

# Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī: Shi'i Polemics and the Struggle for Religious Authority in Medieval Islam

*Tariq al-Jamil*

Ibn Taymiyya's most scathing critique of Imāmī Shi'a, *Minhāj al-sunna al-nabawiyya fī naqḍ kalām al-Shī'a al-Qadariyya*, was written in response to *Minhāj al-karāma fī ma'rifat al-imāma* by the prominent Shi'i scholar, Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn al-Muṭahhar al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī (d. 726/1325). Ibn Taymiyya's extended response highlights the contested nature of religious authority and the dynamic relationships of power between Sunni and Shi'i scholars during this period, a time when Shi'i scholars participated in Syrian scholarly circles and authored works that would provide the foundations for later Shi'i intellectual history. While this was Ibn Taymiyya's first direct response to a work by a Shi'i 'ālim, it was not the only treatise in which he attempted to counteract what he perceived to be a Shi'i threat to the purity of Islam. Ibn Taymiyya's opposition to the Shi'a was not only part of his lifelong crusade against *bid'a* (innovation), but also a response to specific historical circumstances and, in particular, to the Īlkhānid sponsorship of the Shi'a. Furthermore, the refutation of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī by Ibn Taymiyya reflects the accessibility and availability of Shi'i works within the medieval Sunni scholarly community.

## **Shi'i Scholarship and its Intellectual Context**

Although Ibn Taymiyya was born in the small Mesopotamian town of Ḥarrān, his intellectual and political life was formed in Damascus. The city had been a centre of scholastic activity from the earliest Islamic centuries, and during Ibn Taymiyya's lifetime scholars who travelled to the city enjoyed a wealth of opportunities. New religious institutions continued to be established and salaried posts for teachers and stipends for students were widely available.<sup>1</sup> The long-standing tradition of travel in search of learning remained a

dominant educational and career pattern of the 'ulamā' during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, resulting in a network of scholarly contacts across the Islamic world. These networks brought together Sunni and Shi'i scholars, who participated side by side in a host of professional, social, and religious settings.

A growing body of evidence indicates the degree to which Shi'i scholars were actively engaged in the transmission of knowledge during Ibn Taymiyya's lifetime. Stefan H. Winter describes the presence of Shi'i scholars in Syria as a constant feature of the Mamluk period. Moreover, Winter argues that the apparently regular inclusion of Shi'i scholars in Syrian scholarly circles illustrates their ambivalent social position. While some Shi'i scholars studied alongside their Sunni counterparts, other individuals and groups were subject to persecution. Violence against individual Shi'is tended to come in the form of spontaneous and "populist" outbreaks rather than as systematic inquisition, although a few Shi'i scholars were put on trial for vituperation of the Companions of the Prophet, an offence which was vaguely defined.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, Shi'i-Sunni mutual engagement, whether polemic or dialogic, corresponded to, and in many ways produced, a shift in the scholarship of both communities during the period.

As Shi'i scholars participated as teachers, students, and colleagues in shared academic circles with their Sunni counterparts, new trends developed within Shi'i scholarship. It was during this period that Najm al-Dīn Ja'far ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥillī (al-Muḥaqqiq) introduced into Shi'i jurisprudence reformulated theories of *ijtihād* and *taqlīd*, which he borrowed from Sunni works. Shi'i legal works written during the period were modelled on Sunni antecedents, but they also challenged and reinterpreted Sunni legal presuppositions in light of Shi'i doctrines.<sup>3</sup> The Sunni science of Hadith criticism was adopted by Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn Ṭāwūs and al-Muḥaqqiq, despite the differences between the Shi'i Hadith corpus and the Sunni one.<sup>4</sup> Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī later expanded and elaborated on the work of al-Muḥaqqiq and Ibn Ṭāwūs, and this system of Hadith classification became widely identified with his name in subsequent generations.<sup>5</sup> Shi'i scholars, alongside Sunni scholars, made significant contributions to the so-called rational sciences (*'ulūm 'aqliyya*), as can be seen in the large number of scholars attracted to Naṣir al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's observatory at Marāgha, and the volume of works produced there.<sup>6</sup> Writing from Ibn Taymiyya's home city of Damascus in the

last decades of the eighth/fourteenth century, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Makkī produced one of the most influential works of jurisprudence in Shi'i intellectual history, *al-Lum'a al-Dimashqiyya fī fiqh al-Imāmiyya*. Muḥammad ibn Mukarram Ibn Manẓūr, who served as *qāḍī* of Tripoli in North Africa and was later employed in the chancery of Sultan Qalāwūn, completed his famous dictionary, *Lisān al-'Arab*, in 689/1290.<sup>7</sup> According to Sunni biographers, Ibn Manẓūr is said to have maintained certain moderate Shi'i proclivities (*wa kāna fāḍilan wa 'indahū tashayyu' bi-lā rafḍ*).<sup>8</sup> Later Shi'i biographers present him as a Shi'i, citing his work as an important contribution to the Shi'i intellectual tradition.<sup>9</sup> Taken as a whole, these centuries witnessed Shi'i scholars employing a similar vocabulary, and engaging in the same intellectual disciplines as their Sunni counterparts.

However, rather than merely signifying accommodation and acceptance of Sunni dominance, adoption of Sunni methodological frameworks allowed Shi'i scholars to both participate in, and to some degree transform, the intellectual world of their time. Sunni-Shi'i polemics challenge the image, commonly found in modern historiography about the period, of Shi'i scholars subjugated to the coercive power of exclusionary Sunni norms. In fact, the consolidation of a unified Sunni identity was a discursive process that continued well into the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries, as Sunni scholars sought to refine and assert their theological positions. At the same time, Shi'i 'ulamā' were equally engaged in the articulation of foundational theological and legal doctrines. Shi'i-Sunni polemical discourse demonstrates that the process of theological and legal formation was for both communities informed by mutual engagement. In fact, although polemical writings are explicitly concerned with points of divergence between Shi'i and Sunni scholars, they are at the same time indicative of academic exchange and of the degree of diversity present and tolerated among medieval Sunni scholars.

Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī's *Minhāj al-karāma fī ma'rifat al-imāma* [also known as *Minhāj al-karāma fī ithbāt al-imāma*], is a fine example of the vigour of contemporary Shi'i scholarship. It was probably composed in 710/1311 at the request of the Mongol Ḥīkhān Öljeitü with the aim of elucidating of the Imāmī Shi'i doctrine of the imamate while refuting the Sunni theory of the caliphate. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī's *Minhāj al-karāma* directly challenged the Sunni concept of

legitimate leadership and its related theological constructions by asserting the divine election and superiority of the Shi'i Imams. Moreover, *Minhāj al-karāma* was not the first attempt by al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī to formulate systematic refutations of Sunni doctrine. During his stay at the court of Öljeitü, al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī composed several other polemical works dedicated to the Īlkhān. These include *Nahj al-ḥaqq wa-kashf al-ṣidq* which addresses the views of the Ash'arites, and *Istiqsā' al-nazar fi baḥth 'an al-qaḍā' wa-al-qadar*, where he defends the Mu'tazilite view of free choice in human action. It was also during this period that al-Ḥillī composed *Kashf al-yaqīn fi faḍā'il amīr al-mu'minīn*, which praises the virtues of 'Alī and his superiority over the first three Sunni caliphs.<sup>10</sup> All in all, however, al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī's polemical or apologetic writings directed against Sunni theology and jurisprudence are not of major importance within the corpus of his scholarly output, and *Minhaj al-karāma* stands out as his most extensive polemical work.

### Ibn Taymiyya's Opposition to the Shi'a

*Minhāj al-Karāma*, with its articulation of Shi'i claims to religious authority, provoked Ibn Taymiyya to produce his *Mihnāj al-sunna*, his most extensive attack on the Shi'a.<sup>11</sup> The anti-Shi'i polemics of Ibn Taymiyya, self-appointed defender of Sunni traditionalism, formed part of his broader condemnation of innovations in beliefs, customs, and religious practices. In his writings, as well as in other contemporary treatises on innovations (*bida'*), society appears to be thoroughly corrupted at the hands of Shi'is, Christians, Jews, Mongols and nominally Islamized converts, all of whom challenged the established patterns of leadership and the social and political authority of the Sunni 'ulamā'.<sup>12</sup> A persistent theme in these articulations of Sunni traditionalism is the corrupting influence that non-Muslims, as well as recent converts to Islam, have on the Muslim community. Indeed, the process of Islamization was gathering pace in the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries, and Egypt in particular experienced large-scale forced conversions of Copts to Islam.<sup>13</sup> Ibn Taymiyya and others argued that converts carried over remnants of their pre-existing spiritual and ritual practices into their new religion, and in various ways brought to their new community deviant practices, customs, beliefs or

“innovations”. Ibn Baydakīn al-Turkumānī specifically claims that the popularity of certain festivals of Coptic Christian origin among Muslims was a consequence of their practice by Christian converts to Islam.<sup>14</sup>

For Ibn Taymiyya, heterodox groups within Islam were the most vulnerable to the threat posed by non-Muslim minorities. He dedicates one of the early sections of *Minhāj al-sunna* to pointing out the similarities between Shi'is, Jews, and Christians.<sup>15</sup> In particular, Ibn Taymiyya argues that Shi'is share with Christians indeterminate prayer times, and maintain dietary regulations that are comparable to those of the Jews. He also argues that the Imāmī Shi'i insistence on relegating the proclamation of jihad to the exclusive authority of the Imam is of Jewish and Christian origin.

Jonathan Berkey, commenting on these treatises against innovation, draws attention to contemporary changes in social, political, cultural, and religious institutions that may have formed the backdrop to the genre:

Might we see the polemics of men such as Ibn al-Ḥājj and Ibn Taymiyya, not so much as rearguard actions to defend an Islam they inherited intact from earlier generations, but rather as an attempt to assert control, to define authoritatively a cultural complex which had always been fluid and dynamic, but which through a variety of external and internal pressures, looked to their eyes to be on the verge of spiralling out of control.<sup>16</sup>

It is this sense of decay and uncertainty, as well as the overall contested nature of scholarly and political authority, that fuelled Ibn Taymiyya's attacks on Shi'i scholarship and religious practice. Whether or not one accepts the complaint about 'the corruption of the time' as a reflection of social reality or as an anxious response to cultural change, it is a frequent *topos* of historical writing from the period.<sup>17</sup>

Ibn Taymiyya's opposition to Shi'a went beyond his use of the pen. On two separate occasions he participated in military campaigns against Shi'is. In 700/1300, he took part in an expedition undertaken by the Mamluk authorities against the Shi'is in Kasrawān, a highland region to the north-east of Beirut, where the local community was accused of cooperating with the Franks and the Mongols. Ibn Taymiyya then participated in a second military campaign to the

same region in 704/1305. In connection with these campaigns, Ibn Taymiyya also produced a *fatwā* condemning the *rāfiḍa*, or Shi'a of Kasrawān, in order to justify fighting against them. The precise identity of these Shi'a communities has been a subject of debate. Druze chieftains, possibly assisted by Nuṣayrī Shi'is and Maronite Christians, led resistance to the Mamluk invasion of the region, but Ibn Taymiyya's *fatwā* denounced a generalized amalgam of doctrines held by various Shi'i groups.<sup>18</sup>

Ibn Taymiyya was also concerned about the influence of Shi'i scholars and local rulers in Medina. In his treatise on the precedence and superiority of Hadith scholarship in Medina during the first three centuries of Islam, *Ṣiḥḥat uṣūl madhhab ahl al-Madīna*, he attempts to explain why the prestige of the Medinese school had gradually declined.<sup>19</sup> He argues that beginning in the fourth/tenth century, other cities could boast of scholars superior to those of Medina, as Shi'i heresy (*rafḍ*) had taken root in the city of the Prophet.<sup>20</sup> Ibn Taymiyya argues that the majority of the inhabitants of Medina continued to adhere to the Mālikī school of law until around the beginning of the sixth/twelfth century, when the religious life of the city became corrupted by the immigration of heretics from the East (*rāfiḍat al-mashriq*).<sup>21</sup> According to Ibn Taymiyya, many of these Shi'is came from Qāshān, and were descendants of the family of the Prophet. Heretical works incompatible with the Qur'ān and Sunna circulated among the Medinese, and a great deal of money was spent on them. Consequently, innovations (*bida'*) increased in Medina from that time onward.<sup>22</sup>

During Ibn Taymiyya's lifetime, the Mamluk regime took concrete steps to curb the power and influence of the Shi'i ruling elite of Medina. Following his pilgrimage of 1269, Sultan Baybars initiated a policy of sending Sunni scholars to Medina in order to challenge the authority of both the local Shi'i rulers and the still dominant Shi'i 'ulamā'. The contemporary *amīrs* of Medina, the Āl Shīhā, and their allies tried to resist this policy by different means, including the mobilization of their supporters against the Sunni immigrants whom they considered to be agents of forced "sunnification".<sup>23</sup>

One could view Ibn Taymiyya's anti-Shi'i polemical writing as a complement to the political and military policies of the Mamluk sultans against the influence of Shi'i political, military and scholarly groups. In this sense, Ibn Taymiyya's work is part of a struggle for



hegemony over religious discourse, itself reflecting a struggle for social position and status across sectarian boundaries. This struggle also had, perhaps, a personal dimension. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī was one of the most accomplished Shi'i scholar of the seventh/thirteenth and early eighth/fourteenth centuries, a figure of towering importance in the development of the Shi'i intellectual tradition, composing numerous works in a range of disciplines including theology, philosophy, logic, law, grammar, Hadith, and exegesis. He was a well-known public Shi'i figure, whose career path could serve as a model for both Shi'i and Sunni scholars. Thus, in the context of competition for social position and academic prestige, Ibn Taymiyya's polemical refutation may have had both personal and doctrinal dimensions.

### The Texts of *Minhāj al-karāma* and *Minhāj al-sunna*

It is relatively certain that *Minhāj al-karāma* was written shortly after 709/1310 when al-Ḥillī, together with the Shi'i theologian Tāj al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī Āwī, were appointed as advisors to the court of the Īlkhānid ruler, Muḥammad Khudābandah Öljeitü. Their influence may have ultimately led to Öljeitü's conversion to Shi'a in that same year. *Minhāj al-karāma* was subsequently written at the request of the newly converted ruler.<sup>24</sup> In contrast to al-Ḥillī's work, it is difficult to identify with precision *Minhāj al-sunna*'s date of composition. Muḥammad Rashād Sālim, the editor of the 1962 Cairo edition of *Minhāj al-sunna*, dates it as early as 710/1310, placing it during Ibn Taymiyya's stay in Egypt.<sup>25</sup> However, in the introduction to his later edition of Ibn Taymiyya's *Dar' ta'ārūd al-'aql wa-al-naql*, Sālim dates the work to sometime between 713/1313 and 717/1317. Since *Minhāj* mentions *Dar' ta'ārūd al-'aql wa-al-naql* several times, it could not have been written before 713/1313.<sup>26</sup> Henri Laoust states that *Minhāj al-sunna* was written in 716/1317, following Ibn Taymiyya's involvement in the opposition to Ḥumayḍa, the *amīr* of Mecca who had formed an alliance with Öljeitü and who was favourable to the Shi'a in the holy city.<sup>27</sup>

Ibn Taymiyya's refutation closely follows al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī's text. He first quotes the Shi'i author before beginning his counter-argument, responding point by point to each of the seven chapters of *Minhāj al-karāma*. At times, however, Ibn Taymiyya shifts course

and directs his attacks against a variety of antinomian Islamic sects, abandoning his doctrinal preoccupation with Imāmī Shi'a to focus on manifestations of popular Sunnism, including popular festivals and the visitation of shrines. As a result of Ibn Taymiyya's lengthy digressions, *Minhāj al-sunna* is an exponentially larger work than al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī's *Minhāj al-karāma*.<sup>28</sup> Yet, despite its length, Ibn Taymiyya's criticism often ignores important doctrinal and ritual differences between various Shi'i groups, and he generalizes about Shi'i practices, perhaps as a rhetorical strategy. Nonetheless, in the opening pages of *Minhāj al-sunna*, Ibn Taymiyya makes a fundamental distinction between the Imāmī Shi'is whom he regards as misguided Muslims, and the Ismā'ilīs (*Qarāmiṭa*)<sup>29</sup> whom he considers to be outright hypocrites (*munāfiqūn*) and no better than people of the *jāhiliyya*.<sup>30</sup>

Turning now to the details of the refutation and counter-refutation, one can highlight a few main areas of contention. One was al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī's claim that the imamate is one of the pillars of faith (*arkān al-īmān*), to which Ibn Taymiyya countered by arguing that there is nothing in the Qur'ān and the Sunna to support this Shi'i claim.<sup>31</sup> Ibn Taymiyya further argues that the imamate cannot be a pillar of faith when the Imam's disappearance has in practice reduced him to an ineffectual being, unable to respond to any of the temporal or spiritual needs of the believers. According to Ibn Taymiyya, the hidden Imam's absence of over four centuries and the anticipation of his return produced nothing but false hopes, sedition, and corrupt practices in the community.<sup>32</sup> For Ibn Taymiyya, Islamic belief and piety are embodied by moral and ethical practices, and he cites several Qur'ānic verses as proof.<sup>33</sup> Obedience to God and the Prophet is in itself sufficient, and it entitles every Muslim to paradise, without an intercession by the Imam.<sup>34</sup> According to Ibn Taymiyya, by requiring obedience to a hidden Imam who cannot be seen, heard, or communicated with, the Shi'a impose a duty which is beyond the capacity of the believers, and this fundamentally conflicts with the nature of God's justice. The doctrine of the imamate thus aims at creating a human order that is impossible to attain, a purpose that negates the Sunna of the Prophet.<sup>35</sup>

Throughout the text, Ibn Taymiyya broaches wider aspects of Shi'i scholarship and methodology, and he comments on what he sees as the potentially dangerous implications of Shi'i theological



interpretations and religious practices. Ibn Taymiyya's comments are not merely polemical abstractions, but rather demonstrate a familiarity with the theological and legal debates that emerged from Shi'i intellectual discourses. His acquaintance with Shi'i scholars may have extended well beyond reading and responding to Shi'i polemical works. According to Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, Ibn Taymiyya met and had discussions with al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī while on pilgrimage to Mecca, during the last years of al-Ḥillī's life.<sup>36</sup>

Another major point of contention, and one of the central points of Ibn Taymiyya's critique, concerns the ontological status of the Imam that allows him to assume certain divine prerogatives, such as an ability to foretell future events, communication with divine beings, and knowledge of the unseen (*'ilm al-ghayb*).<sup>37</sup> Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī argues that all of the Imams were *muḥaddathūn*, meaning that they possessed the prophetic ability to communicate with celestial beings.<sup>38</sup> He argues that God's justice, majesty, and benevolence dictate that in the absence of the infallible prophets, who were protected from error, forgetfulness, and disobedience, it is now the Imams who must continue to possess this infallibility in order to safeguard the community from error.<sup>39</sup> He therefore argues that the Sunni failure to recognize that God appointed a successor is to attribute to Him a repulsive act and a failure to discharge His responsibility (*fi'l al-qabiḥ wa-al-ikhhlāl bi-al-wājib*).<sup>40</sup> Ibn Taymiyya responds that the argument is rooted in an impermissible analogy between God and his creation, that is, it draws an improper comparison between the acts of human beings and God's essence and attributes.<sup>41</sup> He then invokes historical anecdotes and Hadith that emphasize God's transcendence and his incomparability to inherently fallible human beings.<sup>42</sup>

Throughout the text, al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī associates injustice and error with the actions of the Sunni caliphs, and he provides several examples of the transgressions of the caliphs, such as the killing of al-Ḥusayn. In this regard he quotes a number of prominent scholars, such as the Ḥanbalī jurist Abū al-Faraj Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200), who cursed those who took part in al-Ḥusayn's murder.<sup>43</sup> Each of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī's criticisms of the caliphs are subsequently taken up by Ibn Taymiyya in his refutation.<sup>44</sup>

The next portion of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī's text is a commentary on the Qur'ānic and Hadith-based justifications for the imamate, emphasizing the necessity of the kind of prophetic knowledge and

guidance which can only be provided by the Imams.<sup>45</sup> Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī cites in defence of his position the well-known, "to split into many groups (*sataftariq*)" tradition.<sup>46</sup> He comments that when Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī was asked about the different paths within Islam (*madhāhib*) he would quote the Prophet as saying: "My community will be divided into seventy-three groups and only one of them will be saved, and the rest will be in the hellfire." Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī would go on to explain that the Prophet identified those who will be saved when he said: "The likeness of my family (*ahl al-bayt*) is similar to Noah's Ark: those who rode it were saved and those who were left behind drowned."<sup>47</sup> Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī concludes this portion of his disputation with the definitive statement that indeed the saved group (*al-firqa al-nājiyya*) will be those who support the imamate.<sup>48</sup>

One of the central points of contention in the polemical discourse between Ibn Taymiyya and al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī is the authoritative power of knowledge (*ilm*). Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī bases his claims for the necessity of the imamate on the Imam's command of the so-called transmitted intellectual disciplines and, perhaps more importantly, his ability to approach these disciplines with divine perfection. He turns to historical evidence demonstrating that all the Imams were regarded as the most competent scholars, teachers, and individuals of their respective generations. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī also includes a short excursus on the supernatural qualities of the Imams, which is mostly focused on 'Alī. 'Alī's highest virtue, he writes, was that he was infallible (*ma'ṣūm*).<sup>49</sup> This divine gift manifested itself in 'Alī's intellectual superiority, and made him incapable of even an inadvertent error (*sahw*), in contrast to the Sunni caliphs who are defined not only by such inadvertent errors but also by conscious acts of injustice.<sup>50</sup> 'Alī was granted a divine dispensation of exceptional knowledge, which guaranteed him perfect use of his intellectual faculties as well as complete esoteric knowledge.<sup>51</sup> This esoteric knowledge included the ability to intuitively grasp the underlying cause of events in human history as well as foresee the future. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī argues that 'Alī had prior knowledge of his own death and the martyrdom of al-Ḥusayn.<sup>52</sup> In addition to his supernatural abilities, 'Alī founded and developed virtually all intellectual disciplines, including Arabic grammar, *kalām*, jurisprudence, and *tafsīr*.<sup>53</sup> Even when an explicit link between 'Alī and the origins of any discipline could not be identified,

al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī argues that it can still be circuitously traced back to ‘Alī through a chain of disciples.<sup>54</sup> In his refutation, Ibn Taymiyya argues that there were others who excelled over ‘Alī in some disciplines; moreover, not all the disciplines mentioned by al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī are relevant for justifying ‘Alī’s claim to the imamate.<sup>55</sup>

Al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī also points out that ‘Alī’s knowledge leads to a deeper intimation of religious practice and, therefore, he is the most perfect model of piety after the Prophet Muḥammad. According to al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī, ‘Alī’s piety was manifested by his asceticism (*zuhd*), his coarse robes, simple food and modest lodgings.<sup>56</sup> His poverty was not for selfish reasons; rather he accepted poverty in order to help others by giving his material possessions away as charity. Al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī argues that the following Qur’ānic verse was revealed as a recognition of ‘Alī’s generosity: “Your guardian is God alone, as well as His Messenger and those who believe, those who establish prayer and give in charity while bowing down [in prayer]” (Q 5:55).<sup>57</sup> According to al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī, “Indeed ‘Alī was the most ascetic (*azhad*) human being after the Prophet Muḥammad.”<sup>58</sup> Ibn Taymiyya refutes this claim by arguing that it was Abū Bakr who was the most exemplar model of *zuhd*.<sup>59</sup>

Another point of contention between the two scholars revolves around ‘Alī’s bravery and courage. Al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī contends that ‘Alī was the most courageous of human beings.<sup>60</sup> Al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī cites a number of traditions to assert ‘Alī’s superior bravery and military acumen, including a Hadith in which the Prophet praises ‘Alī’s slaying of the Meccan warrior ‘Amr ibn ‘Abd Wudd ibn Abī Qays during the Battle of the Trench (al-Khandaq): “Truly ‘Alī’s killing ‘Amr ibn ‘Abd Wudd on the day of al-Khandaq is the most excellent act of my community until the Day of Judgment.”<sup>61</sup> He maintains that ‘Alī was the bravest warrior in several other military battles, such as Badr, Banū Nadīr, al-Silsila, Khaybar, and Ḥunayn.<sup>62</sup> For al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī, ‘Alī’s unequalled bravery on the battlefield demonstrates both his exalted position relative to the caliphs and his dedication to implementing God’s command. In his response, Ibn Taymiyya is careful to avoid denigrating ‘Alī’s distinguished military performance. However, Ibn Taymiyya argues that others, in particular Abū Bakr, had equal claim to military achievements.

Al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī goes on to examine one of the defining events in early Shi‘i history, the contested designation of ‘Alī as the

Prophet's successor at Ghadīr Khumm, drawing his evidence from a wealth of Sunni sources describing the event.<sup>63</sup> In particular, he frequently cites the Qur'ān commentary of Abū Ishāq al-Tha'labī (d. 427/1035), *al-Kashf wa-al-bayān 'an tafsīr al-Qur'ān [Tafsīr al-Tha'labī]*.<sup>64</sup> Ibn Taymiyya strongly denies the historicity of the Shi'i narrative and counters that it was Abū Bakr, rather than 'Alī, who had in fact received the designation (*naṣṣ*) of the Prophet.<sup>65</sup>

Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī concludes his discussion of 'Alī's designation as the Prophet's successor by offering further Qur'ānic and Hadith evidence pointing to 'Alī's superiority over the caliphs, supported by sayings attributed to the founders of the four Sunni legal schools. One important example is his invocation of the Qur'ānic passage, "God only desires to keep away uncleanness from you, O People of the House (*ahl al-bayt*) and to purify you a [thorough] purification" (Q 33:33). Al-'Allāma then quotes a tradition found in Ibn Ḥanbal's *Musnad* in order to argue that the verse applies only to the Prophet Muḥammad, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn, 'Alī, and Fāṭima.<sup>66</sup>

The use of Sunni Hadith and Sunni Qur'ānic exegesis is one of the primary literary strategies employed by Shi'i scholars in polemical debates. While Ibn Taymiyya exclusively relies on Sunni materials in support of his arguments, al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī freely appropriates Sunni sources in addition to the Shi'i material. The use of a wide range of Sunni texts to bolster Shi'i doctrinal claims developed long before the exchanges between al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī and Ibn Taymiyya.<sup>67</sup> It served Shi'i scholars as they confronted Sunni hostility to foundational Shi'i doctrines and practices, including temporary marriage (*zawāj al-mut'a*), the conception of dissimulation (*taqiyya*), and intercession (*tawassul, istighātha, shafā'a*). Selective appropriation of Sunni materials as part of Shi'i polemics and apologetics was an effective way of asserting intellectual opposition from a social position of weakness, while at the same time reinforcing a sense of communal solidarity through shared respect for the revealed sources.

## Conclusion

This examination of the competing claims set forth by two of the most prominent Shi'i and Sunni scholars of the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries does not purport to represent the

general pattern of Shi'i-Sunni polemics, or to exhaust the diverse range of arguments within the texts. The aim of the preceding analysis was to frame the polemical and apologetic writings of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī and Ibn Taymiyya within the contested nature of religious authority that characterized the social contexts in which they were produced.

In this context, one of the functions of Ibn Taymiyya's text can be seen as negotiating authority through polemical discourse. There is little doubt that Ibn Taymiyya was aware of patronage enjoyed by al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī in the Īlkhānid court. Although this political dimension is not explicitly mentioned in *Minhāj al-sunna*, Ibn Taymiyya's counter-arguments cannot be disconnected from their historical context. Shi'i-Sunni polemics served an important social function of defining Sunni and Shi'i identities through dialogue across sectarian lines. In this sense, the polemics of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī and Ibn Taymiyya are an attempt to define the orthodox beliefs of each community and to delineate Sunni and Shi'i group membership and affiliation, as the boundaries between the communities continued to be negotiated well into the eighth/fourteenth century.

The Mamluk period witnessed the development of new intellectual approaches, especially among the Shi'a. Rather than signifying accommodation to the dominant claims of the majority community, the literary debates between Shi'i and Sunni scholars reflect power relations as complex as the social and political order. The arguments elaborated by al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī and Ibn Taymiyya have influenced contemporary polemical works, and modern Shi'i refutations of *Minhāj al-sunna* have provoked a number of Sunni counter-refutations.<sup>68</sup> In fact, it is reported that al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī himself considered continuing the cycle of refutations and counter-refutations, but for his adversary's lack of discernment. When al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī learned of Ibn Taymiyya's response, he remarked, "Had he understood what I said, I would have replied to him (*law kāna yafham mā aqūl la-ajabtuhu*)."<sup>69</sup>

## Notes

1. Michael Chamberlain, *Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190–1350* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 37–43, 47–66; Joan E. Gilbert, “Institutionalization of Muslim Scholarship and Professionalization of the ‘Ulamā’ in Medieval Damascus,” *Studia Islamica* 52 (1980): 106–107.
2. Stefan H. Winter, “Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Makkī ‘al-Shahīd al-Awwal’ (d. 1384) and the Shi‘ah of Syria”, *Mamluk Studies Review* 3 (2000): 149–182.
3. Hossein Modarressi Tabātabā‘ī, *An Introduction to Shi‘i Law: A Bibliographical Study* (London: Ithaca Press, 1984), 47–48; Wilferd Madelung, “Authority in the Absence of the Imam,” in W. Madelung, *Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam* (Aldershot, Great Britain: Variorum, 1985), 168. See also Devin J. Stewart, *Islamic Legal Orthodoxy: Twelver Shiite Responses to the Sunni Legal System* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1998), 111–173.
4. Asma Afsaruddin, “An Insight into the Ḥadīth Methodology of Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Tāwūs,” *Der Islam* 72 (1995): 24–46; Etan Kohlberg, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work: Ibn Tāwūs and His Library* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 17.
5. Shi‘i biographers have often credited al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī with the introduction of the quadripartite system of Ḥadīth classification (sound, good, reliable, and weak) into Shi‘i literature. See Muḥammad Bāqir al-Khwānsārī, *Rawḍat al-jannāt fi aḥwāl al-‘ulamā’ wa-al-sādāt*, 8 vols. (Tehran: Maktabat Ismā‘īliyyān, n.d.), 2:266, 271–272; Muḥammad Mahdī ibn Murtaqā Bahr al-‘Ulūm al-Ṭabāṭabā‘ī, *al-‘Ulūm [al-Fawā'id al-rijāliyya]*, 4 vols. (Najaf: Maṭba‘at al-Ādāb, 1965–1967), 2:260; Muḥsin al-Amīn, *A'yān al-shī'a*, 11 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Ta'arūf, 1986), 9:15, 22; ‘Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī, *Miqbās al-hidaya fi ‘ilm al-dirāya*, 7 vols. (Qum: Mu‘assasat Āl al-Bayt li-Ḥyā’ al-Turāth), 1411/1990, 1:137–140.
6. On the importance of Marāgha and the scholarship produced there see Bar Hebraeus (Abū al-Faraj ibn al-‘Ibrī), *Tārīkh mukhtasar al-duwal* (Beirut: al-Maṭba‘a al-Kāthūlikiyya li-al-Ābā’ al-Yasū‘iyyīn, 1890), 500–501; ‘Abd Allāh al-Ni‘ma, *Falāsifat al-shī'a: ḥayātuhum wa-ārā’uhum* (Beirut: Dār Maktabat al-Ḥayāt, 1961), 484; E.S. Kennedy, “The Exact Sciences in Iran under the Saljuqs and Mongols,” in *The Cambridge History of Iran* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 5: 558ff; Sabine Schmidtke, *Theology of al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī (d. 725/1325)* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1991), 13–14.
7. Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Durar al-kāmina fi a’yān al-mi’a al-thāmina*, ed. ‘Abd al-Wārith Muḥammad ‘Alī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1997), 4:262–264, no. 725.
8. al-Ṣafadī, *A’yān al-‘aṣr wa-a’wān al-naṣr* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Mu‘āsir, 1418/1998), 5:270; al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-wu‘āh fi ṭabaqāt al-lughawiyyīn wa-al-nuḥāh* (Cairo: Maṭba‘at ‘Isa al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1964–1965), 1:106; Muḥammad ibn Mukarram ibn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘Arab* (Beirut: Dār Ḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 1968/1417), 1:9–10. It is not clear what his Sunni biographers meant by *tashayyu’ bi-lā rafḍ*. However, it reflects the fluidity of religious affiliations and the indeterminate nomenclature used to refer to the varieties of Shi‘a during the period. See Etan Kohlberg, “Early Attestations of the Term ‘Ithnā ‘Ashariyya’”, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 24 (2000): 343–357.
9. Al-Khwānsārī, *Rawḍat al-jannāt*, 8:79, no. 693; Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt al-‘ulam al-shī'a*, 6 vols. (Qum: Maktabat Ismā‘īliyyān, n.d.), 3:204–205; idem.,



- al-Dhari'a ilā taṣānif al-shī'a*, 26 vols. (Najaf: Maṭba'at al-Gharā, 1936-), 18:308, no. 234; Muḥsin al-Amīn, *A'yān al-shī'a*, 14:370, no. 10133.
10. Aghā Buzurg al-Tīhrānī, *al-Dhari'a ilā taṣānif al-shī'a*, 2:32, 18:69-70, 24:416; Muḥsin al-Amīn, *A'yān al-shī'a*, 9:23-32; Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, *Amal al-āmil fī 'ulamā' Jabal 'Āmil* (Qum: Dār al-Kitāb al-Islāmī, 1965-1966), 2:82-85; Sabine Schmidtke, *The Theology of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī*, 27-34.
  11. Ibn Taymiyya explains his decision to respond to al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī at the beginning of his work. See Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna al-nabawiyya fī naqḍ kalām al-Shī'a wa-al-Qadariyya*, 2 vols. (Cairo: Maktabat Dār al-'Urūba, 1962), 1:15-16. I have also used the Beirut edition of the work: *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1420/1999). On Ibn Taymiyya's reaction to al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī's work, see also Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī, *al-'Uqūd al-durriyya min manāqib Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad ibn Taymiyya*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥamid al-Fiqī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1938), 28.
  12. See Maribel Fierro, "The Treatises against Innovations (*kutub al-bida'*)", *Der Islam*, 69 (1992): 204-46; Vardit Rispler, "Towards a New Understanding of the Term *bid'a'*", *Der Islam* 68 (1991): 320-328. Well known *bida'* treatises produced in the Mamlūk period include Ibn Taymiyya, *Iqtidā' al-sīrat al-mustaqīm mukhālafat aṣḥāb al-jahīm* (Cairo, 1950), trans. Muḥammad Umar Memon as *Ibn Taymiyya's Struggle against Popular Religion* (Paris: Mouton & Co., 1976); Idrīs Ibn Baydakīn, *Kitāb al-luma' fī al-hawādith wa-al-bida'*, 2 vols., ed. Ṣubḥī Labīb (Cairo: Qism al-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyya, al-Ma'had al-almānī li-al-Āthār bi-al-Qāhira, 1986), and Ibn al-Ḥājj al-'Abdarī, *al-Madkhal* (Cairo, 1960).
  13. Tamer el-Leithy, "Coptic Culture and Conversion in Medieval Cairo, 1293-1524 A.D." (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2004); Donald Little, "Coptic Conversion to Islam Under the Bahrī Mamlūks, 692-755/1293-1354," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39 (1976): 552-669; Ira Marvin Lapidus, *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967), 86, 143-184, 266, 288-292; Moshe Perlmann, "Notes on Anti-Christian Propaganda in the Mamluk Empire," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10.4 (1942): 843-861. In the case of Jews, see for example, Mark R. Cohen, *Under Crescent & Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 28-29, 174-177; Mark R. Cohen, "Jews in the Mamluk Environment: The Crisis of 1442 (A Geniza Study)," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 47 (1984):425-448.
  14. Subhi Labib, "The Problem of *Bida'* in the Light of an Arabic Manuscript of the 14th Century", in *Proceedings of the 26th International Congress of Orientalists, 4-10th January 1964*, 4 vols. (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1966-1970), 4:277.
  15. Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna*, 1:13-24.
  16. Jonathán P. Berkey, "The Mamluks as Muslims: the Military Elite and the Construction of Islam in Medieval Egypt", in Thomas Philipp and Ulrich Haarmann (eds.), *The Mamluks in Egyptian Politics and Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 168.
  17. *Ibid.*
  18. Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa al-nihāya*, 14:12, 25; Ibn Taymiyya, *Majmū' fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad ibn Taymiyya* (Riyadh, 1962-66), 5:149-160. See also the following studies: Yaron Friedman, 'Ibn Taymiyya's Fatāwā against the Nuṣayrī-'Alawī Sect', *Der Islam* 82.2 (2005): 349-363; Niels Henrik Olesen, *Culte des saints et pélerinages chez Ibn Taymiyya* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner S.A.,

- 1991), 13–14; Henri Laoust, “Remarques sur les expéditions du Kasrawān sous les premiers Mamluks,” *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* 4 (1940): 93–115; Robert Irwin, *The Middle East in the Middle Ages: The Early Mamluk Sultanate 1250–1352* (Beckenham, Kent: Croon Helm, 1986), 101–102; Kamal Salibi, “Mount Lebanon Under the Mamluks”, in Samir Seikaly et al. (eds.), *Quest for Understanding: Arabic and Islamic Studies in Memory of Malcolm Kerr* (Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1991), 15–32.
19. Werner Ende, “The Nakhāwila, A Shiite Community in Medina Past and Present”, *Die Welt des Islams*, 37.3 (1997): 274–275.
  20. From the context, it appears that Ibn Taymiyya was referring to Mongol domains in Iraq and Iran. Ibn Taymiyya, *Ṣiḥḥat uṣūl madhhab ahl al-Madīna*, ed. Zakariyā ‘Alī Yūsuf (Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Imām, n.d.), 20–22.
  21. *Ibid.*, 21.
  22. *Ibid.*
  23. Shaun E. Marmon, *Eunuchs and Sacred Boundaries in Islamic Society* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 56–60, 138 n159; Other scholars have also concurred with Marmon’s observation that Shi‘i ‘ulamā’ and rulers remained dominant in Medina while subject to increasing pressure from the Mamluk regime. See Ende, “The Nakhāwila”, 276; and Richard T. Mortel, “The Ḥusaynid Amirate of Madīna during the Mamlūk Period”, *Studia Islamica* 80 (1994): 100–102.
  24. Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, 110 vols. (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1956–1972), 107:138–42; ‘Alī al-Ḥusaynī al-Milānī, *Dirāsāt fi Minhāj al-sunna li-ma‘rifat Ibn Taymiyya: Madkhal li-sharḥ Minhāj al-karāma* (Iran: ‘Alī al-Ḥusaynī al-Milānī, 1419/1998 or 1999), 36–38; Sabine Schmidtke, *Theology of al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī*, 23–34.
  25. Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna*, 1:15.
  26. Jon Hoover, *Ibn Taymiyya’s Theodicy of Perpetual Optimism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2007), 10–11.
  27. H. Laoust, “Ibn Taymiyya,” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, new ed., 3:952. In an earlier work, Laoust put the date of composition of *Minhāj al-Sunna* to no earlier than 721/1321, as he believed *Minhāj al-karāma* was written in that year (H. Laoust, “La biographie d’Ibn Taimiyya d’après Ibn Kathīr,” *Bulletin d’études orientales* 9 [1942], 155). However, it is unlikely that *Minhāj al-karāma* would have been written at such a late date since Öljeitü, who commissioned the work, died in 716/1316.
  28. In the 1962 Cairo edition of *Minhāj al-sunna*, which includes the text of al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī’s *Minhāj al-karāma fi ma‘rifat al-imāma*, al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī’s work occupies less than a quarter of the published text.
  29. At various times in the text Ibn Taymiyya uses the pejorative term *qarāmiṭa* to refer to all Ismā‘īlis. The term originally referred to the followers of Ḥamdān Qarmaṭ, an Ismā‘īli leader in the sawād of al-Kūfa during the later part of the third/ninth century. Although the *qarāmiṭa* in al-Bahrayn were rivals of the Fatimids, the term was also pejoratively applied to all Ismā‘īlis. See Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī, *Kitāb firaq al-shī‘a* (Istanbul: Maṭba‘at al-Dawla, 1931), 61–64; Wilferd Madelung, “qarmaṭī”, *Encyclopedia of Islam*, new ed.
  30. Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna*, 1:2–4.
  31. *Ibid.*, 1:70–72.
  32. *Ibid.*

33. *Ibid.*, 1:71.
34. *Ibid.*, 1:72.
35. *Ibid.*
36. Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Durar al-kāmina*, 2:159. This account is mentioned by Schmidtke, who acknowledges that it is not confirmed by any other source (*The Theology of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī*, 34).
37. Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna*, 1:47–60. On the development of these views in Shi'i theology see, Hossein Modarressi, *Crisis and Consolidation in the Formative Period of Shi'ite Islam* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1993), 19–51; Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, *The Divine Guide in Early Shi'ism: The Sources of Esotericism in Islam* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 70–97.
38. The common Twelver Shi'a view was that the Imāms were given the ability to hear and understand celestial beings without seeing their forms, while prophets were endowed with the ability of both hearing and seeing these beings. However, the extent of the Imam's knowledge was a matter of debate among Shi'i scholars. See Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī, *Uṣūl min al-kāfi* (Beirut: Dār al-Ta'ārif, 1401/1980), 1:271; Amir-Moezzi, *The Divine Guide in Early Shi'ism*, 70, 190ff, 191ff.
39. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, *Minhāj al-karāma* (printed in volume 1 of Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna* [Cairo, 1962]), 78.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna*, 1:315.
42. *Ibid.*
43. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, *Minhāj al-karāma*, 85–89.
44. For Ibn Taymiyya's responses, see *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna*, 1:261–286, 1:378, 2:1–28.
45. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, *Minhāj al-karāma*, 89–144.
46. *Ibid.*, 95.
47. *Ibid.*
48. *Ibid.* For Ibn Taymiyya's response, see *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna*, 2:99–108.
49. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, *Minhāj al-karāma*, 145.
50. *Ibid.*, 146.
51. *Ibid.*, 131–135. Ibn Taymiyya takes up the refutation of these points by criticizing the authenticity of the traditions used as proof texts. See *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna*, 3:122–128.
52. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, *Minhāj al-karāma*, 186–189.
53. *Ibid.*, 177–180.
54. *Ibid.*
55. Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1420/1999), 4:132–135.
56. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, *Minhāj al-karāma*, 145–148, 174–177.
57. *Ibid.*, 148.
58. *Ibid.*, 174–177.
59. Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna* (Beirut), 4:129–131.
60. al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, *Minhāj al-karāma*, 179.
61. *Ibid.*, 126.
62. *Ibid.*, 181–186.
63. *Ibid.*, 149–150.
64. On al-Tha'labī, see al-Khwānsārī, *Rawḍat al-jannāt*, 1:245–246; Ibn Khallikān, *Wayfayāt al-a'yān wa-anbā' abnā' al-zamān*, ed. Iḥsān 'Abbās (Beirut: Dār al-Sādir,

- n.d.), 1:79–80; Walid A. Saleh, *The Formation of the Classical Tafsīr Tradition: The Qur'ān Commentary of al-Tha'labī* (d. 427/1035), (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004).
65. Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb minhāj al-sunna*, 1:343–375.
  66. Al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, *Minhāj al-karāma*, 151.
  67. The approach has endured in modern popular Shi'i polemical works. See al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Mūsawī Sulṭān al-Wā'izīn al-Shīrāzī, *Shabhā-yi Pīshāvar: dar difā' az harīm-i Tashayyu'* (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1343/1964); Muḥammad al-Tījānī al-Samāwī, *Thumma ihtadayt* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Fajr, 1980); Muḥammad al-Tījānī al-Samāwī, *Fa-is'alū ahl al-dhikr* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Fajr, 1991); Muḥammad al-Tījānī al-Samāwī, *al-Shī'a hum ahl al-Sunna* (Beirut: Shams al-Mashriq, 1993); 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Musawī, *al-Murāja'āt* (Beirut: al-Dār al-Islāmiyya, 1986).
  68. Sabine Schmidtke lists a number of these books (*Theology of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī*, 95–96).
  69. Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Lisān al-mizān*, 7 vols. (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-A'lamī li-al-Maṭbū'āt, 1390/1971), 2:317; Also see Ṣā'ib 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, *Ibn Taymiyya: ḥayātuhu, 'aqā'iduhu, mawqifuhu min al-Shī'a wa-Ahl al-Bayt* (Qum: Markaz al-Ghadīr li-al-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyya, 1994), 220.