To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Robert Percival Williams entitled "Zuhd in al-Andalus: Asceticism as it was described by Ibn al-Faradi". I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in History.

Dr. Thomas Burman, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of the Graduate School

ZUHD IN AL-ANDALUS: ASCETICISM AS IT WAS DESCRIBED BY IBN AL-FARADI

A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Arts
Degree
The University of Tennessee,Knoxville

Robert Percival Williams
December 1995

Abstract

In this study the practice of asceticism, or *zuhd*, is examined. Previous efforts concentrated on the theoretical tracts composed by medieval Muslims in order to discover how asceticism was practicied in the Islamic world. This study questions the basic assumptions made by Middle East historians in their writings about *zuhd*. This study focused on Islamic Spain, al-Andalus, during the late ninth, tenth, and early eleventh centuries, and relied extensively on the biographical collections composed by Ibn al-Faradi and Ibn Bashkowal. By separating biographies which identified individuals as ascetics from those with no mention of asceticism and analyzing their travel patterns, education, disciplines, location, and community involvement it is possible to view ascetics as a distinct body existing within the *'ulama*. I found that ascetics composed approximately ten percent of those individuals deemed important enough to warrant biographies by the two biographers. It was also apparent that these ascetics existed within the larger body of learned people in Spain and were indistinguishable from their co-religionists in their travel, education, and disciplines. From this it was possible to conclude that ascetics in al-Andalus were not the distinct and physically separate body of religious zealots written about by scholars before this work. It may also be concluded that asceticism in al-Andalus was an internal practice characterized by the elimination of moral doubt, rather than extenal asceticism, characterized by the denial of physical pleasure and isolation. Ultimately the importance of this study lies in increasing the knowledge available about the *'ulama, t*he most important literary body in medieval Islam.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION....1

2. KINBERG....7

3. SUFISM....13

4. THE TERMS OF IBN AL-FARADI....18

5. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS....33

6. KINBERG AND IBN AL-FARADI....42

7. DISCIPLINES OF THE 'ULAMA....48

8. CHALLENGING URVOY....58

9. CONCLUSIONS....63

BIBLIOGRAPHY....67

VITA....70

I. Introduction

It has been long acknowledged by Islamic intellectuals that *zuhd*, a discipline associated with extreme piety and the denial of physical pleasure, is an important issue within the Islamic community. The history of *zuhd* as a subject for debate goes back to the origins of Islam. The issue was first mentioned in the Qur'an, in verse 11:16-17, where it was written , "As for those who wish for the life of this world and its glitter, We give them in this life the wages of their works in full, and they shall not be shortchanged in it. These are the ones who in the next world have nothing but fire". This verse mentioned the main argument used by ascetics to defend their behavior. Ascetics defended their practice by arguing that by living lives of poverty or denying themselves physical pleasure they followed the tenets of the Qur'an. The original *umma* deemed the issue important as well. The importance of *zuhd* to Islamic religious and intellectual tradition is further supported by the fact that the Prophet Muhammad once rebuked a man for abandoning his responsibilities in order to devote all of his time to prayer. The man rejected worldly concerns so that he could become closer to God. In the Prophet's mind this was not a legitimate activity because it placed the rest of the community in the position of taking care of the man's crops and taking care of his animals.[1] This refutation of the practical results of ascetic behavior placed the Prophet in the position of discouraging *zuhd* among his followers. This view of asceticism was challenged, however, by Abu Bakr, the closest companion and father-in-law of Muhammad, and the Prophet's successor as leader of the Islamic community. It was related that Abu Bakr said that "Our abode is transitory, our life therein is but a loan, our breaths are numbered, and our indolence is manifest" [2], and also, "O God, give me plenty of this world and make me desirous of renouncing it".[3] These ideas, abandoning worldly concerns and renouncing the

[1]Von Grunebaum, Gustave, Medieval Islam (Chicago University Press, 1946), p.130.
[2]Ibid, 128.
[3]Ibid, 128.

material world, are fundamental aspects of *zuhd.* Ultimately Abu Bakr's view of ascetic behavior triumphed and asceticism became an accepted discipline for Muslims, supported fundamentally by the Qur'an and himself as first Caliph.

What asceticism is and what ascetics did, however, have never been adequately addressed by historians of Islam. Most of the scholars and ascetics who have written on the subject of *zuhd* have concentrated on the theoretical aspects of the question.[4] Little attention has been paid to the way in which ascetics actually lived their lives. This is important because modern scholars generally viewed asceticism as a part of mysticism and other forms of unusual religious behavior, paying little attention to the role that ascetics played within the *ʿulama.* By studying the role that ascetics played within the Islamic community in late ninth, tenth, and early eleventh century al-Andalus, using biographies, or *tarajim,* written about members of the *ʿulama* who lived during this period, I intend to find a description of *zuhd* as it was understood and practiced by medieval Muslims living in al-Andalus. I will further attempt to understand how ascetics differed, or did not differ, from the rest of the *ʿulama* in relation to how they lived, where they lived, and what disciplines they engaged in outside of *zuhd.*

In order to analyze the role of ascetics within the *ʿulama* in al-Andalus I will rely on Ibn al-Faraḍi's (d. 403/1012) Tārīkh ʿUlama al-Andalus [5], which focused on members of the *ʿulama* living during the late ninth, tenth, and early eleventh centuries. This work by Ibn al-Faraḍi was a

---

[4]There are only a few authors who have addressed *zuhd* directly in their works. The two most prominent of these authors were Margaret Smith and Leah Kinberg. Smith's series of books dealing with mysticism, Readings from the Mystics of Islam (London: Luzac and Co., 1972), Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near East and Middle East (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1931), and An Early Mystic of Baghdad (London: Sheldon Press, 1935), all address asceticism as a part of sufism. Kinberg's two important articles, "What is Meant by Zuhd", Studia Islamica, (1985), 61: 27-44, and "Compromise of Commerce", Der Islam, (1989), 66: 193-212, are the best and most comprehesive articles which deal exclusively with *zuhd.* It should be emphasized, however, that these authors analyze *zuhd* from a theoretical perspective.

[5]There are a number of different editions of Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection which are available. The edition I have chosen was published in Cairo by al-Dar al-Misriyya in 1966. It should be noted that the edition I am using is divided into two volumes which are bound together. The biographies, tarajim,

which continued for almost two centuries following Ibn al-Faradi's death. Ibn al-Faradi's biography contains basic genealogical information about individual members of the *ʿulama* along with descriptions of their travels, teachers, disciplines, and intellectual pursuits. He collected this information during his travels through al-Andalus and al-Maghrib in his capacity as a religious judge and transmitter of Hadith.[6] His biographical collection included over fifteen hundred members of the learned class, including over one hundred who are identified as *zuhhād.* Stephen Humphreys remarked on the scholarly usefulness of the biographical collections of al-Andalus, begun by Ibn al-Faradi and continued by Ibn Bashkuwal (d. 578/1183) and Ibn al-'Abbar (d. 595-658/1199-1260), and wrote that these collections provide scholars with an "insight into cultural and religious life" and "valuable indications as to the typical career patterns and sources of income of the *ʿulama*".[7] In addition, these biographies provide scholars with an opportunity to compare how the ideas and disciplines of the *ʿulama* differed in al-Andalus when compared with al-Mashriq (the Eastern part of the Islamic world). As Humphreys suggested, I will use Ibn al-Faradi's biography and to a lesser extent Ibn Bashkuwal's Kitāb al-Sila fī Tārīkh A'immat al-Andalus[8], which supports the evidence found in Ibn al-Faradi, in order to answer questions that still remain about *zuhd.*

At this point it would be valuable to examine one of the *tarajim* found in Ibn al-Faradi's collection in order to understand exactly what kind of information was presented by the biographer. The biography I have chosen to present is a biography of average length. Some of the biographies were two to three pages long, while others were as short as two or three sentences. For the

---

[6]Ibn al-Faradi was well known during his time and therefore information about him is easy to obtain. One such source is al-Dhahabi's biographical collection, Kitāb al-Tadhkiratu'l-Huffaz, vol. III.

[7]Humphreys, Stephen, Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 187-208. Humphreys dedicated an entire chapter of his book to the role and status of the *ʿulama* in al-Andalus. He analyzed the sources which will be used for this study in this particular chapter.

[8]As with Ibn al-Faradi's collection there are a number of editions of Ibn Bashkuwal's collection available. The edition which was used for this survey was the one published in Cairo by Dar al-Kitāb al-Maṣri in 1989. The *tarjama* numbers function in the same way as they do in Ibn al-Faradi's work.

most part, however, they were about twenty to twenty-five lines long and contained the same general information as the *tarjama* (the singular of *tarajim*) below.

> Number 546- Sa'adūn Ibn Ismā'īl Mawlā Jidhām, a client of the family Akhṭal al-Jidhamiyīn. He was from the people of Rayyah, and his *kunya* [the name that he was known by among the community, usually referring to the first male child] was Abu 'Uthmān.
>
> He studied under Muḥammad Ibn Waḍaha and al-Kashani. He was learned in the required divisions of inheritance and the diversity of opinions of the people about them. He was also learned in the language and poetry. He was accurate and was meticulous in what he wrote.
>
> He was ascetic, cautious in thought, and wandered about; and he didn't marry or take a concubine. He was not occupied with things from this material world.
>
> He died (God have mercy on him) in the year 295. He was remembered by Qāsim Ibn Sa'dan who said he knew about him from the book of Muhammad Ibn Aḥmad written by him in his own hand.[9]

This entry is indicative of the information related by Ibn al-Faraḍi in these *tarajim*. Here, several aspects of the life of Sa'dūn Ibn Ismā'īl become apparent. The first piece of information presented by the biographer is the subject's full name and the name of his city. Then the biographer lists the teachers with whom Sa'dūn Ibn Ismā'īl had studied and, in other entries, the individuals on

---

[9]*Tarjama* 546, Vol. 1: page 183: *Sa'dūn Ibn Ismā'īl Mawlā Judham, Mawla li-al Akhtal al-Jadhamiyīn: min ahl Rayyah: yukna: Abū 'Uthmān.*
Sami'a min: Muḥammad Ibn Waḍḍāh, wa- al-Khashani, wa kāna 'aliman bil-farā'id wa ikhtilāf al-nās fīha, ma'a al-'ilm bil-lughah, wa-al-shi'r. Dābiṭan, ḥasan al-taquyūd lamma kataba. Wa kāna: zāhidan wari'an mutanaqqilan; lam yankuḥ wa la tasarrā, wa la ishtaghala bi-shay'in min al-dunya. Tuwuffiyā (raḥmānuhu Allāh): sinah khams wa tisa'īn wa ma'itayn. Dhakaruhu Qāsim Ibn Sa'dān, wa qala: kāna (ay: Sa'dūn). min kitāb Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad bi-khaṭṭihi.

whose authority the subject transmitted Hadith. This information is important for our study for two reasons. The first reason is that it allows us to see if ascetics studied under the same teachers. If they studied under the same teachers then the conclusion could be drawn that ascetics learned the theoretical aspects of their discipline from a limited number of sources. The second reason is that it provides information about the travel patterns of the *zuhhād* (ascetics, the singular is *zāhid*). While this particular biography does not give the location of the teacher Muḥammad Ibn Waḍḍāh, most of the biographies provide some sort of information about the teachers' locations. The biographer would generally preface the phrase "he learned from" by using the Arabic phrase *raḥala ila al-mashriq* (he traveled to the East). This information is valuable because it allows historians to see where the major learning centers were in the Islamic world and where ascetics traveled during the period of their life when they searched for knowledge.

For the purposes of this paper the most important part of the biography is where the biographer gives the personal characteristics of the *zāhid*. These characteristics were generally introduced by the word *kāna* (he was), followed by a list of attributes which described the personality and character of the ascetic. In this particular *tarjama* Ibn al-Faraḍi described the individual as "ascetic, cautious in thought, and peripatetic". All of these words are important for our study. Ibn al-Faraḍi also provides a list of the other disciplines participated in by Sa'dūn Ibn Ismā'īl. He related that the ascetic was an expert in language and poetry, two disciplines commonly engaged in by the *'ulama* which will be examined later in this work.

While there is valuable information contained in these *tarajim*, they are also painfully vague in many instances. For instance, Ibn al-Faraḍi informed readers that this particular ascetic was knowledgeable about the required divisions of inheritance, but there was no information presented about what other religious duties he was specifically involved with or whether these duties were relevant to his ascetic practices. Besides the lack of information, there are other problems inherent in using these sources. Ibn al-Faraḍi tended to use vague words. For instance, while this

particular *tarjama* contained words easily translated and understood, many contained words such as *fāḍil* (generally translated as virtuous), *ṣāliḥ* (righteous), and *mutawāḍiʿ* (humble). These words inform historians that the individual was regarded in a positive manner, but they do not specifically inform us about the way asceticism was regarded by Ibn al-Faraḍi. For example, *ṣāliḥ* can be translated as "righteous", but does this mean that he was considered a good man in general or does it mean that his practices were considered rightly guided in matters pertaining to religion. These words were further rendered ambiguous by their placement. Generally these words appeared following the phrase "he was", which introduced a string of descriptive words. Therefore no context exists for these words in order to refine their meanings. This makes the task of understanding the exact meaning of these words difficult. Finding the exact meaning of these words and phrases is important for our purposes since part of this analysis centers on how the rest of the *ʿulama* viewed *zuhhād*. While this ambiguity makes it difficult to know exactly what Ibn al-Faraḍi meant by some of his terminology, it is still possible to make conclusions based on his evidence. Using Leah Kinberg's comprehensive analysis of *zuhd* in order to fill in the gaps left by the often ambiguous biographical collection of Ibn al-Faraḍi is one way in which this can be achieved.

2. Kinberg

As has been stated previously, the main focus of this work is to understand what *zuhd* meant to Ibn al-Faraḍi and how *zuhhād* behaved in relation to the rest of the *ʿulama*. It would be difficult to analyze the terms used by the Muslim biographer without a basic understanding of Eastern *zuhd*. For this it is necessary to turn to Kinberg. In two articles, "What is meant by Zuhd?"[10] and "Compromise of Commerce"[11], Kinberg developed the most comprehensive theoretical definition of *zuhd*. Her primary focus was on theoretical tracts written by Eastern *zuhhād* from the Ummayad period through the eleventh century. Kinberg acknowledges that *zuhd* is a far ranging and complex discipline with conflicting views among *zuhhād* about what *zuhd* encompassed and what traits were necessary for individuals to be considered ascetics. In order to deal with the internal conflicts among *zuhhad* Kinberg divided her work into two sections. In the first she discussed general definitions of *zuhd* using a variety of treatises written by ascetics and analyzing their works in order to delineate the major divisions within Islamic asceticism. In the second section she discussed the more specific definitions of *zuhd*. In this section she divided *zuhd* into five major components each ascetic was believed to possess. Of these five components, *riḍā*, *tawakkul*, *qiṣar al-ʿamal*, the attitude of the ascetic to *al-dunya*, and *waraʿ*, Kinberg considered *waraʿ* to be the most vital, and the one which leads the ascetic to be able to accomplish the other four. For this reason I will treat her arguments about *waraʿ* separately from my treatment of *riḍā*, *tawakkul*, *qiṣar al-ʿamal*, and the relationship between the *zāhid* and *al-dunya*.

Kinberg organized her section on the general definitions of *zuhd* into a series of arguments made by various ascetics on what constituted the essence of *zuhd*. The most popular definition of *zuhd* was the one produced by al-Zuhrī (d. 124/741). Al-Zuhrī argued that the essence of

[10]Kinberg, Leah, "What is Meant by Zuhd", Studia Islamica (1985), 61: 27-44.
[11]Kinberg, Leah, "Compromise of Commerce" Der Islam (1988), 66: 193-212.

zuhd was denial of pleasure to the soul. He believed that it was possible to be a *zāhid* without neglecting the body or living in squalor, two activities traditionally associated with the ascetic discipline. The thrust of this argument is that by placing wealth, or the absence of wealth, in such an important place, the ascetic is by this very act placing the material world in a place of importance. Al-Zuhrī believed that true asceticism could be found in the renunciation of the desire to accumulate wealth. For the ascetic this was not just a semantic difference. Al-Zuhrī argued that as long as the primary focus of the ascetic was God, then the amount of wealth a person had was incidental.[12] This view was supported by such illustrious Muslims as Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal (164/780-241/855), whose view had authority due to his position as founder of the Ḥanbali school of law. Ibn Ḥanbal stated, according to Kinberg, that *zuhhād* need not be poor because wealth should not matter one way or the other to ascetics.[13] In essence, they believed that *zuhd* was not the suppression of desire for material possessions and the neglect of the body. Instead he believed that it was the suppression of inner evil desires from the soul. It should not be concluded, however, that there was not opposition to this position in other theoretical tracts composed by *zuhhād.*

Opposition to this viewpoint centered on the belief that the *zāhid* had to be poor. Proponents of poverty believed that accumulating wealth, by its very definition, involved one with the material world. They further believed that involvement with the material world distanced man from God. Although they held the belief that poverty was essential for *zuhd*, they also held the position that the suppression of evil desires within the soul was important as well. This was the view held by al-Shiblī (d. 334/945). Al-Shiblī argued that ascetics must renounce anything that is not God.[14] It is my contention that this belief would not permit the accumulation of material possessions. Other *zuhhād* appear to have shared this belief. Kinberg quoted Abu Ṭalib al-Makkī (d. 386/995) as writing that "choosing poverty is *zuhd*".[15] This view is diametrically opposed to the view that wealth and *zuhd* are

[12]Kinberg, "What is Meant by Zuhd", 30.
[13]Kinberg, "Compromise of Commerce", 197.
[14]Kinberg, "What is Meant by Zuhd", 31.
[15]Ibid, 35.

separate. While Muslims such as Ibn Hanbal believed that *zuhd* was an internal phenomenon that did not necessarily make poverty incumbent on the participant, others believed that poverty was *zuhd.*

With this debate as background, it is now possible to understand the specific components of *zuhd* as Kinberg saw them. Kinberg placed the specific definitions of *zuhd* into two categories: those definitions which dealt with the goal of *zuhd* and those which showed the *zāhid* the methods by which he could achieve the desired goal. The first category included four parts, *riḍā*, *tawakkul*, *qiṣar al-ʿamal*, and the relationship between the *zāhid* and *al-dunya* (the material world), which provided insight into what *zuhhād* hoped to accomplish by their actions. The second category was essentially an analysis of the word *waraʿ* (scrupulosity in thought, especially regarding matters of moral doubt)and the way in which this particular theoretical concept enabled the *zāhid* to co-exist with a world acknowledged to be inherently evil.

The first major component which Kinberg addressed was *riḍā.* She defined *riḍā* as contentment with God. Her theoretical basis for including *rida* as one of the essential components of *zuhd* was Fudayl Ibn ʿIyāḍ (d. 187/803), whom she quoted as having written: "The origin for renouncing this world is contentment with God".[16] The essence of contentment, according to Kinberg, was the ability to adapt to any special or unusual situation that life presented. Kinberg found a number of *zāhids* who elaborated on this idea and further explained that for a *zāhid* practicing *riḍā* "the prohibited (*ḥarām*) does not overcome his patience nor the permissible (*ḥalāl*) overcomes his gratitude".[17] Kinberg does not view *riḍā* to be at odds with the notion of accumulating wealth, but it is at odds with the ostentatious or ungrateful display of wealth. She also clearly links the idea of *riḍā* with *zuhd.*

The second major component of *zuhd* which Kinberg examined was *tawakkul.* *Tawakkul* was defined as "radical reliance on God". Kinberg believed that the definitions for *rida* and *tawakkul* were complementary. She argued that essentially *tawakkul* was trusting in God and *riḍā* was

[16]Ibid, 31.
[17]Ibid, 32.

being content with whatever He provided for you.[18] Kinberg also viewed *tawakkul* as more of an inner manifestation of *zuhd* than an exterior manifestation. She argued that "the inner feeling of *tawakkul* is introduced as the basis for the *zāhid's* way of life, and not poverty and severe restrictions which are manifestations of exterior values".[19] It was in arguing this point, however, that Kinberg was forced to make the admission that *tawakkul*, while an important part of *zuhd*, was not believed by many ascetics to be the sole aspect of asceticism, as the other aspects were considered to be. She wrote that many of the *zuhhād* conceded that *tawakkul* was integral to *zuhd*, but that poverty must also be a part of asceticism as well. She believed that ascetics considered trust in God to be a vital aspect of asceticism, but that the debate over whether this was the most important aspect mirrored the central debate among ascetics over the necessity of poverty for *zuhhād*.

Kinberg concluded that the most complex and controversial aspect of *zuhd* was *qiṣar al-ʿamal*. She defined this phrase as "hope for a short duration". It was in this phrase that the debate over whether *zuhhād* needed to live a life of poverty was most apparent. Kinberg found that some ascetics, such as Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/777), believed that hope for a short duration was viewed as an internal expression of *zuhd*. Ascetics who subscribed to this point of view argued that it was not necessary to live in poverty in order to hope for a short life.[20] There were a number of *zuhhād* mentioned by Kinberg who did not agree with this analysis. These ascetics believed that fulfilling *qiṣar al-ʿamal* made it necessary for the *zāhid* to relinquish all possessions and refuse to plan for the future. Kinberg found it important to note that even *zuhhād* who believed poverty to be necessary to achieving *zuhd* viewed poverty to be an outgrowth of *qiṣar al-ʿamal* rather than its primary focus. In other words, while poverty itself was not desired, it would inevitably occur if the *zāhid* behaved as a *qāṣir al-ʿamal* (one who desires a short duration).[21] Kinberg argued that the conflict between this view

[18]Ibid, 33.
[19]Ibid, 33.
[20]Ibid, 34.
[21]Ibid, 36.

and the view that *zuhhād* need not live in poverty gave rise to numerous tracts written on *al-zuhd fī al-dunya* (asceticism with respect to the things of this world).

Kinberg treated her fourth aspect, the attitude of the *zāhid* toward this world, as a conclusion to her analysis of the debate on poverty. She found three primary attitudes toward the world exhibited by *zuhhād*. The first, and most popular attitude, was that *zuhd* was not the abandonment of this world, only indifference towards it. Clearly this was the attitude which individuals who did not live in poverty expressed. The other two attitudes took a far more disparaging look at the material world. The second attitude was expressed by Kinberg in the form of a quote from al-Junayd (d. 298/910). She quoted him as writing that *zuhd* was "thinking little of the world and wiping out its effects from the heart".[22] The third attitude, similar to the second, emphasized the fact that the world should be little regarded by the ascetic. While Kinberg found a number of ascetics who subscribed to the latter points of view, she concluded that the attitude which most exemplified medieval *zuhd* was the former. She found that *zuhhād* most often participated physically in the world and administered to their earthly affairs, but they guarded against emotional attachment to this world and its possessions. Thus, Kinberg concluded that physical asceticism, while a part of some forms of *zuhd*, was not considered essential to the practice.

After coming to this important conclusion, Kinberg turned her attention to the method by which *zuhhād* could hope to achieve this balance with the world. She believed that the most important factor in this was *wara*, or scrupulosity in thought. In fact, Kinberg found many instances in which *wara* and *zuhd* were considered essentially linked by *zuhhād*.[23] Kinberg made this link as well. She considered *waraʿ* to be the one necessary component for fulfilling the requirements of *zuhd*. *Waraʿ* primarily dealt with the border between what was *ḥalāl* (lawful or allowed) and *ḥarām* (unlawful or prohibited), and areas of *shubḥah* (moral ambiguity).[24] Kinberg used these areas of *waraʿ*

[22]Ibid, 36.
[23]Ibid, 41.
[24]Ibid, 41.

to engage in a comprehensive theoretical discussion about what this scrupulosity meant to the ascetics. She used the words of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal to establish that the way in which *waraʿ* was practiced by the *zāhid* placed him into one of three categories. Kinberg related that Ibn Ḥanbal believed the three classes of *waraʿ*, and by extension *zuhd,* were hierarchical. These classes were: "*zuhd* of the common people (*ʿawāmm*), which is abandoning the *ḥarām*; *zuhd* of the religious elite (*khawāṣṣ*), which is abandoning the surplus of *ḥalāl*, and *zuhd* of those who know God (*ʿārifīn*), which is abandoning whatever detracts the believer from God".[25] Clearly, the first two levels in his analysis fell within the parameters of *waraʿ*. The third level, however, was more ambiguous, and appears to have been referring to ascetics who removed themselves from the material world. Kinberg explained that the levels given by Ibn Ḥanbal contradict other ascetics who also grouped asceticism into three levels. For instance, Ibrahīm Ibn Adham (d. 160/777) had a different third level of *zuhd*. His third level was *zuhd salāmah*, which he defined as the renunciation of moral doubt. Whether one treats Ibn Hanbal or Ibrahīm Ibn Adham as the authority in this matter, two important points emerge from Kinberg's treatment of *waraʿ*. The first is that *waraʿ* was an essential aspect of *zuhd*, and one that guided the ascetic toward *riḍā*, *tawakkul*, and *qiṣar al-ʿamal*. The second is that her study informs historians that ascetics were not all viewed as equals. Indeed, it is clear that her work demonstrated that there were diverse opinions as to what zuhd was and how it was to be practiced.

[25]Ibid, 41.

3. Sufism

Kinberg's analysis of *zuhd* was by far the most comprehensive treatment of the subject. Her primary conclusions were that *zuhd* was an internal, rather than external, practice, and that *waraʿ* was the most important aspect by which *zuhhād* achieved their goal of becoming closer to God. These two conclusions are necessary for this study in that they provide a base from which to depart. This is important because of the vagueness of Ibn al-Faraḍi's terms. With Kinberg's treatment of the subject it is possible to understand the consistent use of the word *warīʿ* in the biographer's collection. It is also integral because words such as *ṣāliḥ* and *ʿābid* can be placed into the context of Kinberg's aspects of asceticism. Her analysis is also important for what it does not do, which is link *zuhd* with mysticism. In fact, Kinberg criticized previous analyses of *zuhd* by suggesting that "modern studies dealing with *zuhd* do not regard it as a term with implications on Islamic society as a whole, but rather as a part of sufism".[26] Kinberg's treatment of *zuhd* did not seek to make the connection between *zuhd* and sufism, and instead treated *zuhd* on its own merits with its own theoretical defense. Unfortunately, most other works which dealt with the subject analyzed asceticism solely from the perspective of how it related to mysticism.

While Kinberg's analysis was an original and complete look at the theoretical basis for *zuhd*, it stands alone as a work which examined *zuhd* apart from mysticism. Originally scholars addressed *zuhd* only as a part of mysticism. I will not be addressing *zuhd* in this manner, however. The fact that most scholars still tend to view asceticism as a part of mysticism demands that this choice be explained. There are three primary reasons why *zuhd* will be recognized as existing apart from sufism and other forms of mysticism. While the link between sufism and *zuhd* exists in many cases, it does not therefore follow that all ascetics were mystics. Indeed, there is little evidence to suggest that

[26]Ibid, 27.

this is the case. Scholars such as Margaret Smith, who wrote her important works on sufism in the mid-twentieth century, did make the link between asceticism and mysticism. She addressed *zuhd* as merely a stage of sufism. She defined *zuhd* as asceticism, and asceticism, she further explained, as the fleeing of sin in order to become closer to God and the leaving behind of worldly concerns.[27] Her view was accepted in the Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam, published in 1965, as the first sentence in its selection on *zuhd* indicates. It defined *zuhd* as "a technical term in Muslim mysticism".[28] In fact, the Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam considers the act of renunciation, in and of itself, as evidence of mysticism.[29] I find that it is patently illogical to assume that *zuhd* only existed as a part of mysticism, as these scholars suggested. Simple logic should tell us that even if sufis invariably practiced *zuhd*, it does not therefore follow that everyone who practiced *zuhd* was a mystic.

The second reason I will not address *zuhd* as a part of sufism is that in recent years two respected scholars have offered evidence that asceticism in fact existed as a discipline separate from sufism. Their analyses supersede the earlier works produced by Smith and those who subscribed to her line of thought. Dominique Urvoy's excellent quantitative analysis of the disciplines participated in by the *ʿulama* in al-Andalus, in his Le monde des ulemas andalous du V/XIe au VII/XIIIe siecle, implicitly refuted the notion that the *zuhd* present in Islamic Spain was necessarily a part of mysticism, which developed later in the area. He made clear the intellectual separation of *zuhd* and sufism when he wrote that "Sufism can no more replace (*zuhd*), than philosophy can replace science".[30] He further made this clear when he argued that *zuhd* gradually decreased as a discipline over time, while sufism gradually increased.[31] While Urvoy dealt with asceticism on a practical

---

[27]Smith, Margaret. Readings From the Mystics of Islam (London: Luzac and Co., 1972), 41.
[28]Gibb, H.A.R. and J.H. Kramers eds., Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1965), p. 661.
[29]Ibid, 661.
[30]Urvoy, Dominique Monde des ulemas andalous du V/XI au VII/XIIIe siecle (Geneve: Librarie Droz, 1978), p. 52. "*Le zuhd, qui avait servi d'ingredient non negligeable dans la vie des hommes de religion, disparait presque, avec quelques efforts cependant pour ne pas etre oublie. Mais le soufisme ne le remplace pas, pas plus que la philosophie ne remplace les sciences*".
[31]Ibid, 122.

level, Kinberg dealt with the subject from a theoretical perspective. She used theoretical tracts written by Eastern *zuhhād* in order to establish a comprehensive definition of *zuhd*.[32] Nowhere in her definition of *zuhd* did she make the link between asceticism and mysticism. As my previous analysis of Kinberg's work suggested, Kinberg believed that zuhd could and should be viewed apart from mysticism. Urvoy and Kinberg are the most recent, and the most thorough, scholars to examine *zuhd*. Their works clearly indicate that the link between sufism and *zuhd* was exaggerated by previous scholars. This contention is supported by the evidence located in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection. As I will argue below, there is no evidence present in the collection which links *zuhhād* with mysticism. This is true even though Maria Isabel Fierro Bello, in her book La heterodoxia en al-Andalus durante el periodo omeya, wrote that "authors of treatises and *mu'tazilite* polemics and others, dominated his doctrine", which indicates that Ibn al-Faraḍi was aware of thought which existed outside of the mainstream of orthodox Islam.[33] She also produced evidence that Ibn al-Faraḍi commented directly on known mystics, such as Ibn Masarra, and was familiar with their mystical practices.[34] This is important because it demonstrates that Ibn al-Faraḍi, even though he was familiar enough with mysticism to comment on it in other places, did not seek to link it with *zuhd*.

The final reason why I will not link *zuhd* with mysticism is that there is simply no evidence to suggest that members of the *'ulama* were active in sufism during the tenth and eleventh centuries according to Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection. In fact I found only one word which could have sufi connotations. The word *faqīr* was used by the biographer in several entries.[35] *Faqīr*

---

[32]Kinberg's bibliography is quite impressive as she used a wide variety of primary texts written by ascetics. Some of the main individuals she relied upon were al-Jaḥīz, Ibn 'Abd Rabbiḥī, al-Raghib al-Isfahanī, and Abu Ṭalib al-Makkī.

[33]Fierro Bello, Maria Isabel La Heterodóxia en al-Andalus Durante el Período Omeya (Madrid: Instituto Hispano-Arabe de Cultura, 1987), p. 114. "*(a)uturos de tratados y polemistas mu'tazilies y otros, dominando su doctrina*".

[34]Ibid, 114

[35]While poverty does not appear to have been a requirement for asceticism, there are at least two ascetics who were described as poor. *Tarjama* 1136, 2: 15-17 indicates that Muḥammad Ibn Waḍḍāh, who will be analyzed in more detail later in this work, was an ascetic and he was "*faqīr*". The other ascetic described in this manner was Qāsim Ibn Khalad (1061, 1:360). He was described by the biographer as "ascetic, virtuous, solitary, scrupulous, with poverty (*kāna zāhidan fāḍilan nāsikan*

can have several meanings, two of which are "sufi mendicant" and "poor man". It is my contention that the placement of the word, as part of the section describing the attributes of the ascetic, indicates that the word was intended to demonstrate the place that the individual held in society. The other words located in this section are descriptive adjectives, such as "pious" or "humble". It is more likely that Ibn al-Faraḍi intended the reader to understand the word as "poor", which would have been more along the pattern of "humble" and "pious". With this in mind, there is no evidence in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection which indicates a sufi presence during this period.

In order to make sense of some of the terminology used by Ibn al-Faraḍi it is necessary to use the basic guidelines and general definition of *zuhd* established by Kinberg. It is also important to note that this comprehensive definition of *zuhd* is far more in-depth than the definitions offered by most scholars. Most of the other scholars who refer to *zuhd* in their works simply define it as "asceticism" with no explanation of what asceticism encompasses.[36] The Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam is a notable exception to this general rule as it offers perhaps the most comprehensive definition of *zuhd* besides Kinberg. It explained *zuhd* as abstinence, "at first from sin, from what is superfluous, from all that estranges from God...;then abstinence from all perishable things by detachment of the heart".[37] This definition provides a surface analysis of *zuhd*, yet it is a much more comprehensive definition than can be found in most other sources. Because other definitions are not as detailed or as thoroughly researched as Kinberg's, it is her work which will be relied upon to fill in the holes present in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection.

The primary goal of this work is to discover what *zuhd* meant to Ibn al-Faraḍi and whether these *zuhhād* behaved in a manner that was consistent with behavior engaged in by their co-religionists in other parts of the Islamic world. It is my argument that they did conform for the most

---

wari'an ma'a al-faqr)". It should be emphasized that these two examples are the only ones I found in the collection.

[36]For examples of the casual manner in which the word *zuhd* is used by scholars of Islam see any of the works on Islam currently in print. Invariably *zuhd* is defined simply as "asceticism" without any explanation as to what Islamic asceticism was or what it encompassed to be a *zāhid*.

[37]Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam, 661.

part to the accepted practice of *zuhd* established in al-Mashriq, Baghdad, and Mecca, and that the reason for this was the extensive travel to the East by the *zuhhād* as part of their religious training and their search for knowledge. It is also my contention that, although they were ascetics, they were also productive members of the *ʿulama* who participated in the same activities as non-ascetic members of the *ʿulama* . As part of this argument I will also address Urvoy's contention that the ascetics existed as communities.[38] Urvoy must have believed that the phrase *ahl al-zuhd*, as used by Ibn Bashkuwal and Ibn al-'Abbar, suggested the separation of ascetics into *zāhid* communities, apart from the rest of the *ʿulama.* I believe this was a misinterpretation of the phrase. I will contend, using evidence from both Ibn al-Faraḍi and Ibn Bashkuwal, that ascetics existed within the larger community and that the phrase *ahl al-zuhd* was used by Ibn al-Faradi not to suggest "community", but rather as a way of denoting their participation in a special or different activity. This was similar to the manner in which Christians were referred to as *Ahl al-kitāb,* not because they lived in communities, but merely because they were Christians.

[38]Urvoy, Dominique, "The ʿUlama of al-Andalus", Jayyusi, Salma Khadra, ed. The Legacy of Muslim Spain (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), p. 857.

4. The Terms of Ibn al-Faradi

Before analyzing what Ibn al-Faradi meant by his use of the word *zuhd*, it is first necessary to establish that when the Muslim biographer used the word he was referring to a discipline rather than to simply a positive characteristic or attribute. By this I mean whether the author regarded *zuhd* as something deeper than simply ascetic behavior, or whether he regarded "*zāhid*" as a characteristic similar to "*fāḍil*" or "*ṣāliḥ*". Clearly, the difference between a positive characteristic and a discipline is an important one, which needs to be explained. By attribute I mean a word which referred to a personal characteristic, such as "virtuous" or "righteous", and intended nothing more than to remark on a favorable aspect of the individual's character. A discipline, on the other hand, referred to a technical practice in which the *ulama* engaged, such as poetry or the study of the Arabic language.[39] It is my contention that Ibn al-Faradi used the words *zuhd* and *zāhid* to suggest a discipline. There are two reasons why this is so. The words were part of descriptions which contained within them other disciplines, such as Hadith transmitters (individuals who transmitted stories of the Prophet's behavior on the authority of respected members of their community). The second reason is that the author tended to use other words which mean "ascetic" in the same phrases which would contain the words *zāhid* or *zuhd*.

It is clear that when Ibn al-Faradi used the words *zuhd* and *zāhid* he was equating them with other disciplines as he often placed them in a position of equality with other recognized disciplines. There are numerous examples of this practice available in Ibn al-Faradi's biographies. One such example is 'Addam Ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Bahilī (n.d.) who was described as "a *zāhid* and a great public reader and reciter of the Qur'an".[40] The grouping of *zāhid* with "public reader" and "Qur'anic

[39]Urvoy, Les mondes des ulemas, 196.
[40]Ibn al-Faradi, Tārīkh, 1006, 1:342. "*Zāhid kathīr al-tilāwa wa-al-dhikr*". This probably refers to recitation and memorization of the qur'an rahter than some other material because in other places in the biographical collection he adds the word "*al-Qur'an*" to the phrase.

reciter", two traditional activities engaged in by the *ulama*, indicates that Ibn al-Faradi was considering *zuhd* as accepted discipline for the *ʿulama*. Similarly, the Muslim biographer described Marwan Ibn ʿAbd al-Malik al-Zāhid (d.363/973) of Cordoba as "a worshipful *zāhid*, who transmitted Hadith".[41] Again, it is apparent that Ibn al-Faradi viewed *zuhd* as a term of the same sort as "transmitter of Hadith", a common discipline of the *ʿulama*. The use of *zuhd* in this manner makes it highly probable that the author regarded it as an accepted discipline.

There is further evidence that Ibn al-Faradi considered *zuhd* to be a discipline rather than an attribute. The author continually used the words *zāhid* or *zuhd* in phrases which contained other words which mean "ascetic". One example of this was his use of the word "*nāsik*". A *nāsik* is an individual who is a "hermit, recluse, penitent; ascetic".[42] Clearly this word was understood to suggest asceticism or characteristics generally associated with ascetics. For instance, in his description of Ahmad Ibn Yahyā (d. 343/954) he related that the individual was "an isolated *zāhid* and a reclusive ascetic (*nāsikan*)".[43] The use of both *zāhid* and *nāsik* in the same phrase is suggestive. While Ibn al-Faradi's text contains numerous examples of similar words appearing in the same entry, I found few examples of words with identical meanings appearing within the same *tarjama*. It is doubtful that the author would have used words in the same phrase which had the exact same meaning for him. Even in this short passage this aspect of his style is apparent. The author used the word "isolated" (*mutaqati'an*) and "reclusive" (*mutabattilan*) in this phrase and, even though the two words have similar meanings, there is a clear difference in the level of intensity between the words. Indeed, it is apparent that the Muslim biographer considered *zāhid* to be a word that suggested something more complex than just "asceticism".

I believe that Ibn al-Faradi's use of *zuhd* and *zāhid* was intended to convey that *zuhd* was a discipline as opposed to just simple physical asceticism. Obviously this is an important

---

[41]Ibid, 1418, 1:342. "*Zāhidan ʿābidan haddatha*".
[42]Cowan, J.M. Arabic-English Dictionary: The Hans Wehr Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic (Ithica: Spoken Language Services, Inc., 1979), p. 1129.
[43]Ibn al-Faradi, Tārīkh, 119, 1:38. "*Kāna zāhidan munqati'an wa nāsikan mutabattilan*".

conclusion for this work. In order to decipher what Ibn al-Faraḍi understood the discipline of *zuhd* to be it is first necessary to accept that he believed *zuhd* to include more than just the physical denial of pleasure. It must be understood that he believed it was an accepted spiritual discipline and was more than just an individual's decision to behave in an abstemious manner. *Zuhd*, according to the biographer, was not a personal characteristic that anyone might possess; rather it was a distinct discipline with a distinctive set of practices and goals which set the practitioners apart in some way from the practitioners of other disciplines.

The focus of this work is to understand what Ibn al-Faraḍi believed *zuhd* to encompass. There are two primary ways by which this will be achieved. The first is by analyzing the words and phrases Ibn al-Faraḍi used to describe the attributes and practices of the men he identified as *zuhhād*. Each of the author's entries included this information and thus they are an essential tool for the historian in making comparisons between individual *zuhhād* and creating generalizations about what Ibn al-Faraḍi believed *zuhd* to be. I have chosen to divide these words and phrases into two categories. The first category is words and phrases which describe aspects of the individual's character. Entries in this category will include words such as "virtuous" or "pure". The second category will concentrate on the *zāhid's* practices as they were viewed by Ibn al-Faraḍi. This is the category into which descriptions such as "isolated" or "abstemious" will be placed. It should be noted that the creation of these categories is somewhat arbitrary. Ibn al-Faraḍi used many words which were vague and these are the words which most often fall into my category of "attributes". Words that are more specific, such as "isolated", fall into the category of "action". It is entirely possible that these categories each include words which could just as easily belong to the other, but this is relatively unimportant to the conclusions which I draw. It is my intention to use both of these categories as the basis for Ibn al-Faraḍi's definition of *zuhd*. The second way in which I will attempt to decipher what *zuhd* meant to the biographer is by analyzing whether there were distinct levels of asceticism present in the biographies. In order to do this it is necessary to use the descriptive passages written by the

biographer so that it may be discovered if there were discrepancies between the adjectives used to describe different *zuhhād.*

It was Ibn al-Faraḍi's practice to use a limited number of Arabic words in describing the attributes of *zuhhād.* These words often appear as part of the same biographical entry as it was Ibn al-Faraḍi's custom, as was stated earlier, to use the word *kāna* ("he was") followed by a string of adjectives describing the pious behavior of the individual. While the importance of the analysis of the practice of *zuhd* is self-evident, the analysis of the way in which Ibn al-Faraḍi thought of *zuhhād* is equally important. There are two primary reasons why this is true. The first reason is that the Muslim biographer's use of descriptive words implicitly affords modern historians an understanding of how other members of the *ʿulama* viewed *zuhhād.* The second reason is that some of the words chosen by Ibn al-Faraḍi, such as "humble" or "worshipful", do more than simply offer a value judgment on the piety of *zuhhād.* They also offer historians an opportunity to discover how it was that ascetics behaved.

The word that most often appeared in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographies in conjunction with *zuhd* was *faḍl. Faḍl*, or virtue, almost invariably appeared whenever *zuhd* or *zāhid* was mentioned. This clearly establishes that there was a link between asceticism and virtue. The most common way in which Ibn al-Faraḍi used the word was as part of a group of adjectives describing the character of the *zāhid.* For instance, in describing Aḥmad Ibn ʿAbd al-Salām (n.d.) of Rayyah, the Muslim biographer stated that "he was learned, virtuous (*fāḍil*), and a possessor of purity and *zuhd*".[44] This was a common pattern for the author. It is again illustrated by his description of Asbagh Ibn Sufyān of Cordoba (n.d.) whom he believed "was among the most virtuous people (*afḍal*)of his time and one of the most ascetic of them".[45] Ibn Bashkuwal's supplement to Ibn al-Faraḍi's work also used the word *faḍl* in nearly every entry describing *zuhhād.* Ibn Bashkuwal described Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Ubayda of Toledo in a way that was reminiscent of the manner in

[44]Ibid, 175, 1:52. "*Kāna ʿaliman fāḍilan dhu ʿafāf wa zuhd*".
[45]Ibid, 254, 1:80. "*Kāna min afḍal ahl zamanihi wa azhadihim*".

which Ibn al-Faradi depicted ascetics from his time. According to Ibn Bashkuwal this ascetic "was known for what was passed to him: speech and work, praiseworthiness, popularity, with virtue (*al-faḍl*), asceticism, excellence, and caution".[46] This example is pertinent for two reasons. The first is that it again exemplifies Ibn al-Faraḍi's pattern of using a string of adjectives to describe the attributes of the ascetic. The second reason this is an informative example is that once more the use of the word *faḍl* is apparent. While *faḍl* is more important for the frequency with which it appeared than for the light it sheds on what Ibn al-Faraḍi believed, there is one important conclusion we can draw from the Muslim biographer's use of the word *faḍl*. *Faḍl* and *zuhd* appeared in tandem in virtually all of the entries in which asceticism was mentioned, leaving historians with the inescapable conclusion that there was a link in the mind of Ibn al-Faraḍi between virtue and asceticism.

The second most common epithet for ascetics in Ibn al-Faraḍi's collection was *ṣāliḥ*. *Ṣāliḥ* is a word with various meanings, but when referring to an individual the most common meaning is "pious of nature" or "righteous", particularly in religious matters. It is my belief that when Ibn al-Faraḍi used this word he was relating that he understood the *zuhhād* to be rightly guided in their religious practices. This is true because had the Muslim biographer simply wanted to convey the idea of piety he would have used the word *fāḍil*, which he did in nearly every biography in which he used the word *ṣāliḥ*. There are numerous examples of Ibn al-Faraḍi using the word *ṣāliḥ* to describe *zuhhād* in his biographies. For instance, Sa'īd Ibn Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Sa'īd Ibn Mūsā Ibn Ḥudīr of Cordoba (d. 391/1000) was described by Ibn al-Faraḍi as "a virtuous, righteous (*ṣāliḥ*), abstemious, ascetic man".[47] This was virtually the same terminology the author used when referring to Muḥammad Ibn Sa'dūna (d. 322/933) who was said to be "a rightly guided, virtuous, ascetic, and cautious man".[48] The use of *ṣāliḥ* by the Muslim biographer is important for understanding how he viewed *zuhd* in al-Andalus. It is clear from his use of *ṣāliḥ* that practitioners of asceticism were not

---

[46]Ibn Bashkowal, Silah, 37: 51-3. "*Yuḥsanu ma yuhwaluhu qawlan wa ʿamalan, maḥmud, maḥbuhan, ma'a al-fāḍilan wa-al-zuhd wa-al-fa'iq wa-al-wardʿ*".
[47]Ibn al-Faradi, Tarikh, 531, 1:175. "*Kāna rajulan fāḍilan ṣāliḥan mutaqashshifan zāhidan*".
[48]Ibid, 1388, 2:104-5. "*Kāna rajulan ṣāliḥan fāḍilan zāhidan wariʿan*".

regarded as heretical by Ibn al-Faraḍi. This point is also supported by evidence available in Ibn Bashkuwal's biographical supplement to Ibn al-Faraḍi's collection. Ibn Bashkuwal referred to numerous *zuhhād* as "*ṣāliḥ*", including Ḥammad Ibn ʿAmmar Ibn Hashim al-Zāhid of Cordoba. Ibn Bashkuwal related that this particular ascetic "was a righteous (*ṣāliḥ*), ascetic, cautious man who was known for charity and godliness".[49] This is similar to the entries which used the word *ṣāliḥ* in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection. According to Tārīkh ʿUlama al-Andalus there is no evidence to suggest that *zuhhād* were considered heretical. Indeed, his use of *ṣāliḥ* suggests just the opposite.

Thus far it is clear that Ibn al-Faraḍi considered *zuhhād* virtuous and righteous, and there is further evidence that he believed some ascetics to be particularly worshipful. The Muslim biographer used the word *ʿābid*, which may be translated as "worship" or "adoration", in at least ten different biographies describing *zuhhād*.[50] The use of the word *ʿābid* is intriguing for one particular reason. *ʿĀbid*, as was stated above, may be translated as "a worshipper of God". Ibn al-Faraḍi's use of this word can also be read as meaning something slightly different from simple worship. For example, the entry for Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbd al-Jabbar Ibn Muḥammad of Cordoba (d. 296/908) reads that "predominant in him were memorization and transmission besides practicing *al-zuhd* and adoration (*al-ʿibada*)".[51] Ibn al-Faraḍi's use of the word *rawīyah*, or reflection, indicates that he was referring to something deeper than simply worship. I believe that this is evidence that some ascetics engaged in reflection on the attributes of God. This may be concluded because it is well known that particularly pious individuals engaged in this practice. While reflection on God is generally studied in relation to mysticism, it is not preposterous to imagine that ascetics who were given to worship would be drawn to this particular practice. It is important to note also that not all of the cases in which *ʿābid* appeared

---

[49]Ibn Bashkuwal, Silah, 355:251. "*Kāna rajulan ṣāliḥan zāhidan wariʿan shuhira bil-khayr wa-al-ṣalaḥ*".

[50]There were numerous *zāhids* whom Ibn al-Faraḍi referred to using the term *ʿābid* (*tarajim* 643:215, 1151:22, 1418:124, 1502:158, 552:185, 913:309, and 1054:353). In all of these entries the word *ʿābid* appears in one of its various forms.

[51]Ibn al-Faraḍi, Tārīkh, 1151, 2:22. "*Kāna al-ghalib ʿalayhi al-haml wa-al-rawīya ma'a al-zuhd wa-al-ʿibada*".

as an attribute also contained the word *rawīya*. In fact it was more common for Ibn al-Faraḍi to list the word as part of a string of adjectives, in the same manner that he did for *fāḍil* and *ṣāliḥ*. This is the case in the biography of Ni'm al-Khalaf Ibn Abī al-Khasib of Toledo (d.298/910) who Ibn al-Faraḍi wrote was "a worshipful (*ʿābid*) *zāhid*, and he was a warrior".[52] There is nothing in this particular biography to suggest that Ni'm al-Khalaf was engaging in adoration of God. The point of *ʿābid* in this biography seems instead to be simply that the individual was a good Muslim who worshipped. The fact that Ibn al-Faraḍi used the word *ʿābid* to describe many of the ascetics is informative for the purpose of discovering what *zuhd* meant to the Muslim biographer. It is apparent that Ibn al-Faraḍi wished to convey to his readers the fact that some *zuhhād* were given to worship, were pious, and engaged in the adoration of God, rather than to convey that the individual was engaing in technical practices which could be linked with sufism

The final word which falls into the category of attributes to be examined is *mutawāḍiʿ*. *Mutawāḍiʿ* is best translated as "humble", "modest", or "unpretentious". The use of this word is informative for two reasons. The first reason is that it demonstrates that at least some *zuhhād* conformed to the ascetic practices of rejecting the material world by behaving with humility. The second reason is that it could indicate that ascetics were conforming to Kinberg's theoretical idea of *riḍā*. *Riḍā* was a term used by Kinberg to explain the ascetic goal of not rejoicing for the good or grieving for the bad. The practical aspects of this theoretical definition included behaving in a manner that was unpretentious and unaffected by worldly concerns. In other words the *zāhid* was to behave as though the world did not matter to him, whether he be rich or poor. The simple and humble life alluded to by the use of the term *mutawāḍiʿ* clearly indicates that Ibn al-Faraḍi believed that the *zuhhād* chose to behave in way which did not cause attention to be drawn to their wealth or their worldly state. This is true because the Muslim biographer listed the humility of the *zuhhād* as an attribute, indicating that it was an intentional decision to behave in a manner which suggested that they held a lower station

[52]Ibid, 1502, 2:158. "*Kāna zāhidan ʿābidan wa kāna muḥariban*".

in life for pious reasons rather than because their station in life actually was of a low level. The fact that Ibn al-Faraḍi believed their humility was an attribute is clear when one examines the biography of Idrīs Ibn Yaḥyā of Cordoba (n.d.) who he stated was "cautious in thought, abstemious, ascetic, and humble".[53] The fact that Ibn al-Faraḍi used the term *mutawāḍiʿ* along with terms such as *wariʿ* (an individual who practiced *waraʿ*), and *zāhid*, demonstrates that *tawaḍu* (the Form VI *maṣdar* from which *mutawāḍiʿ* is derived) was considered a virtue. It also informs historians that in al-Andalus, according to Ibn al-Faraḍi, ascetics practiced Kinberg's concept of *riḍā*. This claim is further bolstered by evidence from the same passage regarding Idrīs Ibn Yaḥyā. The author informed his readers that, "the world does not affect him (Idrīs Ibn Yaḥyā)".[54] That is the essence of *riḍā*. This idea is supported by evidence located in Ibn Bashkuwal's supplementary biographies. In describing one particular *zāhid*, ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn 'Uthmān Ibn Saʿīd Ibn Dhunīn Ibn ʿAsim Ibn ʿAbd al-Malik Ibn Idrīs Ibn Bahlul Ibn Azraq Ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Muḥammad al-Safadī, the later biographer wrote that he "was charitable, virtuous, a *zāhid*, a worshiper, a jurist consult in religious matters, humble, cautious in thought, noble, learned, and he put his knowledge into practice (*ʿamil*)".[55] Clearly this is an individual who was active and somewhat successful , as his position as a religious judge and a worker suggests, but who also behaved with humility. Thus the idea of the *zāhid* who believed in not ostentatiously displaying the good fortune bestowed on him in this world is evident in Ibn al-Faraḍi's use of *mutawāḍiʿ*, and illustrates Kinberg's concept of *riḍā*.

The attributes chosen by Ibn al-Faraḍi to represent the character of *zuhhād* are instrumental to determining how the Muslim biographer and his contemporaries thought of *zuhd* and ascetics. From the evidence found in his biographies it is clear that *zuhhād* were regarded as virtuous, righteous, were known to engage in the adoration of God, were given to worship, and were humble in means and display of wealth. What does this tell historians? There are three important facts that

---

[53]Ibid, 208, 1:64. "*Kāna wariʿan mutaqashshifan zāhidan mutawāḍiʿan*".
[54]Ibid, 208, 1:64. "*Lam tughayyirhu al-dunya*".
[55]Ibn Bashkuwal, Silah, 591:406-8. "*Kāna khayyiran fāḍilan zāhidan ʿābidan qadiyan dīnan mutawāḍiʿan wariʿan saniyan ʿaliman ʿamilan*".

emerge from this evidence. The first fact is that *zuhhād* were viewed favorably by Ibn al-Faraḍi, and, it may be assumed, at least some other members of the *ʿulama*. This is clear from the words that Ibn al-Faraḍi used to describe them, such as virtuous. There is no evidence that the ascetics in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection were considered heretical. If there was any controversy regarding *zuhhād* within al-Andalus the Muslim biographer surely would have mentioned it at some point in his collection. The fact that he did not may be taken as tacit approval of their practices. The second is that *zuhhād* were not regarded as being outside the parameters of mainstream Islam. By this I mean they were not seen as heretics or as individuals practicing their religion in a questionable manner. This is apparent when one considers that Ibn al-Faraḍi used the word *ṣāliḥ* to describe them. This word indicates that that the *zuhhād* were believed to be righteous in their practice of Islam. It is highly unlikely that Ibn al-Faraḍi would have referred to them in this manner if he believed they were practicing Islam in a manner that was not accepted by the rest of the *ʿulama*. The final point that emerges from this aspect of the evidence is the fact that *zuhhād* were known to lead simple, humble lives. The author's use of the word *mutawāḍiʿ* allows historians to draw a parallel between the humility displayed by *zuhhād* from al-Andalus and the theoretical concept of *riḍā*. The fact that some of the ascetics refused to behave in a manner that emphasized their worldly success is the practical essence of the theoretical concept of not rejoicing for the good. While all three of these points are important for establishing an understanding of Ibn al-Faraḍi's definition of *zuhd*, they are only part of the definition. The practical aspects of asceticism will make this definition more complete.

In depicting the practical aspects of the *zuhhād's* lives, Ibn al-Faraḍi emphasized three primary actions undertaken by the ascetics. The first of these was scrupulosity in choosing between right and wrong . While this was not as overt an action as isolation, I have nonetheless considered it an action because ultimately it was scrupulosity that stood as the most essential aspect of asceticism. The act of consciously deciding between what was right and wrong in a scrupulous manner by the ascetic was inherently an action due to the conscious nature of the act. Besides being

an action, this was perhaps the most crucial characteristic of the *zāhid,* as Kinberg considered it to be in her analysis.[56] This was the act of carefully considering each action undertaken by the ascetic in order that the *zāhid* never behave in a manner that was *ḥarām*, or forbidden. Another important factor in determining Ibn al-Faraḍi's conception of *zuhd* was his use of several words which have as their core meaning "reclusive" or "isolated". The importance of these words must be tempered, however, because they appear in only a few of the more than one hundred biographies which deal with ascetics. The final word that will be examined in determining Ibn al-Faraḍi's definition of *zuhd* is *mutaqashshif.* This word, which means "abstemious" or "leading a primitive way of life", is important for the purpose of learning how Ibn al-Faraḍi believed ascetics lived. The use of this word indicates that the Muslim biographer believed that many *zāhids* practiced discipline and temperance in their day to day existence. This point is further strengthened by Ibn al-Faraḍi's use of the word *ʿafāf,* which is translated as "purity" or "abstinence". The author's use of these two words indicates that he recognized that the denial of physical pleasure was an integral aspect of asceticism in al-Andalus for some ascetics.

The most important idea that Ibn al-Faraḍi imparted about the practices of ascetics in al-Andalus was that the *zuhhād* practiced *wardʿ. Wardʿ* is an important concept. When translated merely as "scrupulosity in thought", it loses some of the nuance that was implied in Ibn al-Faraḍi's use of the word. It may be best understood as the ability of the *zāhid* to distinguish between what was allowed and what was forbidden. This ability was fundamental to the practice of *zuhd.* The fact that *wardʿ* was an integral part of *zuhd* is clear by the priority that Ibn al-Faraḍi gave to *wardʿ* in his biographies of *zuhhād. Wardʿ* is mentioned in most of the biographies, only slightly less often than *fāḍil.* Generally the word was included in the list of descriptive words that Ibn al-Faraḍi used to depict the individual's character. For example, the Muslim biographer wrote that Idrīs Ibn Yaḥyā of Cordoba

[56]Kinberg, "What is Meant by Zuhd", 41.

(d. 373/983) was "scrupulous in thought (*wariʿ*), abstemious, a *zāhid*, and humble".[57] While this was the most common way for the word to appear in Ibn al-Faraḍi's text, there were other uses of the word by the biographer. He attached more importance to the word in another entry, separating it from the general list of adjectives that appears in all the entries. In this particular biography, the Muslim biographer wrote that Asbagh Ibn Sufyān of Cordoba (d. 363/973), "was, during the days of his search, involved with *zuhd* and adorned with *waraʿ*".[58] It is notable that in this particular entry the word *waraʿ* was treated as being on the same level as *zuhd*. This is particularly notable because in sufi thought *zuhd* and *waraʿ* are both considered stages of sufism, with *waraʿ* considered the higher stage.[59] The fact that spirituality and scrupulosity were considered to be on the same level, or in the case of sufism a higher level, than *zuhd* is indicative of the role that internal *zuhd* played in the lives of medieval ascetics in al-Andalus. *Waraʿ* is by its nature an internal practice. The fact that Ibn al-Faraḍi gave it such a prominent place in his descriptions of ascetics leads to the conclusion that internal *zuhd*, and particularly scrupulosity, dominated the practice of asceticism in the region. This is in accordance with the evidence that Kinberg presented in her analysis. She found *waraʿ* to be the aspect of asceticism which *zuhhād* found to be most integral to *zuhd*. It is clear that Ibn al-Faraḍi also believed *waraʿ* to be an integral part of *zuhd* because the word was given emphasis not allowed for other characteristics, such as *mutawāḍiʿ* and *ʿābid*. From this it should be concluded that Ibn al-Faraḍi considered *waraʿ*, or the ability to cautiously decide between what is *ḥalāl* and what is *ḥarām*, to be an important and integral aspect of *zuhd*, as well as an indication that internal asceticism, dominated by an intense spiritual relationship with God, was the type of asceticism practiced in al-Andalus.

---

[57]Ibn al-Faraḍi, Tārīkh, 208, 1:64. "*Kāna wariʿan mutaqashshifan zāhidan mutawāḍiʿan*".
[58]Ibid, 255, 1:80. "*Kāna ayyam ṭalabihi mansuban ilā al-zuhd mutahalliyan bil-waraʿ*".
[59]Smith analyzed the various stages of sufism and concluded that *zuhd* was one of the first stages that an individual entered when becoming a sufi. Interestingly, she found *waraʿ* to be a higher stage than *zuhd*.

The second practice that becomes apparent when analyzing Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographies is seclusion or isolation. The idea of seclusion is an important part of this work. It is important not because large numbers of ascetics engaged in the practice, but because they did not. As was demonstrated in the analysis of Kinberg's arguments about *zuhd*, the debate among ascetics over whether seclusion was a necessary aspect of *zuhd* was a part of the ascetic tradition. It is clear that in al-Andalus there was also no uniform manner in which to practice *zuhd*. As with Kinberg's ascetics, some ascetics were more extreme in expressing their asceticism, while the majority were content to live more harmoniously with the material world. One question that I am attempting to address is what place *zuhhād* had in relation to the rest of the *ʿulama*. One argument which I will make is that, for the most part, there was nothing to distinguish *zuhhād* from their contemporaries other than their asceticism. By this I mean that, in the disciplines that they practiced and their location within traditional society ascetics behaved in a manner which closely resembled that of others in the learned religious class. If seclusion were a major part of *zuhd* then this would not be true. The main idea and goal of seclusion is to separate physically and spiritually from the rest of society. It is my argument that this was not a major part of asceticism in al-Andalus. What cannot be denied, however, is the fact that words which have as their core meaning seclusion or isolation appear in several of the biographies. While the number of entries in which these words appeared is not great, only seven out of more than one hundred which mention *zuhd*, they appear often enough to warrant including them as a small part of Ibn al-Faraḍi's understanding of *zuhd*. This is especially true when one considers the manner in which they appeared in his text. There are three primary words which Ibn al-Faraḍi used to convey the idea of seclusion, *mutaqaṭiʿ*, *mutabattil*, and *munqabiḍ*, which he occasionally used together as part of the same entry. For example Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā (d. 343/954), was "an isolated (*mutaqaṭiʿ*) *zāhid* and a reclusive (*mutabattilan*) ascetic".[60] Even though *zuhhād* infrequently were described as reclusive, there can be little doubt that in this particular instance the Muslim biographer

[60]Ibn al-Faraḍi, Tārīkh, 119, 1:38. "*Kāna zāhidan mutaqaṭiʿan wa nāsikan mutabattilan*".

tried to emphasize the link between *zuhd* and seclusion. While this example clearly demonstrates that some ascetics were removed from societal concerns, other *zuhhād* whom Ibn al-Faraḍi described as "reclusive" seem to have also held positions within traditional society. One example of this was Aḥmad Ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Qaynī from Rayyah (n.d.), who, Ibn al-Faraḍi related, "was a learned jurist (*faqīḥ*) and an isolated (*munqabiḍan*) *zāhid*", as well as a memorizer of religious questions (*masā'il*) and a public reader of the Qur'an (*tilāwa*).[61] This individual does not appear to have been completely isolated from the rest of society. If he was isolated he would not have been a public reader of the Qur'an or held a position as a jurist. What this evidence tells historians is that there must have existed different levels of seclusion. On the one hand there is Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā, who appears to have led a secluded life and has an entry which emphasizes his isolation. On the other hand Ibn al-Faraḍi presented Aḥmad Ibn ʿAbd Allāh, whose isolation must have been minimal if his other disciplines are any indication. While *zuhhād* who engaged in seclusion were uncommon in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection, they were more common in Ibn Bashkuwal's supplement. The ascetics mentioned in Ibn Bashkuwal's biographies also seemed to have been involved in their communities. For instance, the biographer wrote that Sulaymān Ibn Rabi'a al-Qaysī was "from the people of seclusion (*inqibaḍ*)and righteousness and abstinence and *zuhd* in the things of this world".[62] This same individual also transmitted Hadith and acted as a jurisconsult for his community. As in the case of the secluded *zuhhād* mentioned in Ibn al-Faradi's biographies, Sulaymān Ibn Rabi'a was apparently considered secluded yet he took an active part in his community. Clearly the terms for seclusion, as they were used by the biographers, were not intended to convey the sense that the *zuhhād* completely isolated themselves from society. The word appears to have been used to indicate that the *zuhhād* occasionally isolated themselves from society while still fulfilling vital roles as *ʿulama*. One additional point emerges from Ibn al-Faraḍi's use of these terms. The infrequency with which they appeared is

---

[61]Ibid, 130, 1:41. "*Kāna ʿamilan faqīḥan wa zāhidan munqabiḍan*".
[62]Ibn Bashkuwal, Silaḥ, 460:320-1. "*Kana min ahl al-inqibaḍ wa-al-ṣalaḥ wa-al-ʿafāf wa-al-zuhd fī al-dunya*".

another indication that it was internal *zuhd*, rather than *zuhd* which manifested itself in the form of demonstrative displays of isolation, which was the most common during Ibn al-Faraḍi's period. This supports the notion that *waraʿ* was a more integral aspect to asceticism than was seclusion.

The final aspect of *zuhd* which Ibn al-Faraḍi stressed was that of the physical denial of pleasure. This concept appears in Ibn al-Faraḍi's text in the form of the words *mutqashshif*, or "abstemious", and *ʿafāf*, or "purity" and "abstinence". These two words appear in several biographies. For example, the Muslim biographer wrote that Saʿīd Ibn Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Saʿīd (d. 391/1000) was "a virtuous man, righteous, abstemious, and a *zāhid*".[63] This is the general pattern that the author used when referring to the disciplined nature of the ascetics. He did not elaborate on their refusal of pleasure any more than to write that they were denying themselves excessive food and drink. It is also important to note that even this practice was not considered extreme or outside the bounds of contemporary Islamic practices to Ibn al-Faraḍi. This is evident because in the same passage in which he related that Saʿīd Ibn Aḥmad was abstemious he also related that the *zāhid* was *ṣāliḥ*, or rightly guided in his religious practices.

While abstinence from excessive food and drink was part of Ibn al-Faraḍi's understanding of *zuhd*, abstinence from sexual intercourse was also a small part of this understanding. In his description of Aḥmad Ibn ʿAbd al-Salām (n.d.) of Rayyah he wrote that the individual was virtuous and learned as well as "a possessor of *ʿafāf* and *zuhd*".[64] The appearance of celibacy as a virtue was not uncommon in the biographical collections. In fact, Ibn Bashkuwal also cited evidence of abstinence in his work. Ibn Baskhkuwal related that Sulaymān Ibn Rabi'a al-Qaysī "was from the people of seclusion and righteousness and abstinence (*al-ʿafāf*) and *al-zuhd* in the world".[65] As with

[63]Ibn al-Faradi, Tarikh, 531, 1:175. "*Kāna rajulan fāḍilan ṣāliḥan mutaqashshifan zāhidan*".
[64]Ibid, 175, 1:52. "*Dhu ʿafāf wa zuhd*".
[65]Ibn Bashkuwal, Silah, 460:320-1. "*Kāna min ahl al-inqibaḍ wa-al-ṣalaḥ wa-al-ʿafāf wa-al-zuhd fī al-dunya*".

parameters of accepted Islamic practice. More importantly, it was recognized by the biogrphers as a practice which occurred among ascetics.

5. Preliminary Conclusions

Using the words and phrases of Ibn al-Faraḍi, and to a lesser extent those found in Ibn Bashkuwal's supplement to the Tārīkh ʿUlama al-Andalus, it is possible to form a partial and preliminary definition of what *zuhd* meant to the Muslim biographer. There are two main aspects to that definition which I have outlined here: how they were viewed by the rest of the *ʿulama* and how *zuhd* manifested itself in the practices of the *zuhhād*. It is evident from the writings of Ibn al-Faraḍi that most *zuhhād* were considered virtuous, rightly guided in religious matters, and worshipers. What is important in this evidence is the fact that *zuhhād* were not considered mystics or extremists. This is clear because Ibn al-Faraḍi did not list the attributes and disciplines, including *zuhd*, of *zuhhād* in a different manner than he listed them for other members of the *ʿulama*. In fact, Ibn al-Faraḍi appears to have considered them pious examples for other Muslims. It is also striking that ascetics were regarded as "worshipers". This is important because he used the word "*ʿābid*" in the section where he customarily placed his list of positive attributes. Clearly this implies that worship was considered a positive attribute. On its face this would not appear to be exceptional. What makes it exceptional is the fact that Ibn al-Faraḍi emphasized this attribute in so many different biographies. His emphasis on this trait provides historians with evidence that there was a vital link between *zuhd* and exceptional worship. The practical aspects of *zuhd* were more clearly defined by the author. By far the most vital practice of *zuhhād* was that of *waraʿ*. *Waraʿ*, or the ability to distinguish between what was allowed or what was forbidden, was a prerequisite for the diligent *zāhid*. The evidence found in Kinberg combined with the frequency with which Ibn al-Faraḍi used the term *waraʿ* to describe ascetics leads to

the conclusion that scrupulosity was an integral and necessary aspect of *zuhd*. It is also clear that *wara'* and spirituality played a more important part in the life of the *zāhid* than did isolation. If Ibn al-Faraḍi is to be believed, it must be understood that this was a limited practice and one which was fairly uncommon for ascetics. This fact was also emphasized in the theoretical tracts examined by Leah Kinberg. She found that there was an internal debate among *zuhhād* as to whether *zuhd* was internal, distinguished by the practice of *wara'* and the elimination of moral doubt, or external, marked by the rejection of the material world (*al-dunya*).[66] Kinberg concluded that reclusiveness and isolation were less common than was internal *zuhd*. This internal division appears to have existed in al-Andalus according to Ibn al-Faraḍi. The evidence that was presented above indicates that internal *zuhd* was more common than external in this region. This is evident since Ibn al-Faraḍi used *wara'* in most of the biographies which included *zuhd*. There was evidence of external *zuhd*, however. Besides his use of the words *mutabattil*, *munqabiḍ*, and *mutaqaṭi'* to indicate the idea of physical withdrawal from the material world , the biographer also used the words *mutqashshif* and *'afāf* to indicate external manifestations of ascetic behavior. The evidence that ascetics were abstemious and chaste completes the working definition of what Ibn al-Faraḍi understood *zuhd* to mean. From all of this evidence it may be concluded that *zuhhād* were virtuous, righteous, humble, religious men who were most often careful to eliminate moral doubt from their lives, and who, in some instances, secluded themselves or engaged in the denial of physical pleasure in an effort to remove themselves from worldly concerns.

There are problems inherent in using the words provided by Ibn al-Faraḍi as evidence, however. The most drastic problem is the nebulous nature of many of the words he chose. While it is entirely possible that each of these descriptive words, *ṣāliḥ*, *fāḍil*, *'ābid*, and *mutawāḍi'*, was used exactly as I have translated them, there are two other possibilities. The first possibility is that Ibn al-Faraḍi intended to convey to his readers a technical meaning for each of these words. While there is no evidence in the biographer's collection to suggest what these technical meanings could have been,

[66]Kinberg, "What is Meant by Zuhd", 36-8.

apart from the several meanings these words usually carry, it is possible that these technical meanings were understood by Ibn al-Faraḍi and his readers and were thus not expressed. The second possibility is that these words held no particular importance other than the fact they were used to express piety. By this I mean that Ibn al-Faraḍi could have used the words as expressions of piety which carried no additional importance. This seems less likely, however, because the words do not appear in any uniform manner. If these words did not have specific meanings and instead were used simply to convey the idea of piety, then we would expect to find them appearing in a similar manner in the various entries. The way in which Ibn al-Faraḍi used terms in combination, as he used *zāhid* and *fāḍil*, leads to the conclusion that many of his expressions were automatic and not the result of a detailed study of the character of an individual. The fact that these words appeared in many different combinations, sometimes not appearing at all, would indicate that these expressions were used to indicate specific character traits rather than general expressions of piety. The author clearly chose certain words for some ascetics and different words for others.

Besides the specific order and combination in which these words appear, there is another important aspect to their appearance. The fact is that not only did these words appear as specific descriptions of piety, they appeared as descriptions of piety specific to *zuhhād*. For these words to be of any importance for establishing a definition of *zuhd* in al-Andalus the words must be specific to *zuhhād*. If these words appear in most of the entries, ascetic or otherwise, then they tell us little about asceticism. The fact is, however, that in only a few of the more than fourteen hundred entries which do not mention *zuhd* can we find the listing of descriptions of piety which appear in virtually all of the entries which do mention *zuhd*. In other words, these words, *fāḍil*, *ṣāliḥ*, *ʿābid*, and *mutawāḍiʿ*, were used almost exclusively to describe *zuhhād*.[67] The few entries which did contain the

[67]While it was not common for non-ascetics to be described with religious terminology, there were exceptions to this general rule. For example, *tarjama* 215:66, Ismāʿīl Ibn ʿUthmān Ayūb of Cordoba, was "*ṣāliḥan fāḍilan*". This was an unusual entry, however. For the most part, any time the descriptive religious words appeared without the word "*zāhid*" they were accompanied by the word "*waraʿ*". This was the case in *tarjama* 284:93, Baqī Ibn al-ʿAsī of Cordoba, which read "*fāḍilan*

words without mention of asceticism almost invariably contained the word *waraʿ*. It was demonstrated in Kinberg's analysis that the words *zuhd* and *waraʿ* were in many instances considered interchangeable among ascetics,[68] which could explain why these particular entries contained expressions of piety generally reserved by Ibn al-Faraḍi for *zuhhād*. Whether the words appeared in these few entries for this reason or another, the fact that these words were far more likely to occur in ascetic entries than in other entries is the fact which is important for the purposes of this paper. This is important because it demonstrates that these words were considered indicative of ascetic behavior.

While the biographer's use of the descriptions of piety was somewhat vague, his use of the words which offer the idea of seclusion and isolation was not vague. These words were all clearly intended to inform readers that these particular *zuhhād* lived apart from the rest of the *ʿulama* in some form. In addition, these words were also used exclusively for *zuhhād*. I could find no examples of non-ascetics whom Ibn al-Faraḍi described as living apart from their community. There are two ways to look at this information. Either only *zuhhād* isolated themselves from their communities, or anyone who isolated himself from his community was considered a *zāhid*. In either case there is an unmistakable link between isolation and asceticism.

Thus far it has been demonstrated that ascetics were pious, practiced *waraʿ*, and occasionally isolated themselves, but in order to receive a full picture of *zuhd* in al-Andalus there is one more area which must be explored. This is whether the levels of asceticism which appeared in Kinberg's analysis also were apparent in Ibn al-Faraḍi's work. It is my conclusion that there were three levels of *zuhd* present in Tārīkh ʿUlama al-Andalus. The first level of *zuhd* that is present is what will be referred to in this analysis as simple asceticism. This level is characterized by the failure of Ibn al-Faraḍi to offer any descriptive terms for the ascetic other than *zāhid* and in some cases *fāḍil*. It is

---

ṣāliḥan wariʿan". These examples were two of the very few examples which appeared in the collection.

[68]Kinberg, "What is Meant by Zuhd", 41-3.

important to note here that these individuals did not suffer from Ibn al-Faraḍi's ignorance about their lives. In fact, some of their entries were substantial in length. Despite knowing much about their lives, however, the biographer was sparing with his choice of descriptive words to describe their character. It is this situation which led me to place them into this category. The second level will be referred to as pious asceticism. This level of *zuhd* is distinguished by the use of words conveying the ideas of exceptional piety and religious diligence. Words such as *ṣāliḥ*, *ʿābid*, and *mutawāḍiʿ* express a level of piety that is higher than simply using the word *fāḍil*, and distinctly mark this level as separate from simple asceticism. The third level of *zuhd* that is apparent in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection will be referred to as "active asceticism". This level is characterized by words which depict the actions taken by ascetics, such as isolation, disparagement of the world, and denial of physical pleasure. These entries are clearly distinct from the entries which belong in the other two categories. Where the other two levels give no indication of external manifestations of ascetic behavior, the entries about active ascetics demonstrate the external practices of ascetics. This may be taken as evidence that the active ascetics were the only ones who behaved in this manner. Indeed, if the characteristics of active asceticism were practiced by all ascetics either they would have been included in the biographies of other ascetics or they would have been assumed by Ibn al-Faraḍi to have been described simply by using the word *zuhd* and would not have been included in the active ascetic biographies.

The first level of asceticism, as was stated above, was important for what was not stated rather than what was stated. The two most common words found in the descriptive passages for these particular ascetics were *zāhid* and *fāḍil*. In fact, for the most part these were the only descriptive words offered by the author in these shorter entries. For instance, in his biography of Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad of Cordoba (d. 303/915) Ibn al-Faraḍi related that Aḥmad was "among the people of *al-zuhd* and virtue".[69] There is nothing else in the passage which describes the characteristics of this

[69]Ibn al-Faraḍi, Tārīkh, 89, 1:30. "*Min ahl al-zuhd wa-al-faḍl*".

individual. Had Ibn al-Faraḍi known that he was involved with isolation, *wara'*, or any of the other common ascetic attributes, it is certain that he would have mentioned them. There is also evidence that Ibn al-Faraḍi did not omit these details because of ignorance. It is clear from this biography, which included such details as where the individual was from, when he died, and who his most influential teachers were, that the Muslim biographer knew many details about the life of Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad, and yet "virtuous" and "ascetic" are the only words that Ibn al-Faraḍi chose to use when describing the *zāhid*. This pattern occurred for many of the *zuhhād* about whom Ibn al-Faraḍi wrote biographies. The biographer wrote that Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā Ibn Ḥabīb of Cordoba (d. 282/895) "was characterized as possessing virtue and *zuhd*".[70] Again it is clear that Ibn al-Faraḍi knew detailed information about the life of this ascetic. His biography included information about where the individual was born, where he lived, where he traveled, and when he died. With all of these details available to the biographer, the only words he used to present the character and actions of Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā were "virtuous" and "ascetic". It is my contention that Ibn al-Faraḍi recognized distinct differences in the way in which *zuhd* was practiced in al-Andalus. The dearth of details about the *zuhhād* which I have grouped into the category of simple asceticism leads to one of two conclusions. The first possible conclusion is that Ibn al-Faraḍi simply did not know enough about the lives of these men to offer any more detail than he did. The other information presented, however, including detailed information about their teachers and their travel, indicates that the Muslim biographer did have fairly comprehensive knowledge about these *zuhhād*. The other conclusion, which is more logical, is that the author simply did not believe that the ascetic behavior exhibited by these individuals was remarkable. A second important point that emerges from an analysis of this level of asceticism is the fact that there was no evidence that these *zuhhād* engaged in external *zuhd*. In fact, the lack of any qualifying adjectives to describe the behavior of these ascetics is an implicit recognition by Ibn al-Faraḍi of the fact that they did not engage in external *zuhd*.

---

[70]Ibid, 66, 1:25. "*Kāna mawsufan bil-faḍl wa-al-zuhd*".

The second level of asceticism was pious asceticism. This category, as was stated above, was characterized by the use of words which were intended to express a high level of piety for these particular *zuhhād*. For instance, Ibn al-Faradi used several words intended to demonstrate piety when describing Muhammad Ibn Sa'dūna (d. 322/933). He stated that the *zāhid* was "rightly guided, virtuous, cautious in thought, and an ascetic man".[71] The Muslim biographer conveyed the idea that this was a pious individual. This contrasts dramatically with the biography of Ahmad Ibn Yahyā, whose biography stated only that he was a *zāhid* and virtuous.[72] The use of *ṣāliḥ* and *warā* in Muhammad Ibn Sa'udūna's biography clearly was intended to demonstrate a level of piety that was greater than that of Ahmad Ibn Yahyā. I believe that the use of these descriptive words in the case of one individual and not another was intentional, and that this contention is supported by the evidence available in Ibn Bashkuwal's supplement. Ibn Bashkuwal followed the same pattern as Ibn al-Faradi . For instance, in describing Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Mūsā Ibn 'Aṭa Allāh al-Sinhajī he related that "(Ahmad Ibn Muhammad) was extreme in virtue and religion, dedicated to benevolence, and he was humble and was one of the people of asceticism in the things of this world".[73] There can be no question that Ibn Bashkuwal intended to demonstrate in this biography that the *zāhid* was extremely pious. This is the essence of pious asceticism. This level was characterized by the use of more details relating to the piety and religious diligence of the individual and the fact that there was no mention of other practices associated with active asceticism. These examples certainly fit into this category. The biographers portrayed each of these *zuhhād* as extremely pious individuals who were not known to have engaged in seclusion or abstemious behavior. Again, this is evidence that the *zuhd* practiced by these Muslims was internal and did not encompass poverty or seclusion, aspects of asceticism associated with external *zuhd*.

---

[71]Ibid, 1389, 2:104-5. "*Kāna rajulan ṣāliḥan fāḍilan zāhidan wari'an*".
[72]See footnote 70.
[73]Ibn Bashkuwal, Silah, 176:136. "*Kāna mutanahiyan fī al-faḍl wa-al-dīn, munqaṭi'an ilā al-khayrīn wa kāna al-'abbid wa ahl al-zuhd fī al-dunya*".

The third, and highest, level of *zuhd* was active asceticism. Active asceticism was characterized by active participation in activities such as seclusion, denial of physical pleasure, and disparagement of the material world. The fact that Ibn al-Faraḍi specifically mentioned these activities in some of the *zuhhād's* biographies is evidence that he separated these individuals from other ascetics in his mind. It is also clear that he viewed these *zuhhād* as more pious and extreme than their fellow ascetics. This is true because the biographies which included information about active participation in ascetic disciplines also included the same words that the biographer used to indicate piety. For instance, Idrīs Ibn ʿUbayd ʿAllāh Ibn Idrīs Ibn ʿUbayd of Cordoba (d. 373/983), known as Abū Yaḥyā was "a cautious thinker, abstemious, a *zāhid*, humble, and the world did not affect him".[74] In this example there is evidence of the piety of the individual in Ibn al-Faraḍi's use of the words *waraʿ* (cautious thinker) and *mutawāḍiʿ* (humble). There is evidence of the ascetic activities of the individual as well in his use of the word *mutaqashshif* (abstemious). It was Ibn al-Faraḍi's intent in using these particular words together to convey a sense of piety and asceticism that was greater than those found in the *zuhhād* on the other levels. This pattern of separating the active ascetics from the other ascetics by using numerous descriptive adjectives can also be found in Ibn Bashkuwal's supplement to Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection. In describing Ḥayyān al-Zāhid of Cordoba (d. 481/1088), Ibn Bashkuwal wrote that "he was a righteous, ascetic, cautious, humble, and reclusive man".[75] This example demonstrates the difference in the way ascetics were portrayed in these collections. Ibn Bashkuwal used virtually the same words to describe Ḥayyān al-Zāhid as he did in describing the pious ascetic , Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad. In both descriptions he used the word "humble" and other words which suggested that the individual was pious. The difference between the two entries is that in the latter Ibn Bashkuwal emphasized the fact that Ḥayyān al-Zāhid was reclusive, while in the former no such description is evident. From this evidence it may be concluded that Ibn al-Faraḍi, and later

---

[74]Ibn al-Faraḍi, Tārīkh, 208, 1:64. "*Kāna wariʿan mutaqashshifan zāhidan mutawāḍiʿan, lam tughayyirhu al-dunya*".
[75]Ibn Bashkuwal, Silah, 348:247. "*Kāna rajulan ṣāliḥan wariʿan khashiʿan mutabattilan*".

Ibn Bashkuwal, distinguished between *zuhhād* who actively engaged in traditional ascetic practices and those who did not. It may also be concluded that the fact that the biographers distinguished between the different manifestations of asceticism and that the number of ascetics identified as active was so low, is evidence that the biographers recognized that internal *zuhd* was far more common than external *zuhd.*

The three levels of *zuhd* are important to enhancing our understanding of what *zuhd* meant to Ibn al-Faraḍi. There are two primary reasons why this is true. The first is that it demonstrates that Ibn al-Faraḍi recognized that not all ascetics behaved in the same manner. Indeed, simply stating that someone was a *zāhid* was problematic without other accompanying words which help to explain how the individual behaved. This is the reason why Ibn al-Faraḍi used different adjectives to describe different *zuhhād.* The second reason is that it is further evidence of the way in which *zuhhād* were viewed by their contemporaries. It was clear from the three levels that there were distinct differences in the use of expressions of piety by the biographer. It was also clear that simple ascetics were described in terms which were less positive than the pious and active *zuhhād.* From this it may be surmised that Ibn al-Faraḍi viewed active and pious ascetics in a more positive manner than he viewed simple ascetics. Thus, it may be concluded that the "more ascetic" an individual, the more favorably the individual was viewed by the biographer.

6. Kinberg and Ibn al-Faraḍi

It is now useful to compare the general definition extracted from Ibn al-Faraḍi with the more technical theoretical definition formulated by Leah Kinberg in order to determine whether *zuhd* encompassed the same aspects in al-Andalus as it did in the Eastern part of the Islamic world. It should be clear from the evidence that I have presented that Ibn al-Faraḍi did not use the technical terms apparent in the theoretical tracts, other than *waraʿ*. It is also clear that some of the words chosen by the biographer to represent the character and actions of the ascetics did fit into the model Kinberg established. One point that was apparent in Kinberg's analysis was that the theoretical concepts she used, such as *riḍā* and *tawakkul*, held meanings that were similar. For this reason some of the words used by Ibn al-Faraḍi could be interpreted as belonging in two or even three of her categories. Despite this ambiguity, it is apparent that several of the concepts Kinberg found in the Eastern theoretical tracts are also apparent in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection.

The idea of *riḍā*, as presented by Kinberg, was understood to be contentment. The word which most closely approaches her understanding of this term was *mutawāḍiʿ*. *Mutawāḍiʿ* was understood to mean "humble" or "unpretentious". As Kinberg explained, someone who engages in *riḍā* "is a man for whom 'the prohibited (*ḥarām*) does not overcome his patience nor the permissible (*ḥalāl*) overcomes his gratitude'".[76] It seems to me that this explanation of *riḍā* was similar to my understanding of *mutawāḍiʿ*. The essence of both of these words is that the individual does not make

[76]Kinberg, "What is Meant by Zuhd", 32.

outward displays of happiness or despair. There is another phrase which indicates that the practice of *riḍā* existed in al-Andalus. When Ibn al-Faraḍi described Idrīs Ibn Yaḥyā as "not being affected by the world (*lam tughayyirhu al-dunya*)"[77], this was an indication of *riḍā*. The essence of *riḍā*, according to Kinberg, was not allowing the outside world to affect the *zāhid's* relationship with God. In effect, the *zāhid* was to exist in the material world without allowing himself to be affected by it. It would be incorrect, however, to assume that Ibn al-Faraḍi was aware of the theoretical terminology or that he intended *mutawadi* to represent the concept of *riḍā* in his biographies. What is correct, however, is that the key aspect of *riḍā*- not being affected by earthly diversions- was recognized by Ibn al-Faraḍi as being a part of *zuhd*.

The idea of *tawakkul* is even more nebulous than that of *riḍā*. Kinberg explained *tawakkul* as "trust in God". There is nothing in Ibn al-Faraḍi which can be understood as meaning this. What can be surmised from Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographies is that there was a correspondence between ascetics and worship in the medieval mind. This is apparent because of the language used to describe ascetics. The biographer used terms such as "*ṣāliḥ*" and "*ʿābid*" which did not appear in the biographies of non-ascetics. From this it can be concluded that ascetics were viewed as having a relationship with God that was more intense than their co-religionists in al-Andalus. It cannot be concluded, however, that this evidence suggests that the individuals in al-Andalus practiced *tawakkul* as Kinberg understood it. While in Kinberg's analysis "trust in God" clearly meant that the individual was religious, another component of this concept was trust *only* in God. Clearly the *zuhhād* presented by Ibn al-Faraḍi did not distance themselves from society in the manner that "trust only in God" suggests. It is my conclusion that the evidence of the special relationship between *zuhhād* and God present in the form of the unique language used to describe *zuhhād* by the Muslim biographer indicates only that ascetics were recognized to be more religious than the rest of the *ʿulama*. It is not evidence that *tawakkul* existed during this period in the form that Kinberg described in her work.

[77]Ibn al-Faradi, Tārīkh, 208, 1:64.

The third aspect of Kinberg's definition of *zuhd* was *qiṣar al-ʿamal*. As was stated before, *qiṣar al-ʿamal* was controversial because there was a difference of opinion among ascetics about whether this concept required *zuhhād* to live in poverty. Those ascetics who did not live in poverty believed that this concept should have been understood as a more intense form of *riḍā*. By this I mean that *riḍā* was "not being affected by the world" and *qiṣar al-ʿamal* was understood to be "distancing oneself from the world". It was evident that in Ibn al-Faraḍi there was no evidence to support the notion that ascetics lived in poverty, but there was evidence that ascetics separated themselves from the rest of society. Clearly, when Ibn al-Faraḍi used words such as *munqabiḍ* and *mutabattil* he was trying to convey the information that these particular ascetics isolated themselves from society. This could be interpreted as evidence of *qiṣar al-ʿamal*. From this it may be concluded that *zuhd* in al-Andalus was acknowledged by Ibn al-Faraḍi as possessing the characteristics of *qiṣar al-ʿamal*, excluding the characteristic of intentional poverty, but that it was not common or required for ascetics in the region to practice isolation.

One of the areas in which there seems to be clear correspondence between the evidence presented by Kinberg and the evidence available in Ibn al-Faraḍi's collection was *waraʿ*. *Waraʿ*, as Kinberg explained, was "scrupulosity in thought". This word was the only one of Kinberg's technical terms that also appeared in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographies in the form in which she had it listed. There are two important points which emerge from his use of this word. The first point is that while it is not known whether the Muslim biographer had access to theoretical tracts written by ascetics which explained the meaning of *waraʿ* as they understood it, it is clear that his use of the word *waraʿ* demonstrates that he recognized that this concept was essential to *zuhd*. Indeed, the privilege that Kinberg gave to this concept, as the requirement that most represented *zuhd*, was supported by the privileged placement of the word in Ibn al-Faraḍi. The second point is that the privilege given to this word by Ibn al-Faraḍi, and the dearth of examples which relate information about isolation, is evidence that he recognized internal *zuhd* to be the dominant practice in al-Andalus. Kinberg argued

that internal *zuhd* was more common than external *zuhd*, and that integrity was more indicative of asceticism than was isolation or poverty. The evidence found in Ibn al-Faraḍi suggests that this was true in al-Andalus as well.

The final comparison between Kinberg and Ibn al-Faraḍi which is useful for our purposes was in their use of levels in order to describe the differences of intensity among *zuhhād*. What was clear from Kinberg's division of asceticism is that it was an internal division. Her use of levels centered on the notion that ascetics were separated by their ability to refrain from the *ḥarām*, *ḥalāl*, and *shubuḥāt*.[78] These are distinctions that were not made by Ibn al-Faraḍi. It was not the purpose of the biographer to explain the nuances of *wara'* to his readers. What was clear in Ibn al-Faraḍi's work, however, was the fact that there were differences in the way in which ascetics were portrayed in his biographical collection. It should be apparent that the levels chosen by Kinberg and the levels which I have established are not the same. It should also be apparent that both Kinberg and Ibn al-Faraḍi recognized distinct differences in the manner in which asceticism was practiced. Despite these differences the fact remains that both Kinberg and Ibn al-Faraḍi recognized that all ascetics did not practice their discipline in the same manner or with the same level of intensity.

It may be concluded from the similarities presented here that there was some congruity between asceticism as it was practiced in al-Andalus and the Eastern asceticism described by Kinberg. Aspects of asceticism recognized by Kinberg, such as *wara'* and *riḍā*, were clearly present in Ibn al-Faraḍi's description of *zuhd*. Other aspects, such as *tawakkul* and *qiṣar al-ʿamal*, were not expounded upon by the biographer in any detail. From this there are two primary conclusions which may be drawn. The first is that, as in Kinberg's analysis, internal *zuhd* was the primary method in which asceticism was practiced. As in the East, in al-Andalus ascetics were not required to live in poverty or isolate themselves from the material world in order to be considered *zuhhād* by their

[78]Kinberg, "What is Meant by Zuhd", 42.

contemporaries. It was also true that *waraʿ*, the essential aspect of internal *zuhd* according to Kinberg, was an integral aspect of *zuhd*, according to Ibn al-Faraḍi as well. The second conclusion which emerges is that the sizable minority whom Kinberg found practicing external *zuhd* was not apparent in his text. This is known because even the ascetics who were "isolated" did not completely separate themselves from their communities. From this we can conclude that even though there were differences in the manner in which ascetics practiced *zuhd* in al-Andalus, internal *zuhd* was the almost exclusive manner in which they chose to practice their asceticism.

This completes Ibn al-Faraḍi's definition of *zuhd*. This definition was not exactly the same as the definition formulated by Kinberg, although it was close. The primary aspect of her definition which was not present in the biographies was the desire by ascetics to leave their worldly concerns to God and not take care of themselves. Other than that, however, most of her definition is similar to Ibn al-Faraḍi's. The explanation for this similarity can be found in analyzing the travel patterns of the *zuhhād*. As was stated above, Kinberg's primary sources were theoretical tracts written by *zuhhād* who lived in the Eastern Islamic world. Ibn al-Faraḍi's collection informs historians that ascetics, like the rest of the *ʿulama*, traveled to the East at least once in their life as part of their religious obligation. An example of a *zāhid* who engaged in this practice was Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Rūmī of Cordoba. Ibn al-Faraḍi related that this particular ascetic "had a trip to the East (*lahu riḥlatun ila al-mashriq*)".[79] This trip also served as a quest for knowledge. During these trips it is clear that *zuhhād* came into contact with Eastern ascetics. It can be assumed that the similarity between the asceticism practiced in al-Andalus and the asceticism practiced in the rest of the empire can be traced to this contact.

[79]Almost every member of the *ʿulama* in al-Andalus traveled to the East, including most of the ascetics. An example of the way in which this was worded by the biographer is illustrated by *tarjama* 82:29. In Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Rūmī of Cordoba's biography it was written that "he had a trip to the East (*lahu riḥlatun ila al-mashriq*)". As with other entries, his biography then proceeds to name the individuals with whom Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad studied on his trip.

At this point it is necessary to evaluate the terminology used to describe *zuhhād*. It should be clear that Muslims who engaged in *zuhd* practiced their discipline internally. The external manifestations of *zuhd*, such as isolation and poverty, were rare. With this in mind, it is important to recognize that the discipline of *zuhd* does not appear to have adhered to the preconceived ideas which are associated with asceticism. The Encyclopedia of Religion gave six aspects of asceticism which almost invariably occurred among ascetics of the world's major religions. The aspects were fasting, sexual continence, poverty or begging, seclusion or isolation, self-inflicted pain, and what was termed "inner asceticism".[80] Clearly five of these aspects were not evident on a large scale in al-Andalus. The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that *zuhd*, as it was practiced in al-Andalus, did not conform to the generally accepted standards of ascetic behavior. In fact, *zuhd* so poorly compares to the Encyclopedia of Religion standards that it may be concluded that what Ibn al-Faraḍi described in his biographies was not asceticism at all according to the traditional understanding of what is encompassed by this word. In fact, I believe it would be erroneous to refer to *zuhhād* as "ascetics". However, since I have thus far defined *zāhid* using the term "ascetic", as it has traditionally been defined, I will continue to do so to maintain the coherence of the paper.

[80]Eliade, Mircea, ed. Encyclopedia of Religion, Vol. 1 (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1987), p. 442.

7. Disciplines of the 'Ulama

This general understanding of *zuhd* and the conclusions that have been drawn it thus far are important for enhancing our knowledge of how *zuhhād* behaved and how they were regarded by their co-religionists. This was not the only information available on these subjects in Ibn al-Faraḍi's biographical collection, however. The biographer also provided historians with a detailed account of the other disciplines practiced by the *zuhhād.* The primary disciplines practiced by the *ʿulama* during the period immediately following Ibn al-Faraḍi's lifetime, and it may be assumed these same disciplines were the primary ones practiced during Ibn al-Faraḍi's time, were outlined in Urvoy's Le monde des 'ulema. Urvoy suggests that there were eleven primary disciplines, including *zuhd*, in which they engaged. These were Hadith transmission, jurisprudence, Qur'anic *tafsīr*, *usūl al-fiqḥ* (the study of the roots of law), belles-lettres (*ʿadāb*), poetry, linguistics, history, the sciences and philosophy, and *kalām*.[81] Most of these disciplines were apparent in the biographies of the *zuhhād.* In addition to these disciplines there were also several community practices that the *zuhhād* engaged in which demonstrated that they were part of the general Islamic community. These practices include acting as prayer leaders, and voicing the Qur'an for the community.

One discipline which was not commonly practiced by *zuhhād* was *kalām*. *Kalām* can be defined literally as "speech", but was understood by medieval Muslims to also mean "theology". *Kalām* was a popular discipline among the *ʿulama* in medieval Islam, but it did not become a discipline which was commonly practiced in al-Andalus until the twelfth century according to

[81]Urvoy, Le monde des ulemas, 196. These tables appear throughout this work. Each table lists the primary disciplines and then the number of people who practiced this discipline for a given region during a specific time period.

Urvoy.[82] There was only one *zahid* whom Ibn al-Faradi described as being involved with the study of theology. This individual was Muhammad Ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Misrah of Cordoba (d. 319/931) who Ibn al-Faradi wrote was involved with *kalām* and who actually dedicated one chapter of one of his books to the subject.[83] It must be emphasized, however, that this was the only individual that I found who was involved with both *kalām* and *zuhd*. From this evidence it can be concluded that the discipline of *kalām* was not commonly practiced among the *zuhhād* during the ninth, tenth or early eleventh century.

While *kalām* was not practiced among ascetics, according to Ibn al-Faradi, there were several other disciplines that *zuhhād* did practice. One of these disciplines was jurisprudence. In the biographies there were ample examples of ascetic individuals who acted as *mujtahid, qadīs,* and *faqīhs*. Students of Islam are well aware that *mujtahids* and *faqīhs* performed similar functions. *Mujtahids* and *faqīhs* were involved with the religious aspects of law. They primarily issued *fatwas*, or religious rulings, on theoretical or actual cases regarding religious points of law or theology. They were not, as a rule, part of the governmental structure and, instead, held positions that were important for the religious prestige that was associated with them. *Qadīs*, on the other hand, were involved with the day to day aspects of administering justice. They ruled on matters both civil and criminal, and were part of the governmental structure. *Zuhhād* existed in al-Andalus as *mujtahids, faqīhs,* and *qadīs*. One example of this was Saʿīd Ibn Hasan Mawlā al-ʿAmīr al-Hakm Ibn Hishām (d. 236/850), known as Abū ʿUthmān, whom Ibn al-Faradi described as "a *zāhid*, virtuous, a *faqīh*, and a memorizer of the religious legal questions".[84] Similarly, the biography of ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Muhammad al-Tajibī of Rayyah (n.d.) stated that he was "a *faqīh*, a *zāhid*, and a possessor of right guidance".[85] There were also *mujtahids* mentioned in Ibn al-Faradi's collection. For instance, Asbagh Ibn ʿAlī of Cordoba was

[82]Ibid, 196.
[83]Ibn al-Faradi, Tārīkh, 1204, 1:39-40.
[84]Ibid, 472, 1:160. "*Kāna zāhidan fādilan faqīhan fi al-masā'il*".
[85]Ibid, 704, 1:231. "*Kāna faqīhan zāhidan dhu hudan*".

"a virtuous *zāhid*, a *mujtahid*, and he had a portion of knowledge".[86] Clearly, Asbagh Ibn ʿAlī was an ascetic who also participated in other disciplines and was not isolated from the rest of the *ʿulama*. This point is best made by the Muslim biographer's description of ʿAbbās Ibn Rufaʿah Ibn al-Harīth of Rayyah (n.d.). Ibn al-Faraḍi wrote that "he was a *qaḍī*, a *zāhid*, and he had repudiated the world".[87] From this biography one major point becomes clear. This individual was recognized as a community judge and yet he was also described as repudiating the material world. This is important because it demonstrates that even *zuhhād* who were recognized by their peers as being active *zuhhād* also participated in the affairs of their community. This point becomes clearer when one considers that ascetics also performed the duties incumbent upon *qaḍīs*. For instance, Ibn al-Faraḍi described Aḥmad Ibn Baqī Ibn Makhlad of Cordoba as a *qaḍī*, a transmitter of Hadith, and an ascetic.[88] From these examples two points emerge. The first is that it was not uncommon for *zuhhād* to participate in legal matters for their communities, as *faqīhs, mujtahids,* and *qaḍīs*. The second point is that even *zuhhād* who engaged in activities generally associated with isolation, such as repudiating the world, were active members of their communities, at least as part of the judicial establishment in al-Andalus.

In the previous description of *zuhhād* who were involved in legal disciplines there was also evidence of a *zāhid* who participated in the accumulation of religious knowledge. Specifically, Asbagh Ibn ʿAlī was a *mujtahid* who also sought religious knowledge.[89] There are numerous examples of *zuhhād* who participated in the accumulation of knowledge, although I found no specific examples of any ascetics who were involved in the study of philosophy or the natural sciences. For example, Ghanim Ibn Mantīl of Farīsh (n.d.) was described by Ibn al-Faraḍi as being "well known for *zuhd* and religious knowledge".[90] It is also important to note that the Muslim biographer did not feel it was necessary to explain the fact that a *zāhid* was engaged in the seeking of

---

[86]Ibid, 260, 1:82. "*Kāna zāhidan fāḍilan mujtahidan, wa lahu ḥaẓẓ min al-ʿilm*".
[87]Ibid, 882, 1:297. "*Kāna qaḍīan zāhidan qad nabadha al-dunya*".
[88]Ibid, 103, 1:33.
[89]Ibid, 260, 1:82.
[90]Ibid, 1021, 1:347. "*Kāna mawsufan bil-zuhd wa-al-ʿilm*".

religious knowledge. From this it may be concluded that it was not uncommon for *zuhhād* to engage in the act of traveling and accumulating religious knowledge. In fact, almost everyone in the *ʿulama*, including *zuhhād*, traveled to the East. There were two primary reasons for their travel. The first, obviously, was to fulfill their religious obligation of making one pilgrimage in their life to Mecca. The second reason is that they wanted to visit the major learning centers of the East. For this reason they studied with scholars in Mecca and Baghdad. Due to the fact that virtually all of the learned people in al-Andalus during this period traveled to the East, it may be concluded that this was an important part of the general education of the *ʿulama*. Another example of this was Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Miṣrah, who was mentioned earlier as having engaged in *kalām*. Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbd Allāh also demonstrates that it was not rare for ascetics to be involved in several disciplines, as he was involved with *zuhd*, *kalām*, and the search for knowledge. His search took him to the East for an extended period of time, where he studied the Qur'an and *kalām* in Baghdad and Acre.[91] These examples demonstrate a link between practitioners of *zuhd* and the search for knowledge among the learned people in the East, but they also demonstrate one other fact. These examples give no evidence that *zuhhād* journeyed to the East to study the secular sciences or philosophy. It is apparent from these examples that while *zuhhād* readily participated in disciplines which were religious in nature, they were hesitant to participate in disciplines which were outside of the religious sphere. This is apparent because even though they were known to take trips in order to seek out knowledge, there is no evidence available in the biographies which suggests that they attempted to learn about secular subjects. In fact, the major secular disciplines, history, philosophy, and the secular sciences, were not presented by Ibn al-Faraḍi as disciplines in which ascetics participated. From this evidence it is clear that *zuhhād* concerned themselves with disciplines which related to religious matters, but the material world, and its disciplines, did not concern them.

---

[91]See footnote 83.

Another religious discipline which *zuhhād* participated in was the transmission of Hadith. This discipline was vital to the Islamic tradition because besides the Qur'an, the Hadith is the most important source of information for guiding Muslims on how they should live their lives. The most common way for Ibn al-Faradi to present evidence that an individual was involved in the transmission of Hadith was to use the verb *haddatha* (to transmit Hadith) followed by a list of the individuals on whose authority he transmitted. It was also true that most Muslim intellectuals of this period participated in this activity. With this in mind, it is not surprising that most ascetics engaged in this activity as well. One example of a *zahid* who participated in this discipline was Abū 'Uthmān, who was mentioned earlier as having been a *faqīh*. Abū 'Uthmān was said to have "transmitted Hadith on the authority of Ibrāhīm Ibn Muhammad Ibn Bāz".[92] This was the basic pattern which these entries followed. For instance, Sa'īd Ibn Hakam of Cordoba, known as Ibn al-Sanna'a al-Zāhid, "transmitted Hadith on the authority of 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Yahyā".[93] This was similar to the description offered for Qāsim Ibn Thamān of Ilbīrah (d. 318/930). In addition to being recognized as transmitters of Hadith, *zuhhād* were also recognized as authorities by other members of the *'ulama*. For example, Ibn al-Faradi described Khalid Ibn Sa'd as having transmitted Hadith on the authority of the *zāhid* Qāsim Ibn Thamān of Ilbīrah (Elvira) (d. 318/930). In this instance the author wrote that "Khalid Ibn Sa'd transmitted from him (Qāsim Ibn Thamān) and he extolled him and characterized him as possessing *zuhd*".[94] Another informative example of an ascetic who transmitted Hadith was Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Muhammad (d.394/1003). Ibn al-Faradi described him as a reclusive *zāhid*, and a transmitter of Hadith.[95] This is another example of an individual who was considered reclusive yet participated in additional disciplines. Clearly these examples indicate that the transmission of Hadith was an accepted and acknowledged discipline for *zuhhād*. Considering the piety of the ascetics and

---

[92]See footnote 84.
[93]Ibn al-Faradi, Tarikh, 505, 1:170. "*Haddatha 'an 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Yahyā*".
[94]Ibid, 1064, 1:362. "*Haddatha 'anhu Khalid Ibn Sa'd wa athna 'alayhi wa wasafahu bil-zuhd*".
[95]Ibid, 1391, 2:107.

the religious nature of their activities, it cannot be judged surprising that they would be involved with a discipline of this nature.

Another discipline in which *zuhhād* commonly participated during this period was the study of the Qur'an. It is not surprising that ascetics, demonstrated to be extremely pious and rightly guided individuals, would be involved with this discipline. The main focus of individuals who engaged in the Qur'anic discipline was compiling Qur'anic commentaries (*tafsīr*) or studying and memorizing the Qur'an. As was mentioned before, numerous *zuhhād* participated in these disciplines. The most common way for this discipline to appear in Ibn al-Faraḍi's text was for it to be represented with the phrase "he studied the Qur'an". For example, the biography of 'Asbagh Ibn Malik Ibn Mūsā of Cordoba read that "he studied the Qur'an with Ibrāhīm Ibn Muḥammad and recited the Qur'an in accordance with him".[96] Ibn al-Faraḍi, by listing the individual with whom the *zāhid* studied, was informing readers on whose authority he read the Qur'an. This would allow readers to implicitly understand what *tafsīr* the individual used, if in fact the *zāhid* did not write a commentary of his own. There were several *zuhhād* who wrote commentaries of their own, however. For instance, Baqī Ibn Makhlad of Cordoba, whom Ibn al-Faraḍi described as a well known transmitter of Hadith, was known to have written a book called <u>*Tafsīr al-Qur'an*</u> according to the Muslim biographer.[97] As with other disciplines that have been examined in this work, there is evidence that individuals who were known to disparage the world engaged in Qur'anic disciplines. This was the case with Qāsim Ibn Nasīr of Shadhunah (d. 338/949) who traveled to Mecca, became a *faqīḥ*, and was a memorizer of the Qur'an. Ibn al-Faraḍi also described him as writing "poetry about *zuhd* and disparagement of the world".[98] Clearly this was an individual who would be considered an active *zāhid*, yet he also was involved with a Qur'anic discipline, took the traditional trip to Mecca and other places in the East in order to further his knowledge, and acted as a *faqīḥ* for his community. Overall, the Qur'anic disciplines were

---

[96]Ibid, 260, 1:79. "*Sami'an min Ibrāhīm Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Bāz wa qara'a alayhi al-Qur'an*".
[97]Ibid, 103, 1:33.
[98]Ibid, 1069, 1:364-6. "*Aktharu shi'rihi fī al-zuhd wa dhamm al-dunya*".

practiced by numerous ascetics and further illustrate the fact that ascetics behaved in a manner that precluded complete isolation from the rest of the *ʿulama.*

The discipline of poetry was another discipline which was popular among *zuhhād.* While it may appear strange for individuals who believed in sparsity and abhorred excess to engage in a discipline which was predicated on the ability to wield language in an excessive manner, nevertheless it is accepted that *zuhhād* were well known for using the discipline of poetry as a method of conveying their spiritual beliefs. A. Hamori is one modern scholar who has studied the subject. He found that *zuhdiyyat*, poetry written by *zuhhād*, had two primary themes which separated it from other poetry: the mortality of man and the vanity of human wishes.[99] These themes were clearly within the realm of thought associated with *zuhhād* as it has been described by Ibn al-Faraḍi and Kinberg. It is not surprising then that there were ascetics who engaged in *zuhdiyyat* in Tārīkh ʿUlama al-Andalus. For instance, the Muslim biographer described both Ṭahīr Ibn Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Mūsā Ibn Ibrāhīm (d. 315/927)[100] and Qāsim Ibn Naṣīr Ibn Raqas (d. 338/949)[101] using the word "*sha'ir*" (poet). The subject matter described by Hamori was also apparent in the biographies. Ibn al-Faraḍi noted that Qāsim Ibn Naṣīr wrote "much of his poetry about *zuhd* and disparagement of the world (*akthar shi'rihi fī al-zuhd wa- dhamm al-dunya*)".[102] It is clear from this that *zuhhād* in al-Andalus engaged in *zuhdiyyat.* It is also clear that *zuhhād* did not treat poetry as a secular discipline. For the ascetic, *zuhdiyyat* was an inherently religious discipline which allowed them to "disparage the world" without becoming affected by it.

The final discipline in which ascetics engaged in large numbers was the study of linguistics, *lughawiyat.* This discipline encompassed two primary aspects. The first , and the most

---

[99]Hamori, A., "Ascetic Poetry", Ashtiany, Julia and T.M. Johnstone eds., Cambridge History of Arabic Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 265.
[100]Ibn al-Faradi, Tarikh, 622, 1:208.
[101]Ibid, 1069, 1:362.
[102]Ibid, 1069, 1:362.

common among *zuhhād*, was the study of Arabic grammar. This was important because it allowed ascetics to read the Qur'an more authoritatively. The second aspect was the act of learning other languages. It is unclear whether *zuhhād* learned other languages, but it can be assumed that they did not because there was no mention by the biographer of any language other than Arabic learned by these individuals. While it can be assumed that these ascetics were studying Arabic, Ibn al-Faraḍi provided little information about what exactly this discipline encompassed. For the most part he simply wrote "*kāna hafiẓan lil-lughah*" (he was a memorizer of the language) or "*ʿaliman bil-ʿarabiyya*" (he was learned in Arabic). The nature of Arabic, with its largely unvowelled texts and its difficult grammatical constructions, demanded that there exist within communities individuals with the skill to transmit and vowel Arabic in order that their important religious texts and commentaries could be read authoritatively. The religious reasons for this are obvious. The Qur'an is the most important book which must be read in Arabic and the difficulty of voicing this holy work caused the need to have a linguist within the community. Clearly this is an area which would be suited for the most religious people within the community, since it requires an extensive knowledge of the Qur'an. It is therefore not surprising that the *zuhhād* of al-Andalus would engage in this discipline.

As was stated above, there are numerous examples of ascetics who engaged in the study of language. For instance, Ibn al-Faraḍi described Muḥammad Ibn ʿAmār Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Ibn Ibrāhīm of Cordoba (d. 367/977) as "a memorizer of the language".[103] Another ascetic who was known to practice linguistics was Qāsim Ibn Nasīr Ibn Riqas. This particular Muslim also demonstrates that *zuhhād* occasionally participated in several different disciplines. Qāsim Ibn Nasīr was a linguist, in addition to his work as a poet.[104] Unfortunately for scholars who wish to learn more about how linguists practiced their discipline, there is nothing more offered in these entries than the fact that they were linguists.[105] The fact that *zuhhād* participated in this discipline is important in and

[103]Ibid, 1318, 2:76. "*Kāna ʿaliman bi-al-nahwi hafiẓan lil-lughah*".
[104]Ibid, 1069, 1:362.
[105]Ibid, 658, 1:219-20, 1103, 2:5-6.

of itself, however. It is important because it serves as another example which demonstrates that *zuhhād* did not separate themselves physically or spiritually from their communities. They were, in fact, practicing the traditional disciplines engaged in by their co-religionists who did not practice *zuhd*.

Besides the traditional disciplines delineated by Urvoy, there were other activities that the *zuhhād* of al-Andalus participated in which demonstrate that they functioned in a manner which was consistent with the behavior of the rest of the *ʿulama*. One such activity was warfare. While this may appear to be an unusual activity for ascetics to be involved with, it must be remembered that warfare in certain instances was considered virtuous and a religious obligation. This type of warfare, known as *jihād*, was the sort in which they participated. One *zāhid* described in this manner by Ibn al-Faraḍi was Ni'm al-Khalaf Ibn Abī al-Khasib of Toledo (d.298/910). The Muslim biographer wrote that he was "a *zāhid*, a worshiper, and he was a warrior (*muḥarib*)".[106] The fact that this man was fighting for his religion was emphasized by Ibn al-Faraḍi as he added that Ni'm al-Khalaf "was killed as a martyr (*qutila shahīdan*)". There were other ascetics mentioned by the biographer who fought in *jihāds*. One such *zāhid*, Saʿīd Ibn Mūsā Ibn Mahs al-Ghassānī of Ilbīrah (d. 393/1002) was described as having fought in "many *jihāds* (*kathīr al-jihād*)".[107] This evidence, and the fact that Ibn al-Faraḍi did not remark on *jihāds* as being an unusual activity for ascetics, demonstrates that *zuhhād* considered the fighting of holy wars a legitimate activity. It is also further evidence that they did not completely separate themselves from secular society.

There were also a number of activities in which the ascetics participated which were essentially religious in nature. These activities were generally public religious functions. For instance, ʿAmār Ibn Yaḥyā of Rayyah was "a memorizer of the religious questions, and often publicly read the Qur'an (*kathīr al-tilāwa lil-Qur'an*)".[108] Ibn al-Faraḍi's text contains numerous examples of *zuhhād* who were chosen to publicly read the Qur'an for their communities. For example, he described both

---

[106]Ibid, 1502, 2:158. "*Kāna zāhidan ʿābidan wa kāna muḥariban*".
[107]Ibid, 533, 1:176.
[108]Ibid, 959, 1:324. "*Kāna ḥafiẓan al-masā'il, kathīr al-tilāwa lil-Qur'an mawsufan bil-zuhd*".

'Addam Ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Bahilī[109] and Aḥmad Ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Qaynī of Rayyah[110] as public readers and memorizers of the Qur'an. Clearly it was common for ascetics to act as authorities in their communities on the voicing of the Qur'an, a highly technical and difficult activity. This should not be surprising considering the high level of respect that *zuhhād* commanded on religious matters according to the biographer.

There are two primary points which emerge from this discussion of disciplines. The first point is that all of the disciplines which the ascetics engaged in were religious in nature. *Zuhhād* participated in legal matters (as *faqīḥs*, *mujtahids*, and *qaḍīs*), *tafsīr*, poetry, Hadith transmission, and the study of language (particularly the study of Arabic), which were all essentially religious. Even the other activities they participated in, such as *jihād* or public recitation of the Qur'an, were fundamentally religious activities. Indeed, it is clear that the *zuhhād* did not participate in disciplines which were inherently secular. It is hard to imagine that ascetics could have maintained their avowed desire to separate themselves from the secular world as much as possible while engaging in disciplines such as history. The second primary point is that ascetics had to be a part of their communities in order to participate in some of these disciplines. This is an important point because there exists a mistaken impression that *zuhhād* attempted to separate themselves from the rest of the *ʿulama*. It is clear that individuals who practiced *zuhd* were integral members of their communities because the disciplines they practiced entailed contact with others. Individuals who were *qaḍīs* or who read the Qur'an in a public forum at religious services had to act as part of their communities. It is difficult to imagine how a *qaḍī* could be isolated from the rest of the *ʿulama*. Clearly this is evidence that ascetics were valued and integral members of the *ʿulama* who were not isolated from community affairs.

---

[109]Ibid, 1006, 1:342.
[110]Ibid, 130, 1:41.

8. Challenging Urvoy

The fact that *zuhhād* clearly had to live among the rest of the *ʿulama* in order to participate in these disciplines makes Urvoy's claim that they existed in segregated communities suspect. Urvoy believed that from the ninth century on there was a trend toward the grouping of *zuhhād* into "deviant" communities. It was his contention that society in al-Andalus as a whole was incapable of accepting the ascetic lifestyle within the religious framework that had been established in the area. Thus, *zuhhād* separated themselves into what Urvoy termed "jurist-ascetic" communities.[111] The problem with this argument, besides the fact that I believe it was founded on a faulty premise, is that it was not footnoted. There is nothing to suggest where Urvoy discovered this idea or on what authority the idea was based. The only conclusion that I can reach is that this idea was based on the fact that the biographers whom Urvoy relied upon, Ibn al-Faraḍi, Ibn Bashkuwal, and Ibn al-'Abbar, used the phrase "*ahl al-zuhd*" (which he must have translated as "community of *zuhd*" rather than "people of *zuhd*") throughout their works. It is my contention that through analyzing this phrase, the premise that I believe Urvoy based his theory on, and the travel patterns of *zuhhād* in Ibn al-Faraḍi's collection of biographies, it may be concluded that ascetics did not separate themselves from their communities. The exceptions to this rule are those who isolated themselves from their communities and other *zuhhād* as well, and those individuals obviously do not fit into Urvoy's argument about "jurist-ascetic" communities.

The main problem with Urvoy's argument is that I believe he has mistranslated the word "*ahl*" in coming to his conclusion. The fact that this word appears is not to be understood as an indication that these were "communities" of *zuhhād*. It is more likely that the word was simply a convention used by the biographers to make the point that the individuals were "among the people"

---

[111]Urvoy, Dominique, "The ʿUlama of al-andalus", p. 857.

who practiced *zuhd*. I believe that this becomes clear when one considers that the biographers tended to use the word "*ahl*" with other descriptive words as well. For instance, in describing Sulaymān Ibn Ayūb, Ibn al-Faraḍi related that he was "from the people of religious knowledge and learned speculation (*min ahl al-ʿilm wa al-naẓar*).[112] Clearly it was not the intent of the biographer to suggest that "people of religious knowledge and learned speculation" separated themselves into their own communities. This was a common pattern for the biographer. Ibn al-Faraḍi described Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad of Cordoba (d. 303/915) as being "from the people of *zuhd* and virtue (*min ahl al-zuhd wa-al-faḍl*) ".[113] This is an example of Ibn al-Faraḍi using the term "people" or "community" of *zuhd*, but in this example he also referred to "the community of *faḍl*". Again, it is difficult to imagine that the biographer wished for his readers to understand this phrase to mean that "virtuous" people separated themselves from the rest of the *ʿulama*. These examples point to a second problem for Urvoy. If these phrases are truly to be understood as implying physical communities, then how is it possible for an individual to belong to more than one of these communities. This is even clearer in examples from Ibn Bashkuwal. He wrote that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Muḥammad Ibn ʿAṭṭab Ibn Muḥsan was "*min ahl al-faḍl wa-al-ḥikmah wa-al-mutawāḍiʿah* (from the people of virtue, knowledge and humility)".[114] It was obviously not Ibn Bashkuwal's intent to lead readers to the conclusion that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān belonged to a community of virtuous people, a community of knowledgeable people, and a community of humble people. It is therefore my conclusion that the use of this word by the biographers was meant to suggest that individuals were "among the people who possessed the attribute of" *zuhd*, *faḍl*, *ḥikm*, *ʿilm*, or any of the other words which accompanied this common phrase.

The second major problem which I have with Urvoy's conclusion is that he based his argument on a premise which I believe is flawed. He argued that the reason *zuhhād* would desire to separate themselves from the rest of the *ʿulama* was that the rest of society was unaccepting of their

[112]Ibn al-Faradi, Tārīkh, 566, 1:188.
[113]Ibid, 89, 1:30.
[114]Ibn Bashkuwal, Silah, 753:512-3.

views. This has been challenged by the evidence which has been presented in this work. There was nothing in Ibn al-Faradi's biographical collection to suggest that ascetics were anything but respected by their contemporaries. The language which the biographer chose to represent his perception of the *zuhhād* was entirely favorable. There was no evidence in the collection which related to major problems that ascetics might have had with their co-religionists. The lack of any such evidence, combined with the fact that Ibn al-Faradi, who was not identified as a *zāhid* in any source of which I am aware, used favorable language when describing them, leads to the conclusion that ascetics were not persecuted or disdained by their contemporaries, and therefore had no apparent political reason to separate themselves. Since it has already been established in this paper that there was no reason inherent in the practice of *zuhd* which required physical separation from the rest of society, at least as *zuhd* was practiced in al-Andalus, there is no acceptable explanation which would illuminate why *zuhhād* would choose to live in isolated communities populated only by other ascetics.

The final argument which I will pose in favor of *zuhhād* co-existing and living among their co-religionists is that they had a number of different teachers. If *zuhhād* truly were separated then one would expect that they would have the same teachers and that they would transmit Hadith under the same authorities, as the nature of their seclusion would lead to older and more respected *zuhhād* appearing in the biographies as the teachers for many of the ascetics. This was not the case. They transmitted Hadith under any number of authorities and their teachers were as varied as their travels. In fact, the only teacher who seemed to appear in the biographies of ascetics with any regularity was Muḥammad Ibn Waddāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Yūsuf. Unfortunately for scholars, the identity of this individual was not explained by Ibn al-Faradi in any detail and it is unclear from the biographies whether he even lived in al-Andalus.[115] There were a number of *zuhhād* who studied

[115]It is unclear from Ibn al-Faradi's text who Muḥammad Ibn Waddāh was. There is some evidence that he was from al-Sham (Greater Syria), but there was also evidence which suggests otherwise. There were actually two Muḥammad Ibn Waddāh who appeared in the text, one of which can be immediately dismissed because his entry was too short to be the entry of this individual. The other entry is more interesting and may possibly be the Muḥammad Ibn Waddāh who had so many ascetic students. This individual (*tarjama* 1136, 2: 15) was a client of the Amīr, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, and went

under this individual, however. I found at least eleven ascetics for whom the biographer lists Ibn Waḍḍāh as their primary teacher.[116] It is doubtful that they constituted a community, however, because the dates of their deaths, ranging from the late third century A.H. to the mid-fourth century A.H., indicate that this individual taught over a long period of time and thus renders the relatively large number of ascetics taught by Ibn Waḍḍāh less startling. After all, the fact that he taught eleven *zuhhād* over a period which seems to have been more than half a century long is not that impressive. Another fact which does not support the contention that Ibn Waḍḍāh was only a trainer of ascetics is that he also was a teacher of Muslims who did not practice *zuhd*. For instance, Ibn al-Faraḍi listed Ibn Waḍḍāh as the primary teacher of both Khalīl Ibn ʿAbd al-Malik Ibn Khalib[117] and ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿAmarūsh Abī Yūsuf[118]. Neither of these individuals were listed as *zuhhād* by the biographer. It is also important to note that, besides Ibn Waḍḍāh, no other teacher appears to have taught a large number of ascetics. This is a fact which indicates that *zuhhād*, like other members of the *ʿulama*, learned from a large number of teachers spread over a vast area encompassing al-Andalus and the Eastern part of the Islamic world.

It is clear that Urvoy was mistaken in his assertion that ascetics isolated themselves into communities in al-Andalus beginning in the ninth century. There is no evidence which suggests that this was the case and, in fact, there is evidence to the contrary in the form of a diverse number of teachers and authorities. The only evidence which could be viewed as supporting Urvoy's contention was the use of the word "*ahl*" by the biographers. Even this ambiguous word does not support him,

---

often to the East. He was also known to have transmitted Hadith, an activity which many of his students practiced as well. This particular individual is supported by al-Dhaḥabī's biographical collection as well (al-Huffaẓ, entry 670). Al-Dhaḥabī quotes Ibn al-Faraḍi extensively about a Muḥammad Ibn Waḍḍāh who was known to transmit Hadith. This entry is three pages long and details the individual's life, leaving little doubt that this is the famous teacher.

[116]Muḥammad Ibn Waḍḍāh's ascetic students were: Aḥmad Ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (112, 1:36), Aḥmad Ibn Yaḥyā (119, 1:38), Ismāʿīl Ibn ʿAmār Ibn Ismāʿīl (213, 1:65), Asbagh Ibn Malik Ibn Mūsā (250, 1:79), Khalaf Ibn Saʿīd al-Manī of Cordoba (405, 1:134), Sa'dūn Ibn Ismāʿīl (547, 1:183), Sulaymān Ibn Muḥammad (554, 1:186), Shaybān Ibn Sulaymān (596, 1:197), ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad (787, 1:260-1), and Abū al-'Ajanis al-Zāhid (911, 1:308).

[117]Ibn al-Faraḍi, Tārīkh, 419, 1:139-140.

[118]Ibid, 736, 1:239.

however. It is clear that the biographers intended the word as a way of grouping an individual into a general category of people rather than to suggest he was physically part of a community. With this in mind, it is evident that ascetics existed as part of the general *ʿulama*. This is an important fact for this discussion of *zuhd*. One argument which I have made throughout this work is that ascetics existed as part of the *ʿulama* and behaved in a manner which was consistent with their fellow Muslims. The fact that ascetics did not physically separate themselves from their communities is certainly support for that contention.

9. Conclusions

It was the purpose of this paper to accomplish three things: understanding *zuhd* according to the biographical collection of Ibn al-Faraḍi, comparing *zuhd* in al-Andalus with Eastern asceticism, and discovering what place *zuhhād* held in their society. Ibn al-Faraḍi's text has proved to be a fertile source for answering these questions. In his biographical collection there is ample evidence about ascetics and about the various disciplines that were practiced in the region. It is possible to understand his conception of *zuhd* through these biographical entries and to realize that this conception was somewhat different from the traditional explanations of asceticism. It was clear that he understood *zuhhād* to have a spirituality which was not evident in his descriptions of other members of the *ʿulama*. It was also apparent that he viewed *zuhd* as primarily an internal phenomenon. This we know to be true for two reasons: the absence of a significant number of *zuhhād* who practiced isolation and the prominence of the word *waraʿ* in entries dealing with *zuhd*. This definition is also informative for the purpose of discovering what role ascetics played within their communities. Ibn al-Faraḍi's understanding of what constituted *zuhd* in al-Andalus certainly would not preclude *zuhhād* from living among the rest of the *ʿulama*. After analyzing the various disciplines in which the ascetics engaged, it is clear that not only were *zuhhād* not precluded from living among their communities, some of the disciplines they practiced make it apparent that they must have lived among the rest of the *ʿulama*.

The original purpose of this work was to analyze the evidence provided by Ibn al-Faraḍi about *zuhd* in order to discover how *zuhhād* practiced their discipline and what the biographer understood this discipline to encompass. With the aid of Kinberg's theoretical framework this goal has been accomplished. It is clear from Ibn al-Faraḍi that *zuhhād* were individuals who were considered abnormally pious by their co-religionists. It is also apparent that their discipline was internal in nature. This is evident from the emphasis that the author gave to *waraʿ*. The word *waraʿ*, as

Kinberg described in her works, was understood by medieval Muslims to represent the act of eliminating moral doubt. This is inherently an internal act by the ascetic. It was also clear from the biographical collection that *zuhd*, as it was described by Ibn al-Faraḍi, was not equivalent to the predominant modern understanding of asceticism. There were only a few *zuhhād*, out of the more than one hundred present in the biographies, who isolated themselves or engaged in physical deprivation. These traditional aspects of asceticism simply were not exercised by the "ascetics" in al-Andalus. From this it may be concluded that *zuhd* was not asceticism, but rather it was a deep spirituality marked by the presence of *waraʿ*.

The second goal of this work was to discover how *zuhd*, as it was practiced in al-Andalus, compared with *zuhd* in the Eastern Islamic world. The basis for my conclusions in this section was the evidence in Ibn al-Faraḍi and Kinberg's analysis of primary sources written about Eastern *zuhd*. It became clear when comparing the two that there were several aspects of Eastern asceticism which appeared during the period covered by Ibn al-Faraḍi's biography. The most prominent of these aspects was *waraʿ*. As with Kinberg's analysis, *waraʿ* was the most essential component of *zuhd* in Ibn al-Faraḍi's collection. This is important because it also demonstrates that in al-Andalus, as in al-Mashriq, *zuhd* was considered an internal practice in which piety was the desired goal. The fact that the two regions practiced *zuhd* in a similar manner can be explained by the fact that *zuhhād*, like other members of the *ʿulama*, journeyed East at least once in their lives. Both as a religious obligation and as part of their search for knowledge, ascetics in al-Andalus journeyed to the major learning centers of the Eastern Islamic world and studied there under teachers who were known to practice *zuhd*. Clearly this was a case where religious knowledge was transferred from these *zuhhād* back to al-Andalus and accounts for the similarity in their practice of *zuhd*.

The final area I wished to explore was the role that ascetics had within the *ʿulama*. There were two primary ways in which I addressed this issue. It was obvious from the disciplines they engaged in that ascetics participated in their communities. There is little chance that an individual who

acted as a public reader or *qaḍī* could have isolated himself from his community. What was also clear from the exploration of this area was that *zuhhād* avoided the secular disciplines. Even though evidence has shown that *zuhhād* refused to participate in disciplines which were not religious in nature, they still were active members of the *ʿulama*. The second way in which this issue was addressed was in analyzing Urvoy's argument that ascetics lived in *zāhid* communities. Clearly the notion that they isolated themselves into separate enclaves within the structure of society in al-Andalus is antithetical to the idea that they co-existed as productive and respected members of the learned class. It is my belief that his argument was shown to be groundless and that I demonstrated that ascetics certainly lived among the rest of society. In response to the question: what role did *zuhhād* play within the *ʿulama*? The answer is that they existed in the same manner as any other member of the learned class existed, except for the fact that their focus was entirely on religious matters. While this may seem to be an important deviation from the norm among the *ʿulama*, it must be remembered that these religious activities were primarily internal in nature and resulted in a higher level of piety among *zuhhād* rather than any marked difference in the way they lived.

One final point which emerges from this survey is that the rigidity which characterized the theoretical tracts examined by Kinberg were not apparent in Ibn al-Faraḍi's collection. The language used by the Muslim biographer was far more ambigious than that used by Kinberg, and was therefore more difficult to decipher. This ambiguity also makes it evident that *zuhhād* in al-Andalus closely resembled their contemporaries. This view contrasts with Kinberg's analysis which presents ascetics as a rigid group inherently defined by their practices. This analysis challenges that argument by asserting that asceticism, as it was practiced during the time of Ibn al-Faraḍi did not distinguish itself from other disciplines in substantial ways.

In conclusion, this survey of *zuhd* in al-Andalus during the late ninth, tenth, and early eleventh centuries is important for enhancing our knowledge of how the *ʿulama*, the most important class within Islamic society in matters relating to religion and knowledge, functioned.

Zuhhād constituted almost ten percent of the people whom Ibn al-Faraḍi considered to be part of this learned class. Clearly this is a large and influential number of ascetics, and it demonstrates that *zuhd* flourished during this period in al-Andalus. By enhancing our understanding of both what Muslims in al-Andalus believed *zuhd* to be and how *zuhhād* co-existed with their fellow Muslims, it is possible to gain a clearer comprehension of how the *ʿulama* were organized in the region and what disciplines and activities were considered to be accepted practice in al-Andalus. Clearly this work challenges the notion that *zuhhād* were outside of the accepted religious framework within al-Andalus. Indeed, it is apparent from Ibn al-Faraḍi's treatment of the subject that *zuhhād* were recognized and accepted members of the *ʿulama*. This work also reaffirms the notion there was an intellectual link between the Eastern and Western parts of the Islamic world. It is clear that *zuhd* in al-Andalus was similar to *zuhd* in the East, and that *zuhhād* in al-Andalus were recognized by their contemporaries to be within the parameters of orthodox Islam. For the most part the only thing that separated them from the rest of the *ʿulama* was the fact that they practiced the discipline of *zuhd*. In most other respects they were indistinguishable.

Bibliography

Agius, Dionisius A., Arabic Literary Works As A Source of Documentation For Technical Terms Of The Material Culture (Berlin: Klaus Scwartz Verlag, 1984).

Al-Dhaḥabī, Kitāb Tadhkiratu 'l-Huffaz Vol. 3.

Ashtiany, Julia and T.M. Johnstone, The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: 'Abbasid Belles Lettres Hamori, A. "Ascetic Poetry", p. 265-275, (Cambridge: University Press, 1990).

Asin Palacios, Miguel, Obras Escogidas (Madrid, 1946), Vol. 1.
-Obras Escogidas (Madrid, 1946), Vol. 2-3.

Bishko, C.J., Studies in Medieval Spanish Frontier History (London:Variorum Reprints, 1980).

Collins, Roger, Law and Culture, and Regionalism in Early Medieval Spain (Hampshire: Variorum, 1992).

Dozy, Reinhart, Supplement Aux Dictionnaires Arabes Vol. 1 and 2 (Beirut: Librarie Du Liban, 1968).

Fierro Bello, Maria Isabel, La Heterodoxia En al-Andalus Durante El Periodo Omeya (Madrid: Instituto Hispano-Arabe De Cultura, 1987).

Fletcher, Richard, Moorish Spain (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1992).

Glick, Thomas, Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).

Grunebaum, Gustave Von, Medieval Islam (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953).
-Arabic Poetry (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz, 1973).

Harvey, L.P., Islamic Spain 1250 to 1500 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

Hitti, Phillip K., History of the Arabs (London:Macmillan Press LTD, 1970).

Hourani, Albert, A History of the Arab Peoples (New York: Warner Books, 1991).

Humphreys, Stephen, Islamic History (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

Ibn al-Faraḍi, Tārīkh ʿUlama al-Andalus (Cairo: Dar al-Misri, 1966).

Ibn Baskowal, Al-Ṣilato (Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani, 1989).

Juynboll, G.H.A., Muslim Tradition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Kinberg, Leah, "What is Meant by Zuhd?", Studia Islamica, 1985, V. 61: 27-44.
-"Compromise of Commerce", Der Islam, 1989, v. 66: 193-212.

Lane, Edward William, Arabic-English Lexicon Vol. 3 (Beirut: Librarie du Liban, 1980).

Massignon, Lious, Essai Sur Les Origines Du Lexique Technique De La Mystique Musulmane (Paris: Librarie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1968).

O'Callaghan, Joseph F., A History of Medieval Spain (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1975).

Reilly, Bernard F., The Medieval Spains (Cambridge: University Press, 1993).
-The Contest of Christian and Muslim Spain (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992).

Smith, Margaret, Studies in Early Mysticism (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1973).
-Readings From the Mystics of Islam (London: Luzac and Co., 1972).
-An Early Mystic of Baghdad (London: Sheldon Press, 1973).

Urvoy, Dominique, Monde des ulemas andalous du V/XI au VII/XIII siecle (Geneva: Librarie Droz, 1978).

Watt, William Montgomery, A History of Islamic Spain (Edinburgh: University Press, 1965).

VITA

Robert Williams was born in Fort Sill, Oklahoma on January 27, 1969. He attended schools in the Canal Zone in the country of Panama and the city of Radford, Virginia before graduating from W.T. Woodson High School in Fairfax, Virginia in June, 1987. He entered the University of Tennessee at Knoxville in the fall of 1987 where in May, 1993 he received a Bachelor of Arts in History. The following August he began his Master of Arts program at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. He will receive his Master of Arts diploma in December of 1995.

He is presently awaiting the Fall Quarter to begin at the University of Chicago where he has been accepted into the Doctoral program.