

# A Statistical Portrait of the Resistance to Logic by Sunni Muslim Scholars Based on the Works of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (849-909/1448-1505)\*

Mufti Ali

---

## Abstract

On the basis of my analysis of four works composed by al-Suyūṭī, I argue that hostility to logic was a predominant feature of Sunni scholarship, especially during the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries. Logic was condemned by distinguished Sunni scholars in Valencia, Fez, Aleppo, Iraq, and Mecca, but especially in Egypt and Syria. This conclusion confirms Goldziher's argument that resistance to logic started already in the 2nd/8th century and increased in the 13th and 14th centuries; and disconfirms al-Rouayheb's argument that opposition to logic was never predominant among Muslim Sunni scholars.

## Keywords

Islamic law, logic, al-Suyūṭī, prosopography

## Introduction

In his *Stellung*, Goldziher suggests that Ja'far al-Šādiq (d. 148/764), the seventh *imām* of the Shī'ī *Ithnā 'Ashariyya*, condemned logic

---

*Correspondence:* Komplek Cigadung Mandiri, Blok- J, no. 17, Pandeglang 42251 Banten Indonesia. *E-mail:* muftiani@yahoo.com.

\* Currently Staff lecturer, Faculty of Theology, IAIN Banten Indonesia, and Ph.D candidate at the University of Leiden, The Netherlands, under the supervision of Prof. Dr. P. S. van Koningsveld, to whom I express my gratitude. I also thank Prof. David S. Powers and an anonymous reader for their helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft of this essay.

because he understood that Aristotle's method of proof on "the validity of religious doctrines" would result in grave evil.<sup>1</sup> To Ja'far the following quote is ascribed: "People will occupy themselves with logic until they will question even their belief in God. If you hear anything of this kind, say: 'there is no god except the unique One; there is nothing like unto Him.'" <sup>2</sup> Among the scholars who opposed logic, Goldziher mentions the Shāfi'ī Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūri (d. 643/1246), the Ḥanbalī Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329), and the Shāfi'ī Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 909/1505).<sup>3</sup> According to Goldziher, antagonism to the study of logic increased after al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111).<sup>4</sup>

Opposition to logic took the form of condemning logicians and burning their treatises. Makdisi suggests that opposition to logic<sup>5</sup> was also reflected by the emergence of *madrasas*, or 'law colleges,' centers for training jurists and institutions of learning with formalized curricula that excluded the 'foreign sciences,' including philosophy and logic.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I. Goldziher, "Die Stellung der alten Orthodoxie zu den antiken Wissenschaften," in *Gesammelte Schriften* (1970) vol. 5, 357-400 (originally published in *Abhandlungen der könig. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften* [1915-1916], 3-46). I rely on the English translation of Goldziher's article by Merlin L. Swartz, "The Attitude of Orthodox Islam toward the 'Ancient Sciences,'" in *Studies on Islam* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 185-215.

<sup>2</sup> Goldziher, "Attitude," 199.

<sup>3</sup> Goldziher, "Attitude," 201-8.

<sup>4</sup> Goldziher, "Attitude," 204.

<sup>5</sup> According to Makdisi, Muslim scholars were engaged in the struggle against the adoption of 'Rationalist instruments of methodology,' philosophy, logic and dialectic. See G. Makdisi, *The Rise of Humanism in Classical Islam and the Christian West with Special Reference to Scholasticism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990), 7, 43.

<sup>6</sup> G. Makdisi discusses opposition to the 'foreign sciences,' in the following works: *Rise*, 3; "Law and Traditionalism in the Institutions of Learning of Medieval Islam," in *Theology and Law in Islam*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971), 75-89; "The Non-Ash'arite Shafi'ism of Abū Ḥāmid Ghazzālī," *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* LIV, 1986, 239-57; "Ash'ari and the Ash'arites in Islamic Religious History I," *Studia Islamica*, XVII, 1962, 37-80; "Ash'ari and the Ash'arites in Islamic Religious History II," *Studia Islamica*, XVIII, 1963, 19-39; "The Juridical Theology of Shāfi'ī: Origins and Significance of *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*," *Studia Islamica*, LIX, 1984, 5-48; "Hanbalite Islam," in Merlin L. Swartz (ed. and transl.), *Studies on Islam* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University

Hostility to the 'foreign sciences' was also reflected, Makdisi states, in the emergence "of the personal schools of law in the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup>/8<sup>th</sup> century; in the proliferation of mosques for the study of law in the 3<sup>rd</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> centuries;" in the "subsequent development and proliferation of the *madrasa*" in the 4<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>/11<sup>th</sup> centuries; and in the "significant development of other conservative institutions, such as the *dār al-hadīth*," in the 6<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>7</sup>

Goldziher associates the alleged decline of Muslim civilization with Muslim resistance to the 'Greek sciences,' and Makdisi equates the resistance to logic with the emergence of *madrasas*. Similarly, Brentjes attributes the decline of Muslim civilization after the 13<sup>th</sup> century to four factors which implicitly reflect resistance to logic: (1) The dichotomy between the ancient 'rational' sciences and religious and legal sciences; (2) the marginal position of the ancient sciences in the Muslim world; (3) "the rejection of innovation as a positive value for Muslim society and the insistence on social practice based on authoritative learning"; and (4) the replacement of philosophy by "the canon of religious duties as the ideal of salvation."<sup>8</sup>

In his 2004 article,<sup>9</sup> el-Rouayheb challenges Goldziher's argument, confirmed by Makdisi and Brentjes,<sup>10</sup> that opposition to logic was already manifest in the 2<sup>nd</sup>/8<sup>th</sup> century and increased in intensity in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, when al-Shahrazūrī and Ibn Taymiyya composed works in which they censured it. El-Rouayheb rejects Makdisi's suggestion that opposition to logic was facilitated by the establishment of *madrasas* that were opposed to Greek learning. El-Rouayheb also questions Goldziher's suggestion that hostility to logic

---

Press, 1981), 216-74; *Ibn Qudāma's Censure of Speculative Theology: An Edition and Translation of Ibn Qudāma's Tahrīm al-Nazar fī Kutub Ahl al-Kalām* (London: Luzac & Company Ltd., 1962), ix.

<sup>7</sup>) Makdisi, *Rise*, 282-3.

<sup>8</sup>) Sonja Brentjes, "Orthodoxy," *Ancient Sciences, Power, and the Madrasa* ("college") in *Ayyubid and early Mamluk Damascus* (International Workshop Experience and Knowledge Structures in Arabic and Latin Sciences Organized by Muhammad Abattouy and Paul Weinig, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science Berlin, December 16-17, 1996), 3.

<sup>9</sup>) Khaled el-Rouayheb, "Sunni Muslim Scholars on the Status of Logic, 1500-1800," *Islamic Law and Society* 11, 2 (2004), 213-32.

<sup>10</sup>) Goldziher, "Attitude," 198, 201-8; Makdisi, *Rise*, 282-3; Brentjes, "Orthodoxy," 3.

was found predominantly among Sunni scholars, “at least between the endorsement of the discipline by Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111) and the rise of the Salafiyya in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.”

El-Rouayheb bases his argument on discussions concerning the status of logic by Sunni scholars in the period between 1500 and 1800. He argues that “hostility to logic was a minority position in scholarly circles throughout this period.” Since “many of the scholars of this period regularly invoked earlier authorities in support of their position,” el-Rouayhab says, Goldziher’s suggestion that hostility to logic was a predominant feature of Sunni scholarship, especially between the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, is no longer tenable.<sup>11</sup>

In this essay, I revisit the status of logic by discussing four works composed by al-Suyūṭī: *Al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Tahrim al-Ishtighāl bi-‘ilm al-Manṭiq* (hereinafter: QM), *Jahd al-Qariḥa fī Tajrīd al-Naṣiḥa* (hereinafter: JQ), *Ṣawn al-Manṭiq wa’l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa’l-Kalām* (hereinafter: SM), and a *fatwā* against logic (hereinafter: *Fatwā*). An analysis of the contents of these four works indicates that hostility to logic did become a predominant feature of Sunni thinking, especially during the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries. A prosopographical study of the opponents of logic mentioned by al-Suyūṭī shows that logic was condemned by distinguished Sunni scholars in Valencia, Fez, Aleppo, Iraq, and Mecca, but especially in Egypt and Syria.

Before discussing these four works, three points should be noted: First, the authorities listed in these four works are meagre in number, but their prominence and professional status combine to suggest that opposition to logic was a prevalent feature of Sunni Islam. Second, although QM, JQ, SM and the *Fatwā* convey the shared normative message of their authors as a prominent legal scholar, i.e., that logic is prohibited, these works guide us to rich prosopographical data which shed light on the history of the opposition to logic in the Islamic world. Third, in his *Fatwā* against logic al-Suyūṭī lists those individuals who he claimed were opposed to logic without

<sup>11</sup>) El-Rouayheb, “Sunnī Muslim Scholars,” 215.

identifying them. But his merit should be acknowledged here, because he has added new data that are indispensable for further prosopographical study on the history of opposition to logic. In addition, his list of scholars who were opposed to logic may serve as a guideline for understanding the anti-logic position adopted by medieval Muslim scholars.

### **Al-Suyūṭī's Texts that Deal with Opposition to Logic**

Al-Suyūṭī discusses opposition to logic in four works: QM, JQ, SM, and a *fatwā* against logic. Internal evidence suggests that QM was written first, followed by JQ, SM, and finally the *Fatwā*.

QM, JQ, SM, and the *Fatwā* represent al-Suyūṭī's systematic attempt to demonstrate that numerous scholars of different generations were vehemently opposed to logic. These scholars expressed their hostility in various ways. Some composed works against logic; some issued *fatwās* against it; and some encouraged people to expel logicians from the community, to burn their works, and even to kill them.

#### *1. QM: Context and Content*

QM is available in two manuscripts. The first was formerly housed in the Āṣafiyya Library in Hyderabad but is now preserved in the Andhra Pradesh Government Oriental Manuscripts Library and Research Institute.<sup>12</sup> The second is a copy made by the late Muṣṭafā Nājī, staff librarian of the Public Library at Rabat (Morocco), from a heavily damaged QM manuscript in a private collection. This copy was prepared for Van Koningsveld and is now part of his private collection. It contains 18 pages (A4 paper) with 30 lines on each page. There are numerous lacunae. The script is clear, with vowels

---

<sup>12</sup> GAL, S. II, 189. In 1975, all of the manuscripts of the Āṣafiyya Library were transferred to the Andhra Pradesh Government Oriental Manuscripts Library and Research Institute, located on the campus of the Osmania University. See Omar Khalidi, "A Guide to Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and Urdu Manuscript Libraries in India," *MELA Notes* 75-76 (Fall 2002-Spring 2003), esp. 8-9.

for easy understanding of ambiguous words. Variant readings are given for passages that are unclear.<sup>13</sup>

In his *Kitāb Bahjat al-‘Ābidīn bi Tarjamat Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Aṣr Jalāl al-Dīn*,<sup>14</sup> al-Shādhilī<sup>15</sup> quotes al-Suyūṭī as saying: “...Generally speaking, I think little of logic. Then I came across statements by leading scholars censuring it and a *fatwā* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ against it. As a result I became averse to it completely. Therefore, I wrote a quire [of a work] which I entitled *al-Ghayth al-Mughriq fī Tahrim al-Manṭiq*.”<sup>16</sup> This statement suggests that al-Suyūṭī composed a work on logic other than QM. In fact, this *al-Ghayth al-Mughriq* is identical with QM. That he did not write another work on the same subject becomes clear from the fact that he does not mention *al-Ghayth al-Mughriq* in either his *al-Taḥadduth*<sup>17</sup> or his *Ḥusn al-Muḥādara*,<sup>18</sup> nor does he mention other works dealing with the same subject. In the introduction to SM, for instance, al-Suyūṭī writes: “Long ago, in the year 867 or 868 [H], I composed a book on the condemnation of the study of logic, which I called “*al-Qawl al-Mushriq*.” In it I included statements made by learned men of Islam who condemned it.”<sup>19</sup> Al-Shādhilī also quotes al-Suyūṭī as

<sup>13</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. P. Sj. van Koningsveld of Leiden University, who provided me with a copy of this transcription.

<sup>14</sup> Ms. Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, 4436, 10, 4574 (2). I would like to thank Cara Williams of this Library, who kindly provided me with a copy of this manuscript.

<sup>15</sup> ‘Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad al-Shādhilī was al-Suyūṭī’s closest disciple and one of his biographers. Al-Suyūṭī gave him the *khirqā* (the sufi mantle) signifying acceptance into the *silsila* and denoting that al-Shādhilī was an authorized practitioner and instructor of mystical teaching. See E. M. Sertain, *Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī: Biography and Background* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 34, 49.

<sup>16</sup> Text: “... *fā ‘zdaraytu al-manṭiq jumlatan thumma waqaftu ‘alā kalām al-‘ulamā’ fī dhammihī wa-mā aftā bihī ibn al-ṣalāḥ fa-miltu ‘an al-manṭiq kulla ‘l-mayl fa allaftu kurrāsāt al-ghayth al-mughriq fī tahrim al-manṭiq...*” MS, Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, fol. 11b; cf. an appendix in al-Suyūṭī’s *Kitāb al-Taḥadduth bi Ni‘mati ‘llāh*, ed. E.M. Sertain (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘at al-‘Arabiyya al-Ḥadītha), 241.

<sup>17</sup> An autobiographical work in which al-Suyūṭī lists all his writings, *al-Taḥadduth*, 105-36; he refers to QM on p. 114.

<sup>18</sup> In his *Ḥusn al-Muḥādara fī Akhbār Miṣr wa’l-Qāhira* (Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Mawsū‘āt, 1903, 159), al-Suyūṭī refers only to QM, which is listed as one of the works dealing with jurisprudence.

<sup>19</sup> See al-Suyūṭī’s introduction to *Ṣawn al-Manṭiq wa’l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa’l-Kalām*, ed. ‘Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār (Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Sa‘āda, 1947), 33.

saying that he wrote a treatise against logic when he was eighteen years old: "...If someone fabricates lies to you [about me], know that since my boyhood I have been determined to love the Sunna and Tradition and to abhor the sciences of the ancients, i.e., philosophy and logic. I composed [a work] condemning logic when I was eighteen years old..."<sup>20</sup> Here al-Suyūṭī is clearly referring to QM. *Al-Ghayth al-Mughbriq* may have been an alternative title of the work.

Although some Shī'ī and Mu'tazilī scholars vigorously opposed logic, al-Suyūṭī limits his discussion in QM to Sunni scholars. In his discussion of logic, he does not make a single reference to the Zaydī Ibn al-Wazīr al-Ṣan'ānī (840/1374), who condemned Greek logic and philosophy in his *Tarjīḥ Asālīb al-Qur'ān 'alā Asālīb al-Yūnān*.<sup>21</sup> Similarly, al-Suyūṭī says nothing about the systematic opposition to logic by the Mu'tazilī Ibn al-Shirshīr (d. 293/905) and the Shī'ī Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī (d. ca. 310/922), the author of *al-Radd 'alā Abl al-Manṭiq*.

Al-Suyūṭī's attack on logic in QM was criticised by a number of scholars. Al-Maghīlī<sup>22</sup> wrote him a letter in verse in which he expressed his surprise at the fact that al-Suyūṭī had composed a book

<sup>20</sup> Text: "qāla raḥimahū allāh idhā taqawwalah laka fa \*lam annī mundhu sinīn nashātu alqaytu bi-ḥubbi 'l-sunna wa'l-ḥadīth wa bughḍī 'l-bidā' wa 'ulūm al-awā'il min falsafa wa manṭiq wa allafu fī dhamm al-manṭiq wa anā ibn thamān 'ashrata sanatan..." MS, al-Shādhilī, *Kitāb Bahjat*, fol. 34b.

<sup>21</sup> Madelung suggests that the great savant and the independent *mujtahid* Ibn al-Wazīr al-Ṣan'ānī played a significant role in moderating Zaydī teachings to make them acceptable to Sunnis. Al-Ṣan'ānī's voluminous *al-'Awāṣim wa'l-Qawāsim* represents his defence of Sunni school doctrines and critique of Zaydī teachings. Likewise, Madelung says, al-Ṣan'ānī accepted the Sunni canonical collection of *ḥadīth* as authoritative in religious teaching. Al-Ṣan'ānī favored the neo-Sunni school in an effort to accommodate the religious views and sentiments of the majority of the people who lived under the control of the Zaydī Imamate. The long-lasting Zaydī rule in Yemen (284-382/897-962) is said to have owed much to al-Ṣan'ānī's merit. See *EP*, s.v. Zaydiyya (W. Madelung).

<sup>22</sup> Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Maghīlī al-Tilimsānī, a reformist *faqīh* widely known for his persecution of the Jewish community in Touat, was born in 842/1440 in Tilimsān where he studied under a number of scholars, including 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Tha'ālābī (d. 875/1470) and Yaḥyā b. Yadīr al-Tadallīsī (d. 877/1477). He died in 909/1504. He wrote twenty-six works, mainly on *fiqh* and *tawḥīd*. He also was interested in formal logic (*manṭiq*). He composed a treatise on logic entitled *Minaḥ al-Waḥḥāb fī Radd al-Fikr 'alā*

condemning logic and prohibiting people from occupying themselves with it.<sup>23</sup> In this letter, cited in *Tarjamat al-Suyūṭī*<sup>24</sup> by al-Dāwūdī al-Mālikī,<sup>25</sup> al-Maghīlī suggests that logic (*manṭiq*) leads one to the truth and guides the ignorant in his search to find it.<sup>26</sup> Likewise, logic can be used to examine the truth of each utterance made in an argument. One cannot find sound proof, al-Maghīlī continues, except by means of logic.<sup>27</sup> Al-Maghīlī knows that logic is alien to Muslims and borrowed from the infidel Greeks. Nevertheless, due to its benefit in argumentation, he argues that Muslims should make use of logic as a tool.<sup>28</sup>

## 2. JQ: Context and Content

In the introduction to SM, al-Suyūṭī notes that JQ was composed in 888/1482, twenty years after QM: “I related in it [QM] that the *Shaykh al-Islām*, one of the scholars who has reached the degree of *ijtihād*, Taqī al-Dīn b. Taymiyya, composed a book to destroy its foundations, which I had not found at that time. Twenty years later, I still had not found it. Then this year, when I was told that God had conferred upon me the rank of *Mujtahid*, someone mentioned

---

*al-Ṣawāb*, which was widely studied in West Africa. See *EP*, s.v. al-Maghīlī (J.O. Hunwick).

<sup>23</sup> Text: “*wa kataba ilā ṣāhib al-tarjama ‘ālim al-mamlaka al-takrūriyya tāj al-dīn abū ‘l-faḍl muḥammad ibn ‘abd al-karīm al-tilimsānī abyāt yata’ajjabu fihā minḥ ḥaythu allafa kitāb fi dhamm al-manṭiq wa’l-nahy ‘an al-ishtighāl bih...*” See al-Dāwūdī al-Mālikī, *Tarjamat al-Suyūṭī*, Wetzstein I, 20 (abbr. WE, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin), fol. 70b-72a.

<sup>24</sup> WE I, 20, fol. 70b-72a in Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Hans Kurio of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, who provided me with a copy of this manuscript. The manuscript, which has 31 lines, is written in a clear hand and has no lacunae. This poetic correspondence on the legal status of logic can be found in Aḥmad Bābā al-Tinbukū, *Nayl al-Ibtihāj bi-Taṭrīz al-Dībāj*, printed on the margins of Ibn Farḥūn, *al-Dībāj al-Mudhahhab fi Ma’rifat A’yān al-Madhhab* (Cairo: Maṭba’at al-Sa’āda, 1329/1911), 330-2.

<sup>25</sup> Al-Dāwūdī was one of al-Suyūṭī’s students and biographers. On one occasion, al-Suyūṭī commissioned him to supervise his books and to be responsible for lending to the visitors books housed in the al-Azhar’s Mosque-library. See Sartain, *Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī*, 72, 111.

<sup>26</sup> al-Mālikī, *Tarjama*, fol. 71a.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

that one of the conditions for *ijtihād* is knowledge of the art of logic. He claimed that I lacked this condition. The poor fellow did not understand that I know it better than those who claim to know and defend it. I know the principles of its foundations, the insights based thereon, as well as the leading logicians of today, with the exception of our very learned teacher, Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Kāfiyājī [d. 879/1475]. Thus I looked for Ibn Taymiyya's book, till I found it. I saw that he called it *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī al-Radd 'alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān*. In it, he brilliantly demonstrates his intention to destroy its foundations one by one, while explaining the weaknesses of its principles. I therefore summarized it in a little composition which I entitled *Jahd al-Qariḥa fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīḥa*.<sup>29</sup>

### 3. SM: Context and Content

There is no doubt that SM was composed after JQ. This conclusion is based on al-Suyūṭī's own report in SM (see above). Al-Suyūṭī complains, however, that many charlatans (viz., his opponents) asked him to explain why logic is prohibited; the sources on which Ibn Ṣalāḥ relied in his legal decision, etc.<sup>30</sup> In response, al-Suyūṭī said: "Thus, I decided to compose an elaborate book [to prohibit logic,] following the course of *ijtihād*, revealing the truth, in which I explain the correctness of what Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ claimed in relation to the prohibition of [the study of logic] to the aforementioned people. Then, when I began [to compose the book], I felt compelled to mention statements made by leading scholars prohibiting the study of theology. Because of the intricate connection between the two [viz., theology and logic,] I entitled the book *Ṣawn al-Manṭiq wa'l-Kalām 'an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa'l-Kalām* (the Defence of [Islamic] Logic and Theology against the Art of [Greek] Logic and Theology)), but only God enables us to reach our goal."<sup>31</sup>

In SM, al-Suyūṭī sometimes relies on JQ. He also quotes verses by Ibn al-Qushayrī, cited by Ibn Taymiyya in his *Naṣīḥa*:

<sup>29</sup>) Al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣawn*, 33-4.

<sup>30</sup>) Al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣawn*, 33.

<sup>31</sup>) Al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣawn*, 33-6.

We severed the ties of brotherhood with those stricken  
By the malady of the book of *al-Shifā'*

They then died while following the religion of Aristotle  
And we lived according to the Religion of the Chosen One.<sup>32</sup>

According to al-Suyūṭī, Ibn Taymiyya also said: "The Greeks were infidel polytheists who worshipped the planets and idols; they were much worse than the Jews and the Christians after the Greeks abrogated and altered [the true religion]."<sup>33</sup>

In SM, al-Suyūṭī adopts the persona of a systematic historian, drawing our attention to the fact that logic and theology were opposed by distinguished scholars of different generations. In his discussion of Muslim opposition to logic, al-Suyūṭī arranges his argument systematically: First, he deals with the origin of logic; then he discusses its transmission to the religious community of Islam; he continues by discussing the connection between *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *uṣūl al-dīn*, on the one hand, and between *uṣūl al-dīn* and logic on the other. Finally, he lists the names of the scholars who opposed logic, starting with al-Shāfi'i and ending with Ibn Taymiyya.

The background to the composition of SM is clarified in *al-Taḥadduth*, which testifies to al-Suyūṭī's ambition to attain the level of *ijtihād*. Since, according to his opponents, logic is a necessary condition for being a *mujtahid*, he must prove to them that he is well-versed in logic and the principles of its foundation. However, he feels compelled to follow the course of his predecessors who prohibited people from occupying themselves with logic. This is why he composed a work condemning the study of logic.<sup>34</sup>

In SM, al-Suyūṭī cites the following works that deal explicitly with opposition to logic: The debate between Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfi (d. 368/979) and Mattā b. Yūnus (d. 328/940)<sup>35</sup> and *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-*

<sup>32</sup> W. B. Hallaq, *Ibn Taymiyya Against the Greek Logicians*, translation with an introduction and notes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 173.

<sup>33</sup> W. B. Hallaq, *Ibn Taymiyya*, 173; al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣawn*, 37-8.

<sup>34</sup> Mufti Ali, "Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī against Logic and Kalām: Analysis and Significance of *Ṣawn al-Manṭiq wa'l-Kalām 'an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa'l-Kalām*," *Hamdard Islamicus*, XXVIII, 2 (2005), 25.

<sup>35</sup> D.S. Margoliouth edited the Arabic text of the debate and translated it into English, "The Discussion between Abū Bishr Matta and Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfi on the Merits of Logic

*Īmān fī Radd 'alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān* by Ibn Taymiyya. The *Fatāwā Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fī 'l-Tafsīr wa'l-Ḥadīth wa'l-Uṣūl wa'l-'aqā'id* deals only incidentally with the resistance to logic.

Why does al-Suyūṭī base himself exclusively on the aforementioned works? Why didn't he use works against logic, such as *Tarjīh Asālib al-Qur'ān 'alā Asālib al-Yūnān* by the Zaydī Ibn al-Wazīr al-Ṣan'ānī who, according to al-Nashshār, was heavily influenced by Ibn Taymiyya;<sup>36</sup> the *Miftāḥ Dār al-Sa'āda*<sup>37</sup> by the Ḥanbalī Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1351), or *Kasr al-Manṭiq* by the Shī'ī Abū 'l-Najā' al-Farīd?

Two explanations come to mind: (1) Al-Suyūṭī had at his disposal only the treatises against logic discussed in SM; (2) as an apologist, he needed to refine his arguments by selecting his sources in such a way as to convince his opponents. The second explanation is the more likely one, for two reasons.

(a) In his autobiographical work, *al-Taḥadduth bi-Ni'mati 'llāh*, al-Suyūṭī maintains that all the *mujaddids* of preceding centuries, with the exception of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz,<sup>38</sup> were Shāfi'īs: Al-Shāfi'ī, Abū 'l-'Abbās b. al-Surayj, Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarā'inī, Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, the *Shaykh* Taqī al-Dīn b. Daqīq al-'Īd, and Sirāj al-Dīn al-Bulqinī.<sup>39</sup> This is confirmed by

---

and Grammar," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London: 1905), 79-130. The text of this discussion can also be found in *al-Imtā' wa'l-Mu'ānasa*, ed. Aḥmad Amīn and Aḥmad al-Zayn (Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta'lif, 1953), I, 107-28.

<sup>36</sup> 'Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār, *Manābij al-Baḥth 'inda Mufakkiri al-Islām* (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1978), 223.

<sup>37</sup> Although al-Suyūṭī does not mention this work in SM, he deals with it in his biographical work, *Bughyat al-Wu'āt*, when discussing its author. See al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-Wu'āt*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda, 1326/1908), 25.

<sup>38</sup> In asserting the central role of Shafi'ism among the *mujaddids*, al-Suyūṭī suggests that 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, the first *mujaddid*, was, like al-Shāfi'ī, a member of the Prophet's family (*min āli rasūl allāh*). See al-Suyūṭī, *al-Taḥadduth*, 217.

<sup>39</sup> Text: "*Wa-wajadnā jamī'a man qīla innahū mab'ūth fī ra's kulli mi'a mimman tamadhbaba bi-madhab al-shāfi'ī wa-inqādi li-qawliḥ, 'alimnā annahū al-imām al-mab'ūth alladhī 'staqarra amr al-nās 'alā qawliḥ, wa-bu'itha ba'dah fī ra's kulli mi'a man yuqarrir madhabah.*" See al-Suyūṭī, *al-Taḥadduth*, 218; This topic is dealt with by I. Goldziher in "Zur Charakteristik Gēlāl ud-dīn us-Sujūṭī's und seiner literarischen Thätigkeit," *Gesammelte Schriften* (1967), I, 52-73.

Hallaq, who suggests that virtually all of the *mujaddids* were Shāfi'īs.<sup>40</sup>

(b) It is noteworthy that eleven of the thirteen authors whose works are abridged in SM were affiliated with the Shāfi'ī school.<sup>41</sup>

In the composition of SM, al-Suyūṭī says: "Thus, I decided to compose an elaborate book, following the course of *ijtihād*, revealing the truth, in which I explain the correctness of what Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ claimed in relating the prohibition [of the study of logic] to the aforementioned people."<sup>42</sup>

#### 4. The *Fatwā*: Context and Content

That the *Fatwā* was composed after JQ and SM is clearly indicated in the following statement by al-Suyūṭī: "... and [then followed] al-Taqī b. Taymiyya, who composed a large volume to condemn logic and destroy its foundations entitled *Naṣīḥat Dhawī 'l-Īmān fī 'l-Radd 'alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān*, which I have summarized into one-third of its original size. [Also] I have composed a volume condemning logic, in which I have collected statements against it made by the learned men..."<sup>43</sup> The abridgement of Ibn Taymiyya's *Naṣīḥa* into one-third of its original size is JQ; and the volume composed by al-Suyūṭī against logic, of course, can only be SM,<sup>44</sup> in which al-Suyūṭī marshals the arguments against logic of more than thirty-six scholars of various juridical schools.

<sup>40</sup> W. B. Hallaq, *The Gate of Ijtihad: A Study in Islamic Legal History*, Ph.D. Diss., University of Washington (University Microfilms International, 1983), 79; "Was the Gate of Ijtihad Closed," *International Journal for Middle Eastern Studies*, XVI, 1984, 28.

<sup>41</sup> The two non-Shāfi'īs are al-Harawī (Ḥanbalī) and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Barr (Mālikī).

<sup>42</sup> Al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣawn*, 35.

<sup>43</sup> Text: "...wa'l-taqī b. taymiyya wa-allaḥa fī dhammih wa-naṣṣa qawā'idah mujallad kabīran sammāh naṣīḥat dhawī 'l-īmān fī 'l-radd 'alā manṭiq al-yūnān wa-qad ikhtaṣartuh fī naḥw ihulth ḥajmih wa-allaftu fī dhamm al-manṭiq mujallad saqtu fih nuṣūṣ al-'imma fī dhālika..." *Fatwā* of al-Suyūṭī, Dār al-Kutub, Majāmi' Qawwāla 25, fol. 328a.

<sup>44</sup> Al-Suyūṭī refers to QM as a quire of paper (*kurrāsa*). SM is a flat volume.

## Prosopographical Data: Opposition to Logic in the Works of al-Suyūṭī

Al-Suyūṭī's discussion of Muslim opposition to logic suggests that he applied what Humphrey and Van Ess call a prosopographical approach. He attempts to establish as many facts as possible about all the individuals considered to have been connected to a particular subject, and then to assemble these facts into a collective portrait.<sup>45</sup> The goal of this approach is to provide what Van Ess calls "*ein statistisches Bild*."<sup>46</sup> In his four works, al-Suyūṭī endeavours to persuade his readers that logic was opposed by many leading scholars. Here follows a chronologically arranged survey of these scholars.

No.	Name	Year of Death	Legal Aff.	Residence	Work(s) Cited
1.	Abū Ḥanīfa <sup>47</sup>	150/768	Eponym	Baghdad	
2.	al-Shāfi'ī <sup>48</sup>	203/820	Eponym	Egypt	
3.	Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfi	368/979	Ḥanafī	Baghdad	<i>al-Munāzara</i>
4.	Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī	383/994	Mālikī	Mecca	<i>Qūt al-Qulūb</i>
5.	Ibn Abī Zayd	ca.386/997	Mālikī		<i>al-Risāla</i>

<sup>45</sup> R.S. Humphreys, *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991), 198.

<sup>46</sup> Joseph van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra, Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), I, ix.

<sup>47</sup> Abū Ḥanīfa's condemnation of logic can be inferred from his explicit derogatory remark on philosophy, about which al-Suyūṭī quotes al-Harawī as having said: "Ṭayyib b. Aḥmad told me—Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn told us—Abu 'l-Qāsim b. Matawayh told us, relating the fact that Ḥāmid b. Rustam spoke to us, that al-Ḥasan b. al-Muṭī' had related about the fact that Ibrāhīm b. Rustam, on the authority of ... said: I said to Abū Ḥanīfa: What do you think about the fact that people argue with each other about forms and bodies? Then he said: [these are] the utterances of the philosophers. You have to follow the tradition and the course of the ancestors, beware of any novelties because they are innovations." See al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣawn*, 66.

<sup>48</sup> Al-Suyūṭī quotes al-Shāfi'ī as having said that the ignorance of the people and their controversies are only caused by their leaving the language of the Arabs and their inclination to the language of Aristotle. According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Shāfi'ī further suggests that people's neglect of the language of the Arabs and their inclination to the language of Aristotle brought about the emergence of the dispute on the createdness of the Koran, the negation of the divine vision and other innovations. See al-Suyūṭī, *Ṣawn*, 48.

No.	Name	Year of Death	Legal Aff.	Residence	Work(s) Cited
6.	Abū 'l-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥaṣṣār	392/1003	Mālikī		
7.	Abū 'l-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥabīb al-Nisabūrī	406/1016	Mālikī	Nishapur	
8.	Ibn 'Abd al-Barr	463/1071	Mālikī	Cordoba	<i>Ithāf al-Nubalā'</i>
9.	Abū Naṣr b. al-Qushayrī	469/1077	Shāfi'ī	Nishapur	-
10.	Abū 'l-Walid al-Bājī	474/1081	Mālikī	Almeira	-
11.	Ibn al-Ṣabbāgh	477/1085	Shāfi'ī	Nishapur	<i>al-Shāmil</i>
12.	al-Juwaynī	478/1085	Shāfi'ī	Nishapur	
13.	Naṣr al-Maqdisī	490/1098	Shāfi'ī	Damascus	<i>al-Ḥujja</i>
14.	al-Ghazālī <sup>49</sup>	505/1111	Shāfi'ī	Ṭūs	<i>Ihyā' &amp; al-Tafrīqa</i>
15.	Abū Bakr al-Turṭūshī	520/1127	Mālikī	Damascus	
16.	Abū Bakr b. al-'Arabī	543/1148	Mālikī	Seville	
17.	Al-'Aṭṭār ('Aqbada)	569/1174	Shāfi'ī	Hamadhān	
18.	Ibn 'Asākir	571/1176	Shāfi'ī	Damascus	<i>Tā'rikh</i>
19.	al-Silafī	576/1180	Shāfi'ī	Alexandria	<i>Mu'jam al-Safar</i>
20.	Ibn al-Jawzī	597/1201	Ḥanbalī	Baghdad	<i>Talbis Iblis</i>
21.	'Imād al-Dīn b. Yūnus	608/1212	Shāfi'ī		
22.	Ibn Jubayr al-Kinānī	614/1217	Mālikī	Valencia	<i>al-Rihla</i>
23.	Ibn Bundār	622/1226	Shāfi'ī	Damascus	
24.	al-Rāfi'ī	623/1226-7	Shāfi'ī	Qazwīnī	<i>al-Sharḥ al-Ṣaghīr</i>
25.	al-Ṭībī	624/1228	Shāfi'ī		
26.	Ibn al-Athīr	630/1233	Shāfi'ī	Mosul	
27.	Ibn 'Abd al-Salām	632/1235	Shāfi'ī		
28.	Abū Ḥabīb al-Mālaqī	640/1243	Mālikī	al-Andalus	
29.	Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ	643/1254	Shāfi'ī	Damascus	<i>Fatāwā</i>
30.	Abū Shāma	665/1268	Shāfi'ī	Damascus	<i>al-Tawakkul</i>
31.	Abū 'Āmir b. Rabī'	666/1268	Mālikī		
32.	al-Nawawī	676/1277	Shāfi'ī	Damascus	<i>Ṭabaqāt, Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab, al-Rawḍa</i>
33.	'Abd al-Sātīr	679/1281	Ḥanbalī	Damascus	
34.	Ibn Abī Ḥamza	695/1296	Mālikī	Cairo	

<sup>49</sup> Referring to *al-Mustafā*, al-Suyūṭī quotes al-Ghazālī as having said: “*hādhibihī muqaddimat al-'ulūm kullihā wa-man lā yuḥīṭu bihā fa-lā thiqaṭa labū bi 'ulūmihī aṣlan* [Logic] is the introduction to all sciences. One who is not well-versed in it, his authority in the sciences is not reliable at all.”). Basing himself on *Naṣīḥat al-Muslim al-Mushfiq li-man Ubṭuliya bi Ḥubb 'Ilm al-Manṭiq* by Sirāj al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī (d. 750/1349), al-Suyūṭī, however, convincingly argues that al-Ghazālī had retreated from this opinion. See al-Suyūṭī's statements in QM, p. 1, l. 22-3: “*wa-qad raja'a 'an hādha 'l-qawl kamā naqalahu 'l-ḥāfiẓ sirāj al-dīn al-qazwīnī...*”

No.	Name	Year of Death	Legal Aff.	Residence	Work(s) Cited
35.	Ibn Daqīq al-ʿĪd	702/1302	Shāfiʿī	Cairo	
36.	al-Adhraʿī	703/1303	Shāfiʿī	Aleppo	
37.	Al-Sharaf al-Dimyāṭī	705/1306	Shāfiʿī	Egypt	
38.	Saʿd al-Dīn al-Ḥārithī	710/1311	Ḥanbalī	Egypt	
39.	al-Sharaf al-Bayḍāwī	716/1317	Shāfiʿī	Egypt	<i>Hāshiya</i>
40.	Ibn Rashīd al-Sibtī	721/1322	Mālikī	Fez	
41.	Ibn Taymiyya	729/1329	Ḥanbalī	Damascus	<i>al-Radd</i>
42.	Kamāl al-Dīn al-Marāghī	c. 730/1330	Shāfiʿī	Damascus	
43.	Burhān al-Dīn al-Jaʿbarī	732/1332	Shāfiʿī		
44.	Zayn al-Dīn al-Subkī	735/1335	Shāfiʿī	Damascus	
45.	Zayn al-Dīn b. al-Muraḥḥil	d. 738/1338	Shāfiʿī	Damascus	
46.	Ibn Kathīr	744/1344	Shāfiʿī	Damascus	<i>Taʾrikh</i>
47.	Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī <sup>50</sup>	744/1344	Shāfiʿī	Damascus	
48.	Abū Ḥayyān al-Gharnāṭī	745/1344	Shāfiʿī	Granada	<i>al-Nuḍār</i>
49.	Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ṣafādī	746/1345	Shāfiʿī	Damascus	<i>Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-ʿAjam</i>
50.	al-Udfuwwī	747/1347	Shāfiʿī	Cairo	<i>Kitāb al-Farāʿid</i>
51.	al-Dhababī	748/1348	Shāfiʿī	Damascus	<i>Siyar, Muʿjam and Taʾrikh</i>
52.	Sirāj al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī	750/1349	Ḥanafī	Iraq	<i>al-Ḥaṭṭ, Naṣībat al-Muslim</i>
53.	Sharaf al-Dīn al-Munāwī	757/1357	Shāfiʿī	Egypt	
54.	ʿIzz al-Dīn b. Jamāʿa	767/1366	Shāfiʿī	Egypt	
55.	Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī <sup>51</sup>	771/1370	Shāfiʿī	Damascus	
56.	al-Asnawī	772/1371	Shāfiʿī	Egypt	<i>Ṭabaqāt</i>
57.	Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī	794/1392	Shāfiʿī	Egypt	
58.	Ibn al-Munayyar	803/1401	Shāfiʿī	Alexandria	
59.	Walī al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī	826/1423	Shāfiʿī	Iraq	
60.	Sharaf al-Dīn b. al-Muqri	837/1434	Shāfiʿī	Yemen	

<sup>50</sup> Al-Suyūṭī also refers to al-Subkī as an opponent of logic. When he was asked about the study of logic, al-Suyūṭī reports, al-Subkī said: “Occupying oneself with the Book, the Sunna and jurisprudence is of greater importance than occupying oneself with [logic].” See al-Suyūṭī’s statement in QM, 3: “*wa-suʿila ʿanh al-shaykh taqī al-dīn al-subkī fa-qāla yanbaghi an yuqaddama ʿalā dhālika al-ishṭighāl bi ʿl-kitāb waʿl-sunna waʿl-fiqh...*”

<sup>51</sup> According to al-Suyūṭī, Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī states that the study of logic might be allowable on the condition that one first mastered the religious sciences and that one had reached a reputation as a *faqīh* or *mufīṭī*. For those with less background in the religious sciences, the study of logic must be declared prohibited (*ḥaram*). See QM, 13; cf., Goldziher, “Attitude,” 207.

No.	Name	Year of Death	Legal Aff.	Residence	Work(s) Cited
61.	al-Malawī	841/1438	-	Egypt	
62.	'Alam al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī	868/1461	Shāfi'ī	Egypt	
63.	Taqī al-Dīn al-Shumunnī	872/1468	Mālikī	Egypt	
64.	Kamāl al-Dīn al-Kāmili	874/1470	Shāfi'ī	Egypt	
65.	'Alā' al-Dīn al-Makkī	ca.880/1476	Shāfi'ī	Egypt	
66.	Ibn al-Ṣadr al-Balbīsī	904/1499	Shāfi'ī	Egypt	<i>al-Tanbihāt</i>
67.	Ibn 'Iṣām al-Asadī	-			
68.	Abū 'l-'Abbās al-Tuwaynī	-			

This information can be summarized as follows: First, although more than half (37) of the scholars who opposed logic lived between 600/1200 and 799/1399, a statistically relevant number of scholars who did not live in this period also opposed logic: eight in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries; seven in the 6<sup>th</sup>, three in the 4<sup>th</sup>, two in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, and one in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. Second, logic was opposed in regions as far apart as Valencia, Fez, Aleppo, Iraq, and Mecca. The most significant opposition to logic was found in Egypt and Syria. Third, most of those who opposed logic were Shāfi'īs (43), although Mālikīs (14), Ḥanbalīs (4), and Ḥanafīs (1) also opposed this discipline. Fourth, most of the written sources used by al-Suyūṭī when discussing opposition to logic are *fiqh* books, their commentaries and super-commentaries (nos. 11, 24, 29, 30, 32, 39, 51 and 66), and biographical dictionaries and works on history (nos. 8, 18, 19, 22, 48, 49, 51, and 56). But he also relies on works dealing specifically with the refutation of logic (nos. 41 and 52), and on those dealing with *kalām* and *taṣawwuf* (nos. 4, 14 and 20). Al-Suyūṭī mentions two works (presumably no longer extant, no. 52) which deal exclusively with opposition to logic.

Fifth, al-Suyūṭī qualifies some scholars (nos. 30, 32, 41, 47, 56) as *mujtabids*;<sup>52</sup> three (nos. 14, 19 and 35) as *mujaddids* (renewers of the religion);<sup>53</sup> four as Chief Judges (*qāḍī al-quḍāt*) (nos. 54,

<sup>52</sup>) Sartain, *Jalāl al-Dīn*, 65.

<sup>53</sup>) Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Taḥadduth*, 218, 222.

53, 62, 63);<sup>54</sup> one as *aqḍā al-quḍāt* (no. 44);<sup>55</sup> and one (no. 61) as a mystic. As for the rest, he and/or the biographers refer to them as the most knowledgeable persons of their time in *Tafsīr*, Tradition and Jurisprudence (no. 29),<sup>56</sup> the “seal of the *Ḥāfiẓs*” (no. 51),<sup>57</sup> the greatest traditionalist in al-Andalus (no. 16),<sup>58</sup> the great *Ḥāfiẓ* and traditionalist of Iraq (no. 52),<sup>59</sup> and the leading scholar of Yemen (no. 60).<sup>60</sup> Three members of the Subkī family (nos. 44, 47, 55), regarded by Laoust as the most eminent representatives of Syro-Egyptian Shafi‘ism,<sup>61</sup> are referred to by al-Suyūṭī in his discussion against logic in QM.

Sixth, al-Suyūṭī also draws our attention to a number of Andalusian sources against logic (nos. 8, 22, 48). One, *al-Nuḍār*, is valuable not only because of the biography of its author, al-Gharnāṭī and his opposition to logic, but also for the history of al-Andalus. This work, according to al-Suyūṭī, treats al-Gharnāṭī’s early life, his academic activities, his teachers and his flight from Granada. Finally, al-Suyūṭī clearly refers mostly to Sunni scholars of the Shāfi‘ī school of law, despite the fact that some non-Sunni scholars opposed logic.

## Conclusion

In his 2004 article, el-Rouayheb has challenged Goldziher’s argument that opposition to logic was never predominant among Muslim Sunni scholars. Based on his study of some discussions concerning the

<sup>54</sup> Al-Suyūṭī, *Bughya*, 25-7; al-Suyūṭī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāẓ*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad ‘Umar (Cairo: Maktabat Wahba, 1973), 531; QM, fol. 12.

<sup>55</sup> Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyya al-Kubrā*, ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥuluw and Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ṭanāḥī, 10 vols. (Cairo: ‘Isā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1976), X, 89.

<sup>56</sup> Al-Suyūṭī, *Ṭabaqāt*, 500.

<sup>57</sup> Al-Suyūṭī, *Ṭabaqāt*, 517.

<sup>58</sup> Brockelmann, *GAL*, I:368; al-Suyūṭī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn*, ed. Albertus Meursing (Leyden: S. & J. Luchtmans, 1839), 808-9.

<sup>59</sup> Al-Suyūṭī, *Ṭabaqāt*, 526.

<sup>60</sup> Al-Suyūṭī, *Bughya*, 193-4.

<sup>61</sup> See *EP*, s.v. Ibn Taymiyya (H. Laoust).

status of logic by Sunnī scholars in the period between 1500 and 1800, el-Rouayheb concludes that “hostility to logic was indeed a minority view in scholarly circles throughout this period.” Since “many of the scholars of this period regularly invoked earlier authorities in support of their position,” el-Rouayheb says, Goldziher’s suggestion that hostility to logic was a predominant feature of Sunnī scholarship, especially between the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, is no longer defensible.

The study of four works composed by al-Suyūṭī shows that hostility to logic did become a predominant feature of Sunni thinking, especially during the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries. This is based on the fact that the authorities who were referred to by al-Suyūṭī as having been opposed to logic are prominent and influential scholars. A prosopographical study of the opponents of logic mentioned by al-Suyūṭī reveals that logic was condemned by Sunni scholars in regions as far apart as Valencia, Fez, Aleppo, Iraq, and Mecca. The most significant opposition to logic was found in Egypt and Syria.

The result of this investigation confirms Goldziher’s argument that the resistance to logic started already in the 2<sup>nd</sup>/8<sup>th</sup> century and increased in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries.