

# Scientific and Literary Rivalries in Al-Andalus

Mohammed Youssef Ibrahim Banat

Department of Arabic Language, Al-Quds University, East Jerusalem, Palestine

Email: mobanat@staff.alquds.edu

**How to cite this paper:** Banat, M. Y. I. (2024). Scientific and Literary Rivalries in Al-Andalus. *Advances in Historical Studies*, 13, 157-176.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/ahs.2024.133008>

**Received:** May 13, 2024

**Accepted:** September 9, 2024

**Published:** September 12, 2024

Copyright © 2024 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

## Abstract

This research addresses the issue of scientific and literary dispute among scientists themselves, and between students and scientists in Al-Andalus. It includes an introduction, two main sections, and a conclusion. The introduction is dedicated to the phenomenon of competition and dispute among scientists on one hand, and between scientists and students on the other, based on the references in literature and history books, which revealed the state of competition among them and its impact on the scientific and cultural movement. The first section discusses the competition between the Andalusians and the Easterners, while the second section deals with the competition among the Andalusians themselves. In conducting this research, the methodology followed was the inductive analytical approach.

## Keywords

Antagonism, Competition, Literary Forums, Criticism

## 1. The Research Issue

The crux of the research problem lies in the conflicting narratives and information presented in various Andalusian literary sources. While some aspects may align in some, significant divergence exists in others. The researcher has turned his attention to this issue after pursuing several books and sources that briefly touched upon the subject without delving into the specifics and reasons behind the emergence of intense competition among scholars in Andalusia, regardless of whether they were of Andalusian or Eastern descent. Complicating the research problem are the authors' evident biases towards certain figures, expressed through precise language that highlights the partiality clearly. Additionally, no independent study addressing this matter has been found so far.

The importance of the research lies in revealing the real reasons that led to a state of competition between the scientists themselves on the one hand, and the

scientists and students on the other hand. The reasons may be limited to proving the knowledge and superiority of scholars, by misleading others in scientific councils, appearing as victors, and making opponents appear defeated. In the knowledge of literature and grammar, this can be attributed to a second reason, which is the selfishness that exists in the human soul. Each of the scholars tries to rise above others. There is a third reason, which is the regional outlook of scholars coming to Andalusia from the East. There are those who did not accept their presence, and some of them stopped. Hostile attitude in the scientific community.

The most prominent examples that we discussed in detail at the heart of our research regarding the competition between Arab scholars of the East and West is the rivalry between al-Khuṣanī (661 H./971 CE) and al-ʿIḡlī (VII/X), the rivalry between Abū ʿAlī al-Qālī (356 H./969 CE) and al-Ballūṭī (355 H./966 CE), the rivalry Between Abū ʿAlī al-Qālī (356 H./969 CE) and Ibn Rifāʿa al-Ilbīrī (404 H./1014 CE), and the rivalry Between Ṣāʿid al-Bagdādī (417 H./1027 CE) and Ibn al-ʿArī (441 H./1050 CE).

As for the competition between Andalusian scholars themselves, the examples are: The rivalry between Ibn al-Ifīlī (d. 441 AH/1050 CE) and Ibn Ṣuḡayd (d. 426 AH/1035 CE), the rivalry between al-Faṭḥ Ibn Khaqān (529 H./1135 CE) and Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī (521 H./1127 CE), and the rivalry Between Ibn Ḥazm (456 H./1064 CE) and Abū al-Walīd al-Bāḡī (474 H./1082 CE).

## 2. The Significance of Research

Research holds a crucial role in unveiling the dynamics of literary rivalries among the intellectuals of the Andalusian era, shedding light on the prevailing relationships among them. It highlights the areas of agreement and disagreement among the sources of Andalusian literature when addressing specific events, considering the author's proximity to or distance from the incident. Notably, the accuracy of information transmission diminishes with later generations compared to the early generation of scholars. Research serves to paint a vivid picture of the competitive ambience across various fields of knowledge back then, encompassing poetry, literature, language, and jurisprudence. Moreover, it elucidates how both positive and negative influences reverberated through the scientific and cultural movements in Al-Andalus.

## 3. Research Goals

The research aims to examine and analyze some root causes behind the conflicts between scholars and literary figures, as well as the tensions between scholars and astute students who have mastered diverse areas of knowledge, enabling them to voice their opinions, engage in debates with their mentors, counter their arguments, and occasionally rectify their mistakes. By uncovering the genuine motives fueling the rivalries among scholars, the study primarily attributes these competitions to negative rivalries rooted in envy and jealousy. Personal grudges have also fueled profound animosities, exacerbating the divides within the scholarly

community, alongside other reasons grounded in baseless accusations.

#### 4. Prior Research

As far as the researcher knows, no contemporary scholars have independently investigated the disputes among scholars during the Andalusian epoch. Two studies were reviewed: the first, “Inter-City Boasting in Andalusian Literature: An Objective Analysis” by Ammār Šhibli, and the second, “Scientific Competition Between Eastern and Western Scholars on Andalusian Soil” by Ṭāhir Khadiġa. While these studies briefly touched upon some of the figures discussed in this research, they did not provide a comprehensive exploration of the subject matter. Their coverage was broad yet succinct, addressing issues that diverge significantly from the current study’s focus.

#### 5. The Approach

Due to the nature of the study, the researcher employed the inductive analytical approach. The researcher chose this method because the research is historical, making it the most appropriate for historical research that seeks to track the key points the researcher examined while reviewing the significant issues addressed in the study. This involved tracing these points across various sources that discussed them, aiming to uncover how certain pieces of information are narrated and interpreted in diverse ways.

#### 6. Introduction

Literary competitions have been a central topic of discussion since the early centuries of the Hijri calendar. This subject has sparked intense debates between acceptance and rejection, leading to a significant critical movement manifested in the writing of rebuttal books by various scholars in response to their adversaries and their perceived shortcomings. Critiques of writers’ language skills have fueled extensive debates, dialogues, and disputes, resulting in the authoring of accusatory and vindictory texts, attacks, and defenses. In particular, esteemed writers were facing criticism from their scholarly peers for minor errors that might even have been acknowledged personally. Readers exploring the news and tales narrated in literary and historical works, detailing the debates among eminent literary scholars, can gain insight into the competitive yet unscrupulous environments, shedding light on the objectives of these discussions. This allows readers and researchers to grasp the dominant egos in these circles, blurring their judgment and showcasing each individual’s eagerness to discredit their opponents, accusing them of incompetence before the intellectual elite. Such behavior is often fueled by animosity and envy from rivals and detractors. It is common for every scholar to have both supporters and detractors, with one group fervently defending them while the other vehemently attacks them, aiming to expose their flaws in every possible way.

Readers exploring the lives of Andalusian scholars will encounter various rivalries among them. These conflicts were not merely about honorable competition

but were often rooted in jealousy, envy, and animosity, as previously mentioned. Each scholar sought to triumph over their opponent, especially during debates in the presence of the caliph or a prince. The stories passed down to us provide a glimpse into the literary circles, highlighting the disagreements and rivalries that characterized these settings.

The Andalusian narratives found in literary and historical texts unequivocally point to numerous factors contributing to these rivalries. Some of them stem from internal dynamics among Andalusian scholars, while others are linked to the migration of Eastern scholars to Andalusia or the competition between mentors and their disciples. By examining these stories, they can be categorized as follows.

### **7. The First Axis: Interaction between Andalusian and Eastern Scholars**

Since the early days of Islamic conquest, Andalusia heavily relied on the East for its cultural development. Eastern scholars significantly enriched Andalusian cultural life by numerous means, such as importing Eastern books composed in various disciplines and the migration of renowned Eastern scholars to Andalusia to promote the sciences. In return, many Andalusians journeyed to the East to learn from Eastern scholars, returning home equipped to teach and even author specialized books in their mastered fields. This mutual exchange not only contributed to a vibrant cultural scene but also empowered Andalusians to showcase their intellectual prowess akin to their Eastern counterparts, fostering a competitive spirit among them and the Eastern immigrants in Andalusia. Subsequently, we will delve into how this narrative took a wrong turn, as depicted in literary and historical accounts, portraying a distorted image of certain figures and highlighting tensions and conflicts among scholars and students alike. The researcher documented various instances of disputes and disagreements among scholars and students, emphasizing the importance of upholding ethical standards in scholarly pursuits. Among the most notable rivalries were those involving the following individuals.

### **8. The Rivalry between Al-Khuṣānī (661 H./971 CE) and Al-'Iḡlī (VII/X)**

Groups of Andalusian scholars traveled to the East on educational trips to learn language sciences. After mastering them, they returned to hold scientific councils that were eagerly attended by students. This encouraged literary movement on the one hand, and created a state of intense competition between resident and visiting scholars on the other. It seems that the main driving forces of... have been envy and jealousy, not knowledge and expertise. This is especially true after a wave of students turned away from the council of the resident scholar, and turned instead to, and flocked instead to the council of the visiting scholar, as was the case with al-Khuṣānī and al-'Iḡlī. When al-'Iḡlī, a visiting scholar, returned to Cordoba from Iraq, people flocked to him and abandoned al-Khuṣānī's council. 'Ufayr (317 H./930

CE), a student, said: “al-Khuṣānī asked me: Why do you not hasten to what everyone else is hastening to?” I replied: “I do not seek a replacement for you.” He said, “I prefer that you go to the man and attend his council.” So, I went to al-ʿIḡlī and attended his council. He dictated: “*al-Miraha*”: enmity, its plural is ‘*miar*.’ One of those who wrote before him was Zaid Al-ʿYayyīnī. I said, “May God have mercy on you!” Abu Ubayd, in his book, said, “*al-Miraha*” enmity, its plural is ‘*miar*.’ It was as if I saw Zaid erasing what he had written and saying, “This is the truth.” Then I responded with another and a third word in the council. People dispersed from him, and no one returned to him after that. The news reached al-Khuṣānī. When I visited him, he honored me and said, “Indeed, you are a trustworthy repository of knowledge” (Al-Zubaydī, 1984).

This story indicates that the student ʿUfayr b. Masʿūd managed to outsmart al-ʿIḡlī and embarrass him, at the instigation of his sheikh, who asked him to secretly enter al-ʿIḡlī’s scientific council to expose him in front of the students and attendees. Through this trick, life returned to al-Khuṣānī’s council after it had become empty of students.

In this story, it is implied that ʿUfayr was one of the intelligent students. He did not ask al-ʿIḡlī any questions to provoke him and test his knowledge of the language. Instead, his response was to the meaning of a word written by one of the students who used to transcribe what their teacher said. However, the teacher did not comment on it or defend what he said to the students, indicating that he was wrong and the student was correct.

There is no doubt that this story reveals an unfair competition among scholars in the same city. Envy led Ibn ʿUfayr to exclude al-ʿIḡlī from the study circles so that his *ṣaykh*, al-Khuṣānī, could return with students after they had deserted him. It is truly shameful to embarrass a scholar in front of his students.

## 9. The Rivalry between Abū ʿAlī al-Qālī (356 H./969 CE) and al-Ballūṭī (355H./966 CE)

Andalusian historical sources recount two stories that unveil a clear rivalry between al-Qālī and judge Mundhir ibn Saʿīd al-Ballūṭī. The researcher attributes this to feelings of jealousy and envy, particularly when al-Qālī arrived in Andalusia from Iraq, spending twenty-six years there, gaining a prestigious position with the caliph and his court, becoming widely renowned for his immense knowledge, and significantly influencing the scientific community in Andalusian society. This admiration for him among his contemporaries in Andalusia was tinged with envy. Al-Maqqarī (1041 H./1632 CE) narrates: “Abd al-Raḥmān III (350 H./961 CE) instructed his son, al-Ḥakam (366 H./976 CE), to accompany Abū ʿAlī to Cordoba, where he acted as if he were a minister on his father’s behalf. Welcomed by a delegation of his most esteemed subjects, chosen as a mark of respect for Abū ʿAlī, they journeyed towards Cordoba in a grand procession, engaging in literary discussions and reciting poetry along the way.” (Al-Maqqarī, 1968: 3/70).

One of the earliest stories recorded in literary and historical sources revolves

around a lavish celebration hosted by the Caliph ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III in his palace to welcome the ambassador from Constantinople, who arrived with a retinue bearing gifts from the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII. Books recount a peculiar incident involving Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī, where four different sources agree on depicting al-Qālī as defeated in front of his initial adversary, Judge Mundhir bin Saeed al-Ballūṭī.

Historians were divided when interpreting this event. The first group suggested that al-Qālī was tasked with preparing and delivering the speech at the celebration, representing the Humaidi perspective. They explained, “The ruler al-Mustaṣfir held Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī in high regard, considering him capable of handling any responsibility within his domain. Therefore, when the Byzantine King’s messenger arrived, he instructed him, upon entering the court, to deliver a speech as according to the customary practice. However, at that moment, when Abū ‘Alī saw the crowd, observed the ceremony, he became timid, unable to stand or speak for himself” (Al-Ḥumaydī, 1989: 2/555-556).

This narration is mentioned by al-Faṭḥ b. Khaqān (529 H./1135 CE) in *Maṭmaḥ al-anfus* adding that al-Qālī was the first of the speakers, praising his status, pointing out his ability to improvise, and his mastery of language (Ibn Khaqān, 2010: 38).

The second team was led by al-Nubāhī (792 H./1390 CE), who noted a discrepancy in the name of the person tasked with preparing the sermon initially; it was al-Kusaynānī and not al-Qālī. Al-Nubāhī mentioned: “The judge instructed his son, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Kusaynānī, to get ready for this task and to craft a powerful sermon to present before the caliph, boasting of his unique ability to articulate words like no other.” (Al-Nubāhī, 1983: 66).

When it comes to Ibn Khaldun, he mentioned that there were multiple speakers at the event, but he stressed that al-Qālī was the one tasked with speaking first. He stated, “Among them was Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī, a newcomer from Iraq, who held a high position and was the heir to the throne, appointed due to his pride.” In his historical account, Ibn Khaldun shows a preference for al-Ballūṭī, especially when highlighting his triumph over his rivals among the orators. By saying “Among them,” he clearly indicates the presence of more than one speaker, although he does not name them specifically, only mentioning al-Qālī. He also points out their joint failure to deliver a suitable speech for the occasion. This is where al-Ballūṭī shines as the hero who saved the day, as Ibn Khaldūn (808 H./1406 CE) praises him, noting, “So, when they all gathered, Muṣṭafī B. Sa’īd al-Ballūṭī stood up and improvised a speech”.

The researcher begins by questioning three aspects that cast doubt on the authenticity of the situation and the narrative that has been embellished, exaggerated, and twisted. Through this scrutiny, it becomes evident that the aim was to tarnish al-Qālī’s reputation and highlight his failure during that significant historical event. Initially, the researcher attributes al-Qālī’s stumble to his fascination with the grandiosity of the celebration, rendering him speechless in the face of the

overwhelming situation. Ibn Khaqān recounts an incident where it was suggested to Abū ‘Alī Al-Baghdādī to “Rise and dispel this illusion.” Upon doing so, he paused, expressed gratitude, then fell silent, deep in thought about the words he was expected to deliver [Ibn Khaqān, 1983: 38]. Here, Ibn Khaqān contradicts himself; hadn’t he previously mentioned that al-Qālī was the first choice for delivering a speech? Yet now, he implies that others have preceded him in addressing the guests. This unexpected request caught him off guard, unprepared for a speech. Such circumstances undoubtedly demand time for composing thoughts, selecting fitting expressions, and making his statement, “He stood silently, reflecting,” a significant exaggeration. It’s implausible that al-Qālī was completely blank-minded, failing to articulate his thoughts.

The second matter emphasizes the readiness of the orators to deliver their speeches, including al-Qālī, but they were all amazed by the grandeur of the council and feared the gravity of the situation, so they lost their words. Ibn Khaldun said, “Al-Ḥakam Al-Mustanşir ordered the orators to deliver speeches in that assembly, to glorify the matter of Islam and the caliphate, and to thank God for the appearance and exaltation of His religion, so they prepared for that, then the gravity of the council dazzled them, and they began to speak but stumbled, among them was Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī, a newcomer from Iraq” (Ibn Khaldūn, *Al-Tārikh*, 4/183).

The third matter is the narrative that Al-Maqqarī transmitted from Ibn Khaqān with some additions and changes in the speech format, emphasizing the narration of the first group that al-Qālī was the first to be asked to deliver a sermon a speech. When he stood up, he couldn’t speak, words escaped him, and he fell to the ground, unable to stand on his feet. Al-Maqqarī says: “When he stood up to speak about what he saw, the grandeur and splendor of the place overwhelmed him, the magnificence of the caliphate. He couldn’t find a word, but fainted and fell to the ground.” (Al-Maqqarī, 1968: 1/368).

These accounts reveal a clear inconsistency in recounting what transpired at that event, with a noticeable exaggeration to undermine al-Qālī’s character and display his incompetence. It’s hard to believe that Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī was so amazed by what he witnessed, considering his background living in the shadows of palaces and serving as a teacher to al-Mustanşir. There’s a discrepancy in how the story is told, whether it was spontaneous or prepared in advance, but regardless, the researcher is confident that al-Qālī could have delivered a speech at the gathering. It’s plausible that he could have faltered, but it’s hard to accept the news portraying him as absent-minded, given his vast knowledge. It’s truly perplexing to picture him standing there helpless and silent in such a situation.

As a result of al-Qālī’s failure in that exam, as mentioned in the previous sources, they present to us the hero who saved the situation, seizing the opportunity that awaited him to appear. Al-Munḍir bin Saeed al-Ballūṭī did so without anyone asking him to, delivering a long speech without prior preparation, immortalized by literary and historical books. As al-Ḥumaydī mentioned, “Abū al-

Ḥakam Muṣṭafī b. Saʿīd was perceptive, so he rose to the occasion, delivering an eloquent speech effortlessly” (Al-Ḥumaydī, 1989: 2/556), thus managing to attract the attention of the audience and becoming a shining, famous name.

The researcher noted that the news in the sources, despite their consensus that al-Ballūṭī’s sermon was not prepared in advance, is not easy to accept and acknowledge its validity. The evidence for this is what Al-Nubāhī mentioned, indicating that al-Ballūṭī was waiting for the opportunity to excel and prevail over al-Qālī, confirming this by saying: “He rose to his position [...] and Abū ‘Alī began his first sermon with amazing words [...] as if he had memorized it before that for a while” (Al-Nubāhī, 1983: 66).

This story shows that the Andalusians tended to show their superiority over the newcomers; hence, we find al-Ballūṭī seizing the opportunity to defeat al-Qālī and to undermine his authority, to weaken his position, as evidenced by that bitter complaint revealed at the end of the sermon about the preoccupation of the people of Andalusia with the newcomers to them, turning away from their own people, as if he reproaches them for forgetting the creative minds among the sons of Andalusia.

There is another story in which the researcher found a reference to the origin of the dispute between al-Qālī and al-Ballūṭī. This situation was not just the result of this incident, but rather the culmination of a series of incidents. Our memory takes us back to discussing a copy of the book *Al-ʿAyn* that al-Ballūṭī brought with him from Egypt. The author of mentioned the story of that book and the many errors it contained. Therefore, al-Mustanṣir asked Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī and three others to work on comparing all the copies after hearing from them about the many errors that al-Ballūṭī had made. He asked them to produce a new copy free of any *ʿAyn* errors. Al-Ḥumaydī said: “As for the copy of the *Al-gadi* that he wrote in his own handwriting, it is the most distorted, erroneous, and altered copy. We asked him about what we remember of it, and we recited broken verses to him, and we heard corrected words and altered languages (you mean: dialectal variants of some words?). Abū ‘Alī asked him about that, and he replied something similar to that.” (Al-Ḥumaydī, 1989: 1/92). When they contacted al-qādi al-Ballūṭī to inform him of the truth about his copy (suggestion: about the true quality of his copy), he wrote three poetic verses mocking them, which prompted them to take it to Al-Mustanṣir seeking his justice and fairness. They requested to be gathered with al-Ballūṭī to see the reality of his mistakes. In this regard, al-Ḥumaydī said: “And if our master wishes to know the reality of what we have understood, let him attend, and let Professor Abū ‘Alī attend, then we will discuss every word we have understood from him.” (Al-Ḥumaydī, 1989: 1/93). One of the four scholars composed eleven poetic verses inviting al-Ballūṭī to a debate, praising the status and linguistic position of al-Qālī, and then dedicated them to the Caliph Mustanṣir, who laughed and ordered them to be sealed and sent to al-Ballūṭī. After that, no word was heard from him. The researcher believes that this incident was a strong impetus and a direct cause of fueling the dispute between

them.

### **10. The Rivalry between Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī (356 H./969 CE) and Ibn Rifā’a al-Iībīrī (404 H./1014 CE)**

There is another story that reveals the pride of the Andalusians of their country and their scholars, showing that they used to deliberately embarrass the scholars coming from the East in the presence of senior state officials. The story is also related to Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī and In Rifā’a al-Iībīrī, as a dialogue took place regarding the narration of a poetic verse in the presence of Ibn Rimāḥis, the representative of the Commander of the Faithful ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III. al-Iībīrī objected to the narration by al-Qālī, denied it, became angry, and left the council in an attempt to diminish the status of Abū ‘Alī, due to a minor mistake in poetic meter, claiming that the poetic verse was famous among people and not prone to mistakes by children. As a result, Ibn Rimāḥis wrote to the ruling al-Mustansīr informing him of what happened and expressing his displeasure with al-Iībīrī’s actions. The ruler wrote on the paper: “Praise be to God who made in one of our valleys someone who corrects the mistakes of the visitors from Iraq to us, and al-Iībīrī is more deserving of approval than anger, so leave him to his own affairs, and treat the visiting man with respect, and through testing, he may either pass or fail.” (*Al-Maqqarī, 1968: 3/71*).

From this story, we understand that it portrays the failure of Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī, the famous linguist, due to a prosodic mistake, to show the scientific status of Andalusia and its superiority over the Mašriq. Not only that, but al-Iībīrī tries to incite the listeners against him to diminish his significance, as revealed by the words of the caliph, who thanked God for the presence of a stubborn opponent who confronts any newcomer to Andalusia.

### **11. The Rivalry between Šā’id al-Bagdādī (417 H./1027 CE) and Ibn al-’Arīf (441 H./1050 CE)**

Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī was not the sole visitor to Andalusia; he was accompanied by the linguist Šā’id al-Bagdādī. Al-Bagdādī engaged in linguistic and literary competitions with the scholars of Andalusia, particularly with al-Qālī’s students. Sa’id was known for his sharp wit and quick responses, yet he faced accusations of fabrication and forgery when unable to provide an answer.

There is a story that indicates the readiness of three students of al-Qālī to subject Šā’id al-Bagdādī to an exam in order to show their superiority over him. According to the story the dignitaries of the time, such as Al-Zubaydī, Al-’Ašimī Ibn al-’Arīf, and others, gathered at the palace of Al-Manšūr b. Abī ‘Amir (392 H./1002 CE). Al-Manšūr said to them: This man who has come to us, Šā’id, claims to have mastered the disciplines in these disciplines that you are the lanterns of, and their crescent moons, and I would like him to be examined so that the depth of his knowledge becomes evident. Al-Manšūr dismissed his council and guests and asked him about Abū Sa’id Al-Sirāfi (368 H./979 CE), claiming to have met

him and read to him a book by Sibawayhī. Al-'Aṣimī took the initiative to ask, but al-Bagdādī apologized that grammar is not his field of expertise, nor the head of his craft. Al-Zubaydī asked: What have you mastered, O *ṣaykh*? He said: Memorizing they are? Vocabulary in the language. He asked: What is the Morphological Balance of (*'Aulaq*)? He laughed and said: Is someone like me asking about this? Only young students are asked about it. Al-Zubaydī said: We asked you, and we do not doubt that you know it. His color changed and he said: (*'Afa*). Al-Zubaydī said: Your friend is a charlatan. Ṣā'id said: Isn't the *ṣaykh*'s profession morphology? He said to him: Yes. Sa'id said: "I am good at, my strength lies in memorizing poems, narrating news, and deciphering riddles." (Ibn Bassām, 2000: 4/14).

After reading the story, one can observe that al-Manṣūr boasted about his scholars and experts, giving them credit for spreading knowledge and expertise. However, he questioned Saeid's literary prowess when he remarked, "He claims to be proficient in literature." Ṣā'id apologized for not knowing an answer, clarifying his lack of expertise in Arabic grammar rules. Regarding the morphological analysis of the word "*'Aulaq*" Saeid's response was accurate, although he hesitated due to its root "*Walaq*," meaning "lying." Overlooking this root, the students reverted the word to "*Alaq*" meaning "madness," suggesting a different morphological balance, "*Faw'al*." Both answers, theirs and Ṣā'id's, could be deemed correct in this context.

Upon closer inspection of the term "*mumakhrīq*," it becomes clear that it carries a grave accusation of falsehood. They all aimed to discredit and disprove him in the presence of al-Manṣūr.

There is no doubt that the debates that took place between Saeid and his opponents indicate his great knowledge and mastery of the sciences of language and literature. When his opponent, Ibn al-'Arīf, debated him in the presence of al-Manṣūr, Ṣā'id managed to triumph over him, "and he did not utter a word in the assembly without reciting a relevant poem or presenting a compatible story, which increased al-Manṣūr's admiration of him." (Ibn Bassām, 2000: 4/14).

One of the things that increased the anger of al-Qālī's students towards Sa'id was that when Mansur ibn Abi 'Amir presented the book *al-Nawādir* authored by Abū 'Alī al-Qālī to get his opinion on it, he said: "If Al-Manṣūr wants to give an order, I will dictate to the scribes of his state a book that is higher in status and greater in importance, without including in it any news like Abū 'Alī did, so Mansur allowed him to do so" (Ibn Bassām, 2000: 4/14).

When Ṣā'id finished his famous book, *al-Fuṣūṣ* scientists began to examine it, monitoring his mistakes. They found in it no news they had heard before nor a word they deemed true. The matter reached al-Manṣūr, who said that he was a man capable of lying. Ṣā'id's matter was exposed, so they asked al-Manṣūr to order the alteration of some book's features to indicate that it was very old. They wrote on the cover *The Book of Jokes* by Abū l-Ghawth l-Ṣan'ani (Ibn Bassām, 2000: 4/15).

Here, Ṣā'id claimed that he saw it in a certain country, written by so and so, so

the Al-Manşūr took it from him so that its content would not be known, as Şā'id words did not match the content of the book. Therefore, Mansur ordered the book, *al-Fuṣūṣ* to be thrown in the river.

This story, with all its strangeness, contains a great conspiracy and deception against the person of Şā'id. Did he not stipulate when he wrote the book that he would bring every strange and unfamiliar thing? And that he would not include a single piece of news from those mentioned by Abū 'Alī al-Qālī in his books? It seems that this is what led the scholars of Cordoba to not accept or acknowledge what Şā'id presented in his book; they had never heard of him in the first place, and he was strange and unfamiliar to them, so they would never believe him, and therefore they rejected what was in it, and threw it in the river.

[Here, Şā'id claimed that he saw it in a certain country, written by so and so, so al-Manşūr took it from him so that its content would not be known, as Şā'id's words did not match the content of the book. Therefore, Mansur ordered to throw the book *al-Fuṣūṣ* in the river.

This story, with all its strangeness, contains a great conspiracy and deception against Şā'id. Did he not stipulate when he wrote the book that he would bring every strange and unfamiliar thing? And that he would not include a single piece of news from those mentioned by Abū 'Alī al-Qālī in his book? It seems that this is what led the scholars of Cordoba to not accept or acknowledge what Şā'id presented in his book because they had never heard of him in the first place, and he was strange and unfamiliar to them, so they would never believe him, and therefore they rejected what was in it, and threw it in the river.]

Most likely, the reason behind the disbelief of Saeid was that he was very humorous, as he had a very witty and playful personality. In this regard, the author of the book *al-Mu'yib fī talkhīṣ akhbār al-Magrib* said, "If Abū l-'Ala was not so playful, he would have believed in everything he brought (al-Marrākuṣī, 1994: 41).

The mentioned story about the three students clearly indicates the ignition of enmity between Ibn al-'Arif and Şā'id, especially when Ibn Al-Areef left the gathering defeated and broken, which shook his image in front of al-Manşūr and his two companions who relied heavily on him to tarnish the reputation of Şā'id and expose him to al-Manşūr. However, luck was not on his side, and that's why we find him in every situation, waiting for the opportunity to harm him.

We must not forget the great position that Saeid achieved because of his cleverness, sweetness of speech, and his love for jokes. Al-Manşūr used to ask him every night to read something from his delightful and enjoyable book *Al-Īawwās b. Qa'tal al-Maḍḥayī* with his cousin 'Afra". He often treated him well and gave him a lot of money, not only that, but he also made him part of his special circle in the Diwan of the Nobles. This was a strong reason for Ibn Al-Areef to look at him with envy, as he was one of the workers in that Diwan, and he must have been jealous of him, envying him for the money he obtained thanks to the sweetness of his speech and the eloquence of his words.

Ibn Bassam narrates another story that shows the extent of malice, hatred, and

envy that Ibn al-'Arif harbored towards Saeid in that council where al-Manşūr subjected Şā'id to a test to confirm his ability to improvise poetry. He ordered a rose that had not yet bloomed to be brought to him and asked Saeid to describe it. Şā'id spontaneously composed a poem about it, excelling in it:

*Aba Amer came to you,  
a rose with a scent like musk.  
Like a virgin girl, someone saw her  
and she covered her head with her sleeves in shame.*

Al-Manşūr was pleased with Şā'id's words and approved of them. However, Ibn al-'Areef, filled with envy, disagreed. He accused Saeid of stealing two verses from a Baghdadi poet, claiming to have them at home in the poet's own handwriting. Quickly, Ibn al-'Areef mounted his mule and rushed to Ibn Badr's gathering. He recounted the incident, crafted verses mimicking Saeid's style, but altered them, and then presented them in an old notebook. Sneakily, he added Saeid's verses and hastened to the caliph's court to expose him. Al-Manşūr, angered by the theft accusation, decided to test Şā'id again. Surprisingly, Saeid passed the test, showcasing his quick wit and improvisation skills, impressing Al-Manşūr greatly. As a reward, Şā'id received a thousand dinars, a hundred garments, and a monthly stipend of thirty dinars, and became part of the court poets' circle (Ibn Bassām, 2000: 4/16-17).

Al-Maqqarī narrated another story in which the enmity between two men emerged, caused by envy and spite. This incident took place in the presence of Al-Manşūr after Ibn al-'Arif composed poetic verses describing Al-'Āmiriyya. Şā'id, who was present, and upon hearing the verses, said to Al-Mansur, "I can improvise better verses than these." He then proceeded to create magnificent verses on the spot, impressing Al-Manşūr with his improvisation. Al-Manşūr said to Ibn al-'Arif, "What benefit do you have in contradicting someone who can improvise like this? How then would his composition be?" Ibn al-'Arif replied, "What aided him in this improvisation is what he receives in terms of wealth from your presence." Şā'id responded, "So, this means that his lack of generosity silenced you and made improvisation difficult for you." Al-Manşūr laughed and said, "You both must compete in what is better than this" (Al-Maqqarī, 1968: 1/584).

## 12. The Second Axis: Literary Disputes among Andalusian Scholars Themselves

### A) Between Ibn al-Iflilī (d. 441 AH/1050 CE) and Ibn Şuhayd (d. 426 AH/1035 CE)

The literary status reached by this poet or was the main trigger for envy, as enemies began to use all means to undermine their opponents by tracking their mistakes, inciting princes and ministers against them. In this way, they were able to diminish the value of their opponents' writings, expose them, strip them of their poetic qualities, accuse them of theft, or of imitation and lack of creativity. This is what actually happened between Ibn Shahid and Ibn al-Iflilī.

Ibn al-Ifilī hailed from Eastern roots and stood out as a pioneer in Cordoba during his time, particularly in the realm of Arabic linguistics. He specialized in deciphering unfamiliar terms, delving into their meanings alongside his contemporaries (Al-Ḥamawī, 1991). Anecdotes recall a debate he had with the follower of Ibn Šuhayd from the jinn, where each disguised himself to test the other's knowledge. Ibn al-Ifilī confidently stated, "I came prepared for discussion, dressed in the attire of eloquence, admitting, 'I, too, am unsure of whom you have read.' In response, Ibn Shahid queried, 'Is like this said to me?' prompting Ibn al-Ifilī to retort, 'And what of it?'" He said: "Discuss with me about Al-Khalīl's book." I said: "I have it in a container." He said: "Then debate with me about Sibawayhi's book." I said: "I have a cat that defecated on it, as well as on Ibn Durstawayhi's explanation." So he said to me: "Forget it, I am the master of eloquence." I said: "Oh God! You were just like a mediocre singer, neither excelling in delighting nor failing in disappointing." He said: "The educated ones have taught it to me." I said: "It is not their concern, it is from the teachings of Allah the Almighty, as He said: 'The Merciful taught the Quran, created man, and taught him eloquence.' It is not a poem to be interpreted, Never, until musk comes from your breath, and amber from your sweat" (Ibn Šuhayd, 2010).

The reader of Ibn Shahid's words finds that he often mocks linguists, always trying to belittle their status. Therefore, he ridiculed and mocked Al-Khalīl's book and Sibawayhi's book. Not content with that, he claimed to be the father of eloquence. When the debate between them intensified, Ibn al-Ifilī accused him and described him as a mediocre poet, neither good nor bad enough to be the best. Ibn al-Ifilī denied his knowledge of eloquence and refused to acknowledge him as a skilled writer.

The reader of Ibn Šuhayd's news finds that he had many enemies, especially his friends, who left him alone. The reason for this goes back to his recklessness, madness, and licentiousness. He was obscene in his speech and excessively praised the young men, so they instigated the princes and ministers against him. This had an impact on his personality, making him resentful of all the writers of his time, accusing them of incompetence and negligence. This is revealed in the news mentioned in *Risālat al-tawābi' wa-l-zawābi'* where Ibn Šuhayd mentioned three of his enemies and adversaries. The first of them is Abu Muhammad, who heavily criticized Ibn Shahid and tried to denigrate him in the eyes of the Caliph al-Musta'in against him, accusing him of stealing poems, saying: "As for Abū Muḥammad, his tongue discredited me in al-Mustain's view al-Musta'in, and a group of envious people helped him." (Ibn Šuhayd, 2010: 123).

The second, Abū Bakr, known as Iškimyāt, accused Ibn Shahid of having stolen writings, said: "Chapters of his words were presented to the writer Abu Bakr known as Bashkoumyat, who said: wonderful paragraphs, except that they are not his composition, but he found them." (Ibn Bassām, 2000: 1/183).

The third of his enemies was Ibn al-Ifilī. Ibn Shahid said about him: "As for Abū al-Qāsim al-Ifilī, his place in my heart is established, and his love is deeply

ingrained, although he is against me.” (Ibn Šuhayd, 2010: 123).

Through the last paragraph, the researcher found that the relationship of friendship was what brought together Ibn al-Iflilī and Ibn Šuhayd. However, the situation quickly changed, and friends turned into enemies. Most likely, the disagreement that arose between them was due to professional reasons rather than personal ones, especially when Ibn al-Iflilī started working in the field of rhetoric and eloquence. Al-Ḥumaydī says: “With his knowledge of grammar and language, he spoke about the meanings of poetry, the types of rhetoric, and criticism for both” (Al-Ḥumaydī, 1/234).

It seems that this provoked Ibn Shahid, who mocked Ibn al-Iflilī a lot. Ibn Bas-sam mentioned to us that the son of Ibn al-Iflilī was arrogant and envious of others. He said: “He was proud of himself, very envious, sticking his head in clear error when imitating or engaging in it, and no one could divert him from it” (Ibn Bassām, 2000: 1/219).

There is a story indicating the failure of the son of Ibn al-Iflilī in the profession of writing, showing that he did not know the science of rhetoric. He underwent an examination when appointed as a scribe during the days of Al-Mustakfī bi-llah Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, but did not pass the exam, leading to his dismissal from the position because his writing lacked eloquence and rhetoric, as he wrote in a traditional manner without any creativity. (Ibn Bassām, 2000: 1/219).

In the dispute between Ibn Šuhayd and Ibn al-Iflilī, we find that Ibn Šuhayd uses all his rhetorical and eloquent tools to discredit his opponent, question his knowledge and morals, deliberately harm him with harsh criticism, and draw a sarcastic caricature of him in revenge. He talked about Ibn al-Iflilī’s miserliness, revealed the ugliness of his physical characteristics, and chose a nickname for Ibn al-Iflilī’s devil, “camel’s nose,” in a sarcastic reference to the large size of Ibn al-Iflilī’s nose.

### **13. The Rivalry between al-Faṭḥ Ibn Khaqān (529 H./1135 CE) and Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī (521 H./1127 CE)**

The reader of the biography of Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī finds that some aspects are shrouded in mystery, especially in the early stages of his upbringing, his history, his relationships with the writers of his era, as well as the rulers. This is attributed to the loss of many of his books that could reveal to us many aspects of his personal life. In addition, the scarcity of books that have reached us speaking about the time period in which he lived has made the task of researching the details of his life difficult and challenging.

His poetry fills in some gaps about aspects of his life and provides us with important information about the writers, rulers, and citizens he interacted with through documentation of his relationships with them (Şāḥib Abū Ŷanāḥ, 10).

It is truly strange that there are two verses of poetry he composed, which opened the door to criticism and accusations of fabrication and falsehood. A group of authors began to compose false stories and news that defamed Ibn al-Sayyid al-

Baṭalyūsī. The latest of these was a letter composed to slander and mock him, accusing him with baseless charges void of any foundation in truth. This is what we will try to uncover, stand against, and reject in defense of this writer who had a rich history of knowledge and contributions, leaving us a collection of books in various fields such as jurisprudence, literature, language, hadith, and philosophy, among others. This is what made his friend al-Faḥ Ibn Khaqān praise and commend him, saying: “He has a deep understanding of modern and ancient sciences, and a sound methodology in his approaches, never straying from the boundaries of the law, nor deviating from the principles of the Sunnah, or its branches” (Ibn Khaqān, 2010: 709). Al-Dahabī praised his knowledge and status, saying: “He was trustworthy in what he wrote, narrated, and compiled.” He described him as an authority in language, literature, a prominent master, and his works are evidence of his depth, breadth, influence, and extensive reach” (Al-Ḍabbī, 1989: 2/436).

On the other hand, we find that the authors who distorted the image of this talented scholar worked to distort reality, accusing him of loving young boys. Two poetic verses, composed by Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī, were used to harm his reputation and diminish his status accusing him of sexual deviation. These two verses are related to the sons of the ruler of Cordoba, as Al-Qiftī says: “And he had three sons, one of them named ‘Azzūn, the second Raḥmūn, and the third Ḥassūn, and they were young in age but among the most beautiful of people. Abū Muḥammad b. al-Sayyid was infatuated with them unable to accompany them, as he was not their equal in terms of social status. He used to sit under a tree, absorbed in a book he was reading, and in it, he read two verses, which are:

*Did I hide my illness until it almost hid me? I fell in love with ‘Azzūn, so they comforted me.*

*Then have mercy on me by Raḥmūn, and if my soul becomes thirsty to the saliva of Ḥassūn, give me a drink of it.*

He feared for his life because of their father, so he fled to Cordoba and went out to Valencia.” (Al-Qiftī, 1986: 2/143).

His words suggest a sexual deviation, as he regularly flirted with the students under his tutelage. When al-Qiftī remarked, “He has become infatuated with them, unable to be apart from their company,” it clearly hints at his strong attachment. Consequently, he fled Cordoba, fearing for his life from their father’s wrath. A careful reader of the verses would understand that they were spoken in a light-hearted manner, aiming to bring joy to the students’ hearts. Humor, in this context, extends beyond situations of foolishness and stupidity to include funny instances related to beauty. This sentiment is captured in the verses recited by Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī, expressing his admiration for the students’ beauty, known to be the most attractive individuals. Their charming and humorous nature, especially as children, brought joy, happiness, and laughter to those around them. Al-Qiftī’s description of him sitting under a tree engrossed in a book before reciting the verses, indicates his desire for personal amusement. His eloquence aided in

articulating his admiration for their beauty, improvising the verses to humorously express his appreciation for their aesthetics.

This news, attributed to Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī, reveals another aspect of his life, which was filled with dignity and integrity. It shows his inclination towards attachment to the world and indulging in its pleasures, as evidenced by his poems. However, the researcher denies the accusation against him, as we did not find in his poems any evidence that he flirted with young men other than these two lines, and it is most likely that he said them in jest. His love poems did not go beyond the traditional love poetry that speaks of longing to meet the beloved. One reason to support the story imposed on him is al-Maqqarī's victory in saying: "I saw a wonderful composition, written by al-Faṭḥ Ibn Khaqān the famous author of the two works *Qalā'id al-'iqyān* and *Maṭmaḥ al-anfus*, which was exclusively dedicated to the description of the great al-Sayyid, and here I quote it in full, for its novelty, clarity, and eloquence, even if it contains some humor, which it is better to avoid" (Al-Maqqarī, 1978: 3/103). The final statement of al-Maqqarī is supported by the fact that many poets composed numerous poems and verses in love or descriptive poetry for entertainment to escape worries and sorrows, and Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī would not tarnish the bright image that his contemporaries, biographers, painted of him. He would not risk his vast scientific reputation, especially in the fields of jurisprudence, hadith, and philosophy, for the sake of these two verses.

It seems that the story mentioned by al-Qifṭī was a powerful weapon that some of the opponents of Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī used as a tool for criticism, defamation, disparagement, and slander. He stripped his pen to write a eulogy criticizing Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī, undermining his status, and attacking his figure, with the aim of tarnishing his image and harming him. This eulogy was the origin of the dispute between Ibn al-Sayyid al-Baṭalyūsī and al-Faṭḥ Ibn Khaqān, as mentioned by some modern references, and it is a controversial issue. Some affirm its attribution to Ibn Khaqān, while others deny its attribution to him. Each team has its own evidence and proof.

Some skeptics of attributing this story to al-Faṭḥ Ibn Khaqān, such as Dr. Iḥsān 'Abbās, relied on the fact that al-Faṭḥ Ibn Khaqān authored a separate book containing the biography of Ibn al-Sayyid, praised him greatly in it, and went on to say that he did not know that there was a dispute between them before or after that (*History of Andalusian Literature Era of Sects* 315).

Other researchers have agreed on the validity of attributing this treatise to al-Faṭḥ Ibn Khaqān. Some of them relied on what was mentioned in the manuscript "Andalusian Messages," in which its author affirmed in the introduction of that treatise that it was crafted by al-Faṭḥ Ibn Khaqān, saying: "A treatise made by al-Faṭḥ Ibn Khaqān for the teacher Abu Muhammad al-Baṭalyūsī." This is clear evidence of its attribution to him, leaving no room for doubt.

It is necessary to mention that this attribution was also attributed to Abū Abd Allah b. Abī al-Khiṣāl, but he denied it and disassociated himself from it, and

wrote a letter to his friend, the minister and writer Abū al-Ḥusayn Sirāj b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. Sirāj, in which he distanced himself from what was attributed to him regarding the authorship of the Qurtubī Maqāma (*Rasāl wa maqāmāt andalusyya* 105).

Despite some confirmed evidence attributing this position to al-Faḥ Ibn Khaqān, the researcher tends to agree with Dr. Iḥsān ‘Abbās’s doubts about its accuracy for two reasons. The first reason relates to the books that discussed the biography of Ibn al-Sayyid, as none of them mentioned any existing dispute between him and al-Faḥ. What strengthens this assumption is what al-Maqqarī said about him: “He is the sheikh of knowledge and its leader, in his hands lie its reins and control, the Arabs seek guidance from him, the rarest of dialectal variants, and grammar are found with him” (Al-Maqqarī, 1978: 3/106). On the other hand, al-Faḥ Ibn Khaqān authored a specific book in which he praised and commended his sheikh and mentor extensively, enumerated his praiseworthy virtues and qualities, and mentioned the sciences in which he excelled and became famous. The following statement leads us to doubt whether this treatise is correctly attributed to him: “He is the richest of our scholars in knowledge... the most truthful in speech, the most generous in kindness, the highest in rank, and the farthest in attainment. I saw fit to dedicate a book to his news” (Al-Maqqarī, 1978: 3/105). Anyone who reads this statement would have trouble imagining that this treatise was authored by him. There is a stark contrast between these embellished words detailing his praiseworthy qualities and that treatise filled with offensive words and expressions that the tongue refrains from mentioning or even discussing.

In those previous quotations, there is something that denies the attribution of the treatise to al-Faḥ Ibn Khaqān. Even if it is true for him, it expresses a side of his lack of loyalty to his master and friend, and at the same time, reveals a state of contradiction in which Faḥ was praised by Ibn al-Sayyid and showered with insults and defamation by others.

The story attributed to Ibn Khaqān revolves around a fictional tale put in the mouth of a hero named Ali ibn Hisham, who came from the land of Sham to the lands of Andalusia with the aim of familiarizing himself with the state of literature there. When he arrived in the city of Valencia, he asked the people about the literati there, and al-Baṭalyūsī was mentioned to him. When he went to meet him and talk to him, he met two young men who were reciting poems, and as soon as he asked them about Ibn al-Sayyid, one of them began to criticize him with obscene qualities, mentioning that he: “comes to the gatherings with every vice.” (*al-maqāmāt al-andalusyya* 105). These two young men then began competing in attaching accusations of immorality and debauchery to Ibn al-Sayyid, using explicit words against him. Faced with this scene, Ali ibn Hisham decided to end his meeting with them and announced his withdrawal from the gathering by saying: “So when I heard what I heard, when I heard it, when I heard what I just mentioned, and I was enlightened about the matter of the sheikh, I exceeded in censure, and I indulged in reviling and cursing, and I sought God’s help in reviling.” (*al-maqāmāt*

*al-andalussya* 105).

#### 14. The Rivalry between Ibn Ḥazm (456 H./1064 CE) and Abū al-Walīd al-Bāḡī (474 H./1082 CE)

If we move away a little from literary disputes, we also find disagreements in jurisprudential doctrines. Perhaps the best example of this is the conflict that emerged and flared up between two distinguished scholars from Andalusia, the jurists Ibn Ḥazm and al-Bāḡī. It is worth noting that both of them suffered greatly from the people of their countries, who deprived them of their rights and favored new scholars from the East over them. Despite that, there was a state of contention and animosity between them as they both worked in the same field, namely the field of jurisprudence. Strangely enough, they both shared the same suffering, as the people of Andalusia rejected and opposed them. There is no clearer evidence of this than the bitter complaint through which Ibn Ḥazm explicitly expressed his anger towards the people of Andalusia who did not appreciate their scholars, criticized them heavily, sought to find their mistakes, and monitored them closely. He attributed this to the factor of envy, as the most envied people in the world are the people of knowledge. He said, “Especially our Andalusia, as it is plagued by the envy of its people towards the prominent scholars among them, the skilled ones, their independence often brings it, and their disapproval of their virtues, following their faults and stumbles” (Ibn Ḥazm, 1987: 2/177).

There is no doubt that the dispute between them spread during the jurisprudential debates in the fifth century AH. Ibn Ḥazm worked on spreading the Ḍahīrī school, declaring a relentless war against the Malikī school and its supporters, as well as fighting against other Sunni schools. The supporters of the first school hindered jihad and called for adhering to the apparent meaning of the Quranic text and the noble Prophetic tradition.

Al-Bāḡī, therefore, emerges to confront Ibn Ḥazm and refute his ideas, tracking him everywhere he goes in an attempt to undermine him. Intense debates ensued between them, indicating al-Bāḡī’s mastery of those sciences after spending thirteen years in the East seeking and acquiring knowledge. He returned to his homeland in Andalusia, excelled in teaching, and achieved a prestigious position in Andalusian society (Al-Yaḥsubī, 1998: 2/348).

The two men met on the island of Majorca, and debates ensued between them that led to the triumph of al-Bāḡī over Ibn Ḥazm, who left defeated. In this regard, al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ said, “There were sessions between them that were the cause of the disgrace of Ibn Hazm and his departure from Majorca, although he was the head of its people, his affairs continued to deteriorate thereafter” (Al-Yaḥsubī, 1998: 2/350).

Upon investigating the causes of the dispute between them, we find that the real reason lies in a personal matter at its core. The evidence for this is what Al-Bajī said to Ibn Hazm during their discussion: “I have greater determination than you in seeking knowledge; because you seek it while having a life of luxury, staying up

with a lamp of gold, whereas I seek it while staying up with a simple market lamp.”

There was nothing from Ibn Hazm except that he replied by saying, “This speech is upon you, not for you; because you sought knowledge while in that state hoping to exchange it for a similar state of mine, I asked for it while you were doing for what I have done and mentioned it, not seeking anything but the elevation of knowledge in this world and the hereafter” (Al-Maqqarī, 1968: 2/77).

Al-Maqqarī commented on this debate, saying: “So he humiliated him,” meaning that Ibn Ḥazm embarrassed al-Bāyī, showing clear bias from Al-Maqqarī towards Ibn Hazm.

## 15. Research Conclusions and Results

The study reached the following results:

1. The study showed that jealousy and envy are the origins of disputes among the scholars in Al-Andalus.
2. The study revealed the existence of a state of animosity and hostility between the natives of Al-Andalus and the scholars coming from the East.
3. The study indicated that the scholars of Al-Andalus had a great deal of knowledge, but they were not given the status they deserved from the princes and the people of their country; therefore, they took action to confront their rivals and competitors from the East.
4. The study showed that literary and historical sources vary in reporting news, with some exaggeration and deviation from reality.
5. Some sources clearly showed considerable bias towards one party over another, which is an obstacle to objectivity and fairness in the judgments issued by their authors.
6. Literary disputes revealed a side of the relationships between scholars, contributing to portraying a clear picture of the intellectual atmosphere in literary gatherings and scientific circles.
7. The disputes showcased the pride of some scholars and their superiority over their rivals, revealing their mastery of the subjects they studied.

## Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

## References

- Al-Ḍabbī, A. I. Y. (1989). *Buḡyat al-Multamis fī Tārīkh Riḡāl ahl al-Andalus* (Edited by Ibrāhīm Al-Abyārī). Dār al-Kitāb al-Miṣrī.
- Al-Ḥamawī, Y. (1991). *Mu'ḡam al-Udabā'*. Dār al-Kutub Al-'Ilmiyya.
- Al-Ḥumaydī, M. I. F. (1989). *Ÿadwāt Al-Muqtabis fī Tārīkh “Ulamā” al-Andalus* (Edited by Ibrāhīm Al-Abyārī). Dār Al-Kutub al-Miṣrī.
- Al-Maqqarī, A. I. M. (1968). *Nafḡ al-ṡīb min Guṣn al-Andalus al-Rātīb* (Edited by Iḡsān ‘Abbās). Dār Ṣadir.
- Al-Maqqarī, A. I. M. (1978). *Azhār Al-Riyād fī Abār al-Qādi ‘Ayyād*. Fund for the Revival

of Islamic Heritage.

Al-Marrākuṣī, 'A. el-W. (1994). *Al-Mu'ayib fi Talkhīṣ Ajbār al-Magrib* (Edited by Muḥammad 'Azzāb). Dār al-Farḡānī for Publishing and Distribution.

Al-Nubāhī, A. el-Ḥ. (1983). *Tārīkh Qudāt al-Andalus*. Dār al-Afāq al-Ŷadīda.

Al-Qiftī, J. el-D. (1986). *Inbāh al-Ruwāt 'alā Anbāh al-Nuḡāt* (Edited by Muḥammad Abu Al-Fadl Ibrāhīm). Dār al-Fikr.

Al-Yaḥsubī, al-Q. 'A. (1998). *Tartīb Al-Madārik wa Taqrīb Al-Masālik li-Ma'rifa A'lām Maḍhab al-Mālik* (Edited by Muḥammad Salīm Hāšim). Dār al-Kutub Al-'Ilmiyya.

Al-Zubaydī, A. B. M. (1984). *Ṭabaqāt Al-Naḡwiyyin wa al-Lugawiyyin* (Edited by Muḥammad Abū Al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm). Dār al-Ma'arif.

Ibn Bassām, A. el-Ḥ. A. (2000). *Al-Dakhīra fi Maḡāsīn Ahl al-Ŷazīra* (Edited by Iḥsān 'Abbās). Dār al-Garb al-Islamī.

Ibn Ḥazm, A. M. 'A. (1987). *Rasāil Ibn Ḥazm* (Edited by Iḥsān 'Abbās). Arab Institution for Studies.

Ibn Khaqān, al-F. (1983). *Maṭmaḡ al-Anfus wa Masraḡ al-Taannus fi Malāh Ahl Al-Andalus* (Edited by: Muḥammad 'Ali šawabkeh). Muassasat Al-Risāla.

Ibn Khaqān, al-F. (2010). *Qala'id ql-Aqyān wa Maḡasīn al-A'yān* (Edited by Ḥussein Khriyuš). Al-'Alam al-Kutub al-Hadīṭ.

Ibn Šuhayd, A. (2010). *Risāla al-Tawabī' wa-l-Zawabī'* (Edited by Butrus Al-Bustāni). Dār Šādir.