

Said Halim Pasha



Analecta Isisiana: Ottoman and Turkish Studies

A co-publication with The Isis Press, Istanbul, the series consists of collections of thematic essays focused on specific themes of Ottoman and Turkish studies are brought together in *Analecta Isisiana*. These scholarly volumes address important issues throughout Turkish history, offering in a single volume the accumulated insights of a single author over a career of research on the subject.

Said Halim Pasha

Ottoman Statesman and Islamist Thinker
(1865-1921)

Ahmet Seyhun



The Isis Press, Istanbul



gorgias press

2010

Gorgias Press LLC, 954 River Road, Piscataway, NJ, 08854, USA

www.gorgiaspress.com

Copyright © 2010 by The Isis Press, Istanbul

Originally published in 2003

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of The Isis Press, Istanbul.

2010 a

ISBN 978-1-61719-097-1

Printed in the United States of America

Ahmet Şeyhun was born in 1958 in Istanbul. He received a law degree from the University of Istanbul in 1986. After practising law in the same city, he obtained a Master's degree in History at the Boğaziçi University. He earned his Ph.d. in Islamic Studies at McGill University in 2002.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	6
Note on Transliteration	6
Introduction	7
I. Islamism	15
II. The Life and Political Career of Said Halim Pasha Set in a Historical Context	45
III. The Social and Political Thought of Said Halim Pasha	129
Conclusion	163
Bibliography	170

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is based on a Ph.D. thesis submitted at the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University.

First of all, I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Üner Turgay, my thesis supervisor, for his guidance, comments and criticisms. In every stage of my dissertation his concern with the improvement of my work had been consistent and his suggestions constructive. This work could not have been completed without the valuable contribution of Rukiye and Sinan Kunalalp who kindly provided me the writings of Said Halim Pasha in the form of manuscripts and typescripts from the family archives. I would like to thank Princess Zeyneb Halim who has kindly granted me an interview and provided me with some valuable information on her uncle Said Halim Pasha. Thanks are also due to Princess Nîmet Halim Celâlođlu who kindly allowed the use of family photographs. I also thank Ibrahim Zaky who helped me with my Arabic transliteration. I would also like to express my eternal gratitude to my family: without the undying support of my parents Sevin and Kemal Şeyhun and my sister Yeşim Çorluhan, I would not have reached this stage. Finally, this work would have never seen the light of day without the loving support of Brenda.

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

In my dissertation, I used modern Turkish spelling for all Ottoman and modern Turkish terms, names and book titles. For Arabic terms of non-Ottoman context, I followed the system of Arabic transliteration accepted by the Institute of Islamic Studies. For Ottoman cities in the Balkans and Anatolia I preferred using the Turkish names like İzmir, Edirne, Selanik, Üsküb, İşkodra. For Ottoman cities in the Arab Middle East I preferred using the established English names like Cairo, Tripoli, Damascus and Mecca.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to present a critical account of the political life and thought of Prince Said Halim Pasha (1865-1921) against the political and intellectual background of his times.

So why study a figure such as Said Halim Pasha? The answer lies in his important and unique standing among Muslim intellectuals in his field. The originality of Said Halim Pasha's thought can be found in its skillful combination of revivalist and modernist ideas. At the core of his ideology is the revivalist principle of islamization, which in turn was inspired by the tenets of medieval Muslim thinker Ibn Taymiyya.

A junior member of the Egyptian khedivial family, Said Halim was raised in his father's mansion in Yeniköy on the Bosphorus and sent to Europe for advanced studies. Upon his return to Istanbul he secretly became a member of the Young Turk Movement. Nevertheless, although the Young Turks opposed the policies of Sultan Abdülhamid II (1876-1909), the young prince served as a high-ranking official in the Hamidian regime and received gratifications and honors from the sultan. When Abdülhamid's secret police finally discovered his links with the Young Turk opposition, Said Halim had again to face exile: he was first sent to Egypt and from there he went on to Europe.

While in Europe he took part in the Young Turk opposition to Hamidian rule. After the proclamation of the Constitution in July 1908, Said Halim returned to Istanbul and was given the important positions of senator and President of the State Council. In January 1913 he became the minister of foreign affairs in Mahmud Şevket Pasha's cabinet and was appointed shortly afterwards as grand vizir in June 1913 following the latter's assassination.

Said Halim Pasha's appointment was of special significance because it was for the first time since the 1908 Revolution that a Unionist had attained the grand vizirate and headed a cabinet formed of largely of Unionist members. Prior to this and following the fall of the Hamidian regime, the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) had for the most part dominated Ottoman politics. But rather than involve itself directly in the cabinet, it had chosen to exert power through its parliamentary majority. The reasons for the Unionists'

hesitation to participate in cabinet included their political inexperience and humble social origins. In a society where only experienced and cultivated bureaucrats were considered politically trustworthy, CUP members who lacked these qualities were essentially barred from the executive branch of government. This allowed figures like Said Pasha and Kamil Pasha, who were at the service of the autocratic sultan and closely associated with the ancien régime, to maintain their authority by playing pivotal political roles.

The appointment of Said Halim to the grand vizirate constituted a break with this tradition: the new grand vizir was not an old, well-settled, well connected and experienced statesman coming from the *Bab-ı Ali* tradition, nor was he a high ranking military figure like his predecessor, Mahmud Şevket Pasha. Rather, he was a high-born, princely intellectual and idealist who was completely committed to the cause of the Young Turks. He was also a skillful diplomat who took a strong stand against the Great Powers' plans of partitioning the Ottoman Empire.

A respected statesman and an able diplomat, Said Halim was first and foremost an influential thinker, one of the most outspoken representatives of the Islamist school during the Second Constitutional Period (1908-1920). His stance within the Islamist school could be qualified as modernist-revivalist: modernist, not only because of his modern Western style discourse but also because of the many Western-originated institutions and concepts (i.e. parliament and democracy) which figure in his political theory; revivalist because of his advocacy of a return to a pristine Islam. In his famous work entitled *Islamization* (better known under its Turkish title *İslamlaşmak*), Said Halim proposes a complete Islamization of Muslim societies, including "forgetting" their pre-Islamic past and purifying themselves of their pre-Islamic heritage.

Said Halim Pasha's works were written originally in French and most often published in Istanbul and various European capitals between 1910 and 1921. His earliest work—published in Paris—in 1910, bears the ironic title of *Le fanatisme musulman*. In essence it is a tract explaining how Christian Europe's hostility towards the Islamic world since the time of the Crusades caused the economic and technological retardation prevalent in Muslim countries. His second work, *Essai sur les causes de la décadence des peuples musulmans* (published in Istanbul in 1918), also deals with the decline of the Muslim world and is an example of the modernist-revivalist genre that characterized the Muslim decline literature of that period.

Said Halim tended to use the pseudonym Mohammed in the above titles. However, his major work, *Les institutions politiques dans la société musulmane*, which expounds his social and political thought, was published in Rome in 1921 (the year of his assassination by an Armenian militant), under his full name and title: *Le prince Saïd Halim Pacha; ancien Grand-Vézir*. This last work was republished a year later in the journal *Orient et Occident* under the title *Notes pour servir à la réforme de la société musulmane*. An English translation was published in 1967 in Karachi, Pakistan by the Waqf Institution of Begoum Aïsha Bavani under the title *Reform in the Muslim Society*.

Most of Said Halim's works were translated into Ottoman Turkish and appeared during his lifetime in the Islamist-modernist periodical *Sebilürreşad*. Indeed most of the original French versions of these works are existant only in their original hand- and typewritten form and bear the author's annotations.

For the purpose of this study I have relied on the original French versions which no scholar has previously examined. These invaluable sources were generously and kindly provided to me by Rukiye Kunalalp, a member of the family of Said Halim Pasha and include *La crise politique*, which was only partly and inaccurately translated into Turkish for two articles entitled "*Meşrutiyet*" (The Constitutional Regime) and "*Mukallitliklerimiz*" (Our Imitations). In my study, I used both the French original and the Turkish versions comparatively. Other essays are "*La société ottomane*" translated into Turkish under the title "*İçtimai buhranımız*" (Our Society in Crisis); and "Islamization" which enjoyed fame among Islamist intellectuals in its Turkish translation "*İslamlaşmak*."

The political life and thought of Said Halim Pasha have not previously been studied by scholars in any detail. Mustafa Düzdağ's edition of his works using the Turkish title of one of Said Halim's articles, "*Buhranlarımız*," (Our Crises) is merely a modern Turkish adaptation of a work that was already published under the same title in 1335-1338 (1919). A previous edition of this work had also appeared in 1332 (1916). Düzdağ's work also contains also a few pages of biographical notes on Said Halim written by various contemporary figures and by historians. The only study which offers any in-depth analysis of Said Halim's political life is Hanefi Bostan's work entitled *Bir İslamcı Düşünür Said Halim Paşa* (Said Halim Pasha: An Islamist Thinker) (1990). Despite its title, the work does not examine Said Halim's ideas but is instead an account of the life and times of Said Halim.

The topic of Islamism in the late Ottoman Empire has been the object of many scholarly studies over the past forty years. A fundamental work on this topic was written by the late professor Tarık Zafer Tunaya in 1962 and is entitled *İslamcılık Cereyanı* (Islamist Current). It consists of a critical survey of Islamist thought during the Second Constitutional Period (1908-1920), as well as the four decades of Islamist political activity in Republican Turkey. The political and social thought of Said Halim Pasha and other contemporary thinkers including Musa Kazım, Ahmed Naim, Mustafa Sabri and Mehmed Akif (Ersoy) are briefly presented in this study in order to emphasize the continuity between the Islamism of the late Ottoman period and that of the Republican era.

There has recently appeared a more comprehensive account which, although lacking critical perspective is nevertheless valuable. This is İsmail Kara's *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi*, published in three volumes between 1986 and 1989. Kara's work is merely a collection of extracts from the works of the Islamist thinkers of the Second Constitutional Period and Republican era along with short biographies of each thinker. In a more recent study entitled *İslamcıların Siyasi Görüşleri*, published in 1994, Kara endeavored to present the social and political ideas of the Islamist thinkers of the Second Constitutional Period from a critical perspective. Despite its angle, this work remained a general study and could only offer an overall picture of the Islamists' ideas of that period. As far as Said Halim's ideas were concerned, Kara contended himself with investigating a very limited aspect of the pasha's thought and dwelled almost exclusively on Said Halim criticism of the 1908 constitution.

The first critical account of Islamism in the late Ottoman Empire in English was brilliantly but briefly presented by Niyazi Berkes in his important work *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (Montreal, 1963). Here the author also analyzed this and other contemporary social and political currents such as Westernism and Turkism while vividly presenting the ideological debate between these schools. Nevertheless, this work also was intended as a general work on intellectual history of the late Ottoman Empire and therefore could only make some sketchy references to Said Halim's thought besides the ideas of other Islamist intellectuals of his time.

Another interesting study on the Islamic modernism of the Second Constitutional Period was Akşin Somel's M.A thesis. Submitted to the Department of History of the Boğaziçi University, it is limited to the Islamist

thinkers who wrote for the Islamist journal of *Sırat-ı Müstakim*. Somel later published his thesis as an article entitled *Sırat-ı Müstakim: Islamic modernism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1912*, in the *Journal of Middle East Studies* v.1 no.1. Akşin did not include Said Halim Pasha in his study.

For the political and especially diplomatic history of the last decade (1912-1922) of the Ottoman Empire (an especially important facet of this study given Said Halim Pasha's role in the politics of that period, first as minister of foreign affairs (January 1913-October 1915) then as grand vizir (June 1913-February 1917)), I consulted all relevant secondary sources available in Turkish, English and French. One of the most important of these is Ulrich Trumpener's study of the Ottoman involvement in the First World War entitled *Germany and the Ottoman Empire, 1914-1918*. Nevertheless, as rightly pointed out by Feroz Ahmad, the weak point of Trumpener's work is the author's "unfamiliarity with the Turkish side of the story" and his almost exclusive reliance on German diplomatic material.¹ Among the most important of the Turkish sources written during the Republican era is the colossal work by Yusuf Hikmet Bayur entitled *Türk İnkılabı Tarihi* (History of the Turkish Revolution), which draws on all available Ottoman archival materials, as well as relevant European diplomatic sources. I also used the published memoirs and diaries of many Ottoman statesmen from this era including Mahmud Şevket Pasha, Cemal Pasha, Talat Pasha, Ahmed İzzet Pasha and Ali İhsan Sabis Pasha along with those of Palace officials like Tahsin Pasha, Ali Fuad (Türkgeledi) and Halit Ziya (Uşaklıgil), and Mehmet Tevfik (Biren) Beys. I also consulted the memoirs written by religious dignitaries of the empire including Şeyhülislam Mehmed Cemaleddin Efendi and the Armenian patriarch Zaven (the latter shedding important light on the Armenian crisis and tragedy), as well as those of Amir Husayn of Mecca (particularly on the Hijazi revolt), both of which occurred during the grand vizirate of Said Halim Pasha despite his unsuccessful efforts to prevent them. Most important for my study were the political memoirs of Said Halim Pasha written by himself in Rome in the months before his assassination and published in Istanbul in 2001. In addition to the Ottoman sources, I also used the published diplomatic documents of the British, French and Russian governments which cast light on this turbulent period. The memoirs of certain Western diplomats at the Porte at the time of the outbreak of the First World War including French ambassador Maurice Bompard and the United States' ambassador, Henry Morgentau, as well as other contemporary statesmen of the Great Powers like Serge Sazonov (the last Russian foreign minister) and

¹For a detailed criticism of Trumpener's work, see, Feroz Ahmad's book review in *Middle Eastern Studies*, 6 (January 1970), pp. 100-105.

Edward Grey (the British foreign minister) were consulted. During May-June 2001, I conducted a laborious and thorough research in the Ottoman Prime Ministry Archives on the diplomatic activities of Said Halim Pasha and found some very interesting untapped material. I incorporated them into my work. I also had the opportunity of interviewing Princess Zeyneb Halim, niece of Said Halim Pasha, (daughter of Abbas Halim Pasha) in her residence at Salacak, a lovely neighborhood of the Asiatic part of Istanbul. During this interview, Princess Halim provided me with some very valuable information on the private and public life of her uncle Said Halim Pasha.

The political career and thought of Said Halim Pasha cannot be properly examined outside the political and ideological context of his times. Consequently, the second and third chapters of my study focus on the political and ideological developments of the last three decades of the Ottoman Empire. This is done so as to provide the reader with a better understanding of Said Halim's role during this critical period. Indeed as the Ottoman Empire entered its twilight, many competing ideologies began to take shape.

An Islamist thinker, Said Halim was also a loyal Unionist statesman. Despite his ideological differences with secular-minded leaders of the CUP such as Talat and Enver, Said Halim cast his political lot with them. Such actions may appear contradictory; nevertheless, as a fervent champion of Islamic patriotism, Said Halim believed that only the strong leadership of the CUP could reinvigorate and save the Ottoman Empire, the last bulwark of Islam, and preserve it from conquest by aggressive European imperialism which, according to him, was a modern version of the Crusades.

Contrary to the prevailing historical view, Said Halim Pasha was not a mere figurehead of the powerful triumvirate formed by Talat Pasha, Enver Pasha, and Cemal Pasha (actually, it would be more accurate to call it a diarchy, since Cemal Pasha's influence never matched that of Enver and Talat). Instead, Said Halim Pasha served as a counterbalance in the cabinet to the manoeuvres of Enver and Talat. As long as Said Halim remained in power he was an obstacle to the secularizing reforms that the Turkist wing of the CUP was pushing for. For example, two important legislative acts, *The Enactment of the Law of Şeriat Courts Procedure* (an essential move towards unifying the judicial procedure) and *The Codification of the New Family Law*, (which considerably reduced the role of the *Şeriat* in the private lives of Ottoman subjects) could only have been decreed once Said Halim Pasha had resigned

from the grand-vizirate. The laws were signed into force in March 1917, a month after Said Halim's resignation.

As for Said Halim's political thought, it is important to contextualize it within the framework of his political life and within the important intellectual currents of the late Hamidian (1895-1908) and the Second Constitutional (1908-1920) periods. The three main ideologies of this twenty-five year span—Islamism, Turkism, and Westernism—are examined in Chapter Four of this study alongside Said Halim Pasha's rigorous defense of his ideas vis-à-vis Turkist and Westernist writers. My comments focus on his dispute with Ziya Gökalp concerning the impact of national popular and pre-Islamic cultures (*hars*) on the progress and evolution of the Muslim peoples. An examination of this dispute will help us understand the issue of nationalism and Islam which lay at the core of this ideological conflict.¹

¹A collection of Said Halim Pasha's works in Turkish has appeared while the present study was in press. I was therefore unable to use it: *Said Halim Paşa: Bütün Eserleri*, ed. N. Ahmet Özalp, (Istanbul: Anka Yayınları 2003).

CHAPTER ONE: ISLAMISM

By the last quarter of the eighteenth century European colonial powers had succeeded in asserting their military, political and economic supremacy over most non-European societies. Prior to 1775 the Muslim heartlands had rarely been under a direct threat or occupation by a Western power. Indeed until that period, an equilibrium of power existed between the Ottomans, Safavids and Moguls, the three great Muslim empires of Islam, and the expanding Western powers.

This precarious balance was upset during the last decades of the eighteenth century as Muslim empires in central Islamic lands began to lose ground to growing European pressure due to the rising economic and military power of the latter. For example, as a result of a disastrous war with Russia (1768-1774), the Ottoman Empire was forced to sign, on 21 July 1774, the infamous Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca.¹ Among the conditions agreed to by the Ottomans were their being coerced into granting the Russians access to the Black Sea, an economic reserve for the Ottomans until then. Also, they relinquished control of the Crimea, a region largely inhabited by Muslim Tartars (this territory, while having gained its independence through the treaty, was eventually annexed by Russia).

According to Article 2 of the treaty, the Tartars of the Crimea would recognize the Ottoman sultan as the caliph. This clause would later constitute the basis of the Ottoman sultans' claim to the universal Caliphate. The same cannot be said for the sultan's orthodox subjects: while some historians hold that articles 7 and 14 served in the past as a legal basis for an alleged Russian

¹For the Italian version of this treaty (one of the three original languages in which the treaty was written — the other official versions being in Ottoman Turkish and Russian), see Geo. Fred. de Martens, *Recueil de Traités d'alliance, de paix, de trêve, de neutralité, de commerce, de limites, d'échanges etc et de plusieurs autres actes servant à la connaissance des relations étrangères des Puissances et États de l'Europe* (Gottingue: Librairie de Dieterich, 1771-1779). (Hereafter cited as Martens, *Recueil*) See also Gabriel Noradounghian, *Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'Empire Ottoman* (Paris: 1903), vol.1, pp. 351-353. (Hereafter cited as Noradounghian, *Recueil*). For the English translation of the treaty see J.C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East, A Documentary Record 1535-1956* (Oxford: Archive Editions, 1987), vol.1, pp. 54-61.

protectorate over the Orthodox population of the Ottoman Empire¹, others such as Roderic Davison contend that they offer no such ground to the Russian tsar.²

It was in this period that in 1798 Napoleon invaded Egypt and marched into Palestine. For the first time since the Crusades the Muslim heartland was occupied by a Western power. Even Iran was not immune: it too suffered territorial losses at the hands of the Russians and had to cede Georgia and Daghestan in 1813.

Further afield in the Indian subcontinent, the eighteenth century witnessed the gradual disintegration of the Timurid Mughal Empire as a result of its weakening imperial institutions and court rivalries. Persian ruler Nadir Shah's invasion of Delhi in 1739 and the Afghan invasions under Ahmed Shah Abdali between 1748 and 1767 constituted severe blows for the Mughal Empire and accelerated its fall. The situation accelerated the centrifugal forces within the sub-continent. The Jat, Maratha, Sikh and other chieftains increasingly carved out autonomous territories for themselves and undermined the Mughal authority.³ Nevertheless, though the disintegration of the Mughal Empire had started as an internal problem, its fall would be at the hands of the British East India Company, which had taken advantage of the political chaos to conquer India from within in a series of successful wars during the 1760s and 1820s. However, it was not until after the suppression of the Sepoy revolt in 1858, that the British were able to establish their domination over the subcontinent on a firm basis.

The internal crises of Muslim societies at the end of the eighteenth century, along with the decline of central Muslim empires and their subsequent subjugation by European colonial powers led to the emergence in Arabia and India of several protest movements. The leaders of these mainly revivalist movements believed that the source of this crisis lay in moral decay and

¹Article VII of the treaty of Küçük Kaynarca (in its original Italian version) says: "La Fulgida Porta promette una ferma protezione alla religione Christiana, e alle Chiefe di quella permette ancora à ministri dell'Imperial Corte di Russia di fare in ogni occorrenza varie rappresntanze alla Porta à favore della sotto mentevatta eretta Chiefa in Constantinopoli, accennata nell'art.XIV non meno che di quei che la fervono, e promette ricevere queste rimostranze con attenzione, come fatte da persona considerata d'una vicina e finceramente amica Potenza". Martens, *Recueil*. vol. II, p. 296.

²Roderic Davison, "Russian Skill and Turkish Imbecility: The Treaty of Kuchuk Kainardji Reconsidered" *Slavic Review*. 35 (September 1976): p. 482.

³For the disintegration of the Mughal Empire see, Sanjay Subrahmanyam and Muzaffar Alam eds. *The Mughal State 1526-1750*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. See also Muzaffar Alam *The Crisis of Empire in Mughal North India, Awadh and Punjab, 1707-1748*. (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1986).

deviation from pristine Islamic principles. They sought the restoration of the power of Islam by purifying the religion of alien elements and by following the *sunna* of the Prophet.

The most important of these movements emerged in the mid-eighteenth century in central Arabia, and was called the Wahhabiyya, taking its name from its founder, Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahhab (1115-1201 A.H./1703-1792 A.D.).¹ The latter had found in 1744 a powerful protector in Shaykh Muhammad Ibn Saud, a local ruler who adopted his doctrine and agreed to provide him with the financial, political, and military backing necessary to enable Ibn Abd al-Wahhab to spread his tenets across Arabia.

Although the Wahhabi movement had emerged originally in reaction to the practices of popular Islam in Arabia, it had become by the late eighteenth century a serious threat to the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman elite had already initiated a series of modernizing reforms to improve traditional state institutions, particularly the military and the civil service. While the Ottomans used European structures as their model, the Wahhabis advocated a return to the formative period of Islam which they idealized as a pristine age.

Wahhabiyya ideology was based on the doctrine of Ahmad ibn Hanbal (164-241 A.H./780-855 A.D.) and was inspired by the Hanbali theologian and revivalist Ibn Taymiyya (661-728 A.H./1263-1328 A.D.). Considered one of the most important thinkers in Islam, Ibn Taymiyya was the principal inspiration for Muslim revivalists in the eighteenth century and for modernists in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.² Born in Harran (a town located in present-day south-eastern Turkey), Ibn Taymiyya completed his education in Damascus at the Sukkariyya Madrasa. He was subsequently appointed as a professor at the Hanbaliyya Madrasa in the same city on 17 Shaban 695 (20 June 1296). Ibn Taymiyya devoted his academic and political career to a determined and indefatigable struggle against what he called "*Mushrikūn*" (Polytheists). His main goals were to "purify" Islam of any corruptive elements and to enhance the role of the *Ṣeriat* by restoring it to its central position in Muslim life.

¹D.S. Margoliouth, "Wahhabiya", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 1st edition, pp. 1086-1090.

²The most detailed and critical study of the doctrine of Ibn Taymiyya remains the voluminous work of Henri Laoust, *Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Tak-id-din Ahmad b. Taimiya* (Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1939).

Although Ibn Taymiyya's thought derives from Hanbali doctrine, its originality lies in the combination of diverse arguments proposed by dogmatic theologians, traditionalists, and Sufi thinkers. These, in turn, are based on *kalām*, *ḥadīth*, and *irāda* in order to create a new doctrine of mediation. Ibn Taymiyya condemned the practices of popular or folk Islam and considered them as a deviation from the teachings of the Qur'an and the Prophet.

He stated in his *Kitāb Iqtidā al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm wa Mukhālafat Aṣḥāb al-Jahīm* (The Book for the Following of the Straight Path Against the People of Hell) that the survival of pagan customs and habits in Islam had exercised a detrimental effect on Muslims, causing them to diverge from the essence of their religion. Ibn Taymiyya submits that holy days, such as *Āshūrā*, *Mawlid al-Nabiyy* and *Īd-Adhā* began to be celebrated in Islam in later periods under the influence of other religions. Indeed, the feast of *Mawlid al-Nabiyy* (birthday of the Prophet) was instituted as an emulation of Christmas.¹

Ibn Taymiyya equally condemned the visitation of the tombs of the saints (*Ziyārat al-Qubūr*) in order to request their intercession. This he identifies with idol worship since the veneration of the saints' tombs would turn these places into sanctuaries.² Ibn Taymiyya's ideas on the visitation of tombs were adopted by Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, who also considered this practice as a form of *shirk* (polytheism).

The cardinal point of Muhammad ibn Abd-al Wahhab's doctrine was *tawḥīd* (Unity of God), which he expounded in *Kitāb al Tawḥīd* (The Book of Unity). According to Abd-al Wahhab, *tawḥīd* has three meanings which were, *tawḥīd al-rubābiyya*, *tawḥīd al-ulḍiḥiyya* and *tawḥīd al-asmā wal ṣifāt*. Abd-al Wahhab in his thought put emphasis on the third meaning of the *tawḥīd*, *tawḥīdal asmā wal ṣifāt* (the unity of God's attributes as stated in the Qur'an without interpretation).³ He gave the definition of his creed as such: "To describe God as He described Himself in the Qur'an and as His Prophet did in the ḥadīth"⁴ The aim of Ibn Abd-al Wahhab was to purify Islam from the practices of *Jāhiliyya* and to reislamize the tribes of Arabia by teaching them the tenets of pristine Islam.

¹Muhammad Umar Memon, *Ibn Taimiyya's Struggle Against Popular Religion, with an Annotated Translation of his Kitāb Iqtidā al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm Mukhālafat Aṣḥāb al-jahīm*. (The Hague: Mouton, 1976), pp. 12-13.

²Ibid., pp. 13-20.

³Esther Peskes, "Wahhabiyya". *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, p. 40.

⁴H. Laoust, "Ibn Taymiyya." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, p. 951.