

# Translation and Analysis of Ibn Taymiyyah's Third Anti-Mongol Fatwa

Dr. Jabir Sani Maihula

Sokoto State University, Sokoto, Nigeria

**Abstract:**-The three Anti-Mongol fatwas of Ibn Taymiyyah are his most controversial treatises regarding jihad. The controversial nature of the fatwas exposed them to the exploitation by the jihadists. The fatwas are cited in volume twenty eight of the *Majmū' fatāwā*, the third anti-Mongol fatwa is in 28:543 -553. This paper will translate one of these fatwas, the third anti-Mongol fatwa into English and make some analysis on the content of the fatwa. The aim of the translation and analysis is to make the fatwa available to the non-Arabic readers to avoid accessing the fatwas from the analysis of the extremists and also to contextualize Ibn Taymiyyah's harshness in fatwas to the Mongol period.

**Keywords:** Translation, Ibn Taimiyyah, and Anti-Mongol Fatwa.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Anti-Mongol fatwas of Ibn Taymiyyah are his most controversial treatises regarding jihad. The controversial nature of the fatwas exposed them to the exploitation by the jihadists (Hoover, 2016, p. 3). Almost all the contemporary jihadists from 'Abd al-Salām Faraj to ISIS use the fatwas as justification of the apostasy of the contemporary Muslim rulers. Moreover, ISIS uses the fatwas and Ibn Taymiyyah's letter about the Mongol to justify the apostasy of contemporary Muslim communities for refusing to join the Islamic State. (Mongol, 2016 p, 47), Prior to the emergence of the contemporary jihadists, the Wahhābi scholars used the fatwas to justify the apostasy of grave venerators and others. In some instances, the jihadists quote the fatwas through the Wahhābi scholars. The three anti Mongol fatwas are cited in volume twenty eight of the *Majmū' fatāwā*, the third anti-Mongol fatwa is in 28:543 -553 (Ibn Taymiyyah, 1961, p, 67).

This paper will translate the third anti-Mongol fatwa into English and make some analysis on the content of the fatwa. The aim of the translation and analysis is to make the fatwa available to the non-Arabic readers in order to avoid accessing the fatwas from the analysis of the extremists. In the subsequent articles on this journal, the researcher will translate and analyse the two other fatwas. The researcher start with the third fatwa according to the arrangement *Majmū' fatāwā* of being it the first issued by Ibn Taymiyyah chronologically.

## II. TRANSLATION OF THE FATWA

[544] And he was asked, –may Allah have mercy on him and be pleased with him–, about the soldiers who refuse fighting

the Mongols, and they said: some among them [the army of the Mongols] were compelled [to fight]. And if any of them runs away should he be pursued or not?

And he answered: All praise is to Allah the Lord of the universe. Fighting the Mongols that advanced to the Syria is obligatory [in accordance] to the book [of Allah] and the tradition [of the Prophet]; Allah says: “Fight them until there is no turmoil and the whole religion is for Allah.” [Quran 8:39]. And the religion is indeed obedience, when part of the religion is for Allah and part of it is for other than Allah, [then] the fighting is obligatory until the whole religion is for Allah; therefore, Allah says “You who believe, beware of God: give up any outstanding dues from usury, if you are true believers. If you do not, then, be warned of war from God and His Messenger.” [Quran 2:278]. This verse was revealed on the people of Ṭā'if, when they accepted Islam and practiced the prayer and fasting but they refused abstaining from usury. Allah has elucidated that they are fighting Him and His messenger if they do not abstain from usury. And usury is the last thing forbidden by Allah; it is a wealth taken after the acceptance of the giver. If it is obligatory to fight those [the people of Ṭā'if who are at war with Allah and His messenger, [then], what of those who abandon many or most of the Islamic laws like the Mongols?!

[545] The Muslim scholars have come to agreement that it is obligatory to fight a resisting group if it refrains from some of the Islamic obligations that are manifest and widely accepted, if they pronounce the two testimonies and abstain from prayer and *zakāt* or fasting the month Ramadan or pilgrimage of the ancient house or [if they abstain] from the judgement according to the book [of Allah] and the tradition [of the Prophet] or if they refuse forbidding obscenity, alcohol, incest, taking the life and property of a Muslim, usury, gambling or [if they refuse] partaking in the fight against non-believers or if they refuse enforcing poll-tax against the people of the book and similar things from the laws of Islam, [then] they will be fought until the whole religion is for Allah. It is established in the two sahih [Bukhari and Muslim] that when Umar argued with Abū Bakr on those who resist *zakāt*, Abū-Bakar said to him: how could I not fight the one who abandon the rights that Allah and His messenger made obligatory upon him such as *zakāt*, just because he embraces Islam?! and he [Abū-Bakr] said to him: *zakāt* is the obligatory right to be taken from wealth. By Allah, if they withhold from me a rope that they used to give to the Messenger of Allah– Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him–, I will fight them

for withholding it.' 'Umar said: By Allah, as soon as I saw that Allah has expanded the chest of Abū Bakr to fighting, I knew that it was the truth. It is also established in Ṣaḥīḥ from more than one narration that the Prophet—Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him—mentioned the Khārijīs and said about them: “One of you will trivialize his prayer compared to theirs and his fasting compared to theirs and his reading of the Quran compared to theirs: they recite the Quran but it will hardly pass down their throat, they will move out of Islam just as the arrow passes out the prey. Wherever you meet them [546] kill them for Allah will reward whoever kills them on the day of judgement, if I were to meet them I would kill them the killing of 'Ad (Ād are the people of Prophet Hūd peace be upon him).

The [pious] predecessors and imams have agreed on fighting them [the Khārijīs]. The first to fight them was 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib—may Allah be pleased with him—, Muslims in the early Umayyad and Abbasid caliphates had been fighting alongside rulers even if they were tyrants. Hajjāj and his deputies were among the ones who fought them [Khārijīs], all the imams command fighting them.

The Mongols and their likes are more rebelled from the Islamic law than the ones who resisted *zakāt* and the Khārijīs of Ṭā'if that refused abstaining from usury. Whoever doubts about fighting them is the most ignorant of the Islamic religion. The Muslims have agreed that they [the Khārijīs] should be fought when fighting them is obligatory even if some of them were forced out. Just as al-'Abbas said when he was taken a prisoner of war on the day of Badr: “O messenger of Allah! I was compelled [to fight]. Then the Prophet—the Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him—said: ‘we deal with your outward, Allah deals with your inward.

The scholars have agreed that if non-Muslims army used the Muslim captives as human shield and Muslim might be harmed if they did not fight, then they [the non-Muslim army] would be fought even if that leads to killing the Muslims captives that were used as shield. But if [547] the Muslims might not be harm [if they didn't fight the non-Muslim army] then, there are two statements of scholars concerning the fight that will lead to killing those Muslim [shields]. If those Muslims [shields] are killed they become martyrs. The obligatory jihad should not be abandoned because of the one that would be killed as martyr. If Muslims fight non-Muslims, the one killed from the Muslims is a martyr. Whoever is killed for the benefit of Islam and he is not deserving to be killed inwardly is a martyr. It is established in the two Ṣaḥīḥ from the Prophet—the Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him—that he said: “An army will raid this house [*ka'ba*] and when it reaches a desert land, all of them will be swallowed up by the earth. Then It is said; ‘O Messenger of Allah! Some of them are forced out’ He answered, they will be raised for Judgement according to their intentions.”

If the punishment that Allah sends against the army fighting the Muslims will be descended against the compelled and the

voluntary, then what of the punishment by which God punishes them at the hands of the believers? As Allah said: “Say: Do you wait for us [anything] except one of the two best things [martyrdom or victory]; while we wait for you either that Allah will afflict you with a punishment from Himself or at our hands.” [Quran 9:52]. And we do not know who is forced, we cannot differentiate. If we kill them with Allah's command we would be rewarded and excused, and they will be [resurrected] on their intention. Whoever is compelled [to fight] that cannot resist will be resurrected on the day of judgement based on his intention. If he was killed in the process of establishing the religion it would not be greater than the one who is killed from the Muslim army, but if one of them runs-away, some people made fighting them [analogical] to fighting the rebels that fight with [permissible] interpretation.

[548] Those people if they have a resisting party, is it permissible to follow the one who runs away among them, to kill their captive, or finish off their wounded?; Two famous statements from scholars. It is said: that should not be done; because the announcer of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib announced/called on the day of the camel: the one who runs-away should not be followed, the wounded should not be finished up and the captive should not be killed. And it is said: that should be done; because there was no resisting party on the day of camel. The purpose of fighting was to repel, there were no need of following them after they were repelled. It was like repelling an armed robber. And it was reported that on the day of the Camel and Ṣiffin that their situation was different from that. Whoever makes them part of those with [permissible] interpretation makes these two statements [of scholars] apply to them. The correct [opinion] is that those [the Mongols] are not part of those with [permissible] interpretation. Those [the Mongols] have no any [permissible] interpretation at all. They are type of the rebel Khārijīs, those who resist *zakāt*, the people of Ṭā'if, the *Kharmiyya* and their likes who were fought [based] on their rebellion against the laws of Islam. This topic confuses many people from the jurists; those that have written on “Fighting the Rebels” made the fight against those who resist *zakāt*, the fight against the Khārijīs, 'Alī's fight against the people of Basra and his fighting against Mu'āwiya and his followers, as part of fighting the rebels which was commanded. And they made it a branch of those who have the same view, they erred; the correct is the opinion of the imams of hadith and Sunna and the people of Madinah of the Prophet; such as al-'Awzā'ī, al-Thawrī, Mālik, Aḥmad and others [549]: that there should be difference between this and that, 'Alī fighting of Khārijīs is established by clear text from the Prophet—Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him—, all Muslims agreed on this. But the companions did not agree on the fighting on the day of Ṣiffin and its likes, rather the greatest of the companions such as Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqās, Muhammad ibn Maslama, Usāma ibn Zayd, 'Abd Allah ibn 'Umar and other turned away from it. Beside 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib no one in the [both] armies was greater than Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqās.

The authentic narrations from the Prophet– Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him indicate that reconciliation between the two sects was obligatory; not fighting between them, as it is established in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī that he [the Prophet–Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him] gave a sermon to people and the army with him and he said: “This son of mine is a leader, and Allah will make him reconcile between two big groups of believers.” And Allah reconciled between the people of Iraq and people of Syria via Hassan: the Prophet –Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him– made the reconciliation part of the merits to Hassan. With the [fact that] Hassan stepped down for Mu‘āwiya. If the fighting was recommended and not abandoning the dispute and reconciling with Mu‘āwiya, the Prophet –the Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him– would not have commended him [Hassan] for abandoning what he [the Prophet] commanded and applying what he [the Prophet] did not command. He would not have commended him [Hassan] for abandoning what is more recommended and doing what is less recommended. Then it is known that what Hassan did [reconciliation] is what Allah and His messenger love not fighting. It is established in the Ṣaḥīḥ that the Prophet –the Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him– used to placed him [Hassan] and Usāma on his laps, and says: “O Allah I love both of them, love [O Allah] both of them, and love [550]whoever loves them.”

The effect of the love of the Prophet– Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him has manifested by their detestation to fight in the sedition; Usāma abstained from the fight with either of the sects. Also Hassan always advised ‘Alī not to fight; when he [Hassan] was enthroned he did what he was advising ‘Alī to do –May Allah be pleased with them all. It is established in the Ṣaḥīḥ, from him –the Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him– that he said: “A rebelling [sect] will rebel at the time of division among the Muslims. The closest group to the truth will fight it.” And this rebelling sect is the Khārijīs, and ‘Alī Ibn Abī-Ṭālib fought them. The rest of the hadiths that commands fighting the Khārijīs will trust/support this and also elucidate that fighting them is part of what Allah and His messenger love. And those that fought them alongside ‘Alī Ibn Abī-Ṭālib are more deserving to the truth than Mu‘āwiya and his people. Despite being them more deserving to the truth, the Prophet– Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him– did not command fighting for either of the groups, as he commands fighting the Khārijīs. Rather, he praised reconciliation between the two. It is established from the Prophet– Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him that he detests fighting in the sedition and cautions against it in [some] traditions that such as his saying:” There will be a sedition during which the sitting person is better than the standing [person] and standing [person] is better than the walking, and the walking [person] is better than the running.” And he says: “A time will come that the best property of a Muslim will be sheep which he will take on the top of mountains and the places of rainfall [valleys] so as to flee with his religion from afflictions.”

[551] Sedition is like the battles that take place between the kings of the Muslims and the groups of the Muslims even though each group adheres to the laws of Islam, just like what happened in the battles of the Camel and Ṣiffin; they only fought because of unclear issues and matters that rose. But the Khārijīs, those who resist *zakāt* and the people of Ṭā’if that refused forbidding usury are fought until they accept the established rulings from the Prophet –the Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him–. And those [Mongols] if they have a resisting party, then there is no doubt that it is legal to kill their captive, to follow the one who runs away and to finish off their wounded; if those [Mongols] were in their domains with these belief, it is obligatory for Muslims to intend them in their domains to fight them until the whole religion is for Allah. For those Mongols do not fight for the religion of Allah, rather, they fight people until they become obedient to them, whoever is obedient to them they abstain from him even if he is polytheist, Christian or Jewish and whoever is not obedient to them is their enemy even if he is from prophets or pious people. Allah has commanded the Muslims to fight his enemies; the non-believers, and to befriend his servants: the believers. It is obligatory for the Muslims all of them from the army of Syria, Egypt, Yemen and Maghrib to become allies for fighting the non-believers, they should not fight one another for leadership and desires. The least obligatory upon those Mongols is to fight the closest non-believers to them and abstain from the closest Muslims to them, and to collaborate with each other in [552] fighting non-believers.

And no one will fight alongside [the Mongols] voluntarily except the deviant, innovator, or irreligious [*zindīq*], such as the *malāhida al-qarāmīta al-bāṭiniyya*, and *rāfiḍa al-sabāba* and *jaḥmiyya al-mu‘aṭṭila* from the *al-nufāt al-ḥulūliyya*. And with them [the Mongols] from their blind followers that claim knowledge and religion who are worse than them. The Mongols are ignorant; they blind follow who they think is right. Because of their stray they follow in their stray what is lie against Allah and His Messenger, they change the religion of Allah, they do not forbid what Allah and His Messenger forbid, they do not practice the true religion. If I were to narrate what I know about their affairs the speech would be long.

In general, their path and the religion of Islam cannot be combined. If they were to demonstrate the religion of Allah, the true religion [*al-ḥanīf*], the one He [Allah] sent His Messenger with they would have been guided and become obedient: just like the victorious sect: it is established from the Prophet –the Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him– that he said: “There will always be a group amongst my *umma* who is triumphant upon truth, abandoning them will not harm them, until the order of Allah is given and they will be like that [triumphant]” and it is established in Ṣaḥīḥ from him [the Prophet] that he said: “The people of Maghrib will continue to be triumphant” the beginning of Maghrib is what faces al-Baira and its like. The Prophet–Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him–made this statement while in al-Medina of the Prophet whatever is west to it is west like Syria and Egypt.

What is east to it is east like the island [*al-jazīra*] and Iraq. The predecessors used to call the people of Syria “the people of west” and the people of Iraq “the people of east.”

What I mentioned in this statement of mine [553] of traditions and evidence from sharī‘a is mentioned in other places. Allah knows best.

### III. ANALYSIS OF THE FATWA

According to Aigle, the third fatwa seems to be the first to be issued by Ibn Taymiyyah. It may have been issued at the time of the battle of Wādī al-Khaznadār. According to her the fatwa is dedicated to considering the status of the Mamlūks who fought under duress or willingly in the Mongol armies at the invasion of 699/1299-1300 (Aigle, 2007, p, 117). The nine-page fatwa like the two others is addressing questions posed to Ibn Taymiyyah. In this fatwa, he is asked two questions; firstly, about the Mamlūk soldiers who refuse fighting the Mongols and said some among the army of the Mongols were compelled to fight. And secondly, if any of the Mongol army runs away should he be pursued or not?(IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 544). In answering the question, Ibn Taymiyyah addresses five issues: firstly, the obligation of fighting the Mongols in general, secondly, the obligation of fighting the Mamlūk prisoners who were forced out to fight with the Mongols and thirdly the permissibility of perusing the Mongol army if they flee the battle field. The fourth and fifth issues respectively are the difference between the Khārijīs and the *bughāt* and the status of the people who fought alongside with the Mongols willingly. In the paragraphs below we shall elucidate how Ibn Taymiyyah addresses the five issues one after the other citing quotations from the fatwa and other secondary sources.

The first issue Ibn Taymiyyah begins with in the fatwa is the obligation of fighting the Mongols in general. Although this is not directly addressed in the question, Ibn Taymiyyah uses two Quran verses to argue for the obligation of fighting the Mongols based on their rebellion against some of the widely circulated laws of Islam.

Fighting the Mongols that advanced into the Syria is obligatory [in accordance] to the Book and Sunna. Allah says: “Fight them until there is no turmoil and the whole religion is for Allah.” (Q 8:39). And the religion is indeed obedience, when part of the religion is for Allah and part of it is for other than Allah, [then] the fighting is obligatory until the whole religion is for Allah; therefore, Allah says “You who believe, beware of Allah: give up any outstanding dues from usury, if you are true believers. If you do not, then, be warned of war from Allah and His Messenger.” (Q 2:278)(IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 544).

Furthermore, Ibn Taymiyyah establishes a principle: it is obligatory to fight any resisting group if it refrains from some of the Islamic obligations that are manifest and widely accepted, even if the resisting group claims Islam and practices some of its obligations. Ibn Taymiyyah states:

The Muslim scholars have come to agreement that it is obligatory to fight a resisting group if it refrains from some of the Islamic obligations that are manifest and widely accepted, if they pronounce the two testimonies and abstain from prayer and *zakāt* or fasting the month Ramadan or pilgrimage to the ancient house or [if they abstain] from the judgement according to the book [of Allah] and the tradition [of the Prophet] or if they refuse forbidding obscenity, alcohol, incest, taking the life and property of a Muslim, usury, gambling or [if they refuse] partaking in the fight against non-believers or if they refuse enforcing *jizya* against the people of the Book and similar things from the laws of Islam, [then] they will be fought until the whole religion is for Allah (IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 545).

However, in this fatwa Ibn Taymiyyah did not state how the Mongols rebelled from the Islamic law nor did he mention what qualifies them to be Khārijīs. Although, he classified them as deviants, throughout the fatwa no evil action of the Mongols was mentioned as an example of their deviation.

Another reason for fighting such groups according to Ibn Taymiyyah is the action of the Companions. The Companions in the first generation of Islam, fought two groups who claimed Islam, but both groups refrained from some Islamic obligations. Those who withheld *zakāt* were fought by Caliph AbūBakr and the Khārijīs were fought by ‘AlīibnAbīṬalīb (IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 545). The Mongols according to Ibn Taymiyyah are more heretical than these two groups fought by the Companions. Whoever doubts about fighting them is the most ignorant of the Islamic religion (IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 545).

After establishing the obligation of fighting the Mongols in general, Ibn Taymiyyahpreceded to the second issue which was the first addressed from the questions: the obligation of fighting the solders that were forced out by the Mongols to fight the Mamlūk army. Ibn Taymiyyah considers the Mongols as Khārijīs and cites the agreement of the scholars that the solders forced out to fight alongside the Khārijīs should be fought.

The Muslims have agreed that they [the Khārijīs] should be fought when fighting them is obligatory even if some of them were forced out. Just as al-‘Abbas said when he was taken a prisoner of war on the day of Badr: “O messenger of Allah! I was compelled [to fight]. Then the Prophet

–the Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him- said: ‘we deal with your outward, Allah deals with your inward (IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 546).

As Aigle points out, Ibn Taymiyyah has recourse to the outstanding events of the first centuries of Islam. He uses the scenario of the battle of Badr, to justify jihad against the Mamlūk prisoners among the Mongol soldiers. During the battle of Badr, some Companions had been taken prisoners. Ibn Taymiyyah considers that, as at Badr, if the Mamlūk prisoners fighting in the Mongol army are killed in the battle they will be considered martyrs for God’s cause (Aigle, 2007, p, 103).

Ibn Taymiyyah further states another reason for fighting the soldiers that were forced out by the Mongols. He reports the agreement of the scholars that if non-Muslims army used the Muslim captives as human shield and Muslim might be harmed if they did not fight, then they would fight even if that leads to killing the Muslims captives that were used as shield. However, if the Muslims used as shield were killed they become martyrs. Killing them is for the benefit of Islam and whoever is killed for the benefit of Islam and he is not deserving to be killed inwardly is a martyr (IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 547). Another reason why fighting them is legal is analogy to the punishment that God sent to a group of sinners. It is established in the hadith that: “An army will raid this house [*ka’ba*] and when it reaches a desert land, all of them will be swallowed up by the earth. Then It is said; ‘O Messenger of Allah! Some of them are forced out’ He answered, they will be raised for judgement according to their intentions.” Ibn Taymiyyah comments on the hadith:

If the punishment that God sends against the army fighting the Muslims will be descended against the compelled and the voluntary, then what of the punishment by which God punishes them at the hands of the believers? As Allah said: “Say: Do you wait for us [anything] except one of the two best things [martyrdom or victory]; while we wait for you either that Allah will afflict you with a punishment from Himself or at our hands.” (Q 9:52). And we do not know who is forced, we cannot differentiate. If we kill them with Allah’s command we would be rewarded and excused, and they will be [resurrected] on their intention. Whoever is compelled [to fight] that cannot resist will be resurrected on the day of judgement based on his intention (IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 547).

The third issue addressed by Ibn Taymiyyah is the second question in the fatwa: if any of the Mongol armies run away, should he be pursued or not? Before answering the question, Ibn Taymiyyah reports two opposing opinions of the scholars on pursuing one of the *bughāt* who fought ‘AlībnAbīTālib on the day of Camel. After parading the opinions, Ibn Taymiyyah then argues that the Mongols are not analogous to the *bughāt* who fought ‘Alī based on permissible interpretation. Therefore, the two opinions on the *bughāt* should not apply to them. Instead, the Mongols are analogous to the Khārijīs, those who withheld *zakāt* and the people of Ṭā’if. These categories are not fought due to their rebellion against the political leader (*imam*), rather due to their rebellion against the *sharī’a* (IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 548). He states:

The correct [opinion] is that those [the Mongols] are not part of those with [permissible] interpretation. Those [Mongols] have no any [permissible] interpretation at all. They are type of the rebel Khārijīs, those who resist *zakāt*, the people of Ṭā’if, the Kharmiyya and their likes who were fought [based] on their rebellion against the laws of Islam (IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 548).

Ibn Taymiyyah then advances to the fourth issue which is not included in the question: the difference between *bughāt* and Khārijīs. Citing some hadiths about the two groups, Ibn Taymiyyah outlines some differences between the two groups and argues that the topic confuses many jurists who made the two identical and issued similar verdict on them (IbnTaymiyyah, 1961, p, 549).

This topic confuses many people from the jurists; those that have written on “Fighting the Rebels” made the fight against those who resist *zakāt*, the fight against the Khārijīs, ‘Alī’s fight against the people of Basra and his fighting against Mu‘āwiya and his followers, as part of fighting the rebels which was commanded. And they made it a branch of those who have the same view, they erred; the correct is the opinion of the imams of hadith and Sunna and the people of Medina of the Prophet; such as al-‘Awzā’ī, al-Thawrī, Mālik, Aḥmad and others that there should be difference between this and that, ‘Alī fighting of Khārijīs is established by clear text from the Prophet– Peace and Blessings of Allah be upon him–, all Muslims agreed on this. But the Companions did not agree on the

fighting on the day of Şiffin and its likes, rather the greatest of the Companions such as Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqās, Muhammad ibn Maslama, Usāma ibn Zayd, 'Abd Allah ibn 'Umar and other turned away from it. Beside 'Alī ibn Abī Tālib no one in the [both] armies was greater than Sa'd ibn Abī-Waqqās (Ibn Taymiyyah, 1961, p, 549).

According to Richard Bonney, Ibn Taymiyyah's independent reasoning on this issue is invalid because of the existence of a clear Qur'anic text to fight the group, that is, a transgressor, along with the hadith of the Prophet warning that, 'Ammār bin Yāsir would be killed by the faction of transgressors. Contrary to Ibn Taymiyyah's interpretation, "the faction of transgressors" was that of Mu'āwiya, while fighting on 'Alī's side as a duty and Sunna (Bonny. 2004, p, 112). Nevertheless, Ibn Taymiyyah states some of his predecessor on the issue: "The correct is the opinion of the imams of hadith and Sunna and the people of Medina of the Prophet; such as al-'Awzā'ī, al-Thawrī, Mālik, Aḥmad and others that there should be difference between this and that (Ibn Taymiyyah, 1961, p, 549).

Ibn Taymiyyah concludes the fatwa by criticizing those who fight alongside the Mongols voluntarily. He labelled them innovators, but he did not accuse them of apostasy because hitherto the Mamlūk renegades did not join the Mongols. He also accused the Mongols of being ignorant and changing the religion of Islam.

And no one will fight alongside [the Mongols] voluntarily except the deviant, innovator, or irreligious [*zindīq*], such as the *malāhida al-qarāmita al-bāṭiniyya*, and *Rāfiḍa al-sabāba* and *jaḥmiyya al-mu'aṭṭila* from the *al-nufāt al-ḥulūliyya*. And with them [the Mongols] from their blind followers that claim knowledge and religion who are worse than them. The Mongols are ignorant; they blind follow who they think is right. Because of their stray they follow in their stray what is lie against Allah and His Messenger, they change the religion of Allah, they do not forbid what Allah and His Messenger forbid, they do not practice the true religion. If I were to narrate what I know about their affairs the speech would be long (Ibn Taymiyyah, 1961, p, 549).

In the fatwa, Ibn Taymiyyah did not explicitly label the Mongols apostates, but he made some statements indicating their extreme deviation from the religion of Islam. Such

statements include classifying them as more rebelled from the Islamic law than the Khārijīs and those who refused *zakāt*: "The Mongols and their likes are more rebelled from the Islamic law than the ones who resisted *zakāt* and the Khārijīs of Tā'if that refused abstaining from usury (Ibn Taymiyyah, 1978, p, 553)." Towards the end of the fatwa, Ibn Taymiyyah also argues that the path of the Mongols and the religion of Islam cannot be combined (Ibn Taymiyyah, 1978, p, 553).

#### IV. CONCLUSION

This paper translates and analyses the third anti-Mongol fatwa of Ibn Taymiyyah. The aim of the translation and analyses is to make the fatwa available to non-Arabic reader, so as to avoid accessing it through the extremists' translation. Also, to lay to the reader that Ibn Taymiyyah's harshness is contextualized within the Mongol period for the danger they pose to Islam.

The nine-page fatwa like the two others is addressed questions posed to Ibn Taymiyyah. In this fatwa, he was asked two questions; firstly, about the Mamlūk soldiers who refuse fighting the Mongols and said some among the army of the Mongols were compelled to fight. And secondly, if any of the Mongol army runs away should he be pursued or not?<sup>1</sup> In answering the question, Ibn Taymiyyah addresses five issues: firstly, the obligation of fighting the Mongols in general, secondly, the obligation of fighting the Mamlūk prisoners who were forced out to fight with the Mongols, and thirdly the permissibility of perusing the Mongol army if they flee the battle field. The fourth and fifth issues respectively are the difference between the Khārijīs and the *bughāt* and the status of the people who fought alongside with the Mongols willingly. The paper addressed and analysed the above issues in detail.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. Aigle D. (200), "The Mongol Invasions of Bilād Al-Shām by GhāzānKhān and Ibn Taymīyah's Three "Anti-Mongol" Fatwas." *Mamlūk Studies Review* 11, no.2.
- [2]. Bonney, R. (2004), *Jihād: From Qur'ān to bin Laden*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [3]. Hoover, J. (2016), "*Ibn Taymiyya between Moderation and Radicalism*." In *Reclaiming Islamic Tradition: Modern Interpretations of the Classical Heritage*. Ed. Elisabeth Kendall and Ahmad Khan, 177–203. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- [4]. Ibn Taymiyya, A. A. (1978), *Fatāwā al-kubrā*. ed. Muhammad A. A. And Mustafā A. A. (ed), Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'Ilmiyya.
- [5]. Ibn Taymiyyah, (1961), A. A. *Majmū'at fatāwā* ed. 'Abd al-Rahmān, M. Q. and Muḥammad M. (ed), (Riyadh: Maṭābi' al-Riyāḍ, 1961-67).
- [6]. Lessons from the Fitnah of the Mongols," *Dabiq* 14, (April/May 2016): 47. Last accessed 25/04/2017 <https://azelin.files.wordpress.com/2016/04/the-islamic-state-22dacc84bi-magazine-1422.pdf>.