The Beginnings of Rational Theology in al-Andalus: Ibn Masarra and his *Refutation of al-Kindī's On First Philosophy**

Los comienzos de la teología racional en al-Andalus: Ibn Masarra y su *Refutación de Sobre la Filosofía primera de al-Kindī*

José Bellver

Université Catholique de Louvain

ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9055-3420

The main source on Ibn Masarra's thought before 1972 was Ibn Ḥazm, who briefly described some key elements of Ibn Masarra's theology. In 1972, Muḥammad Kamāl Ibrāhīm Jaʿfar attributed two treatises to Ibn Masarra, *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* and *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*, extant in a manuscript held in the Chester Beatty Library. The contents of these two works differ from previous descriptions of Ibn Masarra's thought in primary sources, which overwhelmingly regard him as a theologian that upheld Qadarī-like tenets, such as *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd* and *istiṭāʿa*. In light of the two works ascribed to Ibn Masarra by Jaʿfar,

La fuente principal antes de 1972 para conocer el pensamiento de Ibn Masarra era una breve descripción que Ibn Ḥazm hizo de algunos elementos fundamentales de su teología. En 1972, Muḥammad Kamāl Ibrāhīm Ŷaʿfar atribuyó a Ibn Masarra dos obras, *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* y *Kitāb Jawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*, que se encuentran en un manuscrito de la Chester Beatty Library. El contenido de estas dos obras difiere de las descripciones que hacen las fuentes primarias del pensamiento de Ibn Masarra, pues en estas últimas se le considera de manera mayoritaria un teólogo con creencias de corte *qadarī*, como *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd* e

subsequent scholarship has criticized the bulk of primary sources on Ibn Masarra as inaccurate and either biased or uninformed, and has dismissed them. However, the most illuminating source on Ibn Masarra, Ibn al-Uqlīshī's *al-Inbāʾ fī sharḥ ḥaqāʾiq al-ṣifāt wa-l-asmāʾ*, appears to have passed unnoticed to scholarship until recently. On the basis of the information provided by Ibn al-Uqlīshī, this paper suggests attributing a work already edited and published under a different author, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* or *Refutation of al-Kindī's On First Philosophy*, to Ibn Masarra. This text was formerly attributed to Ibn Ḥazm. The latter work coincides with descriptions of Ibn Masarra found in primary sources other than the two works Jaʿfar attributes to Ibn Masarra.

Key words: Ibn Masarra; Ibn al-Uqlīshī; Ibn Ḥazm; al-Kindī; intellectual history of the Islamicate world; *kalām*; Islamic theology; Qadariyya; Muʿtazila; Arabic philosophy; Sufism; causality; *ḥurūf*; *iʿtibār*; al-Andalus.

istiṭāʿa. A la vista de las dos obras que Ŷaʿfar atribuyó a Ibn Masarra, la erudición posterior ha tachado la mayoría de fuentes primarias sobre Ibn Masarra de imprecisas, tendenciosas o mal informadas, de modo que las ha descartado. La fuente más esclarecedora sobre Ibn Masarra, *al-Inbāʾ fī šarḥ ḥaqāʾiq al-ṣifāt wa-l-asmāʾ* de Ibn al-Uqlīšī, parece haber pasado desapercibida hasta fechas recientes. Tomando como base la información que aporta Ibn al-Uqlīšī, este artículo sugiere la atribución a Ibn Masarra de *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, o *Refutación de Sobre la Filosofía primera de al-Kindī*, obra ya editada, si bien bajo la atribución a Ibn Ḥazm. Esta obra coincide con descripciones del pensamiento de Ibn Masarra en fuentes primarias, si bien excluyendo de las fuentes primarias las dos obras que Ŷaʿfar le atribuye.

Palabras clave: Ibn Masarra; Ibn al-Uqlīšī; Ibn Ḥazm; al-Kindī; historia intelectual del mundo islámico; *kalām*; teología islámica; Qadariyya; Muʿtazila; filosofía árabe; sufismo; causalidad; *ḥurūf*; *iʿtibār*; al-Andalus.

Introduction

The aim of this article, which is an advance of an upcoming monograph on Ibn Masarra, is to establish the authorship by Ibn Masarra of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* or *Refutation of al-Kindī's On First Philosophy*, formerly ascribed to Ibn Ḥazm. My aim is not to provide a thorough study of this work but, rather, establish its authorship.[1]

In this paper, I limit myself to a very succinct review of some relevant sources dedicated to Ibn Masarra and I examine in some detail the source I believe to be the most informative about him, a source which has apparently gone unnoticed in scholarship until recently,[2] that is, Ibn al-Uqlīshī's (d. 550-1/1155-7) *al-Inbāʾ fī sharḥ ḥaqāʾiq al-ṣifāt wa-*

---

[1] In my upcoming monograph on Ibn Masarra, I will provide a thorough study of the *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*.

[2] Casewit has recently called attention to Ibn al-Uqlīshī's reference to Ibn Masarra, while Casassas Canals and Serrano-Ruano have also recently translated al-Qurṭubī's (d. 671/1273) quotation of Ibn al-Uqlīshī's reference to Ibn Masarra. See Casewit, "Shushtarī's Treatise", p. 3, n. 2, and Casassas Canals and Serrano-Ruano, "Putting Criticisms", pp. 277-278.

l-asmāʾ. The latter indicates that Ibn Masarra refuted al-Kindī's book, *Fam al-dhahab*, which is the title given in al-Andalus to al-Kindī's *On First Philosophy*. Thus, based on the reference provided by Ibn al-Uqlīshī, the title of a work by Ibn Masarra, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* or *Refutation of al-Kindī's On First Philosophy*, can be inferred. Ibn al-Uqlīshī provides sufficient information about Ibn Masarra's refutation of al-Kindī to identify it. This work is extant, though it has been formerly attributed to Ibn Ḥazm.

Ibn Masarra

Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Masarra b. Najīḥ al-Qurṭubī (d. 319/931), usually known simply as Ibn Masarra, is widely acknowledged in the earlier primary sources[3] as the first prominent theologian of al-Andalus and an important ascetic, although his theology attracted stark opposition from others. Some later sources regard Ibn Masarra as one of the greatest seekers on the pathway regarding knowledge, spiritual states and unveilings[4] and as an authority in the science of letters (*ʿilm al-ḥurūf*),[5] and align him with the Sufi predecessors in this science.[6]

Ibn Masarra was born in Cordoba in 269/883 to a family of local descent.[7] His father, ʿAbd Allāh b. Masarra (d. 286/899-90), who excelled in the knowledge of *ḥadīth*, was one of the main teachers in religious sciences at the time in Cordoba.[8] During his first formative trip

---

[3] In this paper, I define 'primary sources' as any primary source, i.e., biographical, historical, theological, Sufi, etc., that refers to or provides information about Ibn Masarra. For methodological reasons, I exclude from these 'primary sources' the two works that Jaʿfar edited and attributed to Ibn Masarra, namely *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and *Risālat al-Iʿtibār*. In this paper, I will refer to these two treatises as the Jaʿfar treatises. As I explain below, in my view, attributing the Jaʿfar treatises to Ibn Masarra is very questionable.

[4] Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 1, p. 148.

[5] Al-Būnī, *Laṭāʾif al-ishārāt*, f. 85r. Al-Būnī mentions Sahl al-Tustarī (d. 283/896) and al-Ḥallāj (d. 309/922) among the earlier authorities in the science of letters, and Ibn Masarra and Ibn Barrajān (d. 536/1141) among the later ones.

[6] [Ibn] al-Uqlīshī, *al-Inbāʾ*, p. 239.

[7] For biographies on Ibn Masarra in primary sources, see Morris, *Ibn Masarra*. For a summary of his biography, see Lévi-Provençal, "A propos de l'ascète". For a general introduction to the current view about Ibn Masarra, see Ramón Guerrero and Garrido Clemente, "Ibn Masarra al-Qurṭubī".

[8] Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 1, pp. 294-296, no. 650.

(*riḥla*) to the east, ʿAbd Allāh b. Masarra was linked to Qadarī circles in Basra. Back in al-Andalus, he was suspected of being a Qadarī, i.e., a proponent of human free will, and a friend of the Andalusī Muʿtazilī Khalīl b. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Kulayb, known by the depreciative "Khalīl al-Ghafla" (fl. 3rd/9th c.).[9] In al-Andalus, ʿAbd Allāh b. Masarra became Ibn Masarra's first teacher. When Ibn Masarra was old enough, his father bequeathed his wealth to him and left for the east on a second pilgrimage, though he died shortly after arriving in Mecca. Ibn Masarra had a brother, Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Masarra who travelled to the east and died in Alexandria when Muḥammad b. Masarra was still alive.[10] Ibn Masarra's other teachers included Ibn Waḍḍāḥ (d. 287/900), an important traditionist and ascetic, and Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Salām al-Khushanī (d. 286/899). After the death of his father in 286/899-90, Ibn Masarra pursued a life of asceticism. Biographical dictionaries report two different trips by Ibn Masarra to the east: the first one by the end of ʿAbd Allāh's emirate around the year 300/912, though there is no indication that he arrived in Mecca.[11] The second trip served to avoid the accusations of *zandaqa* and spanned a period of about three years in Mecca (311–313/924–926), during which time Ibn Masarra took part in the pilgrimages in 311/924 and 312/925.[12] It was probably during his first trip to the east in his early thirties that Ibn Masarra visited Kairouan.[13] He was the only new participant in a meeting in the city hosted by Ibn Ḥārith al-Khushanī's (d. 361/971) teacher, Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad b. Naṣr b. Ziyād al-Hawwārī (d. 317/929),[14] who called Ibn Masarra a young man (*shābb*), whereas during his second trip to the east, he was in his early forties and travelled with companions. Back in al-Andalus, he devoted his life to asceticism and retired with his disciples to a hill (*jabal*) near Cordoba, where he died in 319/931 still middle-aged. Contrary to his disciples and even though he was sus-

---

[9] On Khalīl b. ʿAbd al-Malik, see Fierro, *La heterodoxia*, pp. 91-93.
[10] Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 1, p. 49, no. 23.
[11] Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 2, p. 55.
[12] See the biography devoted to Ibn Masarra's fellow traveler and companion, al-Madīnī, in Ibn al-Abbār, *al-Takmila*, vol. 1, p. 14, no. 8.
[13] Al-Khushanī, *Quḍāt*, pp. 211-212. The same anecdote is reported by Ibn ʿIdhārī, *al-Bayān al-mughrib*, vol. 1, p. 195.
[14] Al-Khushanī gives the name Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad b. Naṣr, whereas Ibn ʿIdhārī gives Aḥmad b. Naṣr b. Ziyād. For more on the latter, see Ibn Farḥūn, *al-Dībāj*, pp. 157-159, no. 26.

pected of *zandaqa*, Ibn Masarra was not finally persecuted nor were his works the object of any *auto-da-fé* during his lifetime.

Ibn Masarra is said to have authored numerous works, of which primary sources provide the following titles: Ibn Ḥayyān (d. 469/1076) lists an abridgement of Mālik's *Mudawwana*;[15] Ibn al-Marʾa (d. 611/1214) cites *Kitāb Tawḥīd al-mūqinīn*;[16] Ibn al-Abbār (d. 658/1260), *Kitāb al-Tabṣira*;[17] al-Qurṭubī (d. 671/1273), *Kitāb al-Tabyīn*;[18] and Ibn ʿArabī (d. 638/1240), *Kitāb al-Ḥurūf*.[19] Elsewhere, Ibn ʿArabī provides a more specific title of Ibn Masarra's *Kitāb al-Ḥurūf*, namely *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*.[20] In addition, Ibn al-Uqlīshī mentions that Ibn Masarra refuted al-Kindī's *On First Philosophy*. Consequently the attribution to Ibn Masarra of the title *Refutation of al-Kindī's On First Philosophy* can be inferred.

Ibn Masarra's views and works sparked stark opposition, to the point that one is tempted to label refutations of Ibn Masarra as a sort of a literary genre on its own. Unfortunately, none of these refutations seems to be extant today.[21] There are records of nine authors of refutations against Ibn Masarra, which extend well into the 5th/11th century, although sources customarily state that the number of refutations was greater. Primary sources list refutations in al-Andalus by Aḥmad b. Khālid (d. 322/934),[22] Abū Bakr al-Zubaydī (d. 379/989), entitled *Hatk sutūr al-mulḥidīn*,[23] Muḥammad b. Yabqā b. Zarb (d. 381/991),[24] Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Naṣr al-Umawī al-Naḥwī (d. ca. 399/1008),[25] Abū ʿUmar al-Ṭala-

---

[15] Ibn Ḥayyān, *al-Muqtabas V*, p. 21.

[16] Ibn al-Marʾa, *Nukat al-Irshād*, vol. 4, f. 195v. See Massignon, *Recueil*, pp. 70-71.

[17] Ibn al-Abbār, *al-Takmila*, vol. 1, p. 233, no. 785.

[18] Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Tadhkira*, p. 771.

[19] Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 2, p. 581.

[20] Ibn ʿArabī, *Sharḥ Kitāb Khalʿ al-naʿlayn*, p. 217.

[21] For a preliminary list of refutations, see Fierro, *La heterodoxia*, p. 139.

[22] On his refutation, see Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 2, p. 56, no. 1202. On him, see al-Khushanī, *Akhbār*, pp. 17-19, no. 15, and Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 1, pp. 72-73, no. 94.

[23] Al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat*, vol. 1, pp. 84-85; al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, *Tartīb al-madārik*, vol. 7, pp. 37-40, here p. 39; Ibn Farḥūn, *al-Dībāj*, vol. 2, pp. 219-220, no. 44; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 16, pp. 417-418, no. 305, here p. 418.

[24] Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 2, pp. 126-127, no. 1361; al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, *Tartīb al-madārik*, vol. 7, pp. 114-118, here p. 115; Ibn Farḥūn, *al-Dībāj*, vol. 2, pp. 230-231, no. 57; al-Nubāhī [al-Bunnāhī], *Taʾrīkh*, p. 78; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 16, p. 411, no. 298.

[25] Ibn Bashkuwāl, *al-Ṣila*, pp. 388-389, no. 570.

mankī (d. 429/1037-8),[26] and the reciter and traditionist, Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī (d. 444/1053).[27]

Among the authors of refutations of Ibn Masarra's thought in the east, primary sources list the famous traditionist and Sufi, Abū Saʿīd Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād al-Aʿrābī (d. 341/952) based in Mecca,[28] Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sālim (d. 356/967),[29] i.e., the leader of the Sālimiyya in Basra whose father was the direct disciple of Sahl al-Tustarī (d. 283/896)[30]—both Abū Saʿīd Ibn al-Aʿrābī and Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sālim were teachers of Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 386/996)—, and the famous Mālikī scholar, Ibn Abī Zayd (d. 386/996),[31] based in Kairouan, one of the teachers of al-Ṭalamankī in that city.[32] Ibn Masarra represents one of the first cases in which eastern scholars engaged with an author from al-Andalus and, thus, one of the first cases of an Andalusī author having an impact in the Mashriq.

This stark opposition also manifested itself by means of the official persecution of his views after his death. In 340/952, 345/956 and 346/957, official condemnations of his views allowing for the persecution and imprisonment of his followers were read in the central mosques of Cordoba and Madīnat al-Zahrāʾ and were sent all over al-Andalus.[33] As a result, in 350/961-2, under the instigation of Ibn Yabqā, the author of one refutation of Ibn Masarra, the works of Ibn Masarra were burnt next to the western side of the central mosque of Cordoba, while a group of his followers were granted the

---

[26] See al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, *Tartīb al-madārik*, vol. 8, pp. 32-33; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 15, pp. 556-558, no. 332. See also Fierro, "El proceso", p. 113; and *eadem*, *La heterodoxia*, p. 139.

[27] [Ibn] al-Uqlīshī, *al-Inbāʾ*, p. 241. On him, see Ibn Bashkuwāl, *al-Ṣila*, pp. 592-593, no. 882.

[28] On him, see Marín, "Abū Saʿīd Ibn al-Aʿrābī".

[29] On him, see Bin Ramli, "The Sālimiyya".

[30] For the attribution of these two refutations to their authors, see Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 2, p. 56, no. 1202.

[31] For this work, see Ibn Khalīl al-Sakūnī, *al-Mukhtār*, p. 58; [Ibn] al-Uqlīshī, *al-Inbāʾ*, p. 240; and al-Dabbāgh, *Maʿālim*, vol. 3, p. 111. Al-Dhahabī also mentions a seemingly lost refutation against the Qadariyya. See al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 17, pp. 10-13, here p. 11. Muḥammad b. Qāsim al-Umawī (d. 403/1013), known as al-Jāliṭī or Ibn al-Jāliṭī, the last imam of Madīnat al-Zahrāʾ, transmitted to Ibn Abī Zayd the *Refutation of Ibn Masarra* by al-Zubaydī. See Ibn Bashkuwāl, *al-Ṣila*, pp. 718-719, no. 1067.

[32] Fierro, "El proceso", p. 103.

[33] Fierro, *La heterodoxia*, pp. 132-133.

chance to repent.[34] Nevertheless, these persecutions did not completely prevent following Ibn Masarra, since there are reports of active groups of followers well into the 5th/11th century, particularly in the area of Almeria.

Ibn Masarra in secondary bibliography pre-Jaʿfar

Before Jaʿfar's announcement in 1972 attributing two new works to Ibn Masarra, there had been a long tradition in modern scholarship devoted to the study of Ibn Masarra[35] based on references in biographical literature. This tradition of Masarrian studies pre-Jaʿfar mainly revolved around the possible influence of the so-called Pseudo-Empedocles on Ibn Masarra.[36] In 1857, Amari published his *Biblioteca arabo-sicula*, excerpting the section by Ibn al-Qifṭī on Empedocles where Ibn al-Qifṭī (d. 646/1248)[37] in keeping with Ṣāʿid al-Andalusī (d. 462/1070)[38] maintains the thesis of an Empedoclean influence on Ibn Masarra.[39] Shortly after, Dozy saw him as an emissary of the Ismāʿīlīs and again pointed out influences by the so-called Pseudo-Empedocles.[40] In 1914, Asín Palacios, in a work whose influence lasted until the publication of the works attributed to Ibn Masarra,[41] gathered the references found in primary sources known to him and associated Ibn Masarra to Muʿtazilī tendencies. Asín Palacios also upheld the thesis of a strong Pseudo-Empedoclean influence on Ibn Masarra, which shaped the dominant view on Ibn Masarra in surveys of the intellectual history of the Islamicate world during most of the twentieth century.

---

[34] Al-Nubāhī [al-Bunnāhī], *Taʾrīkh*, p. 78; Fierro, *La heterodoxia*, pp. 138-139.

[35] Morris gives a good account in his unpublished graduate paper, *Ibn Masarra*, which Brown updates in Brown, *Muḥammad*, pp. 5-29.

[36] For a critical view on the "myth of the Pseudo-Empedocles", see De Smet, *Empedocles Arabus*. For his analysis of Ibn Masarra and the Empedocles question, see pp. 17-20.

[37] Ibn al-Qifṭī, *Taʾrīkh*, p. 16.

[38] Ṣāʿid, *Ṭabaqāt*, pp. 21-22.

[39] Amari, *Biblioteca*, pp. 613-615.

[40] Dozy, *Histoire*, vol. 3, pp. 19-20.

[41] Asín Palacios, *Abenmasarra*. For the English translation, see Asín Palacios, *The Mystical Philosophy*.

In the early seventies, Stern dismissed Asín Palacios' Pseudo-Empe-
doclean thesis,[42] and, shortly after, one of Morris's graduate papers
gathered all the information available in primary sources mentioning
Ibn Masarra.[43] In the late eighties, still unaware of the publication by
Jaʿfar of the two works ascribed to Ibn Masarra, Fierro published her
Heterodoxia where she updated the information on Ibn Masarra and
the Masarrī school with primary sources edited shortly before, such as
Ibn Ḥayyān's *Muqtabas V*, and placed Ibn Masarra and his school in
the context of the religious and political life of the Umayyad al-An-
dalus.[44]

Ibn Masarra in secondary bibliography post-Jaʿfar

In 1972, Muḥammad Kamāl Ibrāhīm Jaʿfar called attention to two
short works included in MS Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ar. 3168,
entitled *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* and *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf wa-ḥaqāʾiqihā
wa-uṣūlihā*, which he attributed to Ibn Masarra.[45] Arberry had already
listed both works in his catalogue of the library's manuscripts and iden-
tified the author as an unknown Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jīlī.[46] He had also
pointed out that no other copies of these two works appeared to be
recorded. However, Jaʿfar reevaluated the *nisba* of the author and read
al-Jabalī instead of the very similar al-Jīlī. Thus, Jaʿfar attributed the au-
thorship to Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jabalī, whom he identified as the famed
Andalusī, Ibn Masarra, thanks to a marginal note next to the title of *Kitāb
Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* mentioning Ibn Masarra. In 1978, Jaʿfar published his
edition of both works citing Ibn Masarra as the author.[47] Jaʿfar's findings
passed unnoticed in western scholarship until the late eighties when Gril
first discussed the *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* in the introduction to his study
on the science of letters in Ibn ʿArabī.[48] In the early nineties, both works
attributed to Ibn Masarra were discussed in two parallel contributions by

---

[42] Stern, "Ibn Masarra".

[43] Morris, *Ibn Masarra*. For his historiographic account, see pp. 3-7.

[44] Fierro, *La heterodoxia*, pp. 113-118 and 132-140.

[45] Jaʿfar, "Min muʾallafāt".

[46] Arberry, *The Chester Beatty Library*, pp. 68-69, no. 3168.

[47] Jaʿfar, *Min qaḍāyā*. Jaʿfar's editions, although unaccredited, were later republished
by ʿUwayḍa in his *Ibn Masarra*.

[48] Gril, "Le science", p. 217.

Addas[49] and Tornero.[50] Addas read both works as clearly Sufi, while Tornero saw parallels with Neo-Platonic philosophers, Bāṭinism and the Ikhwān, inaugurating an ongoing discussion on the classification of both works as either Sufi or philosophical. During the nineties, the works attributed to Ibn Masarra attracted little attention in a period in which scholarship in the Islamic mysticism/Sufism field was mostly devoted to the study of the extant works by Ibn ʿArabī.[51] In the 2000s, Masarrian studies reached new heights when the works attributed to Ibn Masarra were studied more in-depth and began to be put in context. Joseph Kenny carried out a first attempt in 2004, providing a new edition and first translation of *Risālat al-Iʿtibār*.[52] In 2007, Pilar Garrido Clemente submitted her PhD dissertation with more accurate editions of both works,[53] publishing two separate studies which are now the standard editions.[54] Garrido has extensively published since, first, aligning herself with Addas in viewing Ibn Masarra as a Sufi[55] and, second, updating the debates on Ibn Masarra, i.e., on the alleged influence of the so-called Pseudo-Empedocles on the author,[56] the Throne[57] and on his alleged Qadarism[58] with the two newly found works ascribed by Jaʿfar to Ibn Masarra. In 2006, Vahid Brown presented his BA dissertation[59] in which he updated Morris' account of the extant primary sources on Ibn Masarra in the context of Jaʿfar's new findings, pointing to some connections between *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and Jewish mystical trends. In parallel to Brown, Stroumsa elaborated on these connections in more detail and pointed out the possibility of contacts between Ibn Masarra and Jewish mystical milieus during his stay in Kairouan at a time when commentaries on the *Sefer Yetzirah* were in the process of being written.[60]

---

[49] Addas, "Andalusī Mysticism", pp. 912-919.
[50] Tornero, "Noticia".
[51] During this period, the contribution by Ramón Guerrero, "Ibn Masarra", can be mentioned.
[52] Kenny, "Ibn-Masarra".
[53] Garrido Clemente, *Estudio*.
[54] Garrido Clemente, "Edición crítica de la *Risālat al-iʿtibār*"; and *eadem*, "Edición crítica del *K. Jawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*".
[55] Garrido Clemente, "Era Ibn Masarra".
[56] Garrido Clemente, "El debate"; *eadem*, "Sobre la morada".
[57] Garrido Clemente, "Textos relativos".
[58] Garrido Clemente, "Notas".
[59] Brown, *Muḥammad*.
[60] Stroumsa, "Ibn Masarra".

Stroumsa has devoted two additional studies to two works ascribed to Ibn Masarra. First, she and Sviri have provided a study and a new, thoroughly annotated English translation of *Risālat al-Iʿtibār*.[61] Second, she has attempted to reconstruct the contents of the *Kitāb Tawḥīd al-mūqinīn* based on a short quotation from Ibn al-Marʾa.[62]

Over the last decade, scholars have read the works credited to Ibn Masarra in the context of intellectual life in the late third/ninth and early fourth/tenth centuries. De Callataÿ elaborated on the similarities already pointed out some time ago by Tornero between the *Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-ṣafāʾ* and the two works attributed to Ibn Masarra. Since Ibn Masarra was active during the early fourth/tenth century, these similarities would help date the *Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-ṣafāʾ* during the ninth century, one century before the previous, more common dating.[63] In parallel, in light of the two works found by Jaʿfar, Ebstein published another important contribution to Masarrian studies in which he updated the venerable tradition going back to Dozy who traced Ismāʿīlī/Bāṭinī influences on Ibn Masarra and Andalusī Sufism based on the two works ascribed to Ibn Masarra by Jaʿfar.[64]

Ibn Masarra in primary sources

Earlier primary sources about Ibn Masarra regard him as a theologian with Qadarī or Muʿtazilī-like traits. Here I will only limit myself to summarize a handful of these sources, since a thorough analysis of the primary sources on Ibn Masarra exceeds the scope of this article. The earliest extant source on Ibn Masarra's beliefs and the Masarriyya, i.e., Ibn Masarra's followers, is the text written in the name of the Umayyad caliph, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III (r. 300–350/912–961), to be read in the mosques of Cordoba in 9 Dhū l-Ḥijja 340/7 May 952, censuring the Masarriyya. Ibn Ḥayyān[65] preserves this writing through the historian, ʿĪsā b. Aḥmad al-Rāzī (d. 379/989),

---

[61] Stroumsa and Sviri, "The Beginnings".
[62] Stroumsa, "Ibn Masarra's (d. 931) Third Book". Stroumsa summarizes her previous research on Ibn Masarra in her recent book, *Andalus and Sefarad*, pp. 34-57.
[63] De Callataÿ, "Philosophy".
[64] Ebstein, *Mysticism*.
[65] Ibn Ḥayyān, *al-Muqtabas V*, pp. 20-36.

in two different versions, a short and long one. The long version contains a list of the Masarriyya's reproachable traits which include the belief in the created nature of the *Qurʾān*, giving up all hope in the spirit (*rūḥ*) of God, i.e., in divine mercy,[66] the frequent discussion on the theological interpretation of the Qurʾānic verses, forcing the interpretation of the Prophetic traditions, denying the possibility of divine forgiveness (*ghufrān*), repentance (*tawba*) and intercession (*shafāʿa*), withdrawing from the Muslim community and denying the salutation to other Muslims.[67]

Shortly after the first condemnation of Ibn Masarra read on behalf of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III in the Cordoban mosques, the scholar born in Kairouan, Ibn Ḥārith al-Khushanī, who met Ibn Masarra in that city probably during Ibn Masarra's first *riḥla*, included an entry on Ibn Masarra in the so-called *Akhbār al-fuqahāʾ wa-l-muḥaddithīn*. Written after 343/954 and before 350/961, *Akhbār al-fuqahāʾ wa-l-muḥaddithīn* is the earliest extant biographical dictionary of al-Andalus.[68] Al-Khushanī indicates that Ibn Masarra believed in *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd*, a Muʿtazilī tenet which regards reward and punishment in the afterlife as the consequences of human deeds and as non-freely bestowed by God.

In addition to al-Khushanī's *Akhbār al-fuqahāʾ*, the main source for our knowledge of scholars during the emirate and caliphal periods in al-Andalus is Ibn al-Faraḍī's (351–403/962–1013) *Taʾrīkh ʿulamāʾ al-Andalus* which also includes a biography on Ibn Masarra.[69] Ibn al-Faraḍī furnishes many of the known biographical data about Ibn Masarra and points out that the latter was said to believe in the independent capability (*istiṭāʿa*) of human beings and in the enacting of God's threat (*infādh al-waʿīd*), i.e., *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd*. He remarks that Ibn Masarra was accused of forcing the interpretation of large sections of the *Qurʾān* and that he elaborated on the correction of deeds and the examination of the soul's sincerity along the lines of earlier eastern Sufis.

---

[66] This is a reference to *Qurʾān* 12:87 where giving up all hope in the spirit of God is identified with infidelity.

[67] Ibn Ḥayyān, *al-Muqtabas V*, p. 27. For this list, see Fierro, *La Heterodoxia*, p. 135.

[68] Al-Khushanī, *Akhbār*, p. 178, no. 209. For a translation of this entry, see Garrido Clemente, "Ibn Masarra", pp. 102-105.

[69] Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 2, pp. 55-56, no. 1202. This biography is also transmitted by Ibn Ḥayyān with minor variations. See Ibn Ḥayyān, *al-Muqtabas V*, pp. 32-33.

Ibn Ḥazm points out that Ibn Masarra agreed with the views of the Muʿtazila on *qadar*, i.e., divine foreordination.[70] As transmitted by Ibn Ḥazm, divine knowledge (*ʿilm*) and power (*qudra*) are two created (*makhlūq*) and temporally produced (*muḥdath*) attributes for Ibn Masarra. God has two knowledges, both of which are created. The first one is originated as a whole and only concerns the foreknowledge of universals, while the second is God's knowledge of particular events after they take place.

Other references in primary sources to Ibn Masarra include Ṣāʿid al-Andalusī who mentions Ibn Masarra in passing when he presents the beliefs of Empedocles;[71] Ibn al-Marʾa who describes that Ibn Masarra regarded all divine attributes as the same;[72] and Ibn ʿArabī[73] and Ibn Sabʿīn[74] who mentioned Ibn Masarra in regards to the symbolism of letters. Considering all other primary sources, one mention by Ibn ʿArabī is particularly puzzling given that he calls Ibn Masarra one of the greatest people on the spiritual pathway (*ṭarīq*) in terms of knowledge, spiritual state and unveilings.[75] However, in my view, the most illuminating source on Ibn Masarra is Ibn al-Uqlīshī's *al-Inbāʾ fī sharḥ ḥaqāʾiq al-ṣifāt wa-l-asmāʾ*.

Ibn al-Uqlīshī, the key to understanding Ibn Masarra

The traditionist and Sufi, Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Maʿadd b. ʿĪsā al-Uqlīshī (b. 478/1085-6, d. 550/1155-6 or 551/1156-7), known as Ibn al-Uqlīshī or simply al-Uqlīshī,[76] was born in Denia, while his father was born in Uclés (Uqlīsh).[77] Ibn al-Uqlīshī provides the single most important information about Ibn Masarra's beliefs in primary sources. Ibn al-Uqlīshī studied under Ibn al-Sīd al-Baṭalyawsī (d.

---

[70] Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol. 5, pp. 65-66.

[71] Ṣāʿid, *Ṭabaqāt*, pp. 21-22. For Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa (d. 668/1270) transmitting Ṣāʿid's text on Ibn Masarra, see Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 37.

[72] Massignon, *Recueil*, pp. 70-71.

[73] Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 2, p. 581.

[74] Ibn Sabʿīn, *Rasāʾil*, pp. 14-15 and pp. 253-254.

[75] Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 1, p. 148.

[76] On him, see Documentación, "Ibn al-Uqlīshī".

[77] I follow Ibn al-Abbār, who calls him Ibn al-Uqlīshī instead of al-Uqlīshī. See Ibn al-Abbār, *al-Takmila*, vol. 1, pp. 56-58, no. 168.

521/1127), Abū Bakr Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 543/1148) and the Sufi, Ibn al-ʿArīf (d. 536/1141), who was the disciple of Ibn Barrajān (d. 536/1141). He remained for a time in Almeria where he was a student of Abū l-Qāsim b. Ward (d. 540/1146), Ibn ʿAṭiyya (d. 541/1147) and Ibn al-ʿArīf. Both Ibn ʿAṭiyya and Ibn al-ʿArīf were roughly the same age as Ibn al-Uqlīshī. Ibn al-Uqlīshī may have become acquainted with the works of Ibn Masarra in Almeria, since Almeria and, in particular, the nearby town of Pechina were the centers of the Masarriyya and the Ruʿayniyya[78] at least during the first half of the 5th/11th century. Thus, books by Ibn Masarra may have been available in the area late in the century. Ibn al-Uqlīshī left al-Andalus to carry out his pilgrimage in 542/1147-8. He would never return to his home country. Ibn al-Uqlīshī mentions Ibn Masarra twice in his commentary on the names of God, a work entitled *al-Inbāʾ fī sharḥ ḥaqāʾiq al-ṣifāt wa-l-asmāʾ* and which has been edited recently.[79] Ibn al-Uqlīshī arranges the names of God in his *al-Inbāʾ* according to the western Arabic alphabet (*ḥurūf al-hijāʾ*). Thus, it can be surmised that he composed *al-Inbāʾ* before leaving for the east in 542/1147-8. The famed Imām, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Qurṭubī (d. 671/1273), quoted extensively from Ibn al-Uqlīshī's *al-Inbāʾ* in his *al-Asnā fī sharḥ asmāʾ Allāh al-ḥusnā*, including the two paragraphs where Ibn al-Uqlīshī mentions Ibn Masarra.[80] In the introductory sections to his *al-Inbāʾ* and before commenting on the particular names of God, Ibn al-Uqlīshī mentions Ibn Masarra when he addresses speculations by Sufis about the meanings of the letters of the names of God and the opening letters (*fawātiḥ*) of some suras. The first quotation by Ibn al-Uqlīshī mentioning Ibn Masarra reads as follows:[81]

---

[78] The Ruʿayniyya comprised a group that split from the Masarriyya led by Ismāʿīl b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ruʿaynī (fl. early 5th/11th c.), claiming to have the correct interpretation of Ibn Masarra's books. See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol. 5, pp. 66-67.

[79] [Ibn] al-Uqlīshi, *al-Inbāʾ*.

[80] Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Asnā*, pp. 83-84, 158.

[81] My translation is based on [Ibn] al-Uqlīshī, *al-Inbāʾ*, pp. 239-243. I have also checked MS Cairo, al-Azhar, 769 *taṣawwuf*, 18v-19r, one of the manuscripts (MS *jīm*) on which the edition is based (see *al-Inbāʾ*, pp. 101-102, for a description of this manuscript). See also al-Qurṭubī, *al-Asnā*, pp. 83-84, for the edition of al-Qurṭubī's borrowing from Ibn al-Uqlīshī. This edition contains few minor variants from the edited version of *al-Inbāʾ*. For a recent translation of al-Qurṭubī's borrowing of this paragraph, see Casassas Canals and Serrano-Ruano, "Putting Criticisms", pp. 277-278.

Sahl b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Tustarī said:[82] God, exalted be He, through His wisdom made the letters (*ḥurūf*) the roots which, by their combination, make up the speech (*qawl*). The letters cannot be divided. They are the dust (*habāʾ*) and they are the roots of [all] things. [The Sufis] talk lengthily about these matters.

Ibn Masarra al-Qurṭubī al-Jabalī embraced this view regarding the letters and the names. He maintained that the letters opening (*fawātiḥ*) some suras and the ninety-nine names of God, mentioned in the authentic tradition, are allusions (*ʿibārāt*) to luminous and spiritual beings (*mawjūdāt nūrāniyya rūḥāniyya*), which God, glorified be He, originated (*abdaʿa*). [He also maintained] that the Throne is the first originated being (*mubdaʿ*), and that it is the greatest name (*al-ism al-aʿẓam*) with which the hundred is completed. [In like manner, he also maintained] that through these entities (*ashyāʾ*)[83] conclusions can be drawn about the Named, glorified be He, that he who knows [the names] knows the science (*ʿilm*) of the Lordship and of prophecy and all the knowledge of this world (*dunyā*) and the afterlife. [He maintained] that the names are the one hundred mercies mentioned in the *ḥadīth*, that they are the one-hundred degrees to reach paradise, that they are in the second half (*al-niṣf al-thānī*) of the *Qurʾān*, in suras that are neither of the *miʾīn* section (*fī sūra laysat min al-miʾīn*)[84] nor of the *mufaṣṣal* section.[85] [He maintained] that God taught these names to him after severe hardships, a long quest, withdrawing from the world, and turning towards God, exalted be He, since they are not written down in books, but are referred to with symbols, and if he [He?] finds someone asking for [this knowledge], it will take him [Him?] one year to teach him [the names], and he would then attain all the science. He mentioned this in various of his books. His countrymen parted company with him because of this. Al-Zubaydī, the *faqīh* Ibn Abī Zayd, Abū ʿUmar al-Ṭalamankī, and the reciter Abū

---

[82] Here, Ibn al-Uqlīshī quotes the so-called *Risālat al-Ḥurūf* formerly credited to Sahl al-Tustarī. For editions of this work, see Jaʿfar, *Min al-turāth al-ṣūfī*, pp. 366-375; and [Pseudo]-Sahl al-Tustarī, *Risālat al-Ḥurūf*. Ebstein and Sviri have dismissed the attribution of this work to Sahl al-Tustarī. See Ebstein and Sviri, "The so-called *Risālat al-ḥurūf*".

[83] Here al-Qurṭubī gives 'names' (*asmāʾ*) instead of 'entities' or 'things' (*ashyāʾ*).

[84] I follow MS Cairo, al-Azhar, 769 *taṣawwuf*, 18v, instead of the edition which gives *min sūra laysat min al-mubayyan*. The variant *miʾīn* for *mubayyan* is not noted in the edition. MS Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ar. 4591, f. 19r (MS *alif* of the edition), also gives *miʾīn*.

[85] The terms *miʾīn* and *mufaṣṣal* refer to groups of suras in one of the earlier divisions of the *Qurʾān*. This division is transmitted by multiple sources. For instance, Makkī b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 437/1045) transmits that the companions of the Prophet divided the *Qurʾān* into five sections: *al-sabʿ al-ṭiwāl*, *al-miʾīn*, *al-mathānī*, *āl ḥāmīm* and *al-mufaṣṣal*. The *al-sabʿ al-ṭiwāl* are the seven first and longer suras after al-Fātiḥa, thus from al-Baqara to al-Tawba, because the latter also includes al-Anfāl; the *miʾīn* section includes the suras with more than one hundred *āyāt* or with roughly this number; the *mathānī* section includes the suras which follow the *miʾīn*; the *āl ḥāmīm* section includes the suras beginning with these two isolated letters (i.e., *ḥāʾ mīm*); and the *mufaṣṣal* section includes the suras after the *āl ḥāmīm* to the end. The suras in the *mufaṣṣal* section are distinguished because the *basmala* divides this part of the *Qurʾān* into multiple shorter sections (*fuṣūl*) and thus the name *mufaṣṣal*. See Makkī b. Abī Ṭālib, *al-Hidāya*, vol. 1, pp. 82-83.

ʿAmr al-Dānī, among others, wrote refutations against him, and the disavowal of him became immense. They said that he maintained that the names of God, exalted be He, were created. [Ibn Masarra] answered: —I did not mean what they intended. I only say that the Essence of God is described with each beautiful attribute that the intellects that have knowledge of Him, glorified be He, allow. Thus, His Essence, glorified be He, is not devoid (*muʿaṭṭal*) of qualities (*awṣāf*) of praise. And these attributes are not limited in number. On the contrary, every beautiful quality which can be allowed in the Arabic language and in other languages, God, glorified be He, is described by it. As to the ninety-nine names mentioned in the *ḥadīth* and what is mentioned regarding the greatest name, these are the ones that I say that they are originated (*mubdaʿāt*) and made (*majʿūlāt*).[86] And I do not say that they are created (*makhlūqāt*), since they are not bodies, which fall under creation (*khalq*) and embodying (*taqdīr jismānī*). God produces them after nothingness. If the attributes do not cease to exist, the generated beings (*kāʾināt*) would not cease to exist, because the universe is made up of their simple substances. And the error of the philosophers (*ḍalāl al-falāsifa*)[87] lies in the statement that these simples are caused.—[Ibn Masarra] refuted the book of al-Kindī, *Fam al-dhahab*, on this point. He claimed that the view (*madhhab*) that he had embraced was the view of the successful first generation (*salaf*), and that once they knew these names, they knew the secrets of the *Qurʾān*. The Ashʿarīs and all the legists (*fuqahāʾ*) rejected all that he had said. They said:—The rank of these claims, considering the beliefs that they involve, amounts to the abyss, because all what he has said is not supported by proof [in the *Qurʾān* or the Prophetic tradition] and has no root (*aṣl*) or explanation (*bayān*) in the Sharīʿa. This is an invention of his intellect (*ʿaql*), and the intellect has no room in these matters.

Ibn al-Uqlīshī mentions Ibn Masarra a second time in the chapter of his *al-Inbāʾ* dedicated to the divine name, *Dhū l-ʿarsh*.[88]

Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Masarra made statements regarding the Throne which are not in accordance with the views of the Ashʿarīs. Ibn Ḥazm claimed that [the Throne] is the ninth sphere and that the eight [Throne]-carriers mentioned in the

---

[86] The term '*majʿūlāt*' cannot be translated as 'created' or 'created things' in this context, since Ibn al-Uqlīshī points out that for Ibn Masarra the divine names are *majʿūlāt* but not created (*makhlūqāt*). For Ibn Masarra, according to Ibn al-Uqlīshī, a created thing is defined by being composite and is thus a body. *Majʿūlāt* are things (*ashyāʾ*) resulting from a performative action by God, by which things are made (*majʿūl*). These made things comprise both divine names and created beings. All *makhlūqāt* are *majʿūlāt*, but not all *majʿūlāt* are *makhlūqāt*. The only thing which is not made, i.e., which is not effected by other, is God.

[87] I keep to MS Cairo, al-Azhar, 769 *taṣawwuf*, 19r, instead of the edition which gives *ḍallala*.

[88] My translation is based on [Ibn] al-Uqlīshī, *al-Inbāʾ*, pp. 532-534. I have also checked MS Cairo, al-Azhar, 769 *taṣawwuf*, 52v. See also al-Qurṭubī, *al-Asnā*, p. 158, for the edition of al-Qurṭubī's borrowing from Ibn al-Uqlīshī.

Qurʾān are the eight spheres, i.e., the seven heavens and the Footstool, the eighth. [He also maintained] that to every heaven corresponded an angel and, similarly, that an angel also corresponded to the Footstool. He maintained that these eight are the doors of paradise and maintained that the Throne is a body with life and, similarly, the Footstool and every heaven.[89]

And Ibn Masarra said that neither the Throne nor the Footstool are bodies. However, they are two created lights over the heavens. [He also said] that the Throne is the intellect, to which the *ḥadīth* alludes, pointing out that it is the first [being] which God has created. From it, the particular intellects separate heading for creation; and from the Footstool the souls of every rational and non-rational animal separate. All these claims are devoid of proof. These are hidden matters which cannot be asserted with certainty. Thus, everything they said is a supposition and a conjecture. And whoever submits [the matter to God] and [consequently] God gives him insights into the true reality will be successful, and will not talk.

These two illuminating quotations from Ibn al-Uqlīshī contain multiple elements, some of which I examine below.

Al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī

The above quotation from Ibn al-Uqlīshī's *al-Inbāʾ* provides a new title for a work by Ibn Masarra, i.e., *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī fī Kitāb Fam al-dhahab*, or *Refutation of the Book by al-Kindī entitled the Golden Mouth*. This rather descriptive title may refer to one of the works by Ibn Masarra whose titles are already known to us, although we cannot ascertain this since we do not have enough information about the contents of some of Ibn Masarra's works other than their titles. *Kitāb Fam al-dhahab* is one of the titles, in addition to *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, by which al-Kindī's *Kitāb ilā l-Muʿtaṣim bi-Llāh fī l-Falsafa al-ūlā*[90] or *Book addressed to al-Muʿtaṣim bi-Llāh on First Philosophy* (usually shortened to *On First Philosophy*) was known in al-Andalus.[91] There is one known refutation of al-Kindī's *On First Philosophy*. It was edited by Iḥsān ʿAbbās and published under the title, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī al-faylasūf*, although attributed to Ibn Ḥazm.[92] This work is extant in one known manuscript, MS Tunis, BnT, 12777, ff. 95v-111r (former MS

[89] This appears to be a reference to Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol. 2, p. 255.
[90] For the edition, see al-Kindī, *Rasāʾil*, pp. 97-162.
[91] Ṣāʿid, *Ṭabaqāt*, p. 52.
[92] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 361-405.

Tunis, al-Zaytūna, al-Aḥmadiyya, 6814), with the spurious title, *al-Radd ʿalā Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā al-Rāzī* (f. 1r). Despite the name, as Iḥsān ʿAbbās points out in the introduction to his edition,[93] this work is a refutation of al-Kindī's *On First Philosophy* since al-Kindī is frequently mentioned in the text. In addition, his *On First Philosophy* is extensively quoted and referred to as *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, whereas neither Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā al-Rāzī nor his works are mentioned or quoted in the text. In fact, this refutation is the only witness available to some sections of al-Kindī's *On First Philosophy*.[94] While the intent of this book is clear, i.e., to refute some of al-Kindī's ideas, its authorship is unclear, since the manuscript does not name the author. Iḥsān ʿAbbās suggested this work was by Ibn Ḥazm based on the fact that the manuscript contains another work by Ibn Ḥazm, that is, *al-Taqrīb li-ḥadd al-manṭiq*,[95] and that few statements and vocabulary in this work resemble those of Ibn Ḥazm's.[96] Nevertheless, Iḥsān ʿAbbās was not completely convinced of the attribution and also pointed out statements contained in this text with no parallels in Ibn Ḥazm's works.[97] In addition, there are no cross-references in Ibn Ḥazm's works to a refutation of al-Kindī authored by him. Likewise, there are no mentions of a refutation of al-Kindī by Ibn Ḥazm in biographical literature. Moreover, the author of this work introduces the sections authored by himself with 'Muḥammad said', whereas Ibn Ḥazm customarily refers to himself with his *kunya*, Abū Muḥammad, as in 'Abū Muḥammad said', or with his name, ʿAlī. Iḥsān ʿAbbās guessed that the reason why the author referred to himself as 'Muḥammad' might have been the dropping of 'Abū' before 'Muḥammad' in the extant manuscript.[98] Perhaps the most conclusive proof that *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* was not authored by Ibn Ḥazm, who was a prominent Ẓāhirī, is that its author rather harshly criticizes the founder of the so-called Ẓāhirī school, Abū Sulaymān Dāwūd b. ʿAlī al-Iṣfahānī (d. 270/883), under the name Dāwud

---

[93] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 51-58, here 51.
[94] See Adamson and Pormann, *The Philosophical Works*, p. 56, for the translation of these sections.
[95] For the edition, see Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 91-356.
[96] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 53-56.
[97] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 56-58.
[98] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 53.

al-Qiyāsī.[99] Al-Qiyāsī was one of the *nisba*s, in the sense of 'denier of *qiyās*' by which the founder of the Ẓāhirī school was known in al-Andalus.[100]

Ibn al-Uqlīshī is the first to mention a refutation of al-Kindī's *On First Philosophy* in primary sources that we know of. Considering the fact that *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* was almost certainly not authored by Ibn Ḥazm, it is possible that its author would have been Muḥammad Ibn Masarra. Two steps are needed to prove Ibn Masarra's authorship of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* now attributed to Ibn Ḥazm. First, we should determine whether *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* now attributed to Ibn Ḥazm is the work to which Ibn al-Uqlīshī refers and which he credits to Ibn Masarra. Second, in order to avoid the possibility of Ibn al-Uqlīshī incorrectly attributing this work to Ibn Masarra, we should examine its contents in light of the information provided by primary sources about Ibn Masarra, with the exclusion of the Jaʿfar treatises, i.e., the *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and *Risālat al-Iʿtibār*, which Jaʿfar attributed to Ibn Masarra. If the contents of this work coincide with what we already know about Ibn Masarra, the attribution of this work to Ibn Masarra would be rather conclusive. And, consequently, if we can prove that this work is by Ibn Masarra, it will represent a reliable foundation to determine if the two Jaʿfar treatises were authored by Ibn Masarra or not.

In my view, the attribution of the Jaʿfar treatises to Ibn Masarra is very doubtful, and, thus, they cannot be used to establish the authenticity of works by Ibn Masarra. The main basis to support that the Jaʿfar treatises were written by Ibn Masarra is the name of the author appearing in the manuscript, in addition to the fact that Ibn ʿArabī praises Ibn Masarra. Later scholarship has regarded these two works with a Bāṭinī or an early Andalusī intellectual Sufi tone in congruence with Ibn Masarra in light of Ibn ʿArabī's praise. The author's name identifying Ibn Masarra is nothing but a marginal annotation, apparently by a hand different from the scribe's, by which the *nasab* Ibn Masarra is supplemented to the name Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jabalī.[101] These two works were

---

[99] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 391, no. 76.
[100] For examples of al-Qiyāsī as a synonym of al-Ẓāhirī, see Ibn Bashkuwāl, *al-Ṣila*, p. 866, no. 1319; and al-Dāwūdī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 336.
[101] Both *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* (see MS Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ar. 3168, f. 88r) and *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* (see MS Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ar. 3168, f. 65r) are attributed to an Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jabalī, al-Jīlī or al-Ḥablī. These possible variants owe

thus attributed to Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jabalī in a base manuscript in their chain of transmission. To my knowledge, this would be the only known instance in which Ibn Masarra would have been referred to without the *nasab*, Ibn Masarra. Thus, it is unclear if the name Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jabalī refers to him, since there is at least another possible candidate known with this name in al-Andalus.[102] This second Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jabalī, i.e., the physician Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbdūn al-Jabalī (d. after 366/976),[103] may nevertheless be connected with Ibn Masarra, considering the same very unusual *nisba*, i.e., al-Jabalī, in al-Andalus.[104] In addition, Ibn ʿArabī's praising of Ibn Masarra does not prove that these two works were authored by Ibn Masarra. It only suggests that Ibn Masarra may be one possible author among other possibilities known or unknown to us. However, the specific information provided by Ibn ʿArabī—such as the reference to the column with elo-

to the fact that the ductus has only one dot below in both titles. As is now widely accepted, I also favor the reading al-Jabalī, since both treatises show clear signs of an Andalusī origin, and, thus, the readings al-Jīlī and al-Ḥablī would not make sense. A cursive hand adds next to the name of the author in *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* (f. 65r), *nuskha li-bn Masarra/Marra/Murra*, i.e., a copy owned/copied (?) by Ibn Masarra/Marra/Murra. Ibn Marra/Murra is not an infrequent way of writing Ibn Masarra. Even though the handwriting of this marginal annotation is clearly different from the scribe's—the scribe is ʿUthmān b. Yūsuf b. Muḥammad b. Arsalān al-Ḥanafī al-Ḥarīrī (ff. 63r and 160v)—, thus suggesting a marginal annotation by a later owner or reader, the main scribe writes the colophon of the manuscript in cursive (f. 160v). Thus, we cannot completely rule out that the main scribe might have been the author of this marginal annotation, too. Nevertheless, the fact that this is a later annotation either by the scribe or somebody else and written next to one of the two titles suggests that there was no such attribution to Ibn Masarra in the base manuscript from which MS Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ar. 3168, was copied or in one of the previous manuscripts in the chain of transmission of these works. This is also clear because the reference to the *nasab*, i.e., Ibn Masarra, is also missing from the table of contents (f. 1r).

[102] See Ibn al-Abbār, *al-Takmila*, vol. 1, p. 295, no. 1021, and vol. 2, p. 300, no. 857.

[103] On him, see Djebbar, "Ibn ʿAbdūn". Interestingly enough, Ibn ʿAbdūn studied in Basra during the peak of the Sālimiyya, a time when the Sālimiyya were led by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sālim, one of the authors of refutations of Ibn Masarra. Considering his stay in Basra, Ibn ʿAbdūn al-Jabalī may thus have been acquainted with oral traditions going back to Sahl al-Tustarī. His nisba is puzzling since the Pseudo-al-Suhaylī points out that he was born in Cordoba. Thus, his family probably moved shortly after his birth to the surrounding hills of Cordoba. Ibn ʿAbdūn was born in 311/923-4, at roughly the same time Ibn Masarra left for Mecca. See [Pseudo]-al-Suhaylī, *Jadhwat al-muqtabis*, in MS Damascus, Maktabat al-Asad al-Waṭaniyya, Ẓāhiriyya 9006, p. 20.

[104] We may have the impression that the *nisba* al-Jabalī is rather frequent in al-Andalus because of the fame of Ibn Masarra al-Jabalī, but this is not really the case, since this *nisba* occurs only in very few instances in biographical literature.

quent speech (*lisān faṣīḥ*),[105] the eight Throne-carriers,[106] or the clear identification of the Throne and the Reign (*mulk*)—,[107] and by Ibn al-Uqlīshī, which would allow us to identify Ibn Masarra's *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*, are not found in the Jaʿfar treatises. In addition, Ibn ʿArabī seems to not have been exposed to the Pseudo-Sahl/Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jabalī school of *ḥurūf* since, to the best of my knowledge: (i) Ibn ʿArabī does not mention Sahl al-Tustarī as an authority on *ḥurūf* as one would expect; (ii) Ibn ʿArabī does not elaborate on *al-ḥurūf al-muqaṭṭaʿa*, which is the main topic in *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*; and, (iii), consequently, Ibn ʿArabī does not quote any distinct interpretations of groups of *ḥurūf muqaṭṭaʿa*, the most important one in *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* being the commentary on the group of letters *khyʿṣ*, along the lines of the Pseudo-Sahl and Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Jabalī school. Thus, there is no basis to identify *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* with Ibn Masarra's *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*. In all, this rather weak attribution, based solely on a marginal annotation since Ibn ʿArabī's praise has no evidentiary value, has been taken for granted. Garrido has compared the Jaʿfar treatises with the information about Ibn Masarra in primary sources and has pointed out basic disagreements between primary sources on Ibn Masarra and the Jaʿfar treatises.[108] Thus, the Jaʿfar treatises do not meet any of the two requirements proposed here to confirm the attribution of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* to Ibn Masarra, i.e.: (i) that they be identified by specific information in primary sources, as the one on Ibn Masarra's understanding of *ḥurūf*; and (ii) that they agree with the general information in primary sources to avoid the possibility of the source specifically identifying the work incorrectly. As a consequence of the disagreement between primary sources and the contents of the Jaʿfar treatises, the current scholarly consensus holds that all primary sources on Ibn Masarra other than Ibn ʿArabī should be dismissed as biased or uninformed in favor of the Jaʿfar treatises. However, in my view, this basic disagreement between primary sources on Ibn Masarra and the Jaʿfar treatises suggests that, rather than allowing us to disqual-

---

[105] Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 2, p. 581.

[106] Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 1, p. 148-149; *idem, Sharḥ Kitāb Khalʿ al-naʿlayn*, p. 217; *idem*, "ʿUqlat al-mustawfiz", p. 58.

[107] Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 1, p. 148. For these references, see Garrido Clemente, "Sobre la morada", and *eadem*, "Textos relativos".

[108] Garrido Clemente, "Notas".

ify the primary sources, the attribution of the Jaʿfar treatises to Ibn Masarra should be deemed questionable—at most and out of caution. Thus, Ibn Masarra's authorship of the Jaʿfar treatises should not be taken for granted. In any case, this attribution only based on a marginal annotation does not provide a reliable basis to prove or dismiss the authenticity of any work attributed to Ibn Masarra, since it would be possible to dismiss an authentic work of his on the basis of a spurious one. Rather, in the event of the discovery of an authentic work by Ibn Masarra, such as the one proposed here, this new work would allow us to ascertain the authenticity of these two works attributed by Jaʿfar to Ibn Masarra. Thus, I will first examine if the description of Ibn al-Uqlīshi fits with *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, and, second, in case it does, I will examine *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* in light of the primary sources with the exclusion of the Jaʿfar treatises.

The edited *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* is a collection of texts, probably written at different points in time, containing at least two different versions of a refutation of al-Kindī's *On First Philosophy*, along with additional short texts on different topics that extend beyond the contents of al-Kindī's work, at least as it is extant today. Nevertheless, the contents and style of both versions of the refutation of al-Kindī are coherent and point to a single author. To my knowledge, Daiber is the only scholar to have studied the contents of this work in some detail, although he has not questioned the attribution to Ibn Ḥazm.[109] Here, I will limit myself to examine the elements in this work which agree with the description by Ibn al-Uqlīshī of Ibn Masarra's thought in order to identify the author of this work, and I will study this work in more detail elsewhere.[110]

In the two texts translated above, Ibn al-Uqlīshī remarks that he had access to different works by Ibn Masarra. Some of the contents of his description, more specifically on *ḥurūf*, may refer to Ibn Masarra's *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*, a work whose title was mentioned by Ibn ʿArabī. Other than the information that Ibn al-Uqlīshī provides on the views held by Ibn Masarra on *ḥurūf*, which are not addressed in *al-Radd*

---

[109] Daiber, "Die Kritik" and *idem*, "al-Kindī". The *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* is seldom mentioned in the most comprehensive work on Ibn Ḥazm to date, i.e., Adang *et al.*, *Ibn Ḥazm*.

[110] I will provide a thorough study of this work in my forthcoming monograph on Ibn Masarra.

ʿalā l-Kindī, his description of the position by Ibn Masarra on the at-
tributes of God perfectly squares with the refutation of al-Kindī in MS
Tunis, BnT, 12777, now attributed to Ibn Ḥazm and edited by Iḥsān
ʿAbbās. The rather unusual and specific character of the views that Ibn
al-Uqlīshī attributes to Ibn Masarra may allow us to identify this work
with certain ease. In addition, the unconventional character of the beliefs
that Ibn al-Uqlīshī ascribes to Ibn Masarra makes it difficult to believe
that a work upholding them might be authored by Ibn Ḥazm.

Ibn al-Uqlīshī indicates that Ibn Masarra refuted al-Kindī's view on
the caused (*maʿlūl*) nature of the simples (*basāʾiṭ*). According to Ibn
al-Uqlīshī, for Ibn Masarra the simples were the simple substances of
God's attributes which comprise the universe; that is, in Ibn Masarra's
view, the simples are the attributes of God. According to Ibn al-Uqlīshī,
Ibn Masarra's contemporaries ascribed to Ibn Masarra the belief that
the attributes of God were created (*makhlūq*). Ibn Masarra answered
that he did not believe that the attributes of God were created but orig-
inated (*mubdaʿ*) and made (*majʿūl*) by God. For Ibn Masarra, always
according to Ibn al-Uqlīshī, this meant that the attributes of God were
originated from nothingness and that they will cease to exist; otherwise,
the generated beings (*kāʾināt*) constituted by those attributes would not
cease to exist. These ideas, as unconventional as they are, are present,
as we shall see, in *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*. Consequently, they disavow
the former attribution of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* to Ibn Ḥazm.

The aim of the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* is to refute the state-
ment by al-Kindī that God is the cause (*ʿilla*) of beings.[111] Thus, the
aim pointed out by Ibn al-Uqlīshī, i.e., to refute that the simples are
caused, is concomitant to the main aim of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, i.e., to
refute that God causes. The author presents a number of arguments to
refute that God is the cause of beings. For him, considering God as the
cause (*ʿilla*) of things would destroy the unity (*tawḥīd*) of God.[112] The
cause (*ʿilla*) is known (*maʿqūla*) by means of the caused (*maʿlūl*), and
the caused is caused by the cause. Therefore, should God be the cause
of things, the created beings qua caused would necessarily (*iḍṭirāran*)
be relative (*muḍāf*) to their cause, i.e., God. Thus, there would be a re-
lation (*iḍāfa*) between God and the created beings, and the created

[111] Al-Kindī, *Rasāʾil*, p. 97.
[112] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 369, nos. 18-19.

would resemble (*shibh*) the Creator.[113] However, the relative (*muḍāf*) and what resembles the relative (*mā shākala l-muḍāf*) does not reach Him.[114] Or, to put it in different terms, the relativity that the relation between the cause and the caused introduces in the cause would enable the knowing of God and would preclude the absolute oneness of God, who in His absolute unity is detached from any relation.

A second argument relies on divine choice or freedom (*ikhtiyār*).[115] The author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* defines causality as a necessary relation between cause and caused: the cause necessarily causes the caused, and the caused necessarily requires a cause. As the author puts it, the cause is the subject (*mawḍūʿ*) of the caused, and the caused is a predicate (*maḥmūl*) of the cause. Both cause and caused are linked in a relation of necessity towards the other. Thus, if God were a cause, He would not be able to choose whether to begin or stop acting, since He would be limited by the very definition of causality. The latter entails necessity, whereas God cannot be compelled by necessity. The author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* stresses that He is the one with free choice (*mukhtār*), whereas the remaining beings are the ones compelled by necessity (*muḍṭarr*).[116] Consequently, despite that God is the Creator of all beings and the ultimate Agent, He is not the cause of beings, since He would be limited by necessity. It should be stressed that the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* does not deny that God is a cause because he would consider that if causation were a predicate of God's nature, which is absolute actuality, He would necessarily exercise it, but because causation, by its very definition, entails compulsion, and it cannot be predicated of God. God can act at will but cannot cause at will, because there is no choice in causation based on the very definition of causality.

The author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* views God as neither the cause of the caused beings or their actions nor as the cause of the cause. God is the One (*al-Aḥad*) and the Independent from everything (*al-Ṣamad*). However, since created beings are caused, the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* posits two intermediate levels of reality between the caused beings and God. The first level of reality, or division (*faṣl*), below God is

---

[113] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 375, no. 58.
[114] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 369, no. 19.
[115] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 370, no. 21.
[116] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 370, no. 22.

the Possibility (*imkān*), which is the Will (*irāda*) of God or the Throne. Below that, the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* places the level of Passivity (*infiʿāl*), which is the knowledge (*ʿilm*) of God or the Footstool.[117] However, at another point, the author identifies Wisdom (*ḥikma*) with the first division, i.e., that of *irāda* or *imkān*.[118] The level of Passivity consists of the first causes (*ʿilal*), whereas the level of Possibility encompasses the contents of the level of Passivity in a synthetic and simple totality, i.e., the Will of God. The first causes are neither caused nor created, but originated, whereas God is their Originator (*mubdiʾ*).[119] They are the simples of which the entities brought into being (*muhawwayāt*) consist of (*murakkaba*).[120] The first causes are the only ones which fully deserve to be called causes, since all other causes are originated through them. The author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* places two levels of reality between the Creator and the created beings, which are neither the Creator (*khāliq*) nor created (*makhlūq*). Rather, they are originated (*mubdaʿ*), breaking any possible relation (*iḍāfa*) between the Creator and the created. Overall, the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* understands creation as a composition, whereas simple realities are originated but not created. These simple, uncreated but nevertheless originated realities include the four elements.[121]

The author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* points out in passing that the Prophet did not permit saying anything about the highest attributes of God (*al-ṣifāt al-ʿulā*). The knowledge of the hearts cannot reach them, and saying anything about them is not permitted.[122] It is thus possible that the elaborations on the attributes by the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* only refer to attributes below the highest attributes of God.

For the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, the attributes of God are the causes of all beings (*al-ṣifāt ʿilal al-kāʾināt*).[123] He describes the attributes and names of God as simple substances made and placed as subjects (*mawḍūʿ*) by God at His will, i.e., without God being subjected to compulsion (*barīʾ mimmā yalzamu al-mawḍūʿāt min al-ḍarūra*) be-

---

[117] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 378, no. 45.
[118] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 389, no. 68.
[119] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 369, no. 19.
[120] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 370, no. 20.
[121] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 371, no. 23.
[122] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 398, no. 82.
[123] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 382, no. 52.

cause of the links between caused and cause.[124] The attributes and names of God do not reach Him—i.e., there is no relationship whatsoever between God and His attributes—, whereas they reach the created beings which are made up of their simple substances. The attributes do not create and they cannot be said to be created (*wa-naqūlu inna-hā laysat bi-khāliqa wa-lā naqūlu makhlūqa*),[125] since only God is the Creator and the Agent. The only attribute which God has is that he has no attribute (*fa-inna ṣifata-Hu ʿadam ṣifati-Hi*).[126] However, in this statement and considering the context, the author probably means that God has no human attributes. Since the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* considers the attributes to be the causes of the created beings, the attributes should cease to exist; otherwise, the universe would be eternal.[127] This would be so in case the cause were God. But, since God is the producer (*muḥdith*) of the first causes, which are produced at some point from nothingness,[128] and not their cause (*ʿilla*), the universe is not eternal. The author presents this argument against the Dahriyya as follows:

> Those who said that the cause of creation is nothing but the Speech (*qawl*), Will (*irāda*) and Power (*qudra*) and that if all of these were to continue to exist with no end, creation would continue to exist with no end, it is as they said. However, they went astray regarding the first Originator (*al-mubdiʿ al-awwal*), since the cause of creation is no other than the Will, the Speech and the Power, and the Producer in time (*muḥdith*) of these is not a cause. Not at all, since if these attributes would not cease to exist, necessarily the generated beings (*kāʾināt*) would not cease to exist (*lam tazal*),[129] because in the cause there is the necessity of what is caused by it.[130]

Thus, the description by Ibn al-Uqlīshī of Ibn Masarra's very specific views on the attributes of God contained in his *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī fī Kitāb Fam al-dhahab* fully coincides with the refutation of

---

[124] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 371, no. 22.

[125] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 371, no. 22.

[126] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 391, no. 75.

[127] The author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* does not bring up al-Kindī's well-known position against the eternity of the world. The author raises the question of the eternity of the world to support his claim that God is not a cause, but not as a direct criticism of al-Kindī on the eternity of the world. The author's general attitude towards al-Kindī is to assert that the latter clearly affirms the absolute unity of God, but that by calling God a cause, al-Kindī is unintentionally denying God's unity.

[128] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 394, no. 77.

[129] Here, the edition is mistaken. The edition gives *lam nazal*, whereas the manuscript gives *lam tazal*. See MS Tunis, BnT, 12777, f. 103r.

[130] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 383, no. 54.

al-Kindī now credited to Ibn Ḥazm. The description by Ibn al-Uqlīshī
and *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* agree on a number of items, namely the main
topic of the refutation, specifically: that 'the simples are caused' which
rephrases that 'God is a cause'; that God originates the simples; that
the simples are the first causes; that they are His attributes; that they
are produced from nothingness; that the created beings are made up of
them; and that the attributes will cease to exist since, otherwise, the
universe would be eternal. Therefore, we can safely conclude that the
refutation of al-Kindī attributed by Iḥsān ʿAbbās to Ibn Ḥazm is the
one that Ibn al-Uqlīshī ascribes to Ibn Masarra.

Next, if the contents of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* were to match the in-
formation found in primary sources about Ibn Masarra, we would be
able to conclude with a high degree of certainty that this work credited
by Ibn al-Uqlīshī to Ibn Masarra was certainly authored by the latter.

First, and as a general appraisal, the contents of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*
fit with descriptions of Ibn Masarra's unique intellectual profile, in whom
rationality, pietistic asceticism and Bāṭinism—i.e., the science of the
inner realm (*ʿilm al-bāṭin*)—are combined. Al-Khushanī points out that
his intellectual approach was based on rational examination (*naẓar*) and
deduction (*istinbāṭ*), as *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* certainly shows.[131] In addi-
tion, the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* also shows ample concern for
spiritual practice.[132] This coincides with portrayals of Ibn Masarra which
underscore his emphasis on the correction of deeds. And, last, even
though the scope and topic of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* is not Bāṭinī but
mainly theological, there are some hints in the text which suggest that
the author had further developed his thought along Bāṭinī lines in other
works, since, for instance, the author regards the *Qurʾān* as a spirit
(*rūḥ*).[133] In addition, the elaborated style of this work, including the fre-
quent recourse to fictionalized discussions imitating Platonic dia-
logues,[134] aligns with one of the distinct features of Ibn Masarra, i.e., his
eloquence and rhetoric, which Ibn Ḥazm praises in his *al-Risāla fī Faḍl
al-Andalus wa-rijālihā* as one of the finest in al-Andalus.[135] Conse-

---

[131] Al-Khushanī, *Akhbār*, p. 178, no. 209.
[132] See, for instance, Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 403, no. 83.
[133] See, for instance, Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 404, no. 84.
[134] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 391-395, no. 77.
[135] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 2, pp. 171-188, here 188. Ibn Ḥazm only singles out two
Andalusis, one of whom is Ibn Masarra, who stand out in the field of eloquence (*balāgha*).

quently, any attribution of a work to Ibn Masarra with a crude, raw, un-remarkable style should be deemed extremely doubtful. Thus, a first appraisal of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* squares with information in primary sources about Ibn Masarra's intellectual profile.

Second, the tone and personality of the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* coincide with descriptions of sectarian behavior attributed to Ibn Masarra's followers. The official condemnation of the Masarriyya read in the central mosque of Cordoba in 340/952 and transmitted by Ibn Ḥayyān accuses them of not returning the religious salutation (*salām*) and of considering licit to shed the blood of Muslims (*al-umma al-ḥanīfiyya*), to violate their spouses and to capture their progeny.[136] Even though these statements should be taken with caution, they nevertheless point in the direction that the followers of Ibn Masarra deemed themselves as the true Muslims and regarded other Muslims as infidels.[137] The attitude of the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* towards other Islamic schools or towards Muslims who do not share his views is mixed and inconsistent. This suggests that *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* is a collection of texts probably written at different times. First, the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* stresses that whoever affirms the unity of God (*waḥdāniyya*) and the prophecy of Muḥammad remains within the boundaries of Islam, regardless of the fact that the specific view on both tenets might be mistaken. God may condemn or grant Paradise to whomever upholds a mistaken view, but people cannot be considered infidels as long as they affirm the unity of God (*waḥdāniyya*) and the prophecy of Muḥammad.[138] However, in other sections of his work, the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* is far more unbending, pointing out that whoever does not stress the unity of God in an absolute way deviates (*alḥada*) from the true religion and thus becomes a worshiper of idols (*ʿābid wuthun*), that is, an idolater or an infidel.[139] For the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, the absolute affirmation of the unity of God entails the denial of any link between God and creation and avoiding describing God with any attribute grasped by the intellect, since the intellect

---

[136] Ibn Ḥayyān, *al-Muqtabas V*, p. 28.
[137] This behavior is only reported about the followers of Ibn Masarra, but not Ibn Masarra himself, who is only said to have retired to the hills near Cordoba and to have attracted a number of disciples, but not to have anathematized other Muslims.
[138] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 397-398, no. 81.
[139] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 395, no. 77.

can only grasp what is created. Even though the tone of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* is usually neutral and, for the most part, avoids the expected hostility in this kind of genre, there are a few extraordinarily harsh statements which the author directs at those who do not adhere to his understanding of the names of God and His attributes, and, particularly, at those who regard God as a cause. For the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, these are ignorant, liars and, most importantly, deviants (*mulḥidūn*)[140] whom he identifies with idolaters. In addition, the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* also posits that al-Kindī will dwell in the lowest level of hell, since, by calling God a cause, al-Kindī indirectly asserts the eternity of the world. Nevertheless, the author leaves al-Kindī's ultimate abode up to God.[141] In all, since the author regards the divine attributes as the causes and elemental constituents of created beings, it is likely that the author or his followers would target the same reproaches of being a *mulḥid* to whomever understands the divine attributes referred to in the *Qurʾān* as eternal and not different from God, as Ashʿarīs and, in general, mainstream Muslims believe, since in their eyes this would introduce a relationship between God and creation and destroy the unity of God. Thus, these reproaches of being a *mulḥid* are congruous with the sectarian behavior reported among Ibn Masarra's followers in the official condemnation of the Masarriyya read in the central mosque of Cordoba in 340/952.

Third, Ibn al-Uqlīshī pointed out that the scholars who wrote refutations of Ibn Masarra understood that he maintained that the attributes were created. Ibn Ḥazm remarked along these lines that Ibn Masarra viewed the knowledge (*ʿilm*) and the power (*qudra*) of God as two attributes produced in time and created (*ṣifatān muḥdathatān makhlūqatān*).[142] Despite the fact that the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* expressly denies that the attributes were created, his view that they were originated (*mubdaʿ*) and produced in time (*muḥdath*) and that they eventually would cease to exist would certainly be seen by then contemporary scholars (and non-contemporary ones, as well) as a clear statement of his belief in the created natures of the attributes. Thus, on the matter of the created nature of the attributes, the contents of *al-*

---

[140] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 382-383, no. 52, and pp. 387-388, no. 61.
[141] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 387, no. 60.
[142] Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol. 5, p. 65.

Radd ʿalā l-Kindī coincide with descriptions of how Ibn Masarra was seen by contemporary and non-contemporary scholars alike. This is also in line with the distrust with which Ibn Masarra's use of language was met, since, for instance, Ibn al-Faraḍī points out that his ability with language and his use of vocabulary enabled him to hide the real meaning of his discourse.[143]

Fourth, as pointed out above, primary sources remark that Ibn Masarra upheld the belief on *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd*, which regards that reward (*waʿd*) and punishment (*waʿīd*) in the afterlife are exclusively the result of human deeds and not freely bestowed by God, including His forgiveness, since this would deny God's justice. Al-Khushanī,[144] Ibn al-Faraḍī[145] and Abū ʿUmar al-Ṭalamankī (d. 429/1037)[146] ascribe this belief to Ibn Masarra, whereas Ibn al-Uqlīshī makes no reference to Ibn Masarra upholding this belief. In addition, Ibn Ḥayyān points out that the Masarriyya were censured for making people give up all hope in the spirit (*rūḥ*) of God, i.e., in God's mercy, and for denying the possibility of divine forgiveness (*ghufrān*), repentance (*tawba*) and intercession (*shafāʿa*).[147]

The third section (*faṣl*) from the end of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* in the edition by Iḥsān ʿAbbās seems to be an independent work by the same author of *al-Radd*. Even though it is appended at the end of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, along with the last two sections which focus on the spirit (*rūḥ*), this *faṣl* is introduced under the title, *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar* or *Treatise on the Agreement of Justice and Foreordination*,[148] and authored by the same Muḥammad as the rest of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*. However, this section with an independent title is, in fact, thematically linked to the previous sections, nos. 78-82,[149] so that the previous sections work as an introduction to *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar*.[150]

---

[143] Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 2, p. 56.

[144] Al-Khushanī, *Akhbār*, p. 178, no. 209.

[145] Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 2, p. 55.

[146] See al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 15, pp. 556-558, no. 332, here p. 557, where Ibn Masarra is associated with Qadarī views. Al-Dhahabī mistakes Muḥammad Ibn Masarra for the Andalusī traditionist Wahb b. Masarra (d. 346/957).

[147] Ibn Ḥayyān, *al-Muqtabas V*, p. 27.

[148] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 399-403, no. 83.

[149] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 396-399.

[150] This *risāla* included in the *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* may be related to the now lost part of Kindī's *On First Philosophy* which dealt with divine providence.

To begin, let us examine in more detail if the author of *Risālat It-tifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar* is the same as the rest of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*. Even though the focus of *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar* is not the unity of God and the ontological character of His attributes, the few peripheral statements contained in this regard in *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar* are coherent with the theology of the specific refuting sections of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*. For the author of *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar*, to claim that a human action, regardless of its nature, would have its origin in God's foreordination (*qadar*), in the sense of being caused by Him, would diminish the unity of God and would entail associating other realities to God. The author of *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar* presents his argument as follows:

> Whoever maintains that any of his matters, regardless of being an action or a deed, good or bad, stems from the decree of God as a generated being (*kāʾinan*) diminishes (*naqaṣa* —maybe *naqaḍa*, i.e., destroys) His unity and associates it to his Lord. And, whoever claims something about God of which he has no proof, maintains that he has been necessarily compelled by his Lord.[151]

This argument is based on absolute unity and not on divine will, as one would expect considering the topic. Provided that one understands the *qadar* of God as a reference to God and not as a reference to an originated attribute, the underpinning theology is the same as in the refuting sections of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, namely, that the absolute unity of God precludes any causal relationship between God and the created, since a relationship with the created would introduce relativity in the absolute unity of God. In all, the similar underpinning theology, the similar style, the attribution of this text to a 'Muḥammad' in the same way the previous and subsequent sections do, the connection of the topic with previous sections, and its inclusion as a section within the general work are reasons not to doubt that its author is the same as for the rest of the work.

Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar is preceded by a number of sections (nos. 78-82) which serve as an introduction. In these sections, God is singled out because of His unity, whereas everything other than God is informed by duality.[152] Whenever there is a flaw in someone's intellect

---

[151] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 400.
[152] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 397, no. 79.

and in his knowledge of the first causes, the knowledge of the lower levels of reality also becomes flawed.[153] Thus, schools of thought end up favoring one of the two poles in the duality which pervades every domain in the universe. In the case of the 'foreordination (*qadar*) and justice (*ʿadl*)' binomial, God wanted the conjunction of both (*al-mutakallif la-hu arāda an yaqtarina al-qadar bi-l-ʿadl*), whereas, for instance, the Muʿtazila stressed justice over decree.[154]

After establishing the polarity between *qadar* and *ʿadl* in the sections preceding the *risāla*, the author further develops the agreement between *qadar* and *ʿadl* in the specific *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar*. The latter was probably written at a different time than the preceding sections, since the terminology is slightly different, although the content in both is consistent. The aim of *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar* is to provide a theological understanding of divine *qadar*, which would invalidate arguments justifying sins as decreed by God.[155] In *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar*, the author builds a theological framework in which God does not intervene in creation, since this would diminish His unity, as seen above. God decreed (*qaḍā*) all matters and wrote them in the Mother of the Book (*Umm al-kitāb*) before creation,[156] so that everything in creation conforms with His decrees in the *Umm al-kitāb*.[157] Among these decrees, God imposed on Himself mercy (*raḥma*). And from mercy comes justice (*ʿadl*) and favor (*faḍl*), so that God cannot be unfair.

God has decreed all matters in creation. He possesses the power and will of any created being, since the command (*amr*) of God is over his command and the hand of God is over his hand. However, evil actions are not attributable to God. They are the exclusive responsibility of the human beings performing those evil deeds, since they are the ones who acquire (*kasaba*) the consequences of the actions they perform, and the intention is theirs.[158] Thus, even though the author criti-

---

[153] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 397, no. 80.
[154] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 399, no. 82.
[155] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 402, no. 83.
[156] The author only mentions the *Umm al-kitāb* in this section of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*. It is fairly likely that by *Umm al-kitāb* the author understands the first level of reality originated by God, that is, the level of Possibility (*imkān*) or His will (*irāda*), which is originated by God before creation.
[157] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 400, no. 83.
[158] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 401-402, no. 83.

cized the Muʿtazila in the sections preceding *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar*, he upholds human acquisition (*kasb*)—a term that the pro-Muʿtazilī Ḍirār b. ʿAmr (d. c. 200/815) popularized and which was later adopted by the Ashʿarī school—to affirm God's power and decree along exclusive human responsibility for one's actions.[159] After the author establishes the framework which affirms God's decree and the exclusive human responsibility, the author makes a strong *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd* statement:

> Know, nevertheless, that God has decreed on you and for you that if you do good, you will attain good, and if you do evil, you will attain evil. You leave the good because you act in pursuit of the evil and you act in pursuit of the evil because you leave the good. This is all action (*ʿamal*). And the reward (*thawāb*) is only obtained through action, and it is not attained except through endeavor (*saʿy*), like the fruit is not harvested without planting the tree. And in this way, God, exalted may He be, decreed the matter of this world and manages it. [And know] that effort (*ijtihād*) is your intercession (*wasīla*), and action is your bearer, and that God is the helper of the solicitors (*murīdīn*), the supporter of the righteous and the strengthener of those who are patient.[160]

This powerful *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd* statement, which leaves no room for any kind of intercession or divine forgiveness other than deeds, coincides with biographies of Ibn Masarra presenting him as an upholder of the belief in *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd* transmitted by al-Khushanī and Ibn al-Faraḍī. It is also consistent with the accusations of giving up all hope in the spirit of God and of denying the possibility of divine forgiveness, repentance and intercession transmitted by Ibn Ḥayyān, as well as with the accounts of extreme asceticism ascribed to the Masarriyya which would derive from this view. And, lastly, it is also consistent with the intention of the *ḥadīth* that al-Qurṭubī quotes from Muḥammad Ibn Masarra in which divine intercession is exclusively granted because of the good deeds that some dwellers in hell carried out during their life.[161]

Fifth, the doctrine of the two knowledges, which Ibn Ḥazm ascribes to Ibn Masarra,[162] is congruent with some of the topics in *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, including *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar* provided that one

---

[159] For an overview of the meaning and evolution of the concept of *kasb*, see Schwarz, "'Acquisition'". I thank Jan Thiele for this reference.
[160] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 402, no. 83.
[161] Al-Qurṭubī, *al-Tadhkira*, p. 771.
[162] Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol. 5, pp. 65-66.

accepts that Ibn Ḥazm identifies origination (*ibdāʿ*) with creation (*khalq*) as he does elsewhere.[163] Ibn Ḥazm does not refer to the very same *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, since he paraphrases an interpretation of *Qurʾān* 9:94, whereas this verse is not quoted in *al-Radd*. According to Ibn Ḥazm, Ibn Masarra believed that God's knowledge was created. For Ibn Masarra, according to Ibn Ḥazm's account, God has a created foreknowledge of universal matters, whereas the knowledge of the specific actions of individual beings is created after the actions are performed. The created nature of God's foreknowledge of universal matters is equivalent to the accusations of the created nature of the attributes of God. As seen above, the position that Ibn Ḥazm attributes to Ibn Masarra, i.e., that the latter believed that God's knowledge was created, is congruent with the way in which the originated status that the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* associated to the attributes of God can be understood. As to the created nature of God's knowledge of actions only after they are performed, this is equivalent to the accusations of Qadarism leveled at Ibn Masarra. The author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* clearly advocates the foreordination of all matters in the Mother of the Book (*Umm al-kitāb*) before creation. Consequently, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* does not seem to provide enough basis to support the idea that God knows the outcome of events only after they are performed.

Sixth, Ibn ʿArabī points out that Ibn Masarra identified the Throne (*ʿarsh*) with the Reign (*mulk*) when he discussed the carriers of the Throne.[164] This rather infrequent idea is found in *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*.[165] Nevertheless, Ibn ʿArabī does not quote *al-Radd* specifically, since he provides additional views by Ibn Masarra on the carriers of the Throne which are absent from *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*. In any case, this coincidence shows a shared view between *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* and the work by Ibn Masarra quoted by Ibn ʿArabī, perhaps Ibn Masarra's *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*. This points in the direction of common authorship between *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* and the work quoted by Ibn ʿArabī.

And, lastly, the title of *Risālat Ittifāq al-ʿadl bi-l-qadar*, which stresses the agreement between decree and justice, may be one of the

---

[163] See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol. 3, pp. 96 and 117, where he states that origination (*ibdāʿ*) is creation (*khalq*). This is additional proof that Ibn Ḥazm cannot be the author of the *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*.

[164] Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 1, p. 148.

[165] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 378, no. 45.

reasons behind the attribution to Ibn Masarra by an arguably ill-informed Ibn al-Marʾa of the odd belief that all the attributes of God are the same.[166]

On the other side, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* does not seem to provide sufficient basis to support that its author was a Qadarī, i.e., an upholder of free will independent from divine *qadar*. The author urges believers to avoid justifying one's own bad actions, laziness or feebleness on the basis of God's foreordination (*qadar*).[167] Ibn Ḥazm pointed out that Ibn Masarra agreed with the Muʿtazila on *qadar*, a statement that was later echoed by al-Dhahabī.[168] The author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* clearly stresses that all matters are foreordained in the Mother of the Book (*Umm al-kitāb*) before creation[169] and that *qadar* does not abandon the individual at any time. However, since these foreordinations are limited determinations even though they are written down before creation, they should be nevertheless originated (*mubdaʿ*) in keeping with the status that the author grants to divine Will (*irāda*). The author also shuns the Qadariyya and the Muʿtazila; consequently, he certainly believed he was not one of them.[170] Yet, he underscores the equal status of divine Justice (*ʿadl*) along with *qadar* and uses pre-Ashʿarite terminology later adopted by the Ashʿariyya, such as the concept of *kasb*,[171] to justify that the judgment will be exclusively based on one's deeds. Even though the author espouses a rather standard view of *qadar* as divine foreordination before creation—if one grants that *ibdāʿ* is not *khalq*—, his stress on justice and deeds as the only means for salvation with no room for further intercession could be interpreted as implicit support

---

[166] See Ibn al-Marʾa, *Nukat al-Irshād*, vol. 4, ff. 195r-v. After mentioning Ibn Masarra, Ibn al-Marʾa misrepresents Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī's theology of the attributes of God, whom he links with Ibn Masarra. Thus, he is not a reliable source, at least on the theology of Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī, and this casts doubts on the accuracy of his remarks about Ibn Masarra.

[167] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 403, no. 83.

[168] See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol. 5, p. 65; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 15, p. 557, and vol. 16, p. 108. Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 2, pp. 55-56, no. 1202, associates Ibn Masarra with beliefs on *istiṭāʿa* and *infādh al-waʿīd*, i.e., *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd*, which al-Dhahābī, when transmitting the information by Ibn al-Faraḍī, shortens into a statement that Ibn Masarra held Qadarī positions (*kāna yaqūlu bi-l-qadar*). See al-Dhahabī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 23, p. 590, no. 432. Ibn Masarra's father, ʿAbd Allāh, was also believed to hold Qadarī views. See Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 1, p. 296.

[169] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 400, no. 83.

[170] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 398, no. 82.

[171] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 401, no. 83.

for *istiṭāʿa* in the context of early discussions on whether *kasb* implied the cocreation between God and the human being of a particular action, or on whether the human being was free to not perform an action he acquired, so that *ʿadl* would be granted. In short, the author's stress on *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd* may have been seen as an implicit embracing of Qadarī views since, otherwise, it would be questionable if *ʿadl* could be granted. This may have allowed Ibn Ḥazm to align him with the Muʿtazila on *qadar*, although, ultimately, the explicit views of the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* do not seem to be particularly Qadarī and Ibn Ḥazm shares a rather similar understanding of *kasb*.[172]

Conclusions

Ibn al-Uqlīshī provides new information that allows us to clearly identify *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, formerly ascribed to Ibn Ḥazm, as the work he attributes to Ibn Masarra.

Except for the statement by Ibn Ḥazm that Ibn Masarra agreed with the Muʿtazila on *qadar*, of which we do not find enough proof in this work, there is other clear evidence in keeping with primary sources. This includes the author's style and personality, the originated nature (i.e., the created nature as it would appear to other scholars) of the attributes of God, including power (*qudra*) and knowledge (*ʿilm*), strong *al-waʿd wa-l-waʿīd* statements and the very peculiar identification of the Throne with the Reign—all of which leave little room to doubt that the author of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* was in fact Ibn Masarra.[173] Thus, we have a work which one source clearly indicates was authored by Ibn Masarra and which is solidly congruent with information about Ibn

---

[172] Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, vol. 3, p. 117.

[173] *Al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* does not have many distinctive elements that would allow us to identify the place where it was written. One may be the reference to the founder of the so-called Ẓāhirī school, Abū Sulaymān Dāwūd b. ʿAlī al-Iṣfahānī (d. 270/883), with a common version of his name in al-Andalus, i.e., Dāwud al-Qiyāsī. A second one may be the writing of the term 'element' (*usṭuqus*) with a final *ṣād*, thus *usṭuquṣ* (cf. Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 390, no. 71), a rare trait which appears to be more common in al-Andalus than in other regions of the Islamicate world. See for instance, Ibn Ṭufayl, *Kitāb Asrār al-ḥikma al-mashriqiyya*, pp. 51-53; and Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 3, p. 437. Nevertheless, there are also occurrences of *usṭuquṣ* in other regions of the Islamicate world, and in addition this may be a trait introduced by the scribe and not the author.

Masarra found in other primary sources. Consequently, it is safe to con-
clude that *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* was authored by Ibn Masarra.

Al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī shows that Ibn Masarra was a rational theolo-
gian. This does not preclude, nevertheless, that he may have written
other works on philosophy and, particularly, on asceticism and mysti-
cism. Even though we may have the impression that *al-Radd ʿalā l-
Kindī* is a work of philosophy because Ibn Masarra polemicizes with
al-Kindī, he does this as a theologian would reproach a philosopher.
Al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī is a work of rational theology (*kalām*) because it
addresses, through rational means, topics commonly dealt with in the-
ology, such as the attributes of God, God's agency, divine foreordina-
tion and justice, reward and punishment, intercession and divine
forgiveness. It also polemicizes with theological schools in Islam. In
addition, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* departs from an Islamic understanding
of God to prove rationally that God is not a cause. Thus, its premises,
such as the incomparable nature of God and the non-eternal nature of
the universe, are given through revelation. Consequently, *al-Radd ʿalā
l-Kindī* cannot be deemed a work of natural theology, a field of philos-
ophy. Moreover, Ibn Masarra introduces his Neoplatonic ontology in
his *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* incidentally to support his views on divine
agency, which is essentially a theological topic. In all, *al-Radd ʿalā l-
Kindī* is a work of theology and probably the earliest extant witness of
the pursuit of rational theology in al-Andalus.

The signs of Ibn Masarra's impact on the intellectual history of al-
Andalus comprise at least nine refutations—if not more—written dur-
ing one century, three official condemnations, one public burning of
his works, early disparaging biographies written by his contemporaries
or with information provided by multiple contemporary informants,
his exclusion from late biographical works, including the always com-
prehensive *al-Takmila* by Ibn al-Abbār,[174] and generally disdainful ref-
erences to his thought in later works written from different intellectual
positions. These signs cannot be ignored because of a couple of con-
flicting later references by Ibn Sabʿīn and, particularly, by Ibn ʿArabī,
who calls Ibn Masarra one of the greatest people on the spiritual path-
way in terms of knowledge, spiritual states and unveilings. Sources on

---

[174] For the meaning of the exclusion from biographical dictionaries, see Fierro, "Re-
ligious Dissension", p. 482.

Ibn Masarra are too varied, sustained over time and broadly coherent to be dismissed in favor of one single later view, which nevertheless also needs to be explained and accommodated in a comprehensive narrative.[175] A moderate form of Bāṭinism or of early Andalusī intellectual Sufism, depending on the scholar's sensibility, as the one represented

[175] To accommodate Ibn ʿArabī's view of Ibn Masarra with the bulk of primary sources on the latter, it should be underscored that, regardless of the fact that Ibn ʿArabī was aware that Ibn Masarra was the author of a number of works, the only work by Ibn Masarra that Ibn ʿArabī quoted and the only one that he appears to have had access to is *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*. To my knowledge, the earlier work where he quoted *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf* is *ʿUqlat al-mustawfiz*. Thus, when Ibn ʿArabī wrote *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya* in Damascus later in life, he probably drew on *ʿUqlat al-mustawfiz* and his memory to quote *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*, since it is unlikely that he had direct access to Ibn Masarra's work there. Ibn ʿArabī's quotation of Ibn Masarra in *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya* (vol. 1, pp. 148-149) is unclear, since the reader cannot easily separate between the ideas quoted from Ibn Masarra and Ibn ʿArabī's own ideas on the topic. However, Ibn ʿArabī's reference to Ibn Masarra in *Sharḥ Kitāb Khalʿ al-naʿlayn* (p. 217) illuminates his quotation of Ibn Masarra in *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya* (vol. 1, pp. 148-149). It shows that Ibn ʿArabī's long elaboration (vol. 1, p. 148) on the eight Throne-carriers (three prophets and five angels) is a paraphrase of the topic in Ibn Masarra's *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*, rather than Ibn ʿArabī's own grasping of it. This paraphrase is then followed by Ibn ʿArabī's explanation (vol. 1, p. 149) with apparently only some personal elaborations. Thus, this long paraphrase in *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya* (vol. 1, pp. 148-149) illustrates the typology of Ibn Masarra's *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*. This is a work that conjoins the direct grasping of spiritual realities—it provides the names of the prophets and angels who are the Throne-carriers—and the systematization of these unveilings—it classifies the Throne-carriers in four groups of two with their specific functions (this systematization reminds of the division of the four causes in two each in *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*; cf. Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 390, no. 71). Along these lines, the title of Ibn Masarra's book, *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*, resonates with Ibn ʿArabī's reference to the column with eloquent speech (*lisān faṣīḥ*). This suggests that the visionary element—i.e., the direct grasping of spiritual realities—was central to *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*. This is also in keeping with Ibn al-Uqlīshī's reference to Ibn Masarra's personal grasping of the names after a period of isolation and severe hardships. In addition, in *Sharḥ Kitāb Khalʿ al-naʿlayn*, Ibn ʿArabī praises Ibn Masarra's knowledge and spiritual states over Ibn Qasī's, who in Ibn ʿArabī's view had no unveilings; and in *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya* (vol. 1, p. 148) he also praises Ibn Masarra's unveilings (*kashf*). In short, Ibn ʿArabī's praising of Ibn Masarra apparently owes to the fact that, in his view, *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf* was based on unveilings, which were later systematized. As to the compatibility of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* and Ibn ʿArabī's praise, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* does not exclude that Ibn Masarra had authored other works based on unveilings. In addition, Ibn ʿArabī most likely had no access to other works by Ibn Masarra. If *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf* did not contain references to Ibn Masarra's understanding of the divine attributes as *muḥdath*, or, in case it did, if Ibn ʿArabī regarded Ibn Masarra's understanding of the divine attributes as a reference to the thrones of the names (along the lines of *ʿUqlat al-mustawfiz*) rather than the divine attributes themselves, Ibn ʿArabī's praise only based on *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf* would be compatible with *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* and the stark opposition it sparked.

by the two Jaʿfar treatises, very valuable in itself and to explain the evolution of Andalusī intellectual Sufism, cannot account for the impact left by Ibn Masarra when strongly Bāṭinī works such as *Ghāyat al-ḥakīm* or *Rutbat al-ḥakīm* now attributed to Maslama b. Qāsim al-Qurṭubī (d. 353/964) did not receive a single refutation.[176] The explanation should be sought elsewhere, particularly in *kalām* or in any field with theological implications, since the stark reaction against Ibn Masarra cannot be explained except if he directly challenged or was perceived to have challenged core tenets of Islam. *Al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* provides a suitable explanation. Ibn Masarra understands the attributes and names of God as simple, non-eternal and originated entities different from God; he regards the ultimate reward as exclusively dependent on deeds without room for intercession or gracious forgiveness; and he considers any Muslim who would describe God with attributes grasped by the intellect a *mulḥid*, since, in his view, the intellect can only grasp what is created.[177] Even though the intention of Ibn Masarra is a pious attempt to assert the absolute unity of God, deny the eternity of the world and encourage Muslims to pursue a life of asceticism and devotion, the above statements violate core tenets of Islamic consensus and, consequently, they explain why Ibn Masarra attracted such harsh condemnations and refutations.

In an preliminary assessment regarding Ibn Masarra's authorship of *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* in light of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, the personality, style and philosophical finesse shown by Ibn Masarra in his *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* are different and far more elaborate than that found in the works Jaʿfar attributes to him. In addition, despite many common terms between *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* and the Jaʿfar treatises, pointing to an evolving tradition, the underlying theology of *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and *Risālat al-Iʿtibār*, based on divine Self-disclosure (*tajallī*)[178] and divine imprints left in the cosmos (*āthār*), appears to be diametrically contrary to and utterly incompatible with the under-

---

[176] Maslama b. Qāsim attracted some reproaches such as by the *qāḍī* Abū Bakr Ibn al-ʿArabī al-Maʿāfirī (d. 543/1148). However, these rebukes fall very short from those targeted at Ibn Masarra. See Ibn al-ʿArabī, *al-ʿAwāṣim*, p. 368. See also Fierro, "La heterodoxia", pp. 129-130.

[177] If a divine attribute mentioned in the *Qurʾān* can be grasped with the intellect, does this mean that the *Qurʾān* is created as Ibn Masarra's followers were accused of believing? See Ibn Ḥayyān, *al-Muqtabas V*, p. 27.

[178] See Garrido Clemente, "Edición crítica del *K. Jawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*", p. 71.

lying theology in Ibn Masarra's *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*. The latter is based on the impossibility of any relation whatsoever between God and the cosmos, since, otherwise, the divine *waḥdāniyya* would be violated. From a theological point of view, *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* appear to be an intermediary step between Ibn Masarra's understanding of absolute *waḥdāniyya*, completely devoid of any similarity (*tashbīh*) between the cosmos and God, and Ibn ʿArabī's dialectic of divine incomparability (*tanzīh*) and similarity (*tashbīh*). In addition, from a temporal point of view, the Jaʿfar treatises appear to have been written before Ibn Barrajān, since many of Ibn Barrajān's distinctive topics and views are found in them in a seminal way.

Ibn al-Uqlīshī does not provide additional information to support the attribution of *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* to Ibn Masarra. Even though there are a couple of elements in Ibn al-Uqlīshī's description of Ibn Masarra's *ḥurūf* and *asmāʾ*—namely that Ibn Masarra elaborated on the *fawātiḥ*[179] and that the names of God are one-hundred degrees to reach paradise—[180] that can be found in *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*, a few other elements in Ibn al-Uqlīshī's description are missing from the latter work. For instance, Ibn al-Uqlīshī points out that the isolated letters (*ḥurūf muqaṭṭaʿa*) and the ninety-nine names of God are allusions to luminous and spiritual beings originated by God and that they are mercies. He also indicates that Ibn Masarra located the suras containing the *fawātiḥ* according to an early division of the *Qurʾān*. And finally, he points out that Ibn Masarra understood the

[179] Ibn al-Uqlīshī points out in *al-Inbāʾ* that a group of the intimates of God (*awliyāʾ*) regarded the *fawātiḥ*, i.e., the isolated letters (*ḥurūf muqaṭṭaʿa*) opening some suras, as the inner names of God (*al-asmāʾ al-bāṭina*), only known to the intimates and the prophets. Here, Ibn al-Uqlīshī may be making a reference to a specific Sufi-mystical tradition in al-Andalus. See Ibn al-Uqlīshī, *al-Inbāʾ*, pp. 224-226. This section made its way into *Shams al-maʿārif*. See [Pseudo]-al-Būnī, *Shams al-maʿārif al-kubrā*, p. 73.

[180] Deeming the names of God as one-hundred degrees or steps to enter into paradise is a common place in the works on *ḥurūf* and *asmāʾ*. This frequent topos is consequence of perhaps the main *ḥadīth* on the names of God, i.e., 'God has ninety-nine names, one hundred minus one; whoever enumerates them will enter into paradise' (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, p. 1597, no. 6410). Given its recurrence, if other elements in Ibn al-Uqlīshī's description are not found in *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*, this frequent topos cannot be the sole basis to identify *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* as Ibn Masarra's *al-Lisān al-ʿaẓīm fī l-ḥurūf*. For examples of this topos, see [Pseudo]-Sahl al-Tustarī, *Risālat al-Ḥurūf*, p. 61; al-Būnī, *Mūḍiḥ al-ṭarīq*, pp. 6-7; Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, vol. 2, p. 447; al-Ḥarrālī, *al-Lamḥa*, f. 25r. For this topos in *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*, see Garrido Clemente, "Edición crítica del *K. Jawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*", p. 59.

names personally after a period of isolation and severe hardships.[181]
These assertions are not found in *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and thus
provide no basis to support that *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* was Ibn
Masarra's work on *ḥurūf* referred to by Ibn al-Uqlīshī. In addition, the
author of *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* shows a different personal attitude
to the one shown by Ibn Masarra as transmitted by Ibn al-Uqlīshī, since
the author of *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* specifically states that he was
transmitting the views of previous authors, whose differences are only
apparent.[182] The point here does not intend to address the reality of
these experiences but the fact that these are distinct elements not extant
in *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*. Consequently, one should conclude that
Ibn al-Uqlīshī, who provided a very reliable summary of *al-Radd ʿalā
l-Kindī*, did not have *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* before his eyes when he
discussed Ibn Masarra's understanding of *ḥurūf*.

   In addition, there is no evidence to support that *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*
represented an early stage in the intellectual life of Ibn Masarra and
that he later evolved to the diametrically opposed intellectual position
represented by *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and *Risālat al-Iʿtibār*. It does
not seem possible to accommodate *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī*, on the one
hand, and the Jaʿfar treatises, on the other, within a single narrative.
First, because *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* appears to be a collection of texts
written over a rather long period of time. For instance, Ibn Masarra
refers to the first level of reality originated by God, i.e., the Will of
God, in some sections as *irāda*,[183] in other separate sections as
mashīʾa[184] and in a couple of instances as both *irāda* and *mashīʾa*,[185]
which he appears to regard as synonyms. Thus, there is an evolution
in the terminology used by Ibn Masarra but not in the overall idea re-
garding the concept to which these different terms refer. This illustrates
that the texts included in *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* were written at different
points in time, perhaps over a rather long period, although there is no
real evolution in the underlying ideas. Second, because Ibn Masarra
died at the rather young age of fifty, he had relatively less time to con-
vert or adopt a diametrically different intellectual position. And, last

---

[181] [Ibn] al-Uqlīshī, *al-Inbāʾ*, p. 240.
[182] Garrido Clemente, "Edición crítica del *K. Jawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf*", p. 62.
[183] See the sections in Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 376-383, nos. 37-54.
[184] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, pp. 390ff, no. 83.
[185] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 390, no. 72, and p. 401, no. 83.

and foremost, there is no evidence in primary sources to suggest he rejected his initial views at a later point in life. If this had been the case, it would thus be difficult to explain the numerous refutations of his works and the condemnations of his followers after his death.

However, firmly dismissing the attribution of *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* to Ibn Masarra based on a comparison of their content with the *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* requires studying them at length. First, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* is a work of rational theology, whereas *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* and *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* are works of symbolic theology or metaphysics. Thus, there may be less openly shared topics, and the styles can be justifiably different. Second, *Kitāb Khawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* transmits ideas from previous works on *ḥurūf*—the most important one being the so-called *Risālat al-Ḥurūf* by the Pseudo-Sahl al-Tustarī—and builds on them. Consequently, it could be a work that partially transmits Ibn Masarra's views. And, third, Ibn Masarra had an important visionary capacity, as shown by Ibn ʿArabī. Thus, it is difficult to predict from *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* what the contents of his more symbolic works would be. In sum, I will specifically study the attribution of these two works at length elsewhere.

The main topic of *al-Radd ʿalā l-Kindī* is causality. Ibn Masarra repeatedly stresses that God is detached of any relation, and, thus, He is not the cause of beings. For Ibn Masarra, the cause and the caused are related (*muḍāf*) by a necessary relation, so that cause (*ʿilla*)—i.e., the attribute of God—and caused (*maʿlūl*)—i.e., the thing created (*makhlūq*)—are a sort of twofold unity in which the cause has precedence over the caused.[186] Ibn Masarra clearly stresses that there cannot be a cause without a caused, so that the caused necessarily makes the cause a cause. Hence, it is correct to state that the cause causes the caused and that the caused causes the cause.[187] Ibn Masarra's understanding of the attribute of God—i.e., the cause—and the created thing—i.e., the caused thing—as a twofold unity informs Andalusī intellectual Sufism and plants the seed for *takhalluq*—i.e., the assumption of the Divine names by the wayfarer, that is, the assumption of the causes by the caused—, which will ultimately germinate in Ibn ʿArabī's imposing metaphysics of the divine names.

---

[186] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 373, no. 29.
[187] Ibn Ḥazm, *Rasāʾil*, vol. 4, p. 372, no. 27.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Al-Bukhārī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Damascus/Beirut, Dār Ibn Kathīr, 2002.

Al-Būnī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī, *Laṭāʾif al-ishārāt*, in MS Paris, BnF, ar. 2658.

Al-Būnī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī, *Mūḍiḥ al-ṭarīq wa-qusṭās al-taḥqīq*, in MS Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, Special Collections Library, Isl. Ms. 534.

[Pseudo]-al-Būnī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī, *Shams al-maʿārif al-kubrā*, Beirut, Manshūrāt Muʾassasat al-nūr li-l-maṭbūʿāt, 2006.

Al-Dabbāgh, Abū Zayd ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, *Maʿālim al-īmān fī maʿrifat ahl al-Qayrawān*, Ibrāhīm Shabbūḥ (ed.), Cairo, Maktabat al-Khānijī, 1968-1972, 3 vols.

Al-Dāwūdī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, *Ṭabaqāt al-mufassirīn*, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 1983, 2 vols.

Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ et al. (eds.), Beirut, Muʾassasat al-risāla, 1981-1988, 25 vols.

Al-Dhahabī, *Taʾrīkh al-islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-l-aʿlām*, ʿUmar ʿAbd al-Salām al-Tadmurī (ed.), Beirut, Dār al-kitāb al-ʿarabī, 1990-2000, 53 vols.

Al-Ḥarrālī, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī, *al-Lamḥa fī maʿrifat al-ḥurūf*, in MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Fatih 3434.

Ibn al-Abbār, *al-Takmila li-Kitāb al-Ṣila*, ʿAbd al-Salām al-Harrās (ed.), Beirut, Dār al-fikr, 1995, 4 vols.

Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbāʾ*, August Müller (ed.), Cairo, al-Maṭbaʿa al-Wahbiyya, 1882, 2 vols. (reprint Frankfurt, Publications of the Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Science, 1995).

Ibn ʿArabī, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, Cairo, Dār al-kutub al-ʿarabiyya al-kubrā, 1329/1911.

Ibn ʿArabī, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, "ʿUqlat al-mustawfiz", in Ibn ʿArabī, *Kleinere Schriften des Ibn al-ʿArabī*, H.S. Nyberg (ed.), Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1919, pp. 39-99 (Arabic text).

Ibn ʿArabī, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, "Kitāb al-Mīm wa-l-wāw wa-l-nūn", in Ibn ʿArabī, *Rasāʾil Ibn ʿArabī*, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Nimrī (ed.), Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 2001, pp. 83-91.

Ibn ʿArabī, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, *Sharḥ Kitāb Khalʿ al-naʿlayn*, Muḥammad al-Amrānī (ed.), Marrakesh, Muʾassasat Āfāq li-l-dirāsāt wa-l-nashr wa-l-ittiṣāl, 2013.

Ibn al-ʿArabī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, *al-ʿAwāṣim min al-qawāṣim: al-Naṣṣ al-kāmil*, ʿAmmār Ṭālibī (ed.), Cairo, Maktabat dār al-turāth, 1997.

Ibn Bashkuwāl, *al-Ṣila*, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī (ed.), Cairo/Beirut, Dār al-kitāb al-miṣrī/Dār al-kitāb al-lubnānī, 1989, 3 vols. with single pagination.

Ibn al-Faraḍī, *Taʾrīkh ʿulamāʾ al-Andalus*, Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf (ed.), Tunis: Dār al-gharb al-islāmī, 2008, 2 vols.

Ibn Farḥūn, *al-Dībāj al-mudhhab fī maʿrifa aʿyān ʿulamāʾ al-madhhab*, Muḥammad al-Aḥmadī Abū l-Nūr (ed.), Cairo, Dār al-turāth, n.d., 2 vols.

Ibn Ḥayyān, *al-Muqtabas V*, Pedro Chalmeta, Federico Corriente and Maḥmūd Ṣubḥ (eds.), Madrid/Rabat, Instituto hispano-árabe de cultura/Faculté des Lettres, 1979.

Ibn Ḥazm, ʿAlī b. Aḥmad, *al-Fiṣal fī l-milal wa-l-ahwāʾ wa-l-niḥal*, Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Naṣr and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ʿUmayra (eds.), Beirut, Dār al-jīl, 1996, 5 vols.

Ibn Ḥazm, ʿAlī b. Aḥmad, *al-Iḥkām fī uṣūl al-aḥkām*, al-Shaykh Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (ed.), Beirut, Dār al-āfāq al-jadīda, n.d., 8 vols.

Ibn Ḥazm, ʿAlī b. Aḥmad, *Rasāʾil Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī*, Iḥsān ʿAbbās (ed.), Beirut, al-Muʾassasa al-ʿarabiyya li-l-dirāsāt wa-l-nashr, 1987, 4 vols.

Ibn ʿIdhārī, Muḥammad, *al-Bayān al-mughrib fī khtiṣār akhbār mulūk al-Andalus wa-l-Maghrib*, G.S. Colin and É. Lévi-Provençal (eds.), Beirut, Dār al-thaqāfa, 1983, 4 vols.

Ibn Khalīl al-Sakūnī, Abū ʿAlī ʿUmar b. Muḥammad, *al-Mukhtār min Kitāb Laḥn al-ʿāmma wa-l-khāṣṣa fī l-muʿtaqadāt*, Beirut, Sharikat Dār al-mashārīʿ, 2005.

Ibn al-Marʾa, *Nukat al-Irshād*, in MS Cairo, Dār al-kutub, Tawḥīd 6, 4 vols. in five (vols. 1a, 1b, 2, 3 and 4).

Ibn al-Qifṭī, *Taʾrīkh al-ḥukamāʾ*, Julius Lippert (ed.), Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903.

Ibn al-Qifṭī, *Ikhbār al-ʿulamāʾ ʾan akhbār al-ḥukamāʾ*, Ibrāhīm Shams al-Dīn (ed.), Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 2005.

Ibn Sabʿīn, *Rasāʾil Ibn Sabʿīn*, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Badawī (ed.), Cairo, al-Muʾassasa al-miṣriyya al-ʿāmma li-l-taʾlīf wa-l-anbāʾ wa-l-nashr, 1965.

Ibn Ṭufayl, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad, *Kitāb Asrār al-ḥikma al-mashriqiyya aw Risālat Ḥayy b. Yaqẓān*, [Cairo, s.n.], 1909.

[Ibn] al-Uqlīshī, Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Maʿadd, *al-Inbāʾ fī sharḥ ḥaqāʾiq al-ṣifāt wa-l-asmāʾ*, Aḥmad Rajab Abū Sālim (ed.), Kuwayt, Dār al-ḍiyāʾ li-l-nashr wa-l-tawzīʿ, 2017, 2 vols. with single pagination.

Al-Khushanī, Ibn Ḥārith, *Akhbār al-fuqahāʾ wa-l-muḥaddithīn (Historia de los alfaquíes y tradicionistas de al-Andalus)*, María Luisa Ávila y Luis Molina (eds.), Madrid, CSIC, 1992.

Al-Khushanī, Ibn Ḥārith, *Quḍāt Qurṭuba wa-ʿulamāʾ Ifrīqiya*, al-Sayyid ʿIzzat al-ʿAṭṭār al-Ḥusaynī (ed.), Cairo, Maktabat al-Khānijī, 1994.

Al-Kindī, Abū Yūsuf Yaʿqūb b. Isḥāq, *Rasāʾil al-Kindī l-falsafiyya*, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Hādī Abū Rīda (ed.), Cairo, Dār al-fikr al-ʿarabī, 1950.

Al-Kindī, Abū Yūsuf Yaʿqūb b. Isḥāq, *al-Kindī's Metaphysics. A Translation of Yaʿqūb b. Isḥāq al-Kindī's Treatise On First Philosophy (Fī al-Falsafah al-Ūlā) with introduction and commentary by Alfred L. Ivry*, Albany, State University of New York Press, 1970.

Makkī b. Abī Ṭālib, Abū Muḥamamd, *al-Hidāya ilā bulūgh al-nihāya fī ʿilm maʿānī al-Qurʾān wa-tafsīrihi wa-aḥkāmihi wa-jumal min funūn ʿulūmihi*, al-Shāhid al-Būshaykhī et al. (eds.), Sharjah, Majmūʿat buḥūth al-Kitāb wa-l-Sunna, Kulliyyat al-dirāsāt al-ʿulyā wa-l-baḥth al-ʿilmī, Jāmiʿat al-Shāriqa, 2008, 13 vols.

Al-Nubāhī [al-Bunnāhī], *Taʾrīkh quḍāt al-Andalus*, Beirut, Dār al-āfāq al-jadīda, 1983.

Al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, Abū al-Faḍl al-Yaḥṣubī, *Tartīb al-madārik wa-taqrīb al-masālik li-maʿrifat aʿlām madhhab Mālik*, Saʿīd Aḥmad Aʿrāb, Muḥammad Binsharīfa, ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Ṣaḥrāwī, and Muḥammad b. Tāwīt al-Ṭanjī (eds.), Rabat, Wizārat al-awqāf wa-l-shuʾūn al-Islāmiyya, 1966-1983, 8 vols.

Al-Qurṭubī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad, *al-Tadhkira fī aḥwāl al-mawtā*, Ṣādiq b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm (ed.), Riyadh, Dār al-minhāj li-l-nashr wa-l-tawẕīʿ, 1425 AH, 3 vols. with single pagination.

Al-Qurṭubī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad, *al-Asnā fī sharḥ asmāʾ Allāh al-ḥusnā*, Damascus, al-Maktabat al-ʿaṣriyya, 2005.

[Pseudo]-Sahl al-Tustarī, *Risālat al-Ḥurūf*, in Pilar Garrido Clemente, *El inicio de la ciencia de las letras en el islam: La Risālat al-ḥurūf del sufí Sahl al-Tustarī*, Madrid, Mandala Ediciones, 2010, pp. 57-64.

Ṣāʿid al-Andalusī, *Ṭabaqāt al-umam*, Louis Cheikho (ed.), Beirut, al-Maṭbaʿa al-Kāthūlīkiyya li-l-Ābāʾ al-Yasūʿiyyīn, 1912.

Ṣāʿid al-Andalusī, *Science in the medieval world: Book of the Categories of nations*, Semaʿan I. Salem and Alok Kumar (trans.), Austin, University of Texas Press, 1991.

[Pseudo]-al-Suhaylī, Abū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, *Jadhwat al-muqtabis*, in MS Damascus, Maktabat al-Asad al-Waṭaniyya, Ẕāhiriyya 9006.

Al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-wuʿāt*, Muḥammad Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (ed.), Cairo, Maṭbaʿat ʿĪsā l-Bābī l-Ḥalabī, 1964-1965, 2 vols.

Secondary Sources

Addas, Claude, "Andalusī Mysticism and the Rise of Ibn ʿArabī", in Salma Jayyusi (ed.), *The Legacy of Muslim Spain*, Leiden, Brill, 1992, pp. 909-933.

Adamson, Peter and Peter A. Pormann, *The Philosophical Works of al-Kindī*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012.

Adang, Camilla, Maribel Fierro and Sabine Schmidtke (eds.), *Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba: The Life and Works of a Controversial Thinker*, Leiden, Brill, 2012.

Akhtar, Ali Humayun, *Philosophers, Sufis, and Caliphs: Politics and Authority from Cordoba to Cairo and Baghdad*, Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Amari, Michele, *Biblioteca arabo-sicula, ossia Raccolta di testi arabici che toccano la geografia, la storia, le biografie e la bibliografia della Sicilia*, Leipzig, F.A. Brockhaus, 1857.

Arberry, Arthur J., *The Chester Beatty Library: A handlist of the Arabic manuscripts*. Volume I. MSS. 3001 to 3250, Dublin, Emery Walker, 1955.

Asín Palacios, Miguel, *Abenmasarra y su escuela: Orígenes de la filosofía hispanomusulmana*, Madrid, Imprenta Ibérica, 1914; reprinted in Miguel Asín Palacios, *Tres estudios sobre pensamiento y mística hispanomusulmanes*, Madrid, Hiperión, 1992.

Asín Palacios, Miguel, *The Mystical Philosophy of Ibn Masarra and his Followers*, Elmer H. Douglas and Howard W. Yoder (trans.), Leiden, Brill, 1978.

Bin Ramli, Harith, "The Sālimiyya and Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī: The Transmission of Theological Teachings in a Basran Circle of Mystics", in Geneviève Gobillot and Jean-Jacques Thibon (eds.), *Les maîtres soufis et leurs disciples des IIIe-Ve siècles de l'hégire (IXe-XIe)*, Beirut, Presses de IFPO, 2012, pp. 101-129.

Brown, Vahid J., *Muḥammad b. Masarra al-Jabalī and his Place in Medieval Islamicate Intellectual History: Towards a Reappraisal*, unpublished BA dissertation, Reed College, 2006.

Brown, Vahid J., "Andalusī Mysticism: A Recontextualization", *Journal of Islamic Philosophy* (Ann Arbor, MI), 2, 1 (2006), pp. 69-101.

Casassas Canals, Xavier and Delfina Serrano-Ruano, "Putting Criticisms against al-Ghazālī in Perspective: New Materials on the Interface between Law, Rational Theology and Mysticism in Almoravid and Almohad al-Andalus (Ibn Rushd al-Jadd and al-Qurṭubī)", in Ayman Shihadeh and Jan Thiele (eds.), *Philosophical Theology in Islam: Later Ashʿarism East and West*, Leiden, Brill, 2020, pp. 254-297.

Casewit, Yousef, *The Mystics of al-Andalus: Ibn Barrajān and Islamic Thought in the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Casewit, Yousef, "Shushtarī's Treatise *On the Limits of Theology and Sufism*: Discursive Knowledge (ʿilm), Direct Recognition (maʿrifa), and Mystical Realization (taḥqīq) in *al-Risāla al-Quṣāriyya*", *Religions*, 11, 5 (2020), article no. 226 (32 pp.), [online], doi: 10.3390/rel11050226.

Cruz Hernández, Miguel, "La Persecución anti-Masarri durante el reinado de ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir li-dīn Allāh, según Ibn Ḥayyān", *Al-Qanṭara*, 2 (1981), pp. 51-67.

Daiber, Hans, "Die Kritik des Ibn Ḥazm an Kindī's Metaphysik", *Der Islam*, 63 (1986), pp. 284-302.

Daiber, Hans, "al-Kindī in al-Andalus: Ibn Ḥazm's Critique of his Metaphysics",

in *Actas del XII Congreso de la U.E.A.I. (Malaga, 1984)*, Madrid, Union européenne des arabisants et islamisants, 1986, pp. 229-235.

De Callataÿ, Godefroid, "Magia en al-Andalus: *Rasāʾil Ijwān al-Ṣafāʾ*, *Rutbat al-Ḥakīm* y *Gāyat al-Ḥakīm* (*Picatrix*)", *Al-Qanṭara*, 34, 2 (2013), pp. 297-343.

De Callataÿ, Godefroid, "Philosophy and Bāṭinism: Ibn Masarra's *Risālat al-iʿtibār* and the *Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ*", *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 40 (2014), pp. 261-311.

De Smet, Daniel, *Empedocles Arabus: une lecture néoplatonicienne tardive*, Brussels, Paleis der Academiën, 1998.

Djebbar, Ahmed, "Ibn ʿAbdūn", in Jorge Lirola Delgado and José Miguel Puerta Vílchez (eds.), *Biblioteca de al-Andalus*, Almeria, Fundación Ibn Ṭufayl de Estudios Árabes, 2004-2012, vol. 1, pp. 652-654.

Documentación, "Ibn al-Uqlīshī, Abū l-ʿAbbās", in Jorge Lirola Delgado and José Miguel Puerta Vílchez (eds.), *Biblioteca de al-Andalus*, Almeria, Fundación Ibn Ṭufayl de Estudios Árabes, 2004-2012, vol. 5, pp. 531-535, no. 1287.

Dozy, Reinhart, *Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne jusqu'à la conquête de l'Andalousie par les Almoravides (711-1110)*, Leiden, Brill, 1861, 4 vols.

Ebstein, Michael, *Mysticism and Philosophy in al-Andalus: Ibn Masarra, Ibn al-ʿArabī and the Ismāʿīlī Tradition*, Leiden, Brill, 2013.

Ebstein, Michael and Sara Sviri, "The so-called *Risālat al-ḥurūf* (*Epistle on Letters*) ascribed to Sahl al-Tustarī and Letter Mysticism in al-Andalus", *Journal Asiatique*, 299 (2011), pp. 213-270.

Fierro, Maribel, *La heterodoxia en al-Andalus durante el período omeya*, Madrid, Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura, 1987.

Fierro, Maribel, "The Polemic about the *karāmāt al-awliyāʾ* and the Development of Ṣūfism in al-Andalus (Fourth/Tenth-Fifth/Eleventh Centuries)", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 55, 2 (1992), pp. 236-249.

Fierro, Maribel, "El proceso contra Abū ʿUmar al-Ṭalamankī a través de su obra", *Sharq al-Andalus*, 9 (1992), pp. 93-127.

Fierro, Maribel, "Bāṭinism in al-Andalus. Maslama b. Qāsim al-Qurṭubī (d. 353/964), Author of the *Rutbat al-Ḥakīm* and the *Ghāyat al-Ḥakīm* (*Picatrix*)", *Studia Islamica*, 84, 2 (1996), pp. 87-112.

Fierro, Maribel, "Opposition to Sufism in al-Andalus", in F. de Jong and B. Radtke (eds.), *Islamic Mysticism contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*, Leiden, Brill, 1999, pp. 174-206.

Fierro, Maribel, "Religious Dissension in al-Andalus: Ways of Exclusion and Inclusion", *Al-Qanṭara*, 22 (2001), pp. 463-487.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, "Edición crítica del *K. Jawāṣṣ al-ḥurūf* de Ibn Masarra", *Al-Andalus-Magreb*, 14 (2007), pp. 51-89.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, "Edición crítica de la *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* de Ibn Masarra de Córdoba", *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos*, 56 (2007), pp. 81-104.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, *Estudio, traducción y edición de la obra de Ibn Masarra de Córdoba*, PhD dissertation, Universidad de Salamanca, 2007.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, "Sobre la Morada de las cinco columnas mencionadas en la obra *Futūḥāt Makkiyya* de Ibn ʿArabī", in Pablo Beneito Arias and Pilar Garrido Clemente (eds.), *El viaje interior entre Oriente y Occidente: la actualidad del pensamiento de Ibn ʿArabī*, Madrid, Alquitara, 2007, pp. 123-129.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, "Textos relativos al Trono en la obra de Ibn Masarra, contrastados con las doctrinas que Ibn ʿArabī e Ibn Ḥazm le atribuyen", in Pablo Beneito Arias and Pilar Garrido Clemente (eds.), *El viaje interior entre Oriente y Occidente: la actualidad del pensamiento de Ibn ʿArabī*, Madrid, Alquitara, 2007, pp. 134-147.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, "Traducción anotada de la *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* de Ibn Masarra de Córdoba", *Estudios humanísticos. Filología*, 30 (2008), pp. 139-163.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, "Ibn Masarra a través de las fuentes: Obras halladas y escritos desconocidos", *Estudios Humanísticos. Filología*, 31 (2009), pp. 87-106.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, "El debate acerca del presunto influjo del Pseudo-Empédocles en el pensamiento de Ibn Masarra de Córdoba", *Revista española de filosofía medieval*, 16 (2009), pp. 23-34.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, "Notas sobre la atribución de las doctrinas del *qadar*, las dos ciencias y la adquisición de la profecía a Ibn Masarra de Córdoba", *Al-Andalus Magreb: Estudios árabes e islámicos*, 16 (2009), pp. 163-184.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, "¿Era Ibn Masarra de Córdoba un filósofo?", *Anaquel de estudios árabes*, 21 (2010), pp. 123-140.

Garrido Clemente, Pilar, *El inicio de la ciencia de las letras en el islam: La Risālat al-ḥurūf del sufí Sahl al-Tustarī*, Madrid, Mandala Ediciones, 2010.

Gril, Denis, "Le science des lettres", in Michel Chodkiewicz (ed.), *Les illuminations de la Mecque*, Houston and Paris, Rothko Chapel and Sindbad, 1988.

Jaʿfar, Muḥammad Kamāl Ibrāhīm, "Min muʾallafāt Ibn Masarra al-maqfūda", *Majallat Kulliyyat al-tarbiya*, 3-4 (1972), pp. 27-63.

Jaʿfar, Muḥammad Kamāl Ibrāhīm, *Min al-turāth al-ṣūfī li-Sahl b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Tustarī*, [Cairo], Dār al-maʿārif bi-Miṣr, 1974.

Jaʿfar, Muḥammad Kamāl Ibrāhīm, *Min qaḍāyā l-fikr al-islāmī: Dirāsa wa-nuṣūṣ*, [Cairo]: Dār al-ʿulūm, 1978.

Kaddouri, Samir, "Ibn Ḥazm al-Qurṭubī (d. 456/1064)", in Oussama Arabi, David S. Powers and Susan A. Spectorsky (eds), *Islamic Legal Thought: A Compendium of Muslim Jurists*, Leiden, Brill, 2013, pp. 211-238.

Kenny, Joseph, "Ibn-Masarra: His *Risāla al-Iʿtibār*", *Orita: Ibadan Journal of Religious Studies*, 34 (2002), pp. 1-26.

Lévi-Provençal, Evariste, "A propos de l'ascète philosophe Ibn Masarra de Cordoue", *Orientalia Suecana*, 3 (1954), pp. 75-83.

Marín, Manuela, "Abū Saʿīd Ibn al-Aʿrābī et le développement du soufisme en al-Andalus", *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée*, 63-64 (1992), pp. 28-38.

Massignon, Louis, *Recueil de textes inédits concernant l'histoire de la mystique en pays d'Islam*, Paris, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1929.

Morris, James W., *Ibn Masarra: A Reconsideration of the Primary Sources*, unpublished graduate paper, Harvard University, 1973.

Puerta Vílchez, José Miguel, "Abū Muḥammad ʿAlī Ibn Ḥazm: A Biographical Sketch", in Camilla Adang, Maribel Fierro and Sabine Schmidtke (eds.), *Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba: The Life and Works of a Controversial Thinker*, Leiden, Brill, 2012, pp. 3-24.

Ramón Guerrero, Rafael and Pilar Garrido Clemente, "Ibn Masarra, gnóstico y místico andalusí", in J. Solana (ed.), *Las raíces de la cultura europea: Ensayos en homenaje al profesor Joaquín Lomba*, Zaragoza, Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza-Institución Fernando el Católico, 2004, pp. 231-233.

Ramón Guerrero, Rafael, "Ibn Masarra al-Qurṭubī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh", in Jorge Lirola Delgado and José Miguel Puerta Vílchez (eds.), *Biblioteca de al-Andalus*, Almeria, Fundación Ibn Ṭufayl de Estudios Árabes, 2004-2012, vol. 4, pp. 144-154, no. 788.

Schwarz, Michael, "'Acquisition' (*kasb*) in Early *Kalām*", in Samuel M. Stern, Albert Hourani, and Vivian Brown (eds.), *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition: Essays presented by his friends and pupils to Richard Walzer on his seventieth birthday*, Oxford, Cassirer, 1972, pp. 355-387.

Stern, Samuel M., "Ibn Masarra, Follower of Pseudo-Empedocles—An Illusion", *Actas IV Congreso de Estudos Árabes e Islâmicos: Coimbra, Lisboa 1 a 8 de setembro de 1968*, Leiden, Brill, 1971, pp. 325-337.

Stroumsa, Sarah, "Ibn Masarra and the beginnings of mystical thought in al-Andalus", in P. Schäfer (ed.), *Mystical approaches to God: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, Munich, Oldenbourg Verlag, 2006, pp. 97-112.

Stroumsa, Sarah, "The Muʿtazila in al-Andalus: The Footprints of a Phantom", *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World*, 2 (2014), pp. 80-100.

Stroumsa, Sarah, "Ibn Masarra's (d. 931) Third Book", in Khaled El-Rouayheb and Sabine Schmidtke (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 83-100.

Stroumsa, Sarah, *Andalus and Sefarad: On Philosophy and Its History in Islamic Spain*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2019.

Stroumsa, Sarah and Sara Sviri, "The Beginnings of Mystical Philosophy in al-Andalus: Ibn Masarra and his *Epistle on Contemplation*", *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 36 (2009), pp. 201-253.

Tornero, Emilio, "Noticia sobre la publicación de obras inéditas de Ibn Masarra", *Al-Qanṭara*, 14, 1 (1993), pp. 47-64.

ʿUwayḍa, Kāmil Muḥammad Muḥammad, *Ibn Masarra, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Masarra b. Najīḥ al-Qurṭubī, al-faylasūf al-zāhid*, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 1993.