to the negligence of the enemy commander, al-Ḥasan b. Sahl, who was occupied in studying the horoscope of the 'Alid. But Ibn Ṭabāṭabā, merely the nominal leader of the revolt, played only a small part in this event, although some sources mention his receiving a wound outside the gate of Kūfa. The 'Alid, gravely ill, or rather, according to al-Ṭabari, poisoned by Abu 'l-Sarāyā himself, welcomed the latter after the victory over al-Ḥasan b. Sahl, but reproached him for having organized night attacks. However, he expressed to him his last wishes, in particular concerning the new *imām*, who was to be 'Alī b. 'Ubayd Allāh. Although such a definite nomination might have been expected to give rise to contradictory proposals, 'Alī b. 'Ubayd Allāh found himself with the task of choosing the new *imām*, he himself having refused this position on the grounds that others were more entitled to it; he proposed Muḥammad b. Zayd, who, with the assent of Abu 'l-Sarāyā, was elected.

Bibliography: Abu 'l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, *Maḳātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn*, Cairo 1368/1949, 518-36; Ibn 'Inaba, '*Umdat al-ṭālib fi ansāb al-Abi Ṭālib*, Naḍīf 1337/1918, 161; Muḥammad 'Alī Tabrizī, *Rayḥānat al-ādab*, vi, Tabriz 1333/1955, 62-4; C. van Arendonk, *Les débuts de l'Imamat zaidite au Yémen*, Leiden 1960, 95-101.

(B. SCARCIA AMORETTI)

IBN TAGHRIBIRDĪ [see ABU 'L-MAḤĀSIN].

IBN TAYMIYYA, ṬAQĪ AL-DĪN AḤMAD IBN TAYMIYYA, born at Harrān on 10 Rabī' I 661/22 January 1263 and died at Damascus on 20 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 728/26 September 1328, Ḥanballi theologian and jurisconsult. Belonging to a family which had already given to this school two well-known scholars, his uncle Fakhr al-Dīn (d. 622/1225) and his paternal grandfather Maḍīd al-Dīn (d. 653/1255), Ibn Taymiyya was forced to leave his native town in 667/1269 before the approach of the Mongols and to take refuge in Damascus with his father 'Abd al-Ḥalīm (d. 682/1284) and his three brothers. It was at Damascus, where his father was the director of the Sukkariyya *madrasa*, that he was educated; among his teachers was Shams al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Maḳḍisī (d. 682/1283), who was the

first Ḥanballi *ḥādī al-ḥudāt* of Syria after the reform of the judiciary by Baybars. He succeeded his father in his office at the Sukkariyya and, on 2 Muḥarram 683/21 March 1284, gave his first lesson there. One year later, on 10 Ṣafar 684/17 April 1285, he began to teach Qur'ānic exegesis at the Umayyad Mosque.

He performed the Pilgrimage to Mecca towards the end of 691/November 1292 and was back in Damascus in 692/February 1293, bringing with him from this journey the subject matter of his treatise on the *Manāsik al-ḥadīdī* in which he denounced a certain number of *bid'as* in the ritual of the Pilgrimage (MRK, ii, 365-401).

Ibn Taymiyya's first incursion into political life took place in 693/1293, at the time of the affair of 'Assāf al-Naṣrānī, a Christian of Suwaydā' who was accused of having insulted the Prophet: Ibn Taymiyya's intransigence in this affair led to his being imprisoned for the first time, at the 'Adh-rā-wiyya. On this occasion he wrote his first great work, the *K. al-Sārim al-maslūl 'alā shātim al-Rasūl* (Haydarābād 1322/1905).

On 17 Sha'bān 695/20 June 1296, Ibn Taymiyya began to teach at the Ḥanbaliyya, the oldest Ḥanbali *madrasa* of Damascus, where he succeeded one of his teachers, Zayn al-Dīn Ibn al-Munadīdī, who had just died.

During the reign of al-Malik al-Manṣūr Lādīn (696-8/1297-9) he was appointed by the sultan to exhort the faithful to the *djihād* at the time of the expedition undertaken by the sultan against the kingdom of Little Armenia. At almost the same time, in 698/1299, he wrote, at the request of the people of Ḥamāt, one of his most famous professions of faith, *al-Ḥamawīyya al-kubrā*, very hostile to Ash'arism and to *kalām* (MRK, i, 414-69).

Accused by his enemies of anthropomorphism (*tashbīh*), Ibn Taymiyya refused to appear before the Ḥanafī *ḥādī* Djalāl al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Rāzī (d. 745/1344-5), on the grounds that this *ḥādī* had not received from the sultan powers of jurisdiction in matters of dogma. After a private meeting, held in the house of the Shāfi'ī *ḥādī* Imām al-Dīn 'Umar al-Kazwīnī (d. 699/1299-1300), at which the *Ḥamawīyya* was studied, Ibn Taymiyya, whose replies are said to have been judged satisfactory, was troubled no further.

During the Mongol invasion in 699/1300, led by the Ilkhān Ghāzān with the support of the Mamlūk *amīr* Kibḍjak, Ibn Taymiyya was, at Damascus, one of the spokesmen of the resistance party. In addition, he took part, in Shawwāl 699/June 1300, in the expedition which the Mamlūk authorities undertook against the Shī'is of Kasrawān who were accused of helping the Franks and the Mongols.

In 700/1300, when a new Mongol threat arose, he was instructed to exhort people to the *djihād* and went to Cairo, in Djumādā I 700/January 1301, to ask the Mamlūk sultan Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn to intervene in Syria. In 702/1303, at the time of the new Mongol invasion, he was present at the victory of Shaḳḳab, on 4 Ramaḍān 702/22 April 1303, where he had been instructed to issue a *fatwā* on the dispensation from the duty of fasting for those who were fighting.

The years which followed were marked by intense polemic activity. In 704/1305, he attacked a certain Ibrāhīm al-Qattān, accused of using *hashīsh*, and another *shaykh*, Muḥammad al-Khabbāz, who was accused, among other things, of antinomianism. At about the same time he went with some stone-

masons to smash a sacred rock in the mosque of al-Narandj (*Bidāya*, xiv, 34). He also took up arms against the Itihādīyya, supporters of Ibn al-ʿArabi (d. 638/1240-1), and sent to one of their most prominent members, the *shaykh* Naṣr al-Dīn al-Manbidjī, the spiritual director of Baybars al-Djāshnikir, a letter which was courteous, but nevertheless firmly condemned the monism of Ibn al-ʿArabi (*MRM*, i, 161-83). Towards the end of the year 704/July 1305, he took part in a new expedition against the *Rawāfiḍ* of Kasrawān and, on his return, attacked in Damascus the Aḥmadiyya Rifāʿiyya, whose *shaykh* was accused of Mongol sympathies (*MRM*, i, 121-46).

His enemies then renewed their attacks on his *credo* and cast doubts on the correctness of his profession of faith *al-Wāsiṭiyya*, written shortly before the arrival of the Mongols in Damascus. Two councils were held on 8 and 12 Rājab 705/24 and 28 January 1306, at the residence of the governor of Damascus, al-Afram. The second council, a member of which was Šāfi al-Dīn al-Hindī (d. 715/1315), a pupil of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209-10), found that the *Wāsiṭiyya* "was in conformity with the *Kurʾān* and the *Sunna*".

The affair seemed to be finished. However the *Shāfiʿī kādī* Ibn al-Šarṣarī (d. 723/1323), a pupil of Maḥmūd al-Šfahānī (d. 688/1289), set about re-opening it, having several of Ibn Taymiyya's pupils beaten and imprisoning the traditionalist al-Mizzī (d. 743/1342-3). A third council was held at the governor's residence on 7 Šaʿbān 705/22 February 1306, on the sultan's orders. Again the *Wāsiṭiyya* was not condemned, and Ibn al-Šarṣarī resigned. The two adversaries were finally sent to Cairo, where they arrived on 22 Ramaḍān 705/7 April 1306.

The very day after his arrival, Ibn Taymiyya appeared before a new council which was held in the Citadel and consisted of a number of high officials of the state and the four *kādīs* 'l-*ḥudāt* of Egypt. Ibn Taymiyya was accused of anthropomorphism and condemned to imprisonment. He remained in the Citadel of Cairo for nearly a year and a half, until 26 Rabiʿ I 707/25 September 1307. He was released on the intervention of the *amir* Salār, the rival of Baybars al-Djāshnikir, and of the Bedouin *amir* Muḥannāb b. ʿIsā (d. 736/1335-6), for whom he wrote, at a date not known, *al-ʿAḥdā al-tadmu-riyya* (Cairo 1325/1908).

Granted his liberty, but not authorized to return to Syria, Ibn Taymiyya, who continued to denounce all the innovations (*bidʿa*) which he regarded as heretical, soon encountered the opposition of two of the most influential Šūfis of Egypt: Ibn ʿAṭāʾ Allāh (d. 709/1309-10), a pupil of Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Mursī, and Karīm al-Dīn al-Amulī (d. 710/1310-11), the head of the *Dār Saʿīd al-suʿadāʾ*. Following a popular demonstration, he was summoned, in Shawwāl 707/end of March 1308, before the *Shāfiʿī kādī* Badr al-Dīn Ibn Djāmāʾa, who questioned him on his interpretation of the doctrine of the intercession of the saints (*tawassul*; *istiḡātha*). He was authorized to return to Syria but was nevertheless held in Cairo and imprisoned for several months in the prison of the *kādīs*.

The coming to power of Baybars al-Djāshnikir, proclaimed sultan in 708/1309, was to re-open a period of persecutions. On the last night of Šafar 709/7-8 August 1309, Ibn Taymiyya was taken, under strong guard, to Alexandria, where he was put under house arrest. Lodged in a tower of the sultan's palace, permitted to receive visits and to write,

Ibn Taymiyya, during the seven months which his exile was to last, was able to meet at Alexandria Maghribis who were passing through, and wrote some important works, among them a long refutation (now lost) of the *Murshida* of Ibn Tūmār, and the *Radd ʿala ʿl-Manṭiqiyyīn* (Bombay 1368/1949). Restored to the throne on 1 Shawwāl 709/4 March 1310, Muḥammad b. Kalāwūn released Ibn Taymiyya and received him in audience in Cairo (*Bidāya*, xiv, 53-4).

Ibn Taymiyya was back in Cairo on 8 Shawwāl 709/11 March 1310 and remained there again for about three years. He was occasionally consulted by Muḥammad b. Kalāwūn (al-Malik al-Nāṣir) on Syrian affairs and continued to teach privately and to give answers to the various enquiries which were addressed to him. It was at this time that he began, if not the final redaction, at least the development of his treatise on juridical policy, the *Kitāb al-Siyāsa al-šarʿiyya*, the date of which may be put at between 711/1311 and 714/1315 (cf. the Fr. tr. by H. Laoust, Damascus (PIFD) 1948, and Eng. tr. by Omar A. Farrukh, Beirut 1966; latest ed. by Muḥammad al-Mubārak, Beirut 1967). Several of the *Fatāwā miṣriyya* (Cairo 1368/1949) also date from this period.

A new Mongol threat, rapidly dispelled, caused Ibn Taymiyya to return to Damascus, where he arrived, after a brief stay in Jerusalem, on 1 Dhū ʿl-Ḳaʿda 712/28 February 1313. Al-Malik al-Nāṣir, who had preceded him by one week, had left on the Pilgrimage; on his return to Damascus on 11 Muḥarram 713/8 May 1313, he took various measures of administrative and financial reorganization. In addition, a new governor of Damascus, the *amir* Tankiz (d. 740/1340), had been appointed in Rabiʿ II 712/August 1312.

It was under the governorate of Tankiz that Ibn Taymiyya spent his last fifteen years. Promoted to the rank of professor, and considered by his supporters as an independent *mudjtahid*, he now had as his chief pupil Ibn Ḳayyim al-Djauziyya (d. 751/1350 [q.v.]), who did much to spread his ideas and indeed shared some of his persecution. Relations between Hanbalis and Aṣḥʿaris continued often to be strained, as is proved by the incident in Muḥarram 716/April 1316 which again saw the two schools in disagreement on the question of dogma (*Bidāya*, xiv, 75-6).

Towards the end of 716/February 1317 and in the following months, Ibn Taymiyya was involved in the affair concerning Ḥumayda, the *amir* of Mecca who had formed an agreement with the Ilkhān Khudābanda (d. 716/1316) in order that there should prevail in Mecca a policy favourable to Shiʿism; it seems to have been at about this time that Ibn Taymiyya wrote the *Minḥādī al-sunna al-nabawiyya* (Cairo 1321/1904; reprinted), in which he attacked the Imāmi theologian al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī (d. 726/1325) (cf. H. Laoust, *La critique du sunnisme dans la doctrine d'al-Ḥillī*, in *REI*, 1966, 35-60).

However the persecutions were soon to recommence. In 718/1318, a letter from the sultan forbade Ibn Taymiyya to issue any *fatwās* on repudiation (*talāk*) contrary to the prevailing Hanball doctrine; he was criticized for denying the validity of uniting three repudiations into one single one and for considering the oath (*ḥalf*) of repudiation as a single oath if the person who uttered it did not intend to proceed to an actual repudiation. Two councils were held on the matter, presided over

by Tankiz, in 718/1318 and 719/1319. A third council, held on 20 Radjab 720/26 August 1320, accused Ibn Taymiyya of infringing the sultan's prohibition and condemned him to prison.

Ibn Taymiyya was immediately arrested and imprisoned in the Citadel at Damascus, where he remained for slightly over five months, and was released, on 10 Muḥarram 721/9 February 1321, by a decree from al-Malik al-Nāṣir. He is mentioned in the years that followed as taking part in various incidents in the religious or political life of Egypt and Syria (cf. *REI*, 1960, 32-3).

On 16 Shābān 726/18 July 1326, Ibn Taymiyya was again arrested, without any further trial, and was deprived of the right to issue *fatwās* by a decree of the sultan which was read out in the Umayyad Mosque. He was criticized because of his *risāla* on visits to tombs (*ziyārat al-kubūr*) in which he condemned the cult of saints. A number of his disciples were arrested at the same time as he was but must have been released shortly afterwards except for Ibn Kayyim al-Djawiyya (the text of the *Ziyārat al-kubūr*, written before this date, is given in *MR*, 103-22).

Ibn Taymiyya then encountered the opposition of the Mālikī *ḥādī 'l-kudāt*, Taḳī al-Dīn al-Iḥnā'ī (d. 750/1349). Another influential opponent was 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Kūnawī, a disciple of Ibn al-'Arabī, who, after having been director of the Dār Sa'īd al-su'adā' in Cairo, had recently been appointed Shāfi'ī *ḥādī 'l-kudāt* at Damascus.

Ibn Taymiyya remained a prisoner in the Citadel for more than two years; he continued to write and to issue *fatwās*; there date from this period several works which have survived and which were written with the aim of justifying his doctrines, in particular the *Kitāb Ma'ārif al-uṣūl*, on the methodology of *fiqh* (*MRK*, i, 180-217), the *Raf' al-malām* (*MR*, 55-83) and the *Kitāb al-Radd 'ala 'l-Iḥnā'ī* (Cairo 1346/1928), in which he made a violent personal attack on his opponent and set out at length his ideas on the cult of saints (cf. *Essai*, 353-4).

As a result of a complaint by al-Iḥnā'ī to the sultan, the latter ordered, on 9 Djumādā II 728/21 April 1328, that Ibn Taymiyya's paper, ink and pens should be taken from him. Five months later, Ibn Taymiyya died in the Citadel, on 20 Dhū 'l-Ḳa'da 728/26 September 1328. His burial, attended by a large number of the inhabitants of Damascus, was in the cemetery of the *Ṣūfiyya*, where his tomb is still honoured.

Ibn Taymiyya's works are numerous; nearly all have now appeared in print. A list of his main works is given in the treatise by Ibn al-Kayyim entitled *Aṣmā' mu'allafāt Ibn Taymiyya* (Damascus 1372/1953); cf. Brockelmann, II, 125-7 and S II, 119-26. There should be mentioned several collections published in Cairo or in Arabia: *Maḍimū'at al-rasā'il* (abbr. as *MR* in this article, Cairo 1323/1906); *Maḍimū'at al-rasā'il al-kubrā* (abbr. *MRK*, Cairo 1326/1906, 2 vols.); *Kitāb Maḍimū'at al-fatāwa* (Cairo 1326-9/1908-11); *Maḍimū'at al-rasā'il wa 'l-masā'il* (abbr. *MRM*, Cairo (Manār press) 1349/1930, 5 vols.); and finally *Maḍimū'at fatāwā shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad Ibn Taymiyya* (Riyāḍ 1381-3/1961-4, 30 vols.).

Ibn Taymiyya's education was primarily that of a Ḥanbali theologian and jurisconsult. He possessed a very sound knowledge of all the great works of his school, from those of the imām Aḥmad (d. 240/854-5) or of al-Khallāl (d. 311/923-4) to those

of Muwaffaq al-Dīn b. Kudāma (d. 620/1223) or of his own paternal grandfather, Maḍīd al-Dīn Abu 'l-Barakāt (d. 652/1254), whose *Muḥarrar* and *Muntaḥa* formed part of the everyday reading of the Ḥanbalīs of the Mamlūk period.

To this knowledge of early and classical Ḥanbalism, he added not only that of the other schools of jurisprudence (*khilāf*), but also that of heresiographical literature (*ṣirāk*), in particular of *falsafa* and of *Ṣūfism*. Indeed, he refers to knowing and having reflected on the works of many of the *Ṣūfiyya*: Sahl al-Tustarī (d. 283/896), Djunayd (d. 290/903), Abū Ṭālib al-Makki (d. 386/996), Abū 'l-Kāsim al-Kuṣhayrī (d. 564/1169), 'Abd al-Ḳādir al-Djillī (d. 561/1166) and Abū Ḥafṣ al-Suhrawardī (d. 632/1235). He mentions also having allowed himself to be deluded, in his youth, by the *Futūḥāt* of Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 638/1240-1), before discovering how subtly heretical they were. He never condemned *Ṣūfism* in itself, but only that which he considered to be, in the case of too many *Ṣūfis*, inadmissible deviations in doctrine, ritual or morals, such as monism (*waḥdāt al-waḥdūd*), antinomianism (*ibāḥa*) or esotericism (*ghuluww*).

His doctrine was intended to be primarily, while centred on and inspired by the spirit of Ḥanbalism, a doctrine of synthesis or of conciliation—"the happy mean" (*wasaf*)—which would accord to each school its rightful place in a strongly hierarchical whole in conformity with the precepts of the *Qur'ān* and the *Sunna*. "The dogmatic theologians", he wrote, "based their system on reason ('*akl*), the traditionists based theirs on *ḥadīth* (*naql*), and the *Ṣūfis* theirs on free-will (*irāda*)". Tradition, reason and free-will are precisely the three elements Ibn Taymiyya aimed to integrate and harmonize in a solidly constructed doctrine which might be defined as a conservative reformism, whether it was a case of the formulation of the *credo*, the rehabilitation of *idjtiḥād* or the reconstruction of the state.

In the field of dogma, Ibn Taymiyya's main intention was to follow the *Qur'ān* and *ḥadīth*, "to describe God only as He has described Himself, in His Book and as the Prophet has described Him in the *Sunna*". Repudiating simultaneously *ta'ṣīl*, the denial of attributes, *tashbīḥ*, the comparison of God with His creatures, and *ta'wīl*, recourse to allegorical or symbolic exegesis, he concentrates on other notions which are characteristic of Ḥanbalism: *tafwīḍ*, or leaving to God the ultimate mystery of things, and *taslīm*, voluntary and intentional submission to the word of God and of his Prophet both in knowledge and in action; this doctrine nevertheless provides authority, within the framework of Holy Writ and of tradition, for the widest possible scope in the personal interiorization of religion. In fact, in his definition of faith (*īmān*), Ibn Taymiyya encompasses the feelings on which it is based, the formulas in which it is expressed and the actions through which it is completed. In politics, he admits the legitimacy of the first four caliphs (*Rāshidūn*) in their chronological order of succession, but distinguishes between the problem of the caliphate (*khilāfa*) and that of the respective merits (*tafḍīl*) of these four caliphs; although he declares the obvious superiority of Abū Bakr and 'Umar, he acknowledges that there might be hesitation in pronouncing (*tawakkuf*) on the respective merits of 'Uthmān and 'Alī.

His loyalty to the "men of old" (*salaf*) led him to prefer the ideas upheld by the Companions

(*ṣahāba*) or their early successors to the doctrine taught by the founders of the *madhāhib*.

Ibn Taymiyya did not, as is sometimes said, announce the "re-opening" of *idjtiḥād*, and still less did he claim this privilege for himself: he did not consider that *idjtiḥād* required to be "closed", since its continuance is necessary for the interpretation of the Law (cf. the opposition between *kullīyyāt* and *djuz'īyyāt*). But anxious to impose some discipline on this *idjtiḥād*, he attempted to define the rules which every *mudjtahid* ought to follow. With this intent, he announced the absolute supremacy of the text (*naṣṣ*) (Kur'ān or *ḥadīth*) and reduced correspondingly the importance of *idjmā'*, to which he opposed the agreement (*ittifāk*) of the doctors of the Law, the validity of which derives from the text on which it is based.

He attaches much importance to reasoning by analogy (*kīyās*), which consists first of all in seeking the cause (*'illa*) of a judgement (*ḥukm*) resulting from the Kur'ān or from the *Sunna* and then in extending this judgement to all cases which share the same cause.

Ibn Taymiyya was often suspicious of *maṣlaḥa*, which he criticized for approaching methods based on reason (*ra'y*; *istiḥsān*; *ḥawāk*; *kashf*), but he finally approved a use of it which was both extensive and disciplined. The application of *maṣlaḥa*, which may apply in all fields, including even that of the *'ibādāt*, presupposes a previous long meditation on the Kur'ān, on *ḥadīth* and on the jurisprudence of the great doctors of the Law.

In fact Ibn Taymiyya considered religion and the State to be indissolubly linked. Without the coercive power (*ṣhawka*) of the State, religion is in danger. Without the discipline of the revealed Law, the State becomes a tyrannical organization. The essential function of the State is to see that justice (*'adl*) prevails, to ordain good (*amr*) and to forbid evil, to bring about, in reality, the reign of unity (*taḥkīk al-tawḥīd*), and to prepare for the coming of a society devoted to the service of God (*'ibādāt*).

While recognizing the legitimacy of the *Rāshidūn*, Ibn Taymiyya never upheld the principle of the permanence of the single caliphate. He pointed out that the Muslim profession of faith (*ṣhahāda*) requires obedience only to God and to His Prophet: it does not limit the number of the *imāms* to whom obedience is owed. He regards the Muslim community (*umma*) as a natural confederation of states.

Every *imām* is at once the proxy (*wakīl*), guardian (*walī*) and partner (*sharik*) of those whom he administers, and therefore his mission is to construct and instil respect for the system of orders and prohibitions which, within the framework of the revealed Law according to the circumstances, is to govern the various areas of the life of the community.

Furthermore, each member of the community has the duty and the right to give advice (*naṣiḥa*), within the limits of his competence, to his brothers in religion and hence to ordain good and forbid evil, striving to avoid anything which could endanger the solidarity of the Believers and divide the community.

Ibn Taymiyya's economic ethics also share this emphasis on solidarity or the importance of the community. He favours the idea of property, but states that the rich should be the friends and partners of the poor, and substitutes for the idea of competition that of co-operation and mutual help.

He disapproved of the authoritarian fixing of prices (*tas'ir*) and permitted this fixing only after negotiation and agreement. He reminded people that "The revealed Law condemns those who make riches their goal and wish to resemble Kārūn, just as it condemns those whose aim is political power and who wish to be like Pharaoh".

Ibn Taymiyya's influence, even in his own lifetime and under the Bahri Mamlūks, was great, in spite of the hostility which he encountered from the powerful family of the Subki, the two founders of which, Taḳī 'l-Dīn (d. 756/1355) and his son Tādī al-Dīn (d. 771/1369-70), were among the most eminent representatives of Shāfi'ism and Syro-Egyptian Ash'arism. Among his chief disciples, in the world of the *'ulamā'*, were, in addition to Ibn al-Qayyim mentioned above, men or women who sometimes belonged to other schools than his.

Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Wāsiṭī (d. 711/1311-2), one of his first disciples, was the son of the head of the Rifā'iyya brotherhood of Wāsiṭ. Umm Zaynab (d. 711/1311-2), a native of Baghdād, who led a campaign in Damascus against the Itihādiyya, is an excellent example of the type of devout woman which existed at that time in Syria. Al-Mizzī (d. 743/1342-3), who had come from Aleppo and was one of the greatest traditionalists of the period, belonged to the Shāfi'i school. Al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1347-8), the famous theologian and historian, wrote a summary of the *Minḥādī al-sunna* of Ibn Taymiyya. Ibn Kaṭhīr (d. 774/1372-3), also a Shāfi'i, inserted, in his *Bidāya*, a valuable biography of Ibn Taymiyya, of whom he was an admirer. Finally, Ibn Raḍjab (d. 795/1393), who wrote a well-documented history of Ḥanbalism, was inspired by Ibn Taymiyya's doctrine in his *Kawā'id fiḥkiyya*.

In addition, Ibn Taymiyya's influence under the Bahri sultans extended also to the milieu of the *umarā'*. Thus Katbughā al-Manṣūri (d. 721/1321), who was *ḥādīb* at Damascus, and Arḡūn al-Nāṣiri (d. 731/1330-1), who held the offices of viceroy of Egypt and governor of Aleppo, are often described, together with several other *amirs*, as disciples or admirers of Ibn Taymiyya.

Under the Circassian Mamlūks (783-922/1382-1517), Ibn Taymiyya's influence was less apparent but nevertheless continued to be deeply felt in various *'ulamā'* circles. Al-Makrizī (d. 845/1441-2), in his *Khīṭa* (Cairo 1326/1909, iv, 185), contrasts to the supporters of al-Ash'ari—of whom he was one—those of Ibn Taymiyya, the defender of the faith of the "men of old" (*salaf*). "People", he writes, "are divided into two factions over the question of Ibn Taymiyya; for until the present, the latter has retained admirers and disciples in Syria and Egypt".

The Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt (922/1517), which led to the official supremacy of the Ḥanafī school, struck a severe blow to Ḥanbalism, which did not however disappear altogether. Supporters of Ibn Taymiyya remained: among them were al-'Ulaymī (d. ca. 928/1522), the historian of Jerusalem and Hebron, who wrote a history of Ḥanbalism which is a valuable source of information on this school after the death of Ibn al-Qayyim, and also especially al-Mar'i (d. 1033/1623), who wrote a laudatory biography of Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Kawākib al-durriyya* (Cairo 1329/1911). It was under the Ottomans also that Ibn Taymiyya's ideas, most of which were adopted by Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb (d. 1206/1792), gave rise to Wahhābism and to the state of the Su'ūd dynasty. Ibn Taymiyya

remains today, with al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111) and Ibn al-ʿArabi (d. 638/1240), one of the writers who have had the greatest influence on contemporary Islam, particularly in Sunni circles.

Bibliography: In addition to references given in the article, the following may be consulted: Moh. Ben Cheneb, s.v., in *EI*⁷; Brockelmann, II, 125-7; S II, 119-26; H. Laoust, *Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques d'Ibn Taymiyya*, IFAO, Cairo 1939; idem, *Contribution à une étude de la méthodologie canonique d'Ibn Taymiyya*, IFAO, Cairo 1939; idem, *La bibliographie d'Ibn Taymiyya d'après Ibn Kathīr*, in *BÉt. Or.*, ix (1943), 115-62; idem, *Le hanbalisme sous les Mamlūks Bahrides*, in *REI*, 1960, 1-71; idem, *Les schismes dans l'Islam*, Paris 1965, 266-76.

(H. LAOUST)

IBN AL-TAYYĀN [see TAMMĀM B. GHĀLIB].

IBN AL-TAYYIB, ABU 'L-FARĀḌI, ʿABD ALLĀH AL-ʿIRĀQĪ, Nestorian monk, physician, philosopher and theologian known in mediaeval Europe under the name of ABULPHARAGIUS ABDALLA BENATTIBUS. He studied and worked at the ʿAḍudī hospital of Baghdad, was the secretary of the *katholikos* Elias I, and died in 435/1043. The physicians Ibn Buṭlān, ʿAlī b. ʿIsā and Abu 'l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī were his pupils. An inventory of his works of Christian exegesis has been made by Graf: there may be mentioned especially the *Firḍaws al-Naṣrāniyya*, the Arabic translation of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, and the *Fikḥ al-Naṣrāniyya* (ed. W. Hoenerbach and O. Spies, Louvain 1956). In philosophy he wrote several commentaries on works of Aristotle, on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry [see FURFÜRİYŪS] (the text mentioned by Brockelmann I, 233 *Logic* no. 4 is to be attributed to Ibn al-Tayyib and not to al-Fārābī; cf. S. M. Stern, in *BSOAS*, xix (1957), 419-25). He wrote a commentary on the *Tabula Cebetis* of Ibn Miskawayh [q.v.]. In medicine he wrote abridgements of Hippocrates, Aristotle and Galen.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Kifīṭī, ed. J. Lippert, 233; al-Bayhaqī, *Tatimma*, ed. M. Shafīʿ, Lahore 1935, 27; Barhebraeus, *Mukhtaṣar*, ed. Šālhānī, Beirut 1890, 330; Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, Beirut 1377/1957, I, 241; Brockelmann, I, 635, S I, 884; G. Sarton, *Introduction to the history of science*, i, Baltimore 1927, 730; G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, ii, 160-76; F. Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte der arabischen Ärzte*, Göttingen 1840, 132, 78; Leclerc, *Histoire de la médecine arabe*, Paris 1876, i, 486-8.

(J. VERNET)

IBN THAWĀBA, name of the members of an important family, of Christian origin, among whom were several high officials of the ʿAbbāsīd administration. An anecdote related by Ibn al-Nadīm (*Fihrist*, 130) and repeated by Yāqūt (*Udabāʾ*, iv, 144-5) suggests that the family's ancestor, Thawāba, lived in Baḥrayn where he was a barber. His son Muḥammad entered the administration at an unknown date. The best-known members of the family are:

ABU 'L-ʿABBĀS AḤMAD B. MUḤAMMAD, who was, under al-Muhtadī (ruled 255/869-256/870), one of the chief assistants of the vizier Sulaymān b. Waḥb. Ismāʿīl b. Bulbul himself, whom Aḥmad disliked and disagreed with, forgave him for his hostile attitude towards him and entrusted him with the administration of several regions of ʿIrāq. He was to remain in charge of these districts until the arrival in office of the vizier ʿUbayd Allāh b. Sulaymān b. Waḥb, who replaced him by Abu 'l-Ḥasan b. Makhlād; but Ibn

Thawāba remained an official until his death, in 277/890 according to the majority of his biographers, in 273/886 according to al-Šūlī.

He was a stylist of talent and a poet. He is said to have left two works, one of them a collection of letters, which have not survived. But he had acquired a reputation for clumsiness, and his contemporaries regarded as grotesque his affected language, his upstart affectation, and his excessive arrogance. It is not known whether he shared the pro-Šiʿi sentiments of his son Muḥammad, but Ibn Bulbul's conciliatory attitude towards him seems to indicate this.

Ibn Thawāba presided over a circle in which a number of poets and men of letters met regularly. His generosity, sometimes ostentatious, led some poets of his time (such as al-Buḥturī and al-Rūmī) to write of him very elegant panegyrics, which still survive. But the disagreements which he had with some of them, and notably with Ibn al-Rūmī, earned him a series of epigrams full of irony and persiflage. Some writers of the following centuries, and notably al-Tawhīdī, retained the image of him which is given in these satires and present him in some of their anecdotes as a grotesque, narrow and pretentious bore.

Very little is known of the career of his son Muḥammad. He was the secretary of the Turk Bāykbāk and he had to go into hiding for a period to escape from the anger of al-Muhtadī, who had been incited against him by certain courtiers who accused him of Šiʿism. His master finally exonerated him and obtained for him the caliph's pardon, which enabled him to return to his office in 250/864. He also was a man of letters and is said to have left a collection of letters which has not survived.

Bibliography: *Fihrist*, 130, 168; Yāqūt, *Udabāʾ*, iv, 144-74; *Aghānī*, Dār al-Thaqāfa ed., xviii, 96; Tawhīdī, *Akhḫāḥ al-wazīrayn*, Damascus 1965, 236 ff.; Husri, *Zahr*, index; D. Sourdél, *Vizīrat*, index; S. Boustany, *Ibn al-Rūmī, sa vie et son oeuvre*, Beirut 1967, 193-5; *D.M.*, ii, 293.

ABU 'L-HUSAYN DĪʿFAR B. MUḤAMMAD, the brother of Abu 'l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad, occupied a high office in the administration; under the vizierate of ʿUbayd Allāh b. Sulaymān b. Waḥb he was appointed as deputy to the vizier's son, al-Ḥasan, who had just been put in charge of several offices, among them the Chancellery and the Police (*Niṣṣwār*, viii, 83-4; Yāqūt, *Udabāʾ*, vii, 187). On al-Ḥasan's death, Dīʿfar succeeded him in these offices and remained in them until he died in 284/897 (al-Šafādī, *Wāfi*, iii/2, 68). He was replaced by his son Muḥammad, who was a great favourite of al-Muqtadīr and who died in 312/924 (*Udabāʾ*, xviii, 96). Muḥammad was succeeded by his son Abū ʿAbd Allāh Aḥmad, who was the last of the Banū Thawāba to hold an important office in the administration. On his death, the offices which had been hereditary among the Banū Thawāba since the death of al-Ḥasan b. ʿUbayd Allāh were entrusted to Abū Ishāk al-Šābī (*Udabāʾ*, vii, 188).

Dīʿfar was a cultivated man and a talented poet. It is known that he attempted to compete with Ibn al-Rūmī and that he was closely connected with Ibn al-Muʿtazz, who wrote a touching elegy on his death in which Dīʿfar's moral and literary virtues are sympathetically enumerated.

His son and his grandson were also talented men of letters. Abū ʿAbd Allāh is said to have left a collection of letters (*Udabāʾ*, iv, 146).

Bibliography: *Fihrist*, 130, 168; Yāqūt,