



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Muslim opposition to logic and theology in the light of the works of Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti (d. 911/1505)

Ali, M.

Citation

Ali, M. (2008, November 4). *Muslim opposition to logic and theology in the light of the works of Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti (d. 911/1505)*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13226>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13226>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Chapter Three

Şawn al-Manṭiq wa 'l-Kalām 'an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa 'l-Kalām: Its Manuscript, the Date and Purpose of its Composition as well as its Content and Sources

Reading al-Suyūṭī's discussion in QM and JQ as dealt with in chapter one and two, one is impressed by the amount of materials he succeeded to process. However, in his work to be discussed now, *Şawn al-Manṭiq wa 'l-Kalām 'an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa 'l-Kalām*, al-Suyūṭī was almost a systematic historian drawing our attention to the fact that logic and theology were opposed by Muslims of various generations and even from the earliest period of Islamic history. In his discussion of the Muslim opposition to logic, al-Suyūṭī, for instance, systematically arranges his topic as follows: First he deals with the foundation of logic; then he discusses its introduction into the religious community of Islam; furthermore he discusses the historical connection between the books of *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *uṣūl al-dīn* to logic and the beginning of its spread among later scholars. Finally, he enumerates chronologically the scholars who opposed logic, beginning with al-Shāfi'ī (d. 203/820) and ending with Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329). The same pattern holds true, when dealing with the Muslim opposition to *kalām*.

3.1. Manuscript and Edition of SM

SM has been edited twice: First in 1947 by 'Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār, who used the single manuscript of SM found in Dār al-Kutub al-Azhariyya (Majmū' 204) as a base for his edition;⁵⁵¹ and secondly in 1970 by Su'āda 'Abd al-Rāziq, who used al-Nashshār's edition as a starting point. Although al-Nashshār was mentioned as co-editor in the 1970 edition of SM, according to Hallaq, al-Nashshār in reality did not participate in any collaborative work with Su'āda 'Abd al-Rāziq in preparing the second edition. He only provided her with his 1947 edition.⁵⁵²

Based on the scribe's own statement found at the end of the manuscript, which reads: "*tamma min ḥaṭṭ muṣannifih bi-āḥir yawm al-ithnayn al-ḥādīy wa 'l-īshrīn min shahr ramaḍān al-mu'azzam sanat tis'a wa thamānīn wa thamān mi'a*, [the copying of the autograph was completed at the end of Monday, 21st of the Glorified Ramaḍān, of the year 889],"⁵⁵³ one is convinced that the manuscript is not an autograph, but a copy made directly by a scribe⁵⁵⁴ from an autograph by al-

⁵⁵¹Published together in the same volume with al-Suyūṭī's abridgement of Ibn al-Taymiyya's *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī al-Radd 'ala Manṭiq al-Yūnān* by Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda (Cairo: 1947). I am indebted to Dr. N. J.G. Kaptein, the Director of the Indonesian Netherlands Cooperation in Islamic Studies (INIS), and Dr. Abdusamad Kamba, the Educational Attaché of the Indonesian Republic at Cairo, for providing me with a copy of this edition.

⁵⁵²Published together with *Jahd al-Qarīḥa fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīḥa* by Dār al-Naṣr li 'l-Ṭibā'a. See Hallaq, *op. cit.*, p. lvi.

⁵⁵³See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

⁵⁵⁴Al-Nashshār provides no information concerning the fact who this scribe was. Based on Sartain's discussion of al-Suyūṭī's biography and background, one might say that the

Suyūṭī who finished writing it in 888.⁵⁵⁵ The script of the manuscript is tiny and dense but neatly arranged. Each folio is fully covered with about 52 lines and almost no lacunae are found on the pages. According to al-Nashshār, the paper of the manuscript is of one and the same type.⁵⁵⁶

The present author was only able to consult the printed editions of SM. The single manuscript of SM which is preserved in Dār al-Kutub al-Azhariyya is no longer accessible to the public. This was the information obtained by Dr. Nursamad Kamba, the Educational Attaché of the Indonesian Republic at Cairo, from the authorities of the Azhar Library, as he confirmed in a letter to Dr. N.J.G. Kaptein, the Director of the Indonesian Netherlands Cooperation in Islamic Studies (INIS) in Leiden.⁵⁵⁷ Furthermore, the manuscript as downloaded from the website www.alazharonline.org, which is provided by the Maktoum Project for preserving the manuscripts at the Azhar University, consists only of pictures of negative photographs. Though the downloaded negative images of the manuscript were converted into positive ones by a specialist in photographic and digital services at Leiden University, the result was vague and extremely difficult to decipher.

According to al-Nashshār, the edition of SM was undertaken after *Shayḥ* Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Rāziq had come across the manuscript and asked al-Nashshār’s assistance in preparing of it for publication. Due to the former being appointed as a Minister of *Waqf*, al-Nashshār then did the work alone.⁵⁵⁸

As acknowledged in his first edition of the manuscript, al-Nashshār attempted to correct some grammatical and linguistical mistakes found in the text, to make clear some difficult expressions, and also to add some missing phrases in square brackets. For these corrections, al-Nashshār referred to *Qūt al-Qulūb* by Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 383/994),⁵⁵⁹ *Jāmi‘ al-Bayān* by Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Nimarī (d. 463/1071),⁵⁶⁰ *Fayṣal al-Tafrīqa bayn al-Īmān wa ‘l-Zandaqa*⁵⁶¹ and *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn*⁵⁶² by al-Gazālī (d. 505/1112) as well as *Mu‘jam*

scribe most probably refers to ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Shādhilī, who was known as al-Suyūṭī’s pupil, biographer and one of the most important copyists of his works. This was reflected in a number of facts, one of which states that the Syrians sent him a present, because they were so pleased with his accuracy. They also requested that he alone should copy al-Suyūṭī’s works for them. Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 34, 36, 49.

⁵⁵⁵Al-Suyūṭī indicates this information indirectly in his introduction of SM, by explaining that twenty years after he had completed *al-Qawl al-Mushriq* in 867 or 868/1464, he composed SM, due to the fact that he was challenged by his opponents to prove himself well-versed in logic and, hence deserving to undertake *ijtihād*. See SM, *op.cit.*, p. 33.

⁵⁵⁶See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

⁵⁵⁷Dated November 18, 2003.

⁵⁵⁸For the forewords of the *Shayḥ* Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Rāziq and those of ‘Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār, See the introduction of SM, *op. cit.*

⁵⁵⁹*Qūt al-Qulūb*, which was referred to by al-Nashshār, was published in Cairo by al-Maṭba‘a al-Muniriyya in 1932. See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p.125, n. 2.

⁵⁶⁰Al-Nashshār confirmed to have referred to *Jāmi‘ Bayān al-‘Ilm wa Faḍlih* (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Muniriyya, 1946). See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p. 132, n. 1.

⁵⁶¹In his note, al-Nashshār confirmed to have referred to two editions of *al-Tafrīqa*: First, the edition of al-Ḥānījī (1343/1924), and secondly, that of what he referred to as the edition of Cairo (1353/1934). See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p. 183, n. 2.

al-Udabā' by Yāqūt al-Hamawī (d. 624/1229).⁵⁶³ Al-Nashshār also identifies a great deal of prominent figures (*al-a'lām*) featured in the text of SM in the annotations and makes references to the Koranic verses cited in the text.⁵⁶⁴

Being commissioned by Dr. 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd, General Custodian of *Majma' al-Buḥūth al-Islāmiyya* to present to the readers with the new edition of SM in a new and elegant form provided with references based on three works abridged in SM, respectively *al-Ri'āya* by al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/858),⁵⁶⁵ *Kitāb al-Sharī'a* by al-Ājurrī (d. 360/972),⁵⁶⁶ and *Kitāb Ḥalq Af'āl al-'Ibād* by al-Buḥārī (d. 256/870),⁵⁶⁷ which were published after the publication of the 1st edition of SM, Su'āda 'Abd al-Rāziq prepared the second edition of SM.⁵⁶⁸ Her contribution consisted in collating al-Nashshār's edition with the three works mentioned before. This was reflected in the fact that she added on the basis of these works a total number of seven notes in which she proposed corrections to the SM edition of 1947. Furthermore, she redivided the text into smaller paragraphs.

Apart from two no-longer-extant works against *kalām*, *al-Gunya 'an al-Kalām* by al-Ḥaṭṭābī (d.388/988) and *al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Ḥadīth* by Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Sam'ānī (d. 562/1166), all works abridged in SM have been published. The following are the abridged works in SM, which were not used by them due to the fact that these had either not been edited or were not at their disposal at the time they edited the text: *Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih* by Abū Ismā'īl b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Anṣārī al-Harawī (d. ca. 481/1089),⁵⁶⁹ *Ṣariḥ al-Sunna* by al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923),⁵⁷⁰ *Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunna* by Abū 'l-Qāsim Hibat Allāh b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Manṣūr al-Ṭabarī al-Lālakā'ī (d.418/1028),⁵⁷¹ and *Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth* by al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī (d. 463/1071).⁵⁷²

⁵⁶²The *Iḥyā'* which was referred to by al-Nashshār here was that published in 1302/1885 (al-Ṭab' a al-Azhariyya al-Miṣriyya). See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p. 188, n. 7.

⁵⁶³When editing the text of the Debate between al-Sīrāfī and Mattā, al-Nashshār confirmed to have compared the text which was recorded in *Mu'jam al-Udabā'* as edited by Margoliouth (JRAS, London: 1905, p. 79-130). See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p. 190, n. 2.

⁵⁶⁴In the introduction of SM, *op. cit.*

⁵⁶⁵Su'āda confirmed to have referred to *Kitāb al-Ri'āya li Ḥuqūq Allāh* (London: Luzac & Co., 1940), ed. M. Smith. See SM (1970), *op. cit.*, p. 126, n. 1.

⁵⁶⁶Su'āda confirmed to have referred to *Kitāb al-Sharī'a*, which was edited by *al-Shayḥ* Muḥammad Ḥamid al-Faqī (1369/1950). See SM (1970), *op. cit.*, p. 168, n. 2.

⁵⁶⁷*Kitāb Ḥalq Af'āl al-'ibād*, referred to by Su'āda, was that published in India (in 1305/1888). See SM (1970), *op. cit.*, p. 131, n. 2.

⁵⁶⁸For the forewords of Dr. 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd, General Custodian of *Majma' al-Buḥūth al-Islāmiyya* and the introduction of the editor, see SM, *op. cit.*, p. 5-10.

⁵⁶⁹This work was published in Beirut by Dār al-Fikr al-Lubnānī in 1994 and edited by Dr. Samīḥ Dugaym based on Mss. preserved in the British Museum in London (reg. 1571: 27520).

⁵⁷⁰This work was edited by D. Sourdel in "Une Profession de Foi de l'Historien al-Ṭabarī," in *Revue des Etudes Islamique* (1968) XXXVI, fasc. 2.

⁵⁷¹*Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa 'l-Jamā'a* (Riyāḍ: Dār Ṭayyiba, 1985), ed. Dr. Aḥmad Sa'ad Ḥamdān.

⁵⁷²*Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth* by Abū Bakr al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basimevi, 1971), ed. Muḥammad Sa'īd Ḥaṭīboglu.

3.2. Date of Composition of SM

The date of composition of this work can be found in its introduction, in which al-Suyūṭī says: “Long ago, in the year 867 or 868 [H] I composed a book on the prohibition of being occupied with the art of logic, which I named “*al-Qawl al-Mushriq*” into which I included the statements of the learned men of Islam condemning and prohibiting it. I related in it that the *Shayḥ al-Islām*, one of the scholars who has reached the degree of *ijtihād*⁵⁷³ Taqī al-Dīn b. Taymiyya composed a book to undo its foundations, which I had not found at that time. Then, twenty years passed by without finding it. Then when this year had come, and I had told of what God endowed upon me in attaining the rank of independent legal investigation, someone mentioned that one of the conditions for legal investigation is the knowledge of the art of logic claiming that this condition lacked in me.⁵⁷⁴ The poor fellow⁵⁷⁵ did not understand that I knew it better than those who claim to know it and who defend it. I know the principles of its foundations, and on that basis I derived therefrom the insights as well as the knowledge rendered by the leading logicians of today, with the exception of only our very learned teacher Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Kāfyajī.⁵⁷⁶ Thus I sought for Ibn Taymiyya's book, till I found it. I saw that he had entitled it *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī 'l-Radd 'alā Mantīq al-Yūnān*. In it, he expressed excellently his intention to undo its foundations one by one and explain the corruption of its principles. So I summarized it in a little composition which I entitled *Jahd al-Qariḥa fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīḥa*. Then, many of the charlatans, who are far removed from real scholarship, eagerly said: What is the argument to prohibit it? On what sources did Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ rely for his legal decision to that effect? And other expressions of a similar nature. Surprisingly, they defend logic but they do not master it, and they are busying themselves with it but they do not use it in their inquiries, they go about

⁵⁷³*Ijtihād*, according to Schacht, is the use of individual reasoning, obtained by means of analogy, which is applied to the Koran and the custom of the Prophet. Schacht, J., “*Idjtihād*,” in *EI*², III, 1026.

⁵⁷⁴ “... *wa man lā yuḥīṭu bihī falā thiqata lahū bi 'ulūmihī aṣlan...*” The first who heralds this - as generally claimed - is al-Gazālī, in the introduction of *al-Mustaṣfā fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* (Cairo: Al-Maṭba'a al-Amīriyya, 1322/1904), I, 10.

⁵⁷⁵This probably refers to one of al-Suyūṭī's chief opponents, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Jawjarī, one of his rivals ever since they had been in the Hijaz together as students in 869/1464-5. Al-Jawjarī, according to Sartain, called a meeting for a formal debate in the presence of the sultan, emirs and other notables. Being responsive to the calling, al-Suyūṭī, Sartain narrates, requested the presence of two other *mujtahids* besides himself - one to debate with him and the other as a referee - since he could not debate with any individual of inferior status. See Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

⁵⁷⁶Muḥyī al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Kāfyajī the Ḥanafite": Muḥammad b. Sulaymān b. Sa'd b. Mas'ūd al-Rūmī al-Bargamī, born in 788/1387 and died in 879/1475, was given the surname al-Kāfyajī because of his occupation with the book *al-Kāfiya* on grammar (Sartain, *op. cit.*, 29-124). He was one of al-Suyūṭī's teachers, under whom the latter studied for 14 years. He was referred to by al-Shak'a as *ustādh al-wujūd*. Muṣṭafā al-Shak'a, *Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī: Masīratuhū al-Ilmiyya wa Mabāḥithuhū al-Lugawiyya* (Cairo: Dār al-Miṣriyya al-Lubnāniyya, 1994), p. 14.

it at random like the weak-sighted she-camel that beats the ground with her fore feet and they only follow the right direction in discussion and deduction in blindness.

Some of those who spent their life [studying] logic met me. When they saw the statement of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ regarding his legal opinions: *Wa laysa al-ishṭigāl bi ta'allumihī wa ta'līmihī mim mā abāḥahu 'l-shāri' wa la 'stibāḥahū aḥad min al-ṣaḥāba wa 'l-tābi'īn wa 'l-a'emma al-mujtahidīn wa 'l-salaf al-ṣāliḥīn* (studying and teaching logic is not allowed by the Law-giver, by the Companions, the Followers and by the leading scholars who are qualified to undertake *ijtihād*, nor by the Pious Ancestors), they said: This is a testimony to the contrary, which is not accepted. Thus, I said: By God, you neither followed the course of the scholars of religious law nor relied upon that of the logicians!

Thus, I decided to compose an elaborate book [to prohibit it]⁵⁷⁷ following the course of a comprehensive independent legal investigation and deduction, revealing the truth, in which I explain the correctness of what Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ claimed in relating the negation of the permission [of being occupied with logic] to the mentioned people.

When I had begun [to compose the book], and was obliged to mention the statements of the leading scholars in the prohibition of the study of theology, because of the intricate connection between the two, I entitled the book *Ṣawn al-Manṭiq wa 'l-Kalām 'an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa 'l-Kalām* (to Defend [Islamic] Logic and Theology against the Art of [Greek] Logic and Theology), but only God enables us to reach our goal.⁵⁷⁸

From the passages above, it becomes clear that SM was composed in 887 or 888/1484, twenty years after QM, which was composed in 867 or 868/1464.

Neither is there any doubt that SM was composed after JQ. This is based on al-Suyūṭī's own report in SM, as mentioned before, that he had summarized Ibn Taymiyya's *Naṣīḥa* in a little composition which he entitled JQ. But many of the charlatans, i.e. his opponents, al-Suyūṭī complains, eagerly asked him what the argument was to prohibit logic; on what sources did Ibn Ṣalāḥ rely for his legal decision, etc.⁵⁷⁹

Evidently, in his SM al-Suyūṭī can be said to have sometimes relied on JQ. He, for instance, quotes verses by Ibn al-Qushayrī, which were cited by Ibn Taymiyya in his *Naṣīḥa*:

“We cut off our friendship with those stricken by the malady of *Kitāb al-Shifā'*.

They died as adherents to the religion of Aristotle, while we died in the religion of the Chosen.⁵⁸⁰

3.3. Background and Purpose of the Composition of SM

Before we can understand al-Suyūṭī's purpose for the composition of SM, we should grasp the context in which this work was composed. In his work, *The Gate of Ijtihād*, Hallaq suggests that the first incident in Islamic legal history in

⁵⁷⁷The original sentence is cut off here. Perhaps it is *fī taḥrīmih* [to prohibit it].

⁵⁷⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 33-6.

⁵⁷⁹SM, p. 33.

⁵⁸⁰JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 173; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 510-511.

which the *muqallids* openly opposed the claims of a *mujtahid* concerned al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505). This is closely related to al-Suyūṭī's claim for *ijtihād* and *tajdīd*, as can be read in several of his treatises and *fatwās*. As described in his *al-Radd 'alā man Aḥlada ila 'l-Ard wa Jahīla anna 'l-ijtihād fi kull 'asr fard*, al-Suyūṭī, for instance, argues that the task of *ijtihād* should be fulfilled by the Muslim community because it was a collective duty (*fard kifāya*). If there were no *Mujtahids*, al-Suyūṭī maintains, the community would have agreed upon an error.⁵⁸¹

According to Hallaq, al-Suyūṭī's claim for *ijtihād* was contested by the majority of his contemporaries, not because he had not fulfilled the qualifying conditions to be *mujtahid*, but because of 'immense self-confidence' and 'boastfulness.'⁵⁸² For instance, it was asserted by al-Suyūṭī himself that he had attained "the rank of *ijtihād* in *al-ahkām al-shar'īyya*, in prophetic Tradition and in the Arabic language, an achievement unequalled by anyone since the time of Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 756/1355), who was the last scholar in whom these three kinds of *ijtihād* were united." According to Sartain, al-Suyūṭī in his treatises and *fatwās* often condemned his adversaries as fools. In *al-Lafz al-Jawharī fī Radd Ḥubāt al-Jawjarī* (the jewelled statement in refutation of al-Jawjarī's ravings), for instance, Sartain argues, al-Suyūṭī condemns al-Jawjarī, who has disgraced the former's position as one of the '*ulamā*'⁵⁸³

In light of the arguments mentioned above, it can be said that the purpose of the composition of SM is closely connected to al-Suyūṭī's claim for *ijtihād*. Since logic, as claimed by his opponents, was a necessary pre-condition to gain the appellation of *mujtahid*, al-Suyūṭī felt urged to prove to his opponents that he was well-versed in logic and its basic principles. However, following the course of his predecessors, who negated the permission of being occupied with logic, by composing the work, al-Suyūṭī also proved to be an independent scholar prohibiting logic.⁵⁸⁴

Admittedly, by composing SM, al-Suyūṭī not only wanted to prohibit the study of logic, but also put forward the statements of the leading scholars who prohibited the study of theology, for which he abridged a dozen of the works by his predecessors, ranging from *al-Ri'āya* by al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/858), *al-Gunyā 'an al-Kalām* by al-Ḥaṭṭābī (d. 388/988) to *al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Ḥadīth* by al-Sam'ānī (d. 562/1166).

3.4. The Contents of SM

Examining SM at a glance, one might hastily conclude that in arranging his material, al-Suyūṭī did not use any particular method of division. He simply introduces the work and then begins to discuss one subject after another. But if one pays more attention to the structure of the book, one becomes aware that al-Suyūṭī is almost a systematic historian who draws our attention to the fact that

⁵⁸¹Hallaq, W., *The Gate of Ijtihād: A Study of Islamic Legal History* (University Microfilms international, 1983), p. 76-8; Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 62-3.

⁵⁸²Hallaq, *ibidem*.

⁵⁸³Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 61-3.

⁵⁸⁴See Ali, Mufti, "Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī against Logic and Kalām: Analysis and Significance of *Ṣawn al-Manṭiq wa 'l-Kalām 'an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa 'l-Kalām*," in *Hamdard Islamicus*, Pakistan (2005), Vol. XXVIII, no. 2, p. 25.

logic and theology had been subjected to Muslim opposition during various generations. Based on the 1970 edition of SM, al-Suyūṭī's arrangement of his arguments against logic and theology can be clearly seen. The following are the topics of discussion:

- | | |
|--|------------|
| [1]. Introduction, the Reason for Composing the Book | p. 33-36 |
| [2]. Discussion on the Origin and the Foundation of Logic, on its Introduction into the Religious Community of Islam, and those who connected the Books of <i>Uṣūl al-Fiqh</i> and <i>Uṣūl al-Dīn</i> to Logic, as well as its Spread among the Later Scholars | p. 36-46 |
| [3]. Discussion on the Leading Scholars of the Muslims who condemned or Prohibited Logic explicitly | p. 47 |
| [4]. Discussion on the Statement of <i>al-Imām</i> al-Shāfi'ī dealing with the Prohibition of Logic | p. 47-50 |
| [5]. The First to ask about the Ambiguous Passages of the Koran was 'Abd Allāh b. Ṣabīg | p. 50-51 |
| [6]. The Prohibition to study Theology of al-Shāfi'ī | p. 52-55 |
| [7]. Discussion of a Reason for Innovation | p. 55-63 |
| [8]. Discussion of the Reasons why al-Shāfi'ī and other leading Scholars Prohibited <i>Kalām</i> and the Philosophical sciences | p. 64-67 |
| [9]. The Statements of Leading Muslim Scholars on the Prohibition of <i>Kalām</i> | |
| [a]. <i>Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih</i> by al-Harawī | p. 68-126 |
| [b]. <i>Al-Ri'āya</i> by al-Muḥāsibī | p. 126-130 |
| [c]. <i>Kitāb Ḥalq Af'āl al-'Ibād</i> by al-Buḥārī | p. 131-132 |
| [d]. <i>Ṣarīḥ al-Sunna</i> by al-Ṭabarī | p. 133-137 |
| [e]. <i>Al-Gunya 'an al-Kalām</i> by al-Ḥaṭṭābī | p. 137-147 |
| [f]. <i>Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunna</i> by al-Lālakā'ī | p. 148- |
| 168 | |
| [g]. <i>Kitāb al-Sharī'a</i> by al-Ājurri | p. 168-173 |
| [h]. <i>Qūt al-Qulūb</i> by Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī | p. 173-181 |
| [i]. <i>Jāmi' al-Bayān</i> by Abū 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Barr | p. 182-192 |
| [j]. <i>Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth</i> by al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī | p. 192-197 |
| [k]. <i>Al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Ḥadīth</i> by Ibn al-Sam'ānī | p. 198-236 |
| [l]. The Statement of Imām al-Ḥaramayn | p. 236-237 |
| [m]. <i>al-Tafrīqa bayna 'l-Islām wa 'l-Zandaqa</i> by al-Gazālī | p. 237-241 |
| [n]. <i>Iḥyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn</i> by al-Gazālī | p. 241-243 |
| [10]. The Debate between Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfi and Mattā b. Yūnus | p. 243-255 |
| [11]. Discussion on the Refutation by the Learned Men of one who introduced Logic into <i>Uṣūl al-Fiqh</i> | p. 255 |
| [12]. Discussion on the Refutation of One who Introduced Logic into Grammar | p. 255 |

[1]. Introduction, Reason of Composing the Book

In this *Muqaddima*, referring to Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, al-Suyūṭī, as discussed before (see above sub-chapter no. 3.2.), explains the background of his composing SM and indicates the reason why he entitled his work as such.

[2]. Discussion on the Origin and the Foundation of Logic, on its Introduction into the Religious Community of Islam, and on those who connected the Books of *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* and *Uṣūl al-Dīn* to Logic, as well as on its Spread among the Later Scholars

In this chapter, al-Suyūṭī attempts to answer systematically a number of questions revolving around the questions: (1) who was the founder of Logic and how it was founded; (2) When Logic was first introduced into the community of Islam; (3) Who undertook the pioneering attempt to connect the books of *uṣūl* to logic; and (4) Who was responsible for the spread of logic among the later scholars.

Referring to Ibn Taymiyya, al-Suyūṭī maintains that the first to found Logic was Aristotle, a Greek who first proposed the idea of the sempiternality of the universe, one of those who are “atheists” and “infidels.”⁵⁸⁵ He also remarks: “The foundation of logic was initially derived from geometry. They expressed it in figures similar to the figures of geometry. They named them limits (*ḥudūd*) because of the limits of those figures, in order that they were able to shift from a sensibly perceived form to an intellectual form. He [viz. Ibn Taymiyya] said that this was due to the weakness of their intellect and their failure to know them except by means of a far-fetched method. But God paved the way for Muslims to obtain such a degree of knowledge, eloquence, good deeds and faith that they excell by it all kinds of the species of man.”⁵⁸⁶

Basing himself on *al-Ḥujja ‘alā Tārik al-Maḥajja* [the Argument against one who Abandons the *Maḥajja* (the Proved Way) by *al-Shayḥ* Naṣr al-Maqdisī (d. 490/1098) and on *Sharḥ Lāmiyyat al-‘Ajām* by al-Ṣalāḥ al-Ṣafadī (d. 746/1345), al-Suyūṭī convincingly argues that Logic first entered the religious community of Islam when the caliphate was removed from the Umayyads and fell to the Abbasids whose dynasty was based on the support and the rule of the Persians, who bore in their hearts “infidelity” and hatred towards the Arabs and the dynasty of Islam. The exact process of the introduction of logic into the Muslim world took place, according to al-Suyūṭī, through the importation of the books of Greekdom to the world of Islam.⁵⁸⁷ Furthermore, regarding the process of the translation of the Greek books and the methods thereof, al-Suyūṭī comes with lengthy remarks: “The first of their innovations was the importation of the books of Greekdom to the world of Islam. They were translated into Arabic, and thus became widespread among the Muslims. The man responsible for the importation of the books from Byzantium into the Lands of Islam was Yaḥyā b. Ḥālīd b. Barmak.⁵⁸⁸ There were books of Greekdom in Byzantium; the King of Byzantium feared that if the Byzantines would study the books of Greekdom, they would leave Christianity behind and return to the religion of Greekdom. Thus, they would start to quarrel and their unity would be broken up. Therefore, he collected the books in a place on which he built a construction which was covered by stones and gypsum in order that no one had access to it.

⁵⁸⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 36-7.

⁵⁸⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

⁵⁸⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁵⁸⁸Yaḥyā b. Ḥālīd was appointed *wazīr* by Hārūn al-Rashīd. He was appointed Governor of Āzarbayzān in 158/775. In 161/778 he became a secretary tutor to Prince Hārūn, and he remained in office for 17 years, from 170/786 to 187/803. See Sourdel, D [W. Barthold], “al-Barāmika,” in EI², I, 1033-6.

When the command of the dynasty of the Abbasids fell to Yaḥyā b. Ḥālid, who was an atheist, he received news about the books in the edifice in Byzantium. So he bribed the King of the Byzantines of his time with presents, without asking from him anything in return. When he had sent him many presents, the King of Byzantium collected his patriarchs, saying: This man, the servant of the Arab has given me a lot of presents, but without asking anything from me in return. But I am convinced that he desires something. I fear that his need will bring me difficulties. Thus, I am worried. Then, when Yaḥyā's envoy came to him, he asked him: Tell your friend that if he has a need, he should mention it. When the envoy told Yaḥyā, he answered him: What I need is that the books which are under the building, will be sent to me. I will take out from them some that I need, and send back the rest to him. When the King of Byzantium had read his [Yaḥyā's] letter, he danced with joy. Then he gathered the patriarchs, the bishops and the monks, declaring before them: I have told you that the servant of the Arab did indeed have a need. He has expressed it and it is very trivial to me. I have an idea to which you will listen. If you acquiesce with it I will decide upon it; if you have a different view, we will consult together, till we share the same opinion. They asked [the King] : What is it? He answered: He wants to have the Greek books. He will take what he likes and return the rest. Then they said: What do you think ? He said: I know that our ancestor only constructed the building because he feared that if the books would fall into the hands of the Christians, who would read them, this would lead to the corruption of their religion and the demolition of their unity. So I decided to send them, asking him not to send them back, in order that they will be afflicted by them, while we get rid of their evil! Because I am afraid that someone after me will dare to spread them among the people, so that what frightens the Christians will happen to them. Then they said: Yes we agree, King! Please, execute this plan!

Thus he sent the books to Yaḥyā b. Ḥālid. When the books came to him, he gathered all the heretics and philosophers. When he took out the book *Hadd al-Mantiq* [on the definition of logic], Abū Muḥammad b. Abī Zayd said: There have been few to read this book, that have been saved from heresy. He said: Then Yaḥyā organized discussions and debates in his house concerning inappropriate subjects. Every adherent of a religion spoke about his belief and discussed it while his [personal] safety was secured.

I say the implication of these words is that it took place in the Caliphate of al-Rashīd,⁵⁸⁹ as al-Barmakī was his minister. During his life, he fell out of favor. He was murdered in 187 [H] .

In his *Sharḥ Lāmiyyat al-ʿAjam* al-Ṣalāḥ al-Ṣafadī said: It is told that al-Ma'mūn, when he had concluded a truce with a Christian king- I think that he was king of the island of Cyprus- wrote a letter asking from him the library of the Greeks. They were collected there in a house which no one could enter. The king gathered his advisors and consulted with them about it. All of them advised him not to supply the books, except for one patriarch. He said: Supply the books to them, these sciences have not entered any religious state without destroying it and ensnaring its scholars.

⁵⁸⁹Al-Rashīd bi 'llāh, Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr, the thirtieth 'Abbasid Caliph, the son of al-Mustarshid, was born ca. 501/1107-8. He was appointed caliph after his father's death in 529/1135. He died in 532/1138. See Hillenbrand, C., "al-Rashīd," in EI², VIII, 439-40.

A reliable man told me that *al-Shayḥ* Taqī al-Dīn b. Aḥmad b. Taymiyya - may God have mercy upon him - used to say: I do not think that God will overlook [the sins of] al-Ma'mūn. He certainly will retribute him for what he has done to this community by his introduction of these philosophical sciences among the people. Or words to that effect.

Then al-Ṣafadī said: Actually, al-Ma'mūn was not the first to translate and arabicize [foreign books], but there have been many [scholars] who translated them before him. Thus, Yaḥyā b. Ḥālid arabicized a lot of Persian books, like *Kalīla wa-Dimna*, and for his sake the *Almagest*, one of the books of the Greeks,⁵⁹⁰ was arabicized.⁵⁹¹

It is generally known that the first to translate the books of the Greeks was Ḥālid b. Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya, since he was extremely fond of the books of chemistry.

The translators followed two methods: The first was the method of Yūḥannā b. al-Biṭriq,⁵⁹² Ibn al-Nā'ima al-Ḥimsī⁵⁹³ and others, namely that one examine every single Greek word and its meaning, and then proposes a single Arabic word synonymous in meaning with the Greek one, thereby to explain it. One then moves to the next word and does the same, until he completes what he wanted to translate. This method is bad for two reasons: The first is that one cannot find Arabic synonyms for each and every Greek word. Hence, it often happened that Greek words were rendered by Arabic ones signifying the opposite. Secondly, the peculiarities of [Arabic] construction and syntax do not always match their correlatives in another language. Besides, many mistakes may occur when metaphors are used, which is frequently the case in all languages.

(The second method of translation) is the method of Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq [d. ca. 260/873],⁵⁹⁴ al-Jawharī [d. 393/1002]⁵⁹⁵ and others, namely that one examines a

⁵⁹⁰ *Kitāb al-Majistī*, to the Arab astronomers, was the name of the great astronomical work by Ptolemy (the great compilation). Al-Ya'qūbī says in his historical work (written in 278/891, ed. M. th. Houtsma, Leiden 1883, p. 151): "The book *al-Madjiṣṭī* treats of the science of the stars and their movements; the meaning of *al-Madjiṣṭī* is 'the greatest book'". See Suter, H., "al-Magest," in EI1, I, 313.

⁵⁹¹ An elaborate discussion of this issue can be found in Van Koningsveld's "Greek Manuscripts," *op. cit.*, p. 345-372.

⁵⁹² Yūḥannā b. al-Biṭriq was a younger contemporary of Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq with whose aid he translated *De Antidotes*. It is related that he was the physician of al-Muwaffaq Ṭalha (d. 276/891) brother and mainstay of the weak Ḥālif al-Mu'tamid. His son Biṭriq b. Yūḥannā was a physician to the Caliph al-Muqtadir and al-Raḍī. He died in 329/941. See Meyerhof, Max, "New Light on Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq and his Period," in *ISIS: International Review Devoted to the History of Science and its Civilisation* (1926), VIII, 685-724.

⁵⁹³ Abd al-Masīḥ b. Abd Allāh b. Nā'ima al-Ḥimsī was a translator who worked for the Caliph al-Mu'taṣim (218-27/833-42). See Lyons, C.W., "Uthūlūdjiyā," in EI2, X, 954-5.

⁵⁹⁴ Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq Abū Zayd died in ca. 260/873. He was the headmaster of the well-known school of translation. He lived in Bagdad during the reigns and partly at the court of ten Caliphs, viz. Al-Amīn (809-813), al-Ma'mūn (d. 216/833), al-Mu'taṣim (d. 225/842), al-Wathīq (d. 231/847), al-Mutawakkil (d. 245/861), al-Muntaṣir (d. 246/862), al-Musta'in (d. 250/866), al-Mu'tazz (d. 253/869), al-Muhtadī (d. 254/870), and al-Mu'tamid (870-892). See Meyerhof, *op. cit.*, p. 685-720.

⁵⁹⁵ Perhaps this refers to Abū Naṣr Ismā'il b. Hammād al-Jawharī, a celebrated Arabic lexicographer of Turkish origin who died in ca. 393/1002-3. His fame was related to his

sentence and understands its meaning. One should then express its meaning in a correlative sentence in the other language, regardless of the fact whether or not the words correspond exactly. This method is more appropriate. Because of this, the books of Ḥunayn b. Ishāq need no revision, except for [his works] on mathematic, because he did not master [this field], contrary to the works on medicine, logic, physics and theology. The works he translated in these fields do not need correction. As for *Euclid*,⁵⁹⁶ it was revised by Thābit b. Qurra al-Harrānī [d. 288/901],⁵⁹⁷ and the same holds true for the *Almajest* and the intermediate works between the two.”⁵⁹⁸

At the end of his discussion in these passages, al-Suyūṭī comes to the conclusion “that the sciences of the Ancients had reached the Muslims in the first century when they had conquered the lands of the non-Arabs. But they had not spread among them widely and had not become generally known among them, since the ancestors had prohibited one to become engrossed in them. However, [the Greek sciences] became popular in al-Barmakī’s period, while their spread increased in the period of al-Ma’mūn because of the innovations he stimulated and the occupation with the sciences of the Ancients as well as the extinguishing of the Sunna which he promoted.”⁵⁹⁹

Dealing with the third question, al-Suyūṭī quotes Ibn Taymiyya as having said: “Never had anyone of the Muslim thinkers paid attention to the method of the logicians. Nay, the Ash‘arites, the Mu‘tazilites, the Karramites, the Shi‘ites and the other denominations condemned logic and asserted its corruption. The first who mixed logic with the *uṣūl* of the Muslims was Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī. Muslim scholars disputed about him, so frequently that it would take too long to enumerate them all here.”⁶⁰⁰

With respect to the fourth question, relying on Ibn Kathīr, al-Suyūṭī points to al-Ṭūsī (d. 672/1274) who “made the astronomical laboratory” and “a House of Wisdom in which there were philosophers. Each of them earned three *dirhams* per day. There was also a House of Medicine for the medical doctors, who earned two *dirhams*. To each *Muhaddith* who worked in *Dār al-Ḥadīth*, half a *dirham* was paid per day. From that time, the occupation with philosophical sciences became widespread and prominent.”⁶⁰¹

monumental dictionary *Tāj al-Luga wa ‘l-Ṣiḥāḥ al-‘Arabiyya*. See Kopf, L., “al-Djawharī,” in EI², II, 495-7.

⁵⁹⁶Euclid is one of the most well-known mathematicians. His name has been synonymous with geometry up until the twentieth century. He lived after the pupils of Plato (d. 397 BC) and before Archimedes (d.287 BC). He taught in Alexandria. Euclid's fame rests preeminently upon the *Elements*, written in thirteen books. According to Bussard, a translation of *Elements* was made by Ishāq b. Ḥunayn (d.295/910) son of the most famous of the Arabic translators, Ḥunayn b. Ishāq. See H.L.L. Busard, “the First Latin Translation of Euclid's *Elements* commonly ascribed to Adelard of Bath,” in *Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies*, (1983), p. 1-3.

⁵⁹⁷According to Busard, Thābit b. Qurra (d. 288/901) was a scholar who prepared the second recension of Euclid's *Elements*. He was a scholar who in his own right holds a major position within the history of Islamic mathematics. See Busard, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁵⁹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 39-43.

⁵⁹⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 44-5.

⁶⁰⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

⁶⁰¹Ibidem.

This chapter can be regarded as a testimony to the fact that al-Suyūṭī was well-versed not only in the history of logic, but also in that of its introduction to the community of Islam, through the importation of Greek books and the translation movement.

[3]. Discussion of the Leading Muslim Scholars who Condemned or Prohibited Logic Explicitly

Having provided a historical overview of logic, and its inception in the Muslim world, al-Suyūṭī introduces a number of depreciatory views on logic, the first of which is al-Shāfi‘ī’s. The reason why al-Suyūṭī came with these topics is explicitly stated in his following remark: “There is no doubt that a scholar who has reached the degree of *ijtihād* is not allowed to fabricate a statement never expressed by any scholar before, or to put forth an opinion which has not been expressed before. Hence, one of the preconditions for an independent legal investigation (*ijtihād*) is the knowledge of the statements - both unequivocal and controversial - of scholars from among the Companions and after them. In order not to undermine the agreement concerning the view he chooses, he is obliged to mention the sayings of the scholars which are relevant to this subject before establishing the proof, so that the book is composed following the method of *ijtihād*.

Therefore I say: As for the Companions - with whom God may be well-pleased - the Followers, and their Followers, no declaration of any sort concerning it has reached us from them, because it did not exist in their time. It only started at the end of the second century, as mentioned before. In that time, *al-Imām* al-Shāfi‘ī - with whom God may be well-pleased - was alive, so he discussed it. He was the oldest of whom I found that he expressed a depreciatory view concerning it.”⁶⁰²

[4]. Discussion of the Statement of *al-Imām* al-Shāfi‘ī dealing with the Prohibition of Logic

From the passage above, it is clear that the reason why al-Suyūṭī should deal first with the statement of al-Shāfi‘ī against logic is due to two facts (1) that al-Shāfi‘ī, according to al-Suyūṭī, was the oldest to express a depreciatory view concerning logic; and (2) that no one from among the Companions, the Followers and their Followers before al-Shāfi‘ī condemned logic.

In this chapter, al-Suyūṭī provides us with some information concerning al-Shāfi‘ī’s attitude towards logic. Referring to *al-Tadhkira* by the Shafi‘ite ‘Izz al-Dīn b. Jamā‘a (d.767/1366), al-Suyūṭī quotes al-Shāfi‘ī as having said that the ignorance of the people and their controversies are only caused by the fact that they left behind the language of the Arabs and developed a preference for the language of Aristotle.⁶⁰³ Al-Shāfi‘ī went on asserting, according to al-Suyūṭī, that the people’s neglect of the language of the Arabs and their preference for the language of Aristotle brought about the emergence of the dispute on the createdness of the Koran, the negation of the divine vision and other innovations.⁶⁰⁴ In al-Suyūṭī’s words, al-Shāfi‘ī also maintained that the people should not interpret the Arabic texts in accordance with the language of the

⁶⁰²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

⁶⁰³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

⁶⁰⁴Ibidem.

Greeks and the logic of Aristotle which follows a certain system different from that of the language of the Arabs. According to al-Shāfi‘ī, the Koran and the Tradition used the terminology of the Arabs and their thoughts, not the terminologies of the Greeks.⁶⁰⁵

Referring to al-Shāfi‘ī, al-Suyūṭī argues that whoever shifts from the tongue of religion, namely Arabic, to another tongue and renders the existing religious texts in accordance with it, is ignorant and goes astray. Then al-Suyūṭī mentions an example of how his teacher, al-Kafyājī, was criticized by Hanafite jurists, because he did not apply the basic rules of argumentation of the *fiqh* (*qawānīn al-fiqh*), but those of logical deduction.⁶⁰⁶

Furthermore, al-Suyūṭī remarks that “the aim of this discussion is the explanation of the statement of al-Shāfi‘ī - with whom God may be well-pleased - namely that whoever renders the Koran, the Sunna and the *Sharī‘a* according to the requirements of the principles of logic, will not attain the goal of the (divine) laws; if he applies [those logical principles] to solve derivative cases (*al-furū‘*), he will be accused of an error; while if he applies them to solve the principal ones (*al-uṣūl*), he will be accused of an innovation. This is the weightiest argument for the prohibition of this art, because it is the cause of fabrication and innovation, contrary to the Sunna as well as the aim of the legislator. It suffices [us] therefore as proof, derived from the words of al-Shāfi‘ī - may God be pleased with him!

Corresponding to [the above-mentioned prohibition] is the prohibition of speculating about the ambiguous [passages] of the Koran out of fear of distortion and dissension. The two *Shayḥs*⁶⁰⁷ and others related about ‘Ā’isha that she said: the Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace - recited this verse: ‘He it is who hath sent down to thee the Book: in it are clearly formulated verses; these are the essence of the Book: other (verses) are ambiguous. Now as for those in whose hearts is an inclination to stray, they follow the ambiguous parts of it, out of desire of dissension, and seek their explanation, though no one knows their explanation except Allāh: No one takes warning but those of insight.’⁶⁰⁸ He said: If you see the ones who follow the ambiguous passages of [the Koran], [then know that] those are the ones whom God named, and beware of them!”

Concluding this chapter, al-Suyūṭī suggests that one of the foremost reasons why al-Shāfi‘ī prohibited logic is the fact that it is the cause of fabrication and innovation, contrary to the Sunna and the aim of the Legislator.⁶⁰⁹

[5]. The First who asked about the Ambiguous Passages of the Koran was ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣabīg

Why did al-Suyūṭī discuss the question of the ambiguous passages of the Koran? And what is its relation to his discussion on the prohibition of logic, theology and philosophical sciences as well as the sciences of the ancients? The answer to the first question was given by al-Suyūṭī in his following remark: “For this very reason, al-Shāfi‘ī - may God be pleased with him - prohibited the study of

⁶⁰⁵Ibidem.

⁶⁰⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

⁶⁰⁷This appellation belongs to al-Buḥārī and Muslim.

⁶⁰⁸Āli ‘Imrān (III) : 5, Bell, I, 44-5.

⁶⁰⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

theology. Al-Harawī produced in his book on the Condemnation of Theology (*Kitāb Dhamm al-Kalām*), through his chain of transmitters going back to al-Shāfi‘ī, that he said: It was narrated concerning the theologians and ‘Umar [b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb]’s verdict of Ṣabīg⁶¹⁰ that this [verdict] from him indicates that the effective reason for him to prohibit the study of theology was his fear for its stimulation of confusions and its leading to innovations. Thus he forbade it, based on an analogy with the prohibition of speculating about the ambiguous passages of the Koran. This analogy is sound.”

The answer to the second question can be found in al-Suyūṭī’s assumption founded on al-Gazālī’s view that “philosophy is not a separate science, but it comprises four parts: The first is geometry and calculation; the second is logic; the third is theology; and the fourth is physics.”⁶¹¹

Referring to the *Ta’rīḥ* by Ibn Kathīr (d. 744/1345) and that by Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1176) and the *Musnad* by al-Dārimī (d. 282/895), al-Suyūṭī narrates the story of Ṣabīg through various chains of transmission. In the story it was stated that ‘Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb punished Ṣabīg by means of a lashing with date stalks and by ordering people to banish the latter and stop his payment and sustenance, because of his questions, dealing with: (1) a variant reading (*ḥarf*)⁶¹² of the Koran, (2) the ambiguous passages of the Koran and (3) difficult passages of the Koran.⁶¹³

Some other examples of theological issues following those raised by Ṣabīg are related to questions on (1) *qadar*,⁶¹⁴ (2) the attributes of God and (3) the dispute on accidents and substances. According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Harawī adduced the following words from al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad⁶¹⁵ who passed by the people discussing *qadar* “Talk about what you heard from what God has mentioned in His Book, and refrain from a thing from which God has refrained!”⁶¹⁶ When asked about the nature of innovations, Mālik b. Anas identified them with the dispute on the names of God, His attributes, His speech, His knowledge and His

⁶¹⁰In *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ*, Ṣabīg, according to al-Nashshār, is identified with Amīr b. ‘Asīl who used to seek to confuse people with ambiguous words and questions. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 50, n. 4 (N).

⁶¹¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

⁶¹²*Ḥarf* may mean various ways of reading the Koran, as it is attached to the expression *al-aḥruf al-sab‘a*, sometimes identified with *al-qirā’a al-sab‘a* of the prophetic tradition “*unzila al-qur’ān ‘alā sab‘ati aḥruf*” and another tradition: “... *qāla: faqulnā innamā ‘ḥtalaḥnā fī al-qirā’a. qāla: fa ‘ḥmarra wajh rasūl allāh wa qāla: innamā halaka man kāna qablukum bi ‘ḥtilāfihim baynahum...*” See Mukarram, ‘Abd al-‘Āli Sālim, *et. al, Mu‘jam al-Qirā’at al-Qur’āniyya* (Kuwayt: Maṭbū‘at Jāmi‘at al-Kuwayt, 1406/1986) I, 32.

⁶¹³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 50-1.

⁶¹⁴This term refers to God’s decree, the question of which, according to Gardet, was one of the most frequently debated, right from the first centuries on. This term is always combined into the expression *al-qaḍā’ wa’l-qadar* which constitutes, according to Gardet, a kind of binary technical term of *‘ilm al-kalām*. These two words also signify both the Decrees of God, the eternal decree (the most frequent meaning of *qaḍā’*) and the decree given existence in time (the most frequent meaning of *qadar*). Those who centered their discussions around the question of *qadar* are identified with the Qadirites. Gardet, L., “Kadā’ wa’l-Qadar,” in EI², IV, 365-7.

⁶¹⁵Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq died in 107/726. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 92, n. 5, (N).

⁶¹⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

will.⁶¹⁷ Likewise, when asked about the accidents and the substances, Abū Ḥanīfa said that they both were the affair of the philosophers.⁶¹⁸

[6]. Al-Shāfi‘ī’s Prohibition of the Study of Theology

According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Shāfi‘ī’s prohibition of theology was based on an analogy with the prohibition of speculating about the ambiguous passages of the Koran, as already condemned by ‘Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb.⁶¹⁹

This also holds true, according to al-Suyūṭī, for the prohibition of logic. He further argues: “This very effective cause can in fact be found in logic as well, as mentioned by al-Shāfi‘ī. So the evidence for the prohibition of the study of it is deducted analogically from the original case to which theology was compared, namely the ambiguous [verses of the Koran] which it is explicitly forbidden to speculate about. This is a valid analogy which is weakened neither by a contradiction nor an objection. Maybe, the opponent [of this kind of analogy] refutes the existence of the effective cause mentioned in logic, but this kind of refutation is [a kind of] contention. No attention should be paid to it, because induction and deduction invalidate it.”⁶²⁰ Emphasizing al-Shāfi‘ī’s prohibition of theology, Al-Suyūṭī suggests that the scholars of the ancient generation condemned the study of theology, because its origin was to be found among the materialist philosophers.⁶²¹

Al-Suyūṭī then explains how two ambiguous passages of the Koran and one prophetic tradition became the object of baseless interpretation by one of the leading scholars in the rational sciences (*a’immat al-ma’qūlāt*). One of these verses reads: “If there were any gods in the two of them except Allah, they would both go to ruin....”⁶²² In his view, this verse is *dalīl iqnā’ī* (convincing argument), as he interpreted it according to the principles of logical deduction (*qawā’id al-istidlāl al-mantiqī*).⁶²³ However, the Arabs and the Muslims after them, to whom the Koran was revealed, followed the authorities in the science of rethoric (*balāga*) who saw this verse as a specimen of a special stylistic feature of the Koran which they called “speculative argumentation” (*al-iḥtijāj al-naẓarī*). Thus they considered this verse on those linguistic grounds as one of the weightiest arguments for the unity of God. Furthermore al-Suyūṭī suggests that “logic does not lead [us] to anything good. Whoever pays attention to it, is far removed from grasping the objectives of the *Sharī‘a*. Thus there is a grave distance between him and the religious truths.”⁶²⁴

Al-Suyūṭī also mentions another Koranic verse which became the object of their arbitrary interpretation: “They will ask thee about the new moons ...” until the end of the verse.⁶²⁵ The same man’s interpretation of this verse, according to al-Suyūṭī, is reflected by his words: “They [viz. the inquirers

⁶¹⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁶¹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

⁶¹⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

⁶²⁰Ibidem.

⁶²¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁶²²Al-Anbiyā’ (XXI): 22. Bell, I, 306..

⁶²³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁶²⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

⁶²⁵Al-Baqara (II): 185, Bell, I, 26.

mentioned in the verse above] asked about the crescent why it first appears slightly and then increases gradually until it is full. They were answered with an explanation of the wisdom therein, while he avoided to answer what they had asked about [viz. the crescent], because they did not belong to those who were [able] to obtain information about the details of astronomy easily.”⁶²⁶

According to al-Suyūṭī, this answer was wrong, for several reasons: “*First*, the Occasions of the Revelation indicate that they [viz. the inquirers mentioned in the verse] asked about the *ḥikma* not about the person referred to. *Secondly*, it is unworthy to suspect of the Companions - may God be pleased with them!- who had a deeper understanding than all non-Arabs and than the whole *umma*, that they did not belong to those who investigate the details of astronomy easily, while individuals among the later non-Arab [scholars] have investigated them. *Thirdly*, [because according to him], it was beyond the Divine omnipotence to convey that to their minds through an expression which they could comprehend. *Fourthly*, the Companions - may God be pleased with them - have studied many details of religious jurisprudence, difficult parts of the laws of inheritance, as well as of the acts of the soul. What is the science of astronomy in comparison to that? It is more despicable and contemptible, even if it was based on a principle which deserves to be taken into consideration. No doubt, most of it is baseless and not supported by any argument. In contrast, arguments derived from Prophetic traditions and reports point to the contrary, as I [viz. al-Suyūṭī] explained in a separate composition. The author of the treatise [I am quoting] was daring enough to try to plunge through it and through similar other works on the philosophical sciences and the fascination of intellectual abstrusenesses, with the result that he even thought that it would only be easy for him and for his equals and that it would be impossible for anyone [else] to grasp them easily, even the Companions! But to Allah we belong, and to Him is our return!”⁶²⁷

[7]. Discussion of a Reason for Innovation

Emphasizing al-Shafi‘ī’s view that the reason for innovation is the ignorance of Arabic, al-Suyūṭī then turns to exemplify how the ignorance of Arabic has misled people in the interpretation of Koranic verses. Those ignorant of Arabic are referred to by al-Suyūṭī, who relies on *al-Ta’rīḥ al-Kabīr* by al-Buḥārī, as being in accordance with what al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī has said: “The only thing destroying them was their lack of Arabic!”⁶²⁸

Al-Suyūṭī refers here to *Ta’wīl Mushkil al-Qur’ān* by Ibn Qutayba (276/889)⁶²⁹ who stressed that “the only person who knows the excellence of the Koran is the one who often studied it and has a broad knowledge [of it] and understands the ways of expression of the Arabs, the influence on the styles [of

⁶²⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

⁶²⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 54-5.

⁶²⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

⁶²⁹Ibn Qutayba, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Muslim al-Dīnawarī, born at Kūfa in 213/828, was “one of the great Sunnī polygraphs of the 3rd/9th century, being both a theologian and a writer of *adab*.” He died in Bagdad in 276/889. His *Ta’wīl Mushkil al-Qur’ān* was published in Cairo in 1373/1954 and edited by Aḥmad Ṣaqr. See Lecomte, G., “Ibn Qutayba,” in EI², III, 844-7.

expressions] as well [the points by which] God has distinguished the language of the Arabs from all the [other] languages.”⁶³⁰

Concluding his discussion, al-Suyūṭī asserts that “the Koran was revealed in accordance with all these rules. Therefore no one of the translators was able to translate it into any of the languages like the *Injīl* was translated from the Syriac language to the Abyssinian and Greek. The Torah, the Book of Psalms and the other books of God -the Exalted and the Eternal- were translated into Arabic, because the metaphors of the non-Arabs are not of the same extensive range as those of the Arabs.”⁶³¹

As has been discussed before, the speculation on the ambiguous verses of the Koran was the original case from which the prohibition of theology was deduced analogically. The effective cause for both the prohibition of the speculation on the ambiguous verses of the Koran and of theology is the stimulation of confusion leading to innovations. Because this effective cause is also found in logic, philosophy and some of the sciences of the ancients, al-Suyūṭī argues, studying them is also forbidden.

In this chapter al-Suyūṭī asserts that the reason why people speculated about the ambiguous verses of the Koran was their lack of sufficient Arabic. An imperative which can be understood from al-Suyūṭī’s argument enumerated in this chapter and in earlier chapters is the fact that it is necessary for people to master Arabic well, rather than to be occupied with speculations which stimulate confusions and lead to dissension.

Al-Suyūṭī concludes: “the reason for the prohibition of the study of theology is the fact that there is no command [to make use of it], which can be found in the Koran and the Sunna. No discussion about it can be found among the ancestors. This is also the case with logic, namely that there is no command [to make use of it] to be found in the Koran and the Sunna; there is no discussion by the ancestors about it, contrary to Arabic the study of which is commanded in the Tradition and the discussion about which can be found among the ancestors.”⁶³²

As mentioned before, al-Suyūṭī stated the reason why al-Shāfi‘ī prohibited the study of theology, i.e. the latter’s fear that theology stimulates confusion and leads people to innovations. In this chapter, al-Suyūṭī adds two more reasons why theology was prohibited by al-Shāfi‘ī. According to al-Suyūṭī, the second reason was the fact that there is no command to make use of theology to be found in the Koran and the Sunna. No discussion about it can be found among the ancestors. The third reason is the fact that the style of theology is different from that of the Koran and the Sunna. Referring to al-Harawī on the authority of Abū Thawr, al-Suyūṭī quotes al-Shāfi‘ī as having said: “My judgement of theologians is that they should be beaten with a palm-branch, put on a camel, displayed around the communities and tribes and their offences publicly announced: ‘This is the punishment for those who have neglected the Koran and the Sunna and approached theology.’”⁶³³

⁶³⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

⁶³¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁶³²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

⁶³³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 64-5.

According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Shāfi‘ī not only condemned logic and theology, but also philosophy. This is reflected in the latter’s statement which was reported by al-Harawī: “If you hear a man saying that the name is not identical to the object [named] and that a thing is identical to nothing, then testify against him that he is a heretic!”⁶³⁴

[8]. Discussion of the Reasons why al-Shāfi‘ī and other leading Scholars Prohibited *Kalām* and the Philosophical sciences

Abū Ḥanīfa also explicitly condemned philosophy. This is reported by al-Harawī, who says: “Ṭayyib b. Aḥmad told me - Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn told us - Abu ‘l-Qāsim b. Matawayh told us that Ḥāmid b. Rustam related to us that al-Ḥasan b. al-Muṭī‘ that Ibrāhīm b. Rustam on the authority of... said: I said to Abū Ḥanīfa: What do you comment on the disputes people innovated about the forms and bodies? Then he said: [these are] the utterances of the philosophers. You have to follow the tradition and the course of the ancestors, beware of any novelties because they are innovations. This was also produced by Ibn al-Sam‘ānī in *Kitāb al-Intiṣār [li Ahl al-Ḥadīth]*, who said: ‘a reliable man from among our friends related to us that *al-Shayḥ* Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī related to us that Abū al-Qāsim b. Matawayh told it to us.’”⁶³⁵

Referring again to al-Harawī, al-Suyūṭī also mentions Mālik b. Anas as having censured theology: “‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maḥdī has said: I came to see Mālik, whom was being asked a question by a man. He said: Maybe you are one of ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd [d.ca. 144/761]’s”⁶³⁶ adherents. God has cursed ‘Amr, because he fabricated the innovations of theology. If theology was a [real] science, the Companions and the Followers would have discussed it, as they have discussed the religious rules and laws.”⁶³⁷

[9]. The Statements of Leading Muslim Scholars on the Prohibition of *Kalām*

Consistent with his model of argumentation against his opponents, in chapter [9] al-Suyūṭī incorporated into the work we are discussing the texts which he abridged from twelve works of predecessors he considered opponents of *kalām*. Al-Suyūṭī’s motive for abridging the works of his predecessors can be inferred from the general introduction of his abridgement: “*I‘lam anna aimmata ahl al-Sunna mā’ zālū’ yuṣannifūn al-kutub fī dhamm ‘ilm al-kalām, wa ‘l-inkār ‘alā muṭa‘ātih* (know that the leading Muslim scholars of the People of the *Sunna* and the *Jamā‘a* have continuously been composing books to condemn the science of *kalām* as well as to refute its partisans)”⁶³⁸.

[a]. *Kitāb Dhamm ‘Ilm Kalām wa Ahlih* by al-Harawī

⁶³⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

⁶³⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

⁶³⁶‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd, according to Watt, was one of the first members of the Mu‘tazilite school of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. His reputation rests on his asceticism. One of his famous followers was Bishr b. al-Mu‘tamir (d. 210/825). See Watt, W.M., “‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd,” in EI², I, 454.

⁶³⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

⁶³⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

Under the title *Nuṣūs al-A'imma fī Taḥrīm al-Kalām*, al-Suyūṭī first discusses *Kitāb Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih*, by *Shayḥ al-Islām* Ismā'īl al-Harawī. His reason to put the abridgement of the work of al-Harawī at the very beginning becomes clear from his following remark: “*Wa ajallu kitāb ullifa fī dhālika kitāb dhamm al-kalām wa ahlih li shayḥ al-Islām Abī Ismā'īl al-Harawī. Wa huwa mujalladun kulluhū muḥraj bi 'l-asānid, wa anā' ulaḥḥiṣu hunā jamī'a maqāsidihī talḥiṣan ḥasanan* (The most excellent work in that respect [to condemn *kalām* and its authors] is *Kitāb Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih* of *Shayḥ al-Islām* Abū Ismā'īl al-Harawī. The format of this book is a bound volume. All information is given with the chains of transmission, and here I abridge all its purposes adequately”).⁶³⁹ Beaucueuil has qualified this work as “a principal source for the history of the struggle against rational theology in Islam.”⁶⁴⁰ Al-Suyūṭī's abridgement of DhK occupies approximately one fourth (60 printed pages) of SM (of 227 printed pages).

According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Harawī's complete name was Abū Ismā'īl 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Anṣārī al-Harawī. He was a Hanbalite scholar, a *Ḥāfiẓ* of tradition, an expert in language, a prominent figure in *taṣawwuf*, a great savant who established the Sunna and rejected innovations, and the author of *Kitāb Manāzil al-Sā'irīn*.⁶⁴¹ According to Brockelmann, al-Harawī was born in Kuhendiz in the citadel of Herat on the 2nd of Sha'bān 396/4th of May 1005.⁶⁴² His father, Abū Maṣṣūr Muḥammad, whose genealogy goes back to a Companion, Abū Ayyūb Ḥālīd b. Zayd Ḥazrajī, who accomodated the Prophet Muḥammad during his arrival in Madina, was a devotee merchant who taught his son to be puritan and to love science. His father was also a *ṣūfī* who practiced the mystical teaching rigorously. Regarding his mother, no information can be found in any biographical dictionaries.

He studied *ḥadīth* and *tafsīr* in early age under the supervision of Abū Maṣṣūr al-Azdī and Yaḥyā b. 'Ammār. In 417/1026, he went to study in Nishāpūr, where he became a disciple of al-Aṣamm. On the way to Mecca for a pilgrimage, he stayed in Bagdad for some time to attend the lectures of Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥalāl. When he returned from the pilgrimage, he met Abu 'l-Ḥirqānī, who would have a decisive influence on his mystical career.

Although al-Harawī had followed the supervision of Shafī'ite teachers during the early stages of his studies, he adopted Hanbalism with enthusiasm due to its devotion to the Koran and the Sunna.⁶⁴³

He was appointed professor by Niẓām al-Mulk in the end of 480/1087, several years after having been given the title of *Shayḥ al-Islām*, bestowed upon him by al-Muqtadir bi 'llāh in 474/1081, because of his high position in the Hanbalite school.⁶⁴⁴ He died in the city of his birth, on the 22nd of Dhu 'l-Ḥijja 481/8th of March 1088.⁶⁴⁵

⁶³⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁶⁴⁰Beaucueuil, S.D., “al-Ansārī al-Harawī,” in EI², I., 515.

⁶⁴¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

⁶⁴²GAL, S.I, p. 773.

⁶⁴³Beaucueuil, S.D., *Khawādjā 'Abdullah Anṣārī (396-481/1006-1089) Mystique Hanbalite* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1963), p.23-77.

⁶⁴⁴GAL, I, p. 433, S.I, p. 773.

⁶⁴⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

According to al-Hashshash, besides *Dhamm al-Kalām* and *Manāzil al-Sā'irīn*, al-Harawī composed a number of works: *Kitāb al-Arba'in fi 'l-Tawhīd*, *Kitāb al-Arba'in fi 'l-Sunna*, *al-Fārūq fi 'l-Ṣifāt*, *Sharḥ Ḥadīth kull bid'a ḍalāla*, *Takfīr al-Qadariyya*, *Takfīr al-Jahmiyya*, *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-Majīd* and *Manāqib al-Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal*.⁶⁴⁶

According to Brockelmann, the manuscripts of DhK are preserved in two places:

1. In Maktaba al-Zāhiriyya (the manuscript is now preserved in Maktaba al-Asad) in Damascus (reg. 1138)
2. In the British Museum in London (reg. 1571: 27520)⁶⁴⁷

The manuscript of the Asad library, registered no. 1138, consists of 149 folios. Each folio consists of two pages, each of which has twenty lines. The manuscript is not an autograph. It is rather a copy made in the eighth century of the Hijra. It is mentioned at the end of the manuscript that it was copied on Thursday, 24th of Dhū 'l-Qa' da 747/1347.⁶⁴⁸

There exist two editions of DhK. *First*, the edition published in Beirut by Dār al-Fikr al-Lubnānī in 1994 and edited by Dr. Samīḥ Dugaym.⁶⁴⁹ *Secondly*, in the form of a published Ph.D thesis by Muḥammad al-Hashshash, who also translated some parts of it into German.⁶⁵⁰

The DhK was, according to Bearecueil, the fruit of al-Harawī's labour against the partisans of Ash'arism and Mu'tazilism due to which he was "threatened with death on five occasions."⁶⁵¹ (2) However, al-Hashshash has indicated that the motivation for al-Harawī to compose this work was that he wanted to give to the partisans of hanbalism the necessary principles to find the truth by means of obeying the Koran and the Sunna and avoiding *kalām*.⁶⁵²

To understand in which way al-Suyūṭī used *Dhamm al-Kalām* by al-Harawī as the chief source for his discussion of the opposition against *kalām*, it is significant to see how al-Harawī organizes his argument in his work. Based on the edition of Dr. Samīḥ Dugaym (1994), the organization of the contents of this work can be seen in following table:

Introduction	17-24
Chapter I: The ancient <i>Ummas</i> followed the sound path, as long as they clung to obedience and observance; whenever they disputed and debated, they went astray and perished	25-38
Chapter II: Emphasizing that the Prophet used to worry about the <i>Umma</i> with respect to leading scholars who led others astray and disputed on religious matters, and with respect to hypocritical preachers	39-44
Chapter III: The abhorrence of pronouncing and softening speech as well as of speaking impolitely	45-48
Chapter IV: Censuring and Condemning Debate as well as	49-54

⁶⁴⁶Al-Hashshash, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

⁶⁴⁷GAL, I, p. 433.

⁶⁴⁸Mss. Fol. 149 b.

⁶⁴⁹This edition is at my disposal.

⁶⁵⁰Al-Hashshash, *op. cit.*

⁶⁵¹Bearecueil, EI², I, 515.

⁶⁵²Al-Hashshash, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

Mentioning its misfortunes	
Chapter V: The virtue of avoiding the dispute even if its practitioner is in the right	55-57
Chapter VI: The Chosen One's - may God bless him and grant him peace - Condemnation of Debating the Koran and his warning to those who partake in it	58-61
Chapter VII: The Chosen One's anathematization of the dispute on the Koran and his prohibition of it	62-70
Chapter VIII: Establishing the evidence for the falsity of the opinion of those who maintain that the Koran is in no need of the Tradition	71-81
Chapter IX: Emphasizing the opposition of Tradition to reason	82-111
Chapter X: The abhorrence of the Chosen One and his best Umma against the deep occupation [with religious disputation]	112-127
Chapter XI: The abhorrence of being extravagant in matters of religion and of the dissimulation in it as well as of the study of the essences and necessity of obedience	128-141
Chapter XII: The worry of the Prophet and the Pious Ancestors Regarding those occupied by the words of the People of the Books and those who dedicate themselves to the Book of God the Almighty	142-152
Chapter XIII: The Prophet's information to his <i>Umma</i> on the status of the theologians among them	153-160
Chapter XIV: Mentioning issues emerging in the period of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace	161-177
Chapter XV: The Refutation of leading Muslim scholars regarding the captious questions, complicated speech, vague words, debates, deviating <i>ta'wīl</i> ⁶⁵³ and the occupation with it, which the <i>Mutakallimūn</i> undertook, and their views on them according to [their] generations	178-245
Al-Shāfi'ī's Attack against the <i>Mutakallimūn</i> and his Refutation [of them]	246-259
Discussing Ishāq b. Rāhawayh's Refutation of them [the <i>Mutakallimūn</i>]	260-284
Chapter on the fact that the innovators, the theologians and the	284-290

⁶⁵³Eventhough, there was no difference in the early history of the Koranic exegesis between *ta'wīl* and *tafsīr*, most scholars distinguish them. The former is based upon reason and personal opinion (*ra'y*), whereas *tafsīr* is based upon materials derived from the Prophet himself or his Companions or the Successors in the form of *ḥadīth*. Hence, *ta'wīl* is popularly identified with *tafsīr bi 'l-ra'y*, and *tafsīr* with *tafsīr bi 'l-ma'thūr*. See Poonawala, I, "Ta'wīl," in IE², X, 390-392; McAuliffe, however, says: "although apparently synonymous in the earliest period, the significations of *tafsīr* and *ta'wīl* began to diverge as the Qur'ānic sciences developed in the classical period. *Tafsīr* remained the term of more limited denotation, often restricted largely to philological exegesis, while *ta'wīl* connoted hermeneutical approaches that sought to uncover deeper meanings in the text or to align the text with particular theological or philosophical orientations." See McAuliffe, Jane Dammen, *Qur'ānic Christians: An Analysis of Classical and Modern Exegesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 18, n. 15.

transgressors are cursed	
Chapter on the abhorrence of studying under the guidance of the <i>Mutakallimūn</i> and the Innovators	291-297
Chapter on the Exaltation of those who uphold good tradition or those who call [others] to it	298-306
Chapter Discussing the Statement of al-Ash‘arī	307-318

It is clear that some chapters (which are highlighted in bold) were left unabridged. The reason for this was presumably that al-Suyūṭī deemed these chapters redundant to his argument against the *Mutakallimūn*. Moreover, the last chapter discussing the statement of al-Ash‘arī cannot be used as a ‘weapon’ against the *Mutakallimūn*, since it contains arguments in favour of theology by the eponym of Ash‘arite theology. (2) In his abridgement of DhK, al-Suyūṭī has cut all long chains of transmission, mentioning only the closest authority to the source. (3) He has left out long digressive discussions and variant readings of traditions, as well as information of a similar nature repeated by al-Harawī. (4) At several occasions, al-Suyūṭī also paraphrases al-Harawī’s discussion against *kalām*. Al-Suyūṭī, for instance, says: “The author [al-Harawī] said: I found that this statement belongs to Abū Maṣū‘ al-Albanī al-Bustī who said: I saw Yaḥya b. ‘Ammār reprehending the people of *kalām* on the pulpit [so frequently] that I could not count the times.” In reality, however, al-Harawī says in his DhK: “I saw Yaḥyā b. ‘Ammār on many occasions, one of which was on his pulpit anathematizing and cursing the *Mutakallimūn*, as well as testifying the heresy of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī.”⁶⁵⁴ As the result of this abridgement, al-Suyūṭī succeeded in presenting al-Harawī’s arguments against the *Mutakallimūn* more comprehensible and more penetrating.

The Image of the History of the Opposition to *Kalām* Contained in DhK as abridged by al-Suyūṭī in SM

Upon reading DhK as abridged in SM, one finds that the explicit view of al-Harawī is that the opposition to scholastic theology (*kalām*, *jadāl*, *naẓar* and *marā’*) goes back to the earliest period of Islamic history. Enumerating a number of traditions, al-Harawī asserts that the opposition to *kalām* already started with the Prophet, who censured speculation (*kalām*) and the usage of the method of reasoning (*al-naẓar*) as well as the use of critical questioning on some religious tenets, beliefs or practices. In a number of traditions with various chains of transmission, the Prophet, for instance, indicated that “the perishing of those before us happened because of their frequent questions and their arguments with their prophets.”⁶⁵⁵

According to al-Harawī, speculation is superfluous and thus should be regarded as an innovation, because God has revealed religion to the Prophet in a perfect way and completed His blessing through him. This is, al-Harawī argues, in

⁶⁵⁴Al-Harawī, *op. cit.*, p.280.

⁶⁵⁵“... *innamā halaka man qablukum bikathrati su‘alihim wa ‘htilāfihim ‘alā anbiyā’ihim.*” Al-Harawī mentions some traditions pertaining to this question in his DhK, *op. cit.*, p.25.

line with the last words of God revealed to His Prophet: “Today I have perfected your religion for you.”⁶⁵⁶

What had been started by the Prophet with respect to the opposition to *kalām*, al-Harawī maintains, was obviously followed by his successors, whom he classifies into nine generations:

1. The First Generation: The Companions of the Prophet

Al-Harawī maintains that the Companions condemned those who question certain religious articles. ‘Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb, for instance, had lashed Ṣabīg al-Kūfī because of a question concerning a variant reading (*ḥarf*) of the Koran until the blood gushed from his back. On another occasion, ‘Umar also said: “Your discussion is the worst while your speech is also the worst ...”⁶⁵⁷ Along the same line, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, according to al-Harawī, warned people that “at the end of time, there will be a people whose speech and arguments are not known by the adherents of Islam. They are inviting the people to adhere to their message. If one meets them, one is to kill them.”⁶⁵⁸

Other Companions, such as Ibn ‘Abbās, ‘Ikrima, Mu‘āwiya, Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ubayy b. Ka‘b, Mujāhid, al-Nazzāl b. Sabarah, Mu‘adh b. Jabal and Tāwūs, are said to have rejected *kalām* as well. Their criticism of *kalām* revolve around: (a) Speculation on certain verses of the Koran; those involved in it were considered to be people who argue about the religion of God;⁶⁵⁹ those who speculate on these verses were associated to the satans of the Sea-islands;⁶⁶⁰ (b) That those who subject His religion to *qiyās*, will stay in confusion forever, deviating from the right way and plunging into distortion;⁶⁶¹ (c) That God will make those who were engaged in dispute deaf and dumb;⁶⁶² (d) Ascribing ignorance to those who disseminate reports which are not in the Book of God;⁶⁶³ (e) The adherents of heresy are to be inflicted with an incurable disease, *etcetera*.⁶⁶⁴

2. The second generation: the forerunners of the jurists from among the followers

From this generation, al-Harawī records the statements against *kalām* by a number of prominent figures, the most prominent of whom is Ibn Ṭāwūs (d. 132/750).⁶⁶⁵ Al-Harawī, for instance, narrates the attitude of Ibn Ṭāwūs towards the Mu‘tazilites. For this purpose, al-Harawī “followed from the strand of ‘Abd al-Rāziq [d. 211/827]”⁶⁶⁶ who said that Mu‘ammar [d. 153/771]⁶⁶⁷ had related to us the

⁶⁵⁶Al-mā‘ida (V) : 5. Bell, I, 94.

⁶⁵⁷See al-Suyūṭī’s discussion of al-Harawī’s narration of the censure against *kalām* by the Companions in his SM, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

⁶⁵⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁶⁵⁹Ibidem.

⁶⁶⁰Ibidem.

⁶⁶¹Ibidem.

⁶⁶²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

⁶⁶³Ibidem.

⁶⁶⁴Ibidem.

⁶⁶⁵His complete name is ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṭāwūs b. Kaysān al-Yamanī. He died in 132/750. See al-Lālakā‘ī, *op. cit.*, p. 36, n. 2 (H). According to al-Nashshār, his real name was Dhakwān; Ṭāwūs was his *laqab*. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 88, n.1 (N).

⁶⁶⁶‘Abd al-Rāziq al-Ṣan‘ānī died in 211/827. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 91, n.3 (N).

⁶⁶⁷Mu‘ammar b. Rāshid died in 153/771. SM, 91, 4.

words: Ibn Ṭāwūs sat down. A man from the Mu‘tazilites then came and started to argue [about religious matters]. So, Ibn Ṭāwūs inserted his fingers into his ears and said to his son: O, my son! Insert your fingers into your ears! close them up and do not listen to anything in his speech. Mu‘ammar said: This means that the heart is weak. ‘Abd al-Rāziq said - Ibrāhīm b. Yaḥyā’ said to me: I see that the Mu‘tazilites among your group are numerous. He replied: I said: yes. So, they think that you are one of them. He said: Would you please enter this shop with me so that I can speak to you. I replied: No. [He said: why?].⁶⁶⁸ I replied: Because the heart is weak and my religion is not for someone who is subdued.”⁶⁶⁹

3. The Third Generation

Al-Harawī enumerates the censures of *kalām* by a number of personalities, the most prominent among whom was ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Azīz (d. 101/719-20),⁶⁷⁰ who was regarded by al-Suyūṭī as the *mujaddid* of 1st/7th century.⁶⁷¹ For this purpose, al-Harawī records a number of narrations based on the authority of ‘Umar.

To begin with, he (viz. al-Harawī) took “from Abū al-Ṣalt Shihāb b. Ḥurāsh [d. ca. 200/816]⁶⁷² the words: ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz sent a letter to a man, which read: Peace be upon you, to start with, I advice you to fear God, to observe his command, to follow the Sunna of His Messenger - may God bless him and grant him peace - and to abandon what the innovators innovated later on. His Sunna has been established to save them the trouble to look for anything else... Therefore, you have to observe the Sunna which constitutes, by the Will of God, a shield for you.”⁶⁷³

Furthermore, al-Harawī narrates that ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz sent a letter to his son, ‘Abd al-Malik, saying: “Let your knowledge be that of God who has sent it down on His prophet! Through it He indicated the things He loves and reprehends. He also informed the people by means of it about His command. He called them to His Book and guided them into His blessing. By it, He protected them from His punishment. By it, He obliged Himself to please them. Due to it, He placed them in the most virtuous place among His creatures. This is the knowledge, through which, one will not be ignorant; and by being ignorant of which, one will not be knowledgeable. Give it preference beyond anything else! Refrain from observing his prohibitions. That is necessary for one who knows it and [also for one who pursues] to obey God in accordance with what he was exhorted.⁶⁷⁴ That is the light of God which was revealed and by which the saints

⁶⁶⁸This is taken from the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 86b).

⁶⁶⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

⁶⁷⁰The Umayyad caliph ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Azīz (d. 101/719-20), the *mujaddid* of the second century of *Hijra*, was considered by Juynboll as the first who singled out the *sunna* of the Prophet from the *sunnas* of others. See G.H.A. Juynboll, “Sunna” in EI², IX, 878-881; Cf. W.B. Hallaq, “Was the Gate of Ijtihad Closed?” in IJMES, 16 (1984), 3-41.

⁶⁷¹Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

⁶⁷²Abū al-Ṣalt Shihāb b. Ḥurāsh b. Ḥūshab al-Shaybānī al-Wasaṭī died ca. 200/816. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 93, n.3 (N).

⁶⁷³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 93-4.

⁶⁷⁴The copying error also occurs here. The phrase in the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 90b) reads *fā inna dhālika yuḥiqqu ‘alā man ‘alimah wa’ttaba’a ṭā’at-‘Ilāh fīma ūṣiya bih*. Whereas in SM, the phrase reads “*fā inna dhālika yuḥiqqu ‘alā man ‘alimah wa’attabi’u*

of God are also guided. Whoever has no portion of it, does not benefit anything from it. He will remain in the darkness for the rest of his life in his present world.”⁶⁷⁵

Al-Harawī also quotes ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s words: “If you hear arguing, neglect it.”⁶⁷⁶

4. The Fourth Generation

Al-Harawī lists a number of persons included in this generation. One of them to be mentioned here is Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/796).⁶⁷⁷ According to al-Harawī, Mālik b. Anas said: “Beware of the innovations! It was said: O, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, what are the innovations?” He replied: “The people of the innovations who speak about the names of God, His attributes, His speech, His knowledge and His will. They are not silent about a thing on which the Companions and the followers to whom belong the beneficence were silent.”

He also takes from Mālik the words: “Whoever seeks for the religious truth with the help of *kalām*, becomes a heretic.” In the same line, al-Harawī refers to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maḥdī (d. 117/736)⁶⁷⁸ as having said: “I came to see Mālik. He was with a man who asked him about the Koran. He answered: You might be one of ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd’s friends. God has cursed ‘Amr, because he made these innovations of *kalām*. If *kalām* was knowledge, the Companions and the Followers must have made use of it, as also they have done in the laws and the religious rules. But [*kalām*] is a falsity which indicates falsity.”

He then quotes Mālik as having said: “Tradition decreased among the people only when the heresies arose among them. The number of learned men also decreased after the aversion arose among the people.” He also based upon Mālik the words: “Tradition is like Noah’s ship, he who gets aboard, is safe and he who holds back from it, drowns.” Finally he also transmitted from Mālik the words: “Every person coming to me who interprets the Book of God while being ignorant of the languages of the Arabs, is given a warning by me.”⁶⁷⁹

5. The Fifth Generation

A number of persons considered to have opposed *kalām* are included by al-Harawī in the fifth generation: One of them is Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767).⁶⁸⁰ Al-

ṭā‘at-‘llāh fīma uṣā’ bih.” The pronoun I used in SM, in this regard, however is not congruent with the context of the discussion in this passage.

⁶⁷⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

⁶⁷⁶Ibidem.

⁶⁷⁷Mālik’s full name was Abū ‘Abd Allāh Mālik b. Anas b. Mālik b. Abī ‘Amīr b. ‘Amr b. al-Ḥārith b. Gaymān b. Ḥuthayn b. ‘Amr b. al-Ḥārith al-Aṣbahī. He was an *imam* of *dār al-hijra* (Madīna), where the school of the Malikite was located. He wrote a number of works, the chief among which is *al-Muwatta’*. He was born in 90-97/708-16 in Madina and died 179/796. See al-Lālakā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 34, n.7 (H); Cf. J. Schacht’s “Mālik b. Anas” in EI², VI, 262-5.

⁶⁷⁸‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maḥdī b. Ḥassān al-Ḥanbalī Abū Sa’īd al-Baṣrī died in 117/736. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 96, n.3 (N).

⁶⁷⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁶⁸⁰Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu‘mān b. Thābit was a theologian and a religious lawyer, the eponym of the school of the Ḥanafis. He was born in 80/699 and died in 150/767. See J. Schacht, “Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu‘mān,” in EI², I, 123-4.

Harawī quotes Nūh al-Jāmi‘ (d. 173/790)⁶⁸¹ as having said: “I said to Abū Ḥanīfa: What is your opinion on *kalām* with respect to the accidents⁶⁸² and the bodies,⁶⁸³ which people innovated? He replied: [Those are] the concepts of the philosophers. You have to follow the tradition and the way of the pious ancestors. Beware of any fabrication, because it amounts to an innovation.”⁶⁸⁴

Al-Harawī narrates that when Abū Ḥanīfa was asked about *a‘rad* (accidents) and *ajsām* (substances), he said that they both were the concern of philosophers. Abū Ḥanīfa went on asserting that one is to follow the tradition and in the footsteps of the ancestors and ought to beware of any innovation. Accordingly, in the words of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, Abū Ḥanīfa prohibited people from studying *kalām*. Abū Yūsuf al-Qāḍī (d. 182/798) put forth the same censure as Abū Ḥanīfa. The former narrated that one who seeks for religion by use of *kalām*, becomes an atheist and that knowledge of dispute and *kalām* is ignorance.⁶⁸⁵ Ibn al-Mubārak’s (d. 181/798)⁶⁸⁶ criticism of *kalām* was rather soft. He associated dispute to the Mu‘tazilites, lying to the Rafidites⁶⁸⁷ and religion to the scholars of tradition.⁶⁸⁸ ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī held the same opinion as the preceding two scholars mentioned. He stated that *kalām* leads the person immersed in it to atheism. In line with the idea of the scholars mentioned above, Ṭalha b. ‘Amr (d. 152/770)⁶⁸⁹ held that one was not to dispute heretics, because they had a madness

⁶⁸¹Nūh’s full name was Nūh al-Jāmi‘ b. Abī Maryam; his *kunya* was Abū ‘Iṣmah al-Marwazī al-Qurashī. He was also called *al-Jāmi‘*, because of his expertise in many forms of knowledge. He died in 173/789. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 99, n.7 (N).

⁶⁸²Most of the Historians of Muslim philosophy and theology are of the opinion that *‘arad* (pl. *a‘rād*) originated from an Aristotelian term, which is mostly translated into English as ‘accident.’ This term is always defined, according to Rahman, as that which cannot subsist by itself but only in a substance of which it is both the opposite and the complement. See Rahman, F., “‘Araḍ,” in EI², I, 603.

⁶⁸³*Jism* (pl. *ajsām*), a term sometimes rendered in English as ‘body’ and sometimes as ‘substance’ was the term about which the opinions of the Muslim theologians, according to al-Ash‘arī, differs. Ḍirār b. ‘Amr is of the opinion that “*al-jism a‘rād ullifat wa jumi‘at faqāmat wa thubitat faṣārat jisman yaḥtamīl al-a‘rād idhā ḥalla wa al-tagyīr min ḥāl ilā ḥāl wa tilk al-a‘rād hiya mālā taḥlū al-ajsām minḥ aw min diddih naḥw al-ḥayāt wa ‘l-mawt al-ladhāni la yaḥlū al-jism min wāḥid minḥumā*,” whereas Mu‘ammar said that *al-jism “huwa al-ṭawīl al-‘arīḍ al-‘amīq...*” Al-Ash‘arī then recorded more than twelve different opinions on *jism*. See al-Ash‘arī, al-Imām Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Ismā‘il, *Kitāb Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn wa Iḥtilāf al-Muṣallīn* (Istanbul: Maṭba‘at al-Dawla, 1929) ed. H. Ritter, p. 227; 301-6, 2 vols.

⁶⁸⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 99-100.

⁶⁸⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

⁶⁸⁶Ibn al-Mubārak was ‘Abd Allāh al-Marwazī to whom al-Nashshār referred as *‘ālim ḥurāsān wa muḥaddithuhā*. He was originally Turkish died in 181/798. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 100, n. 2 (N).

⁶⁸⁷According to Kohlberg, the Rafidites are the members of the theological denomination, which points to the Proto-Imāmiyya (consequently the Twelver Shi‘a) and also to any members of Shi‘a sects. Al-Ash‘arī, he maintains, identified these groups with those who had by the 3rd/9th century adopted Mu‘tazilites ideas about God’s unity and about the createdness of the Koran. See Kohlberg, E., “al-Rāfiḍa”, in EI², VIII, 386-9.

⁶⁸⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

⁶⁸⁹Ṭalha b. ‘Amr b. ‘Uthmān al-Ḥaḍramī al-Makkī died in 152/. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 101, n. 3 (N).

like that of the scabby camel.⁶⁹⁰ Al-Fuḍayl b. ‘Iyāḍ exhorted that one is not to sit beside a heretic, because that will bring about God’s wrath. In the same line, he held that the author of an innovation will not smell the fragrance of Paradise. The last censure of *kalām* of the scholars of the fifth generation is that of Ḥālid b. al-Ḥārith al-Hujaymī (d. 186/803).⁶⁹¹ He stated that the worst people are those who dispute and altercate.⁶⁹²

6. The Sixth Generation

One of the personalities mentioned by al-Harawī in this generation is Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfi‘ī. Al-Harawī’s discussion of al-Shāfi‘ī’s statements against *kalām* is quoted extensively by al-Suyūṭī in his SM, this is due to the fact that al-Suyūṭī, as discussed before, regarded al-Shāfi‘ī as the first to condemn logic and *kalām* explicitly. Here I quote al-Suyūṭī’s reference to al-Shāfi‘ī’s remarks against *kalām* in his SM *verbatim*:

He [viz. Al-Harawī] then adduced al-Karābisī’s words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said: ‘Everyone speaking about the Book and the Sunna is serious and speaking about anything other than that is nonsensical.’ ” He then transmitted from Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā’ the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said: ‘It is not said concerning the sources [the Koran and Sunna], why and how. In that respect, one rather has to submit.’ ” He then adduced the words of Abu ‘l-Qāsim ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘īd al-Anmāṭī who said: “I heard that al-Muzanī⁶⁹³ said: ‘I used to be involved in *kalām* before the arrival of al-Shāfi‘ī. When he arrived, I came to him and asked him a question related to *kalām*.’ He then asked me: ‘Do you know where you are now?’ I replied: ‘Sure, I am in the Grand Mosque (*al-Masjid al-Jāmi‘*) in Fuṣṭāṭ.’⁶⁹⁴ He then said to him⁶⁹⁵: ‘No, you are in Tārān.’⁶⁹⁶ Abu ‘l-Qāsim said: ‘Tārān is a place in the Red Sea (*baḥr al-qulzum*)⁶⁹⁷ from which hardly a single ship is safe.’ He then posed a question of jurisprudence. And I responded to it. He then put forth something to demolish my answer. So I replied with another thing. He proposed again something demolishing my answer. So when I started to answer with something to demolish his answer, he said to me: ‘This is jurisprudence which involves the Book and the Tradition. [The demolishing is only related to] the opinions of the people. So

⁶⁹⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁶⁹¹Ḥālid b. al-Ḥārith b. ‘Ubayd al-Hujaymī Abū ‘Uthmān al-Baṣrī died in 186/803. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 102, n. 2. (N).

⁶⁹²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

⁶⁹³Ismā‘īl b. Yaḥyā’ al-Muzanī died in 264/879. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 103, n. 4 (N).

⁶⁹⁴Fuṣṭāṭ, old Cairo which was built firstly by the Muslim conquerors. It was located on the east bank of the Nile, alongside the Greco-coptic township of Babylon. See Jomier, J., “al-Fuṣṭāṭ,” in EI², II, 957-9.

⁶⁹⁵The copying error also occurs in this place. In SM, is “he then said to him”. But in the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 113a), it is “he then said to me.”

⁶⁹⁶Tārān is an Island in the Red Sea, which is situated between Qulzum and Wa‘ayla. The inhabitants of Tārān were called Banū Jaddān. They relied for their food much on the sea and lived in ships as their houses. According to al-Yaqūt, Tārān had a reputation for its being the dirtiest place in the Sea of Qulzum. *Jacuts, op. cit.*, vol. I, 811.

⁶⁹⁷According to al-Ḥamawī, *Baḥr al-Qulzum* (the Red Sea) is the part of Indian oceans. Its eastern coast is Berber, while its northern one is Jemen. Another part of its coast stretches out to the city of Qulzum nearby Egypt. *Jacuts, op. cit.*, p. 503, vol. I.

how to speak about the Lord of the Universe, a mistake which can imply an infidelity' [From then on] I left *kalām* and turned towards jurisprudence."⁶⁹⁸

He then adduced the words from 'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal the words: "I heard that Muḥammad b. Dāwud [d. 296/910]⁶⁹⁹ had said: 'In the time of al-Shāfi'ī, nowhere was it recorded, related or even known that he [al-Shāfi'ī] spoke about futilities while he detested the *Mutakallimūn* and the innovators.' "

He then adduced on the authority of 'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal the words from his father: "Whenever al-Shāfi'ī was convinced of the veracity of a report, he followed it. His best property was that he did not desire theology. His only concern was *fiqh*."

He then put forth from al-Muzanī that someone asked him about a matter related to *kalām*. He replied: "I detest this. I even prohibit it just as al-Shāfi'ī did. I heard al-Shāfi'ī saying: 'Mālik was asked about *kalām* and *al-tawḥīd*. So he answered: 'It is absurd for us to think of the fact that the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - taught his *Umma* the *istinjā'*, but did not teach them *al-tawḥīd*. *Al-tawḥīd* is what the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - remarked: I was ordered to kill the people until they say there is no God but Allah. No blood and property could protect the truth of *al-tawḥīd*.' "

He then adduced from al-Karābīsī the words: "I saw al-Shāfi'ī. Then Bishr al-Murīsī came to him. So he said to Bishr: 'Tell me what you are propagating! A crystal-clear book, postulated suppositions or established prophetic traditions concerning which you found from the ancestors both a study and a question?' Bishr replied: 'No, but I am not able to oppose [that view] whatsoever.' Al-Shāfi'ī then said: 'You confirmed your own mistake.'⁷⁰⁰ So what is your position with respect to the discussion on jurisprudence and narratives (*aḥbār*)? People would follow you and learn that?' He replied: 'We have (scanty) contributions (*nubadh*) to it!' When Bishr went away, al-Shāfi'ī said: 'He will never succeed.'⁷⁰¹

He then adduced from Abū Dāwud and Abū Thawr (d. 240/854)⁷⁰² the words: "We heard al-Shāfi'ī saying: 'No one who was occupied with *kalām*, would succeed.' " He also adduced from al-Ḥusayn b. Ismā'īl al-Muḥāmīlī (d. 330/943)⁷⁰³ the following words: "Al-Muzanī said: I asked al-Shāfi'ī about a question related to *kalām*. He replied: Ask me about something of which I can say, when I make a

⁶⁹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

⁶⁹⁹Muḥammad b. Dāwud b. al-Jarrāḥ Abū 'Abd Allāh died in 296/910. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 104, n. 2 (N).

⁷⁰⁰The copying error also occurs in this place. In the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 113b), the phrase reads "... *aqrarta binafsik 'alā al-ḥaṭa'...*" while in SM, it reads "... *aqrarta binafsik 'alā al-ḥaṭa' fih...*" SM, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁷⁰¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁷⁰²This probably refers to Abū Thawr Ibrāhīm b. Ḥālid b. Abī 'l-Yamān al-Kalbī who died in Bagdad in 240/854. Abū Thawr, according to Schacht, was a prominent jurisconsult and founder of a school of religious law. Due to his stay in Irak one generation after al-Shāfi'ī, Abū Thawr, Schacht argues, "seems to have been influenced by al-Shāfi'ī's methodological insistence on the authority of the *ḥādīth* of the Prophet, without, however, renouncing the use of *ra'y* as had been customary in the ancient schools of law." See Schacht, J., "Abū Thawr," in EI², I, 155.

⁷⁰³Al-Ḥusayn b. Ismā'īl al-Muḥāmīlī al-Dībī al-Bagdadī b. 'Abd Allāh died in 330/943. SM, SM, *op. cit.*, p. 105, n. 1 (N).

mistake in it: I made a mistake. Do not ask me about something of which, when I make a mistake, I say: I became an infidel.”

He then adduced the words from Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (d. 286/900)⁷⁰⁴: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said to me: O, Muḥammad, if someone asks you about something related to *kalām*, do not respond to him. Because when he asks you about *diya*,⁷⁰⁵ and you reply: [that amounts to] one *dirham*⁷⁰⁶ or one *daniq*,⁷⁰⁷ he says: You made a mistake. But if someone asks you about something related to *kalām*, and you make a mistake, he says: ‘You became an infidel.’”

He then adduced from al-Rabī‘ b. Sulaymān (d. 270/884)⁷⁰⁸ the words: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: ‘The arguing on religious tenets makes the soul cruel and stirs up animosity.’” He also adduced from al-Rabī‘ the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said to me: O, Rabī‘! Accept from me three matters: [first,] do not enter into discussion about the Companions of the Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace, because the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - will be your opponent on the Day of Resurrection; [secondly,] do not occupy yourself with *kalām*, because I found that some *Mutakalimūn* are in a favour of *al-ta‘ṭīl*,⁷⁰⁹ and [thirdly] do not busy yourself with astrology, because it draws you to *al-ta‘ṭīl*.”

He then adduced from al-Muzanī the words: “The established view of al-Shafi‘ī is abhorrence of the occupation with *kalām*.” He also adduced from al-Karābisī the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī was asked about something related to *kalām*. So he became angry. He then said: ‘Ḥafṣ al-Fard [d. 205/820]⁷¹⁰ and his companions already asked about this [question] before. God abased them.’”⁷¹¹

⁷⁰⁴Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam b. A‘yan al-Miṣrī died in 286/900. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 105, n. 2 (N).

⁷⁰⁵According to Kinder, *diya* signifies blood money or money paid in compensation for life. This term originates from a verse of the Koran (*al-nisā’*: 92), which reads *diyātun musallamatun ilā ahlihā* (blood money is to be paid to his kin). This verse, Kinder maintains, lays down the law of accidental homicide for which the perpetrator must emancipate a slave or fast for two months and give *diya* to the victim’s family if the victim was a *mu‘min* or *dhimmi* (protected people). The amount of *diya* for a free male muslim is set at 100 camels. See Kinder, R., “Blood Money,” in *the Encyclopaedia of the Qur‘ān* ed. Jane Dammen McAuliffe (Leiden-Boston-Köln: E, J. Brill, 2001), vol. I, p. 239.

⁷⁰⁶*Dirham* is a silver coin whose weight is six *dawāniq*. Lane, *op. cit.*, I, 876.

⁷⁰⁷*Dāniq* (pl. *dawāniq*) is the sixth part of a *dirham*. Lane, *op. cit.*, I, 920.

⁷⁰⁸Al-Rabī‘ b. Sulaymān b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Jabbār al-Murādī Abū Muḥammad al-Biṣrī died in 270/884. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 105, n. 3 (N).

⁷⁰⁹*Ta‘ṭīl*, divesting God of His attributes, according to Van Ess, is equivalent with *tanzīh*, “transcendentalism”, a term which is always combined with its opposite term *tashbīh*, “anthropomorphism.” *Ta‘ṭīl* and its derivative *mu‘aṭṭil* or *mu‘aṭṭila* (denoting a person or a group practising *ta‘ṭīl*) are used here in polemical language as a derogatory term for the adversaries of al-Rabī‘ b. Sulaymān, implying that he along with al-Shāfi‘ī form the group who practice *tashbīh*, and oppose those who practice *ta‘ṭīl*, the Mu‘tazilites. On *tashbīh wa ‘l-tanzīh*, see Van Ess, Joseph, “al-Tashbīh wa ‘l-Tanzīh,” in EI², X, 341-4.

⁷¹⁰Ḥafṣ al-Fard was a great polemicist of the Murji‘ite denomination who wrote *Kitāb fī ‘l-Mahlūq ‘alā Abī ‘l-Hudhayl* against Abu ‘l-Hudhayl al-Allāf, who also composed the polemical works, *Kitāb al-Mahlūq ‘alā Ḥafṣ al-Fard* and *Kitāb ‘alā Dirār wa Jahm wa Abī Ḥanīfa wa Ḥafṣ fī ‘l-Mahlūq*. For the study of jurisprudence, he enjoyed the supervision of Abū Yūsuf, a disciple of Abū Ḥanīfa. According to al-Suyūṭī, for the study of theology he was a disciple of Bishr al-Murīsī the *Mutakallim* and much influenced by Dirār b. ‘Amr.

He then put forth from Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Ash‘arī, al-Shāfi‘ī’s friend, the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said: ‘My established view on the *Mutakallimūn* is that their heads should be veiled by the whips and that they should be banished from the land.’ ” He also adduced from al-Karābīsī (d. ca. 245/860)⁷¹² the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said: ‘My (legal) judgment on the *Mutakallimūn* is like ‘Umar’s on Ṣabīg.’ ” He further put forth the words from Aḥmad b. Ḥālid al-Ḥallāl (d. 247/862)⁷¹³: “I heard that al-Shāfi‘ī had said: ‘I did not debate with someone, of whom I know that he clings continuously to innovation.’ ”

He also adduced from Abū Thawr, al-Karābīsī [d. ca. 245/860] and al-Za‘farānī [d. 260/875]⁷¹⁴ the words: “We heard that al-Shāfi‘ī had said: ‘My legal opinion on the people of *kalām* is that they should be beaten with date-stalks and be escorted on the camel which then could bring them around the clans and tribes while summoning the people that this is the consequence of neglecting the Koran and the Tradition, for being fascinated with *kalām*.’ ”

He then transmitted the words from al-Za‘farānī (d. 260/875): “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: ‘I never debated with someone on *kalām*, except once. I asked God’s forgiveness for it.’ ” He also adduced from Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-‘Alā: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: ‘If you hear that someone says that the name is not identical to the object [named], be sure that he is a heretic!’ ” He also took from al-Rabī‘ the words: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying in *Kitāb al-Waṣāyā*: ‘If someone bequeathes his books of knowledge to other people, while among them are theological books, those theological books should not be included in the *waṣīyya*, because [*kalām*] is not regarded as knowledge.’ ” He also adduced from al-Muzanī: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: ‘*Kalām* curses the *Mutakallimūn*.’ ”

He then adduced from al-Rabī‘ [the words]: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī getting off the stairs, while people were discussing theological [questions.] So he shouted at them saying: ‘Be our friendly neighbours, or stay away from us!’ ”⁷¹⁵

He also adduced the words from Abū Thawr (d. 240/854): “I said to al-Shāfi‘ī: ‘Write something on *kalām*.’ So he replied: ‘whoever is occupied with *kalām*, will never succeed.’ ” He then adduced from al-Za‘farānī the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī used to detest *kalām* and to stay far from it.” He also adduced from al-Rabī‘ the words: “One day al-Shāfi‘ī came to us, while in the house there were people discussing something related to *kalām*. So he said: ‘Be our friendly

When he was in Baṣra, he became a disciple of Abu ‘l-Ash‘ath the Philosopher. Among his opponents, he was often called Ḥafṣ al-Qird, Ḥafṣ the Monkey. Al-Shāfi‘ī sometimes called him Ḥafṣ al-Munfarid, the Lonely Ḥafṣ or Ḥafṣ the Single fighter. He died in Egypt in 205/820. Van Ess, TG, *op. cit.*, II, 729-735.

⁷¹¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

⁷¹²Al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī b. Yazīd al-Baghdādī al-Karābīsī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *Faqīh Bagdād* who studied jurisprudence under Imām al-Shāfi‘ī. He was the author of many works. He died in ca. 245/860. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XII, 79-82.

⁷¹³Aḥmad b. Ḥālid al-Ḥallāl Abū al-Baghdādī died in 247/862. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 106, n. 1 (N).

⁷¹⁴*Al-Imām al-‘Allāma Shayḥ al-Fuqahā’ wa ‘l-Muḥaddithīn* Abū ‘Alī, al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ṣabbāḥ al-Baghdādī al-Za‘farānī was born in 170/787. He studied under the supervision of al-Shāfi‘ī, Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna, Abū Mu‘āwiya al-Ḍarīr, Ismā‘il b. ‘Ulayya, etc. Many prominent scholars transmitted prophetic tradition on his authority: al-Buḥārī, Abū Dāwud, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasa‘ī, al-Qazwīnī, etc. He died. in Bagdad in 260/875. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XII, 262-5.

⁷¹⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

neighbours, or stay away from us!’ ” He also adduced from al-Muzanī the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī used to forbid one to enter into discussion concerning *kalām*.” He then adduced from Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam the words: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: ‘If people know what *kalām* comprises, they will certainly flee from it, just as they flee from a lion.’ ” He also adduced from Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā’ (d. 264/877)⁷¹⁶ the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī’s mother said: ‘He refused that Ḥafs al-Fard sits with him.’ ” Al-Sājī said: “She always accompanied him. He took her everywhere with him.”⁷¹⁷ He also adduced from al-Shāfi‘ī the words: “Al-Murīsī’s mother said to me: ‘Advise Bishr to avoid *kalām*!’ So I advised him. But he invited me to *kalām*.”⁷¹⁸

He then adduced from al-Rabī‘ the words: “Someone asked al-Shāfi‘ī [who then said] that this [matter] leads to *kalām*. We will not answer a question related to *kalām*.”⁷¹⁹

He then transmitted from Ibn Ḥuzayma: “I heard Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā’ saying that al-Shāfi‘ī said: ‘Any affliction by God, except *al-shirk*, is better for man than being afflicted by Him with *kalām*.” He also adduced from al-Rabī‘ the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said to me: ‘If I wanted to compose a big book against any adversary, I would have done it. But *kalām* is not my interest. I do not want to be associated with it, as well.’ ”

He then adduced from al-Za‘farānī [d. 260/875] the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī used to wear a big turban as if he was a desert dweller (*a rābī*), while his hand held a cane. He had the sharpest tongue among the people. If speculation (*kalām*) was being practiced in his circle, he prohibited it. He would then say: ‘We are not practitioners of *kalām*.’ ”⁷²⁰

He then adduced from Abū Ḥātim⁷²¹ the words: “Some of al-Shāfi‘ī’s companions said: Al-Shāfi‘ī attended [a circle held] in the Grand Mosque.⁷²² Then someone debated with him on a question. The debate lasted very long. The man brought up a question related to *kalām*. Finally, al-Shāfi‘ī said to him: Leave this! Because it is related to *kalām*.” He also adduced from al-Rabī‘ the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī recited a poem to us censuring *kalām*:

The people go on fabricating innovations# in religious [matters] with their own opinions
with which the messengers were not sent
Until, most of them hold God’s religion in low esteem#

⁷¹⁶According to Bosworth, Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā’ was “the leading Egyptian *muḥaddith* and authority on the *ḵirā’āt*.” See Bosworth, C.E., “al-Ṭabarī,” in EI², X, p. 11.

⁷¹⁷This sentence is taken from “*wakānat ma‘ah yaḥmiluhā’ ilā kull mawḍu‘*” of the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 116a). In SM, this sentence reads “*wa kānat takūnu ma‘ahū yaḥmiluhā’ ma‘ahū ilā kull mawḍu‘*.” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁷¹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁷¹⁹Ibidem.

⁷²⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 107

⁷²¹Muḥammad b. Idrīs b. al-Mundhir al-Ḥanzalī Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *shayḥ al-muḥaddithīn*, who was one of the contemporaries of al-Buḥārī. Among his disciples were Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā’, his son, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Ḥātim, al-Rabī‘ b. Sulaymān, Abū Zur‘a al-Rāzī, Abū Zur‘ā al-Dimashqī, etc. He died in 277/891. See al-Dhahabī, SAN, XIII, 247-263; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 107, n. 1 (N).

⁷²²The copying error also occurs in this place. In SM, this phrase reads “al-Shāfi‘ī attended (*ḥaḍara al-shāfi‘ī*)”, whereas in the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 116b), the phrase reads “I invited al-Shāfi‘ī (*ḥaḍartu al-Shāfi‘ī*).

But it deserves more engagement to be involved in [the matters of] the ancestors⁷²³

This is all of what al-Harawī narrated with chains of transmission from al-Shāfi‘ī’s texts. Most of these [quotations] are adduced in the *manāqib* of al-Shāfi‘ī by Ibn Abī Ḥātim, al-Sājī and al-Bayhaqī.⁷²⁴

7. The Seventh Generation

The censures and the attitudes toward *kalām* of the people of this generation are described by al-Harawī in the following narratives. When Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Būshanjī⁷²⁵ was asked about *al-īmān* (the faith), he said that it is obligatory for all scholars and *ahl al-Islām* to follow the Koran and the *Sunna*, as well as to consider the foundations (*al-uṣūl*) laid down by the Koran and the *Sunna* as the aims of their intellects. In other words, they are not to consider their intellects as the aims of the foundations laid down by the Koran and the *Sunna*.⁷²⁶ Illustrating his words, al-Būshanjī narrated what ‘Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb did to Ṣabīg and ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib to ‘Abd Allāh b. Saba’.⁷²⁷

Accordingly, Ayyūb al-Saḥtiyānī⁷²⁸ said that one is not to dispute with people about a matter one does not know, because that leads one to corruption.⁷²⁹ Justifying his censure of *kalām*, Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā repeated al-Shāfi‘ī’s opinion that there is no sin worse than infidelity, except that of one who is engaged in *kalām*. For the same purpose, he goes on narrating that al-Layth b. Sa‘d used to say: “If one sees one of the *ahl al-kalām* walking on water, do not trust him.” Concluding his words, Yūnus quoted al-Shāfi‘ī’s attitude towards the *mutakallimūn*, namely they should be hit on the head with palm-stalks and expelled to their homelands.⁷³⁰

In the same line, al-Harawī adduced from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Ḥātim (d. 327/940)⁷³¹ the statement that the latter’s father (viz. Abū Ḥātim) and Abū Zur‘a

⁷²³The last verse is taken from DhK, *op. cit.*, p. 256 which reads: “*wa fi ‘lladhī ḥalaw min ḥaqqihī shuglun.*”

⁷²⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

⁷²⁵Al-Būshanjī, the author of *Mas‘alat al-Taslīm li Amri ‘llāh wa ‘l-Nahy ‘an al-Duḥūl fi Kayfiyyatih*, according to al-Suyūṭī, was one of the leading Shafi‘ite scholars, who was referred to by Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī as *shayḥ ahl al-ḥadīth fi zamānih*. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

⁷²⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

⁷²⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

⁷²⁸Abū Bakr b. Abī Tamīma Kaysān al-Baṣrī, Ayyūb al-Saḥtiyānī was described variously as *aḥad al-a‘lām min nujabā’ al-mawālī, sayyid al-fuqahā’, sayyid shabbāb ahl al-baṣra, jāhbadh al-‘ulamā’*, etc. He learned (*sami‘a*) traditions from ‘Amr b. Salma al-Jarmī, Abū ‘l-‘Āliya, Sa‘id b. Jubayr, ‘Abd Allāh b. Shaqīq, Abū Qulāba, al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Mujaḥid, Ibn Sīrīn, etc. The most prominent among those who transmitted traditions on his authority were Sha‘ba, al-Ḥamadān, Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna, Mu‘ammar, Mu‘tamir, Ibn ‘Aliyya, ‘Abd al-Wārith, etc. He died in 131/750 in Baṣra. Al-Dhahabī, TI, juz. 5, p. 228-30.

⁷²⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

⁷³⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

⁷³¹He was a son of the celebrated *muhaddith*, Abū Ḥātim. He was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *al-‘allāma al-ḥāfiẓ*. His *kunya* was Abū Muḥammad who was born in 240/855. He studied under the supervision of his father, Abū Ḥātim, Abī Sa‘id al-Ashaj, al-Za‘farānī, Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā, al-Ḥasan b. ‘Arafa, etc. He died in 327/940. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XIII, 263-9.

(d. ca. 264/879)⁷³² refrained from befriending the *Mutakallimūn* and to study their writings. In al-Harawī's words, both of them said that the author of *kalām* will never be happy. They both refused to compose works based on reason without relying on *athār* and tried to urge people to shun the one who is engaged in it.⁷³³

One is able to find a mild censure of *kalām* in al-Zujjāj al-Naḥwī's words. He stated that one who spends his life engaged in disputes, will find no convenient shelter.⁷³⁴ Accordingly, al-Haytham b. Kulayb (d. 335/947)⁷³⁵ quoted a poem of Qutaybī stating: "Leave alone one engaged in it."⁷³⁶ A warning against *kalām* can be found in the words of Ja'far al-Fargānī (d. 317/930).⁷³⁷ He stated that the least danger of theology, is the disappearance of the fear of God. Yet, if the heart is empty of the fear of God, that means that it is empty of the faith, as well.⁷³⁸

Other censures of *kalām* can also be found in the words of Sahl b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 283/896).⁷³⁹ Interpreting the verse: "*wa ta'āwanū 'ala 'l-birri wa 'l-taqwā' walā' ta'āwanū 'ala 'l-ithmi wa 'l-'udwān*", Sahl associates *al-birr* (righteousness) and *al-taqwā'* (piety) with faith and the *Sunna*, and *al-ithm* (sin) and *al-'udwān* (rancour) with infidelity and innovation.⁷⁴⁰ Sahl's censure of *kalām* seems more vehement in his statements that if one shuns *al-zāhir* (explicit meaning) and proceeds to the allegorical meaning (*al-bāṭin*),⁷⁴¹ one converts, in fact, to *zandaqa* (atheism).⁷⁴²

⁷³² This name probably refers to 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Karīm b. Yazīd b. Farrūḥ, Abū Zur'a al-Rāzī, to whom al-Dhahabī refers as *sayyid al-ḥuffāz* and *muḥaddith al-rayy*. He was born in ca. 200/810. He is said to have attended the circle of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and to have memorized two hundred thousand prophetic traditions. He died in ca. 264/879. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XIII, p. 65-85.

⁷³³ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

⁷³⁴ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁷³⁵ Al-Haytham b. Kulayb b. Surayj b. Ma'qil, Abū Sa'īd al-Shāshī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as the *Ḥāfiẓ* who studied traditions under the supervision of 'Īsā b. Aḥmad al-'Asqalānī al-Balḥī, Muḥammad b. 'Īsā al-Tirmidhī, etc. His disciples were Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Manda, 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Ḥujā'ī and Maṣṣūr b. Naṣr al-Kāgīdī. He died in 335/947. Al-Dhahabī, TI, *Ḥawādith wa Wafāyāt* 331-340 H. (1415/1994), p. 132-3.

⁷³⁶ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁷³⁷ Abū Ja'far al-Fargānī al-'Askarī al-Ḍarīr, Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd was a resident of Damascus who studied traditions under Abū Sa'īd al-Ashajjī, al-Ḥasan b. 'Arafa and 'Umar b. Shabba. Among those who transmitted tradition on his authority were Abū Ḥāshim 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Mu'addib, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Sunnī, Abū Aḥmad al-Ḥākim and Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar. He died in 317/930. Al-Dhahabī, TI, *Ḥawādith wa Wafāyāt* 311-320 H. (1415/1994), p. 548.

⁷³⁸ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁷³⁹ This refers to Abū Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Yūnus b. 'Īsā b. 'Abd Allāh b. Rafī' al-Tustarī, an influential Ṣūfī of medieval Islam who was born in 203/818 in Tustar, Ḥūzistan and died in Baṣra in 283/896. See Böwering, G., "Sahl al-Tustarī," in EI², VIII, p. 840-1.

⁷⁴⁰ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷⁴¹ This is closely connected to what Ibn Kathīr refers to as batinite interpretation (esoteric or allegorical interpretation) of the Koran, which he suggests as Qarmatian interpretation (Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa'l-Nihāya*, VI, 92). Ivanov maintains that the term *bāṭin* (from *batn*, "belly") means 'deduced' with the help of allegorical interpretation (*ta'wīl*). It leads to the doctrine that there is no *zāhir* without its corresponding *bāṭin* and *vice versa*. Thus, the knowledge of the *bāṭin* of each *zāhir*, to its full extent, formed an exclusive prerogative

A censure of *kalām* in a rather different tone can be found in the definition of innovation by Abū Ḥafṣ. When he was asked about innovation, he defined it as neglecting the laws, scorning the traditions and following personal opinion, as well as shunning of authority (*al-ittibāʿ*).⁷⁴³

Al-Harawī then turns to the censure of *kalām* by Abū ʿAlī al-Jūzajānī. In his words, when al-Jūzajānī was asked about the way in which the *Sunna* should be followed, he said that it means avoiding innovations, following the consensus of the first generation of Muslim scholars and remaining far from studies of *kalām* and from its scholars, as well as observing the way of *al-iqtidāʿ* and *al-ittibāʿ*.⁷⁴⁴

Al-Harawī also describes the censures of other people. *First*, according to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Ḥātim, his father (viz. Abū Ḥātim) and Abū Zurʿa used to say: “He who seeks for religion through *kalām*, goes astray.” *Secondly*, when he was asked about the oneness of God, Abū ʿAbbas b. Surayj said that it is *shahāda*, bearing witness that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh. However, the witnessing to the Oneness of God by the people of falsehood involves engagement in accidents (*al-aʿrād*) and substances (*al-ajsām*). The Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - was sent to reject it. *Thirdly*, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad has said that dispute for the cause of victory is preceded by a debate and disputation (*ṣiyāh*), followed by an inclination to dominate others and concluded by hatred and anger.⁷⁴⁵ *Fourthly*, when Abū Bakr b. Biṣṭām asked Abū Bakr b. Sayyār about being engaged in *kalām*, he prohibited him to do so.⁷⁴⁶ *Fifthly*, Abū ʿAmr b. Maṭar (d. 360/972)⁷⁴⁷ said that when Ibn Ḥuzayma was asked about the names and the attributes in *kalām*, he said that it was an innovation in which the leading Muslim scholars and the founders of the schools such as Mālik, Sufyan, al-Awzāʿī, al-Shāfiʿī, Aḥmad, Ishāq, Yaḥyā b. Yaḥya, Ibn al-Mubārak, Muḥammad b. Yaḥya, Abū Ḥanīfa, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan and Abū Yūsuf had not been engaged. They refused to have anything to do with it and led their friends to the Koran and the Sunna.⁷⁴⁸

8. The Eighth Generation

In this generation, al-Harawī describes an interesting narration on the authority of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim, who stated: “I heard Abū Zayd al-Faqīh al-Marwazī [d. 371/982]⁷⁴⁹ saying: I met Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī [d. ca. 320/933]⁷⁵⁰ in Baṣra. I

of the *Imām*, as did therefore the privilege of conveying its *taʿwīl*. Qualified theologians, or anyone, could only offer a *taʿwīl* explanation with the authorisation and endorsement of the *Imām*. The principle of *taʿwīl*, Ivanov goes on maintaining, was violently condemned by the orthodox as easily leading to possible abuse, and chaos in religion. See Ivanov, W., *Brief Survey of the Evolution of Ismaʿilism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1952), p. 24-5.

⁷⁴²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷⁴³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷⁴⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷⁴⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

⁷⁴⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁷⁴⁷Abū ʿAmr b. Maṭar, Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. Maṭar al-Naysābūrī al-Muzakkī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *al-shayḥ al-imām al-quḍwa al-ʿāmil al-muḥaddith* and *shayḥ al-ʿadāla*. He died in 360/972. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVI, 162-3.

⁷⁴⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁷⁴⁹Abū Zayd Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Marwazī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *al-shayḥ al-imām al-muftī al-quḍwa al-zāhid* and *shayḥ al-shāfiʿiyya*.

learnt a bit of *kalām* from him. So I dreamt in my sleep that I was blind. I then related it [this dream] to an interpreter [of dreams]. He said: [This happened] because you acquired knowledge due to which you are led astray. Hence, I refrained from seeing al-Ash‘arī. He then saw me in the street and said to me: O ye Abu Zayd! Do you like to return to Ḥurāsān while you are knowledgeable of the branches (*al-furū‘*) but ignorant of the roots (*al-uṣūl*). I then told him my dream. He said: Do not divulge it here!”⁷⁵¹

9. The Ninth Generation

In this generation, al-Harawī ascribes statements against *kalām* to a number of authorities. He refers, for instance, to Abū Maṣṣūr [al-Albanī] al-Bustī⁷⁵² as having said: “I saw Yaḥya b. ‘Ammār [d. 422/1032]⁷⁵³ reprehending the people of *kalām* on the pulpit [so frequently] that I could not count the times.” I also saw ‘Umar b. Ibrāhīm and our professors doing the same; [and]: I heard al-Ḥasan b. Abī Usāma al-Makkī [saying]: I heard my father saying: “God cursed Abū Dharr, i.e. ‘Abd b. Aḥmad al-Harawī [d. 434/1043].⁷⁵⁴ Because he was the first who introduced *kalām* to al-Ḥaram [viz. Mecca] and the one who spread it among the Maghribis.”

Al-Harawī also mentions that Maṣṣūr b. Ismā‘īl⁷⁵⁵ had said: “I heard al-Ḥusayn b. Shu‘ayb [d. 432/1040]⁷⁵⁶ the jurist saying to Yaḥya b. ‘Ammār: I heard Sālim saying: He who did not learn *kalām*, did not subject his religious belief to

He transmitted *ṣaḥīḥ al-buḥārī* from the authority of al-Firabrī. He also studied (*sami‘a*) tradition under Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Munkadirī, Abu ‘l-‘Abbās Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dagūlī, ‘Umar b. ‘Allak and Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Sa‘dī. Prominent disciples of his were Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī and Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Dāraquṭnī. He died in 371/982 in Merv. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVI, 313-5.

⁷⁵⁰Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī was the Great Imām ‘Alī b. Ismā‘īl b. Abī Bishr, the founder of the Ash‘arite theological school. He was born in 260/875 and died in Bagdad in ca. 320/933. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 119, n. 5 (N); see also Watt, W.M., “al-Ash‘arī, Abu ‘l-Ḥasan,” in EI², I, p. 694-5.

⁷⁵¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 119-120.

⁷⁵²The copying error also occurs in this place. Abū Maṣṣūr al-Albanī al-Bustī (fol. 130b) is mistakenly copied as Abū Maṣṣūr al-Mālīnī al-Bustī.

⁷⁵³*Al-Imām al-Muḥaddith al-Wā‘iz* Yaḥya b. ‘Ammār b. al-‘Anbas was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *shayḥ sijjstān*, who studied under the supervision of Ḥāmid b. Muḥammad al-Raffā, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Adī b. Ḥamduwayh al-Ṣābūnī, etc. The most prominent among his disciples was *Shayḥ al-Islām* Abū Ismā‘īl ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Harawī. He died in 422/1032 in Herat. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVII, 480.

⁷⁵⁴Abū Dharr was ‘Abd b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Gufayr b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī al-Ḥurāsānī al-Harawī al-Mālikī, known as Ibn al-Sammāk. He was regarded by al-Dhahabī as *al-ḥāfiẓ al-imām al-mujawwad al-‘allāma* and *shayḥ al-ḥaram*. He was born in 356/968. He transmitted *ṣaḥīḥ al-buḥārī* from al-Mustamlī, al-Ḥamawī and al-Kushmīhanī. Among his disciples were his son, Abū Maktūm ‘Īsā, Mūsā b. ‘Alī al-Ṣaqalī, Abu ‘l-Walīd al-Bājī, etc. He was Malikite and Ash‘arite. He studied *kalām* under the supervision of al-Qāḍī Abū Bakr b. al-Ṭayyib. He died in 434/1043 in Mecca. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVII, 554-561.

⁷⁵⁵Maṣṣūr b. Ismā‘īl b. ‘Umar al-Tamīmī was well known as Abu ‘l-Ḥasan. He died in 306/918. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 122, n. 4 (N).

⁷⁵⁶Al-Ḥusayn b. Shu‘ayb b. Muḥammad al-Sinjī died in 432/1040. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 122, n. 5 (N).

God. So I said: Did you inherit [something] from your father?” Likewise, al-Harawī refers to ‘Isā b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī⁷⁵⁷ who had remarked: “I heard al-Ḥasan b. Hānī saying: ‘All of us have learned *kalām*, but we became tongue-tied (‘*aqilnā*). So we remained silent. Abu ‘l-Jūdī⁷⁵⁸ and al-Dīnārī [d. 407/1017]⁷⁵⁹ became furious. So they both became chaste in speech.’”⁷⁶⁰

In another passages, al-Harawī also quotes Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad al-Albanī as having said: “I saw al-Dīnārī [d. 407/1017] being asked by Abū Sa’d al-Zāhid to repent. I never saw him in such a baseness like on that day. I also knew that the seminar of Sālīm in the Mosque was cleaned at the time of Yaḥya b. ‘Ammār [d. 422/1032] and ‘Umar b. Ibrāhīm [d. 425/1036]⁷⁶¹ on the basis of consultation. I heard Maṣṣūr b. Ismā‘īl the jurist praising God for that account. Sālīm then came repenting. So Yaḥya b. ‘Ammār said to the chamberlain (*al-ḥājib*)⁷⁶²: Tell him to bring the books of *kalām* in order that we burn them in the fire. But he did not permit him [to do that].”⁷⁶³

[b.] *Al-Ri‘āya* by al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī (d.243/857-8)

Biography

Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥārith b. Asad al-Muḥāsibī was born in 165/783 into a family that lived in Basra. According to most of his biographers, the name of al-Muḥāsibī was given to him because of his habit of self-examination. However, this notion was rejected by ‘Aṭṭār, Smith says, stating that it was due to the fact that he made no statement without previous reflection. His *nisba* of al-Anazī indicates his tribal affiliation to the Beduin tribe, Anaza.⁷⁶⁴

Al-Muḥāsibī was the son of a man who, according to Ibn Ḥallikan, professed the doctrine of man’s free will.⁷⁶⁵ His father was considered a heretic and described variously as a Qadarite, Rafidite and a Magian.⁷⁶⁶ According to

⁷⁵⁷The copying error also occurs in this place. “‘Isā b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī” (fol. 13ob) is mistakenly copied as “‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī.”

⁷⁵⁸Here the editor of SM, al-Nashshār seems to have misidentified Abu ‘l-Jūdī al-Asadī the Shāfi‘ite, with al-Ḥārith b. ‘Amīr who died ca. 100/719 (SM, *op. cit.*, p. 123, n. 2 (N)). All the figures cited by al-Harawī in this generation, including al-Jūdī were contemporaries, and some of them were even teachers, of al-Harawī.

⁷⁵⁹His complete name was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Ḥāmid Abu’l-Ḥasan al-Dīnārī al-Anṣārī al-Harawī. He died in 407/1017. Al-Dhahabī, TI, *Hawādith wa Wafayāt* 401-410 H. (1415/1994), p. 527.

⁷⁶⁰SM, *op. cit.* p. 122-3.

⁷⁶¹‘Umar b. Ibrāhīm b. Ismā‘īl, a cousin (*ḥāl*) of *Shayḥ al-Islām* Abū ‘Uthmān al-Ṣābūnī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *al-ḥāfiẓ al-quḍwa* and *al-zāhid*. Like Yaḥyā b. ‘Ammār, he was also teacher of Abū Ismā‘īl al-Harawī. He died in 425/1036. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVII, p. 448-9.

⁷⁶²According to Sourdél, this term can be translated approximately as chamberlain. It is “used in Muslim countries for the person responsible for guarding the door of access to the ruler, so that only approved visitors may approach him.” See Sourdél, D., “Ḥādḥib,” in EI², III, p. 45.

⁷⁶³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

⁷⁶⁴Al-Muḥāsibī, al-Ḥārith, *Kitāb al-Ri‘āya li Ḥuqūq Allāh*, ed. Margareth Smith (London: Luzac & Co, 1941).

⁷⁶⁵Ibn Ḥallikan, *Biographical Dictionary*, V. I, 365-6, transl. By Bn. Mac Guckin De Slane (Paris: 1842)

⁷⁶⁶Smith, Margareth, in the introduction of *al-Ri‘āya*, p. xv.

most of al-Muḥāsibī's biographers, due to his father's heresy, al-Muḥāsibī refused to inherit seventy thousand dirhems from him, insisting that 'persons of different religions cannot inherit, one from the other.'⁷⁶⁷ According to al-Subkī, al-Muḥāsibī even asked his father to divorce his mother.⁷⁶⁸

That al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī is stated to have been a student under Imām al-Shāfi'ī is controversial among the biographers. According to al-Suyūṭī, Abū Maṣū' al-Tamīmī had included al-Muḥāsibī in the first generation of the companions of al-Shāfi'ī⁷⁶⁹ and considered him one of the followers of al-Shāfi'ī. Abū Āṣim al-'Ibadī, conversely, only considered him one of al-Shāfi'ī's contemporaries. Al-'Ibadī maintained that despite being one of the followers of the Shafi'ite school, al-Muḥāsibī was not reported to have been one of those who met al-Shāfi'ī.⁷⁷⁰

The authority of al-Muḥāsibī in a number of traditional sciences was recognized by most of his biographers. Ibn Ḥallikan considered him one of those who possessed both the science of the exterior and the science of the interior.⁷⁷¹ Al-Subkī, for instance, maintained that al-Muḥāsibī was a leading scholar in *taṣawwuf*, Tradition, *Kalām* and Jurisprudence. His writings, which were reported to have amounted to twenty-one, seventeen of which are known to be extant,⁷⁷² constitute authoritative sources for the scholars of Mysticism, Tradition, *Kalām* and Jurisprudence of the later generation. His authority was always referred to by most of the *Mutakallimī al-Ṣifāṭiyya*, the theologians on the Attributes of God.⁷⁷³ The most recognized authority of al-Muḥāsibī, however, lies in his sufistic teachings.⁷⁷⁴

Al-Muḥāsibī's speculative thoughts and his use of dialectics in support of his views aroused criticism from his contemporaries. According to his biographers, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal was reported to have banished al-Muḥāsibī's writings and prohibited people to read them. It was reported that *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Sa'ad b. 'Amr al-Barza'ī saw Abū Zur'a asked Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal about al-Muḥāsibī and his works. Abu Zur'a was told to avoid al-Muḥāsibī's works because they were full of innovations.⁷⁷⁵

Although the blind reaction of the Sunnites against al-Muḥāsibī owes to their misunderstanding of his use of dialectical reasoning in opposing the Mu'tazila,⁷⁷⁶ the opposition of the Sunnites against al-Muḥāsibī and his eccentric thoughts, according to Arnaldez, however, seem to have been so ubiquitous that it forced him to live in exile in a small town far from Bagdad. That this opposition of his adversaries did not decrease was reflected in his burial ceremony. Most of his biographers reported that when he died in 243/857-8, only four persons attended his funeral.

⁷⁶⁷Ibn Ḥallikan, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

⁷⁶⁸Al-Subkī, TSK, II, 38.

⁷⁶⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

⁷⁷⁰Al-Subkī, TSK, II, 37.

⁷⁷¹Ibn Ḥallikān, *op. cit.* p. 365.

⁷⁷²Smith, *op. cit.*, p. xvi.

⁷⁷³Al-Subkī, TSK, II, 38.

⁷⁷⁴Smith, *ibidem*.

⁷⁷⁵Al-Dhahabī, *Mizān*, *op. cit.*, I, 174.

⁷⁷⁶Arnaldez, *op. cit.* p. 467.

Al-Muḥāsibī's masterpiece, *al-Ri'āya*

Al-Ri'āya has been edited several times, first of which by Margareth Smith (London: 1941) and then by 'Abd al-Qādir Aḥmad 'Aṭā (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 4th ed). According to Smith, al-Muḥāsibī has written twenty-one works representing his authoritative work in Juriprudence, Tradition, *taṣawwuf* and *Kalām*. Of these only seventeen were known to be extant. Considered as al-Muḥāsibī's masterpiece, *al-Ri'āya*, however, was his most authoritative work on Mysticism. Written in the form of counsels, given to a disciple in reply to his questions, *al-Ri'āya* represented its author as willing to help the believers to find the way of life in which they could render to God the service which He is due.⁷⁷⁷

Al-Muḥāsibī's hostile attitude towards debate and argumentation is reflected in his discussion found on several pages in chapter LIX, which deals with self-delusion in relation to God.⁷⁷⁸ In this chapter, al-Muḥāsibī discusses the self-delusion of the people by debate and argumentation as well as by the refutation of the adherents of different religions. Then he classifies people deluded by debate and disputation into two main groups: *First*, those who are led astray and lead others astray. *Secondly*, those who save themselves by following the guidance and the sunna of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace. In concluding his discussion, al-Muḥāsibī addresses his own attitude. He tells us how he prefers to follow guidance rather than being occupied with debate and argumentation. His after-life concerned him so much that he never allowed himself to be occupied with debate and disputation.

According to al-Muḥāsibī, the people who have been deluded by debate and disputation propose different ideas reflecting their course of life. The first category of people maintain that one will not act soundly until one has a sound belief. They also state that no one knows God better than they do. These people can be divided into two groups.

The first group are the ones who have been led astray and have led others astray. Al-Muḥāsibī identifies this group with a number of characteristics: (1) They are not aware of their being led astray due to their sophisticated expertise in argumentation and to their knowledge of complicated theological concepts as well as their apt arguments against their adversaries. (2) They refer to themselves as the ones who uphold the truth revealed by God, and as the ones who oppose all error (*ḍalāla*).⁷⁷⁹

Furthermore, al-Muḥāsibī identifies the second group with the following characteristics: (1) They are deluded by debate and skilful in argumentation. (2) They claim that they uphold the truth and do not follow anything else than it. (3) They are of the opinion that an idea can be regarded sound only if it is formulated through examination and reasoning. They spent their time being occupied with debate, far away from God's guidance, by which they become blind to their sins and mistakes.⁷⁸⁰

According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Muḥāsibī suggests that this group of people are not free from making mistakes in their interpretation and conception. However,

⁷⁷⁷Smith, *op. cit.*, p. xvii.

⁷⁷⁸Al-Muḥāsibī, *al-Ri'āya*, *op. cit.*, p. 458-461; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126-130.

⁷⁷⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126-7.

⁷⁸⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

they deny being deluded by debate and argumentations, claiming that they are knowledgeable of the fact that the Koran has both clear and ambiguous verses. Al-Muḥāsibī then emphasizes their uncountable mistakes in interpretation (*ta'wīl*).⁷⁸¹

The second group of people who uphold the truth and who are deluded by debate and disputation, being far removed from God and from what is worthier, al-Muḥāsibī argues, negate their being deluded by argumentation. Although most of them are well-acquainted with heretics and the innovators, they do not spend their lives in dispute and do not make religion the subject of their disputation. They attempt to exercise self-reflection and prepare for the life in the Hereafter. They speak the truth and avoid committing mistakes against God. Therefore they refute one falsity with another one. They keep doing that.⁷⁸²

Demonstrating his real attitude against debate and argumentation, al-Muḥāsibī states that he does not feel secure to argue through allegorical interpretation (*ta'wīl*) and analogy. One may think that one's arguing is a guidance (right way), whereas it is actually a falsehood and deviation. In another passage, al-Muḥāsibī explains that he used to argue, but since he came to know its danger, he gave up argumentation.⁷⁸³

Concluding his discussion against debate and argumentation, al-Muḥāsibī exhorts people not to be occupied with these things. Debating and arguing, al-Muḥāsibī suggests, make people forget about their life in the Hereafter. Once one is occupied with debate and argumentation, al-Muḥāsibī goes on arguing, one returns to God without having repented.⁷⁸⁴

Al-Muḥāsibī has devoted only one out of sixty-two chapters to his discussion on being deluded by debate and argumentation. A question to be raised here is why did al-Suyūṭī include al-Muḥāsibī in his list of the opponents of *kalām*? An answer that can be proposed immediately is that al-Suyūṭī regards al-Muḥāsibī as belonging to the first generation of followers of al-Shāfi'ī and as a savant in several Islamic knowledges: “*wa 'l-ḥārith hādha qad 'addahu 'l-ustādh abū maṣṣūr al-tamīmī fī 'l-ṭabaqa al-ūlā min aṣṣḥāb al-shāfi'ī...imām al-muslimīn fī 'l-fiqh wa 'l-ṭaṣawwuf wa 'l-ḥadīth wa 'l-kalām wa 'l-zuhd wa 'l-wara' wa 'l-ma'rifa.*”⁷⁸⁵ By incorporating al-Muḥāsibī on his lists against *kalām*, his adversaries may have been led to the impression that *kalām* had been opposed by many Shāfi'ite savants, some of whom had even been occupied with *kalām* before and then repented, like al-Muḥāsibī.

Having compared *al-Ri'āya* with the edition by 'Abd al-Qādir Aḥmad 'Aṭā,⁷⁸⁶ it can be concluded that al-Suyūṭī did not abridge or paraphrase it. He rather incorporated it fully into his SM, presumably because of the fact that all the arguments of al-Muḥāsibī dealing with the censure of debate and contention are penetrating arguments without any digression whatsoever.

[c.] *Kitāb Ḥalq Af'āl al-'Ibād* (forthwith called: KH) of al-Buḥārī, the Author of *al-Ṣaḥīḥ* (d. 256/870)

⁷⁸¹Ibidem.

⁷⁸²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

⁷⁸³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

⁷⁸⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

⁷⁸⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

⁷⁸⁶Al-Ri'āya, *op. cit.*, p. 458-461.

There could have been three reasons why al-Suyūṭī incorporated KḤ into SM: the first two are obvious, and the third is an assumption. *First*, the contents of al-Buḥārī's KḤ explicitly condemns *kalām*. *Secondly*, there is the all-important fact that al-Buḥārī was referred to by al-Suyūṭī as one of those who entitled to undertake *ijtihād*.⁷⁸⁷ *Thirdly*, the fact that al-Subkī has included al-Buḥārī among the Shāfi'ite *faqīhs*, in spite of the refutation of the affiliation of al-Buḥārī to the Shāfi'ite law school by some modern scholars.⁷⁸⁸

This work was published for the first time in India in 1306/1889⁷⁸⁹ and was re-published in Cairo in 1988 in an edition of Abū Muḥammad Sālim b. 'Abd al-Hādī al-Salafī *et al.*⁷⁹⁰

In his KḤ, al-Buḥārī as a traditionist, provides a number of narrations censuring debate, argumentation and *kalām*: "He said in his work [KḤ]: What is known on the authority of Aḥmad [b. Ḥanbal]⁷⁹¹ and the scholars is that they hate discussion and examination of obscure things. They also avoid the *Mutakallimūn*. They only discourse and dispute on a matter concerning which there is [traditionally established] knowledge [available], and which the Messenger - may God bless him and grant him peace - has explained. God the Almighty said: 'And if ye quarrel about anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger...'⁷⁹²

Then he adduced the *ḥadīth*: "The Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - heard some people quarrelling. He said: 'Those who were before you perished only because of this. They contrast certain verses of the Book of God with other ones. The Book of God was revealed only in order that certain verses of it justify other ones. Do not contrast certain verses with other ones. Whatever you know, say [it]; and what is difficult for you [to know], ask it from one who knows it.'"

He also adduced the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace: "Whatever you disagree on, refer it to God and to Muḥammad - may God bless him and grant him peace."

He also adduced the tradition of 'Ā'isha: "He who performs [a religious] practice to which our command does not point, [his reward] is denied."

He [al-Buḥārī] said: "Umar ordered that the ignorant should refer to the Book and the Tradition." Likewise, al-Buḥārī said: "He who does not know that God's *Kalām* is not created, he [should] know and avoid his ignorance by referring to the Book and the Tradition. He who rejects it [i.e. the uncreatedness of the Koran] after having known of it, is a transgressor." God the Almighty said: "Allah is not one to lead a people astray after He has guided them until He makes clear to them what they should guard against..."⁷⁹³ He then said: "But he who

⁷⁸⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

⁷⁸⁸Robson, for instance, rejects the idea of al-Buḥārī being affiliated to the Shāfi'ite law school, since the latter did not consistently subscribe to the doctrine of any particular school. See Robson, J., "al-Bukhārī," in EI², I, 1296-7.

⁷⁸⁹Ed. by Shams al-Ḥaqq 'Azīmābādī in Delhi. GAS, I, 133-4; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 131, no. 1(N).

⁷⁹⁰Published by Maktaba al-Turāth al-Islāmī.

⁷⁹¹This name "Aḥmad" appears repeatedly in KḤ. This probably refers to Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, who vehemently refuted the createdness of the Koran, the discussion of which occupies several pages of KḤ.

⁷⁹²*Al-Nisā'a* (IV): 62. Bell, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 75.

⁷⁹³*Al-Tawba* (IX): 116. Bell., *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 188.

splits off from the Messenger after the Guidance has become clear to him, and follows any other way than that of the believers, We shall consign him to what he has turned to, and roast him in Gehenna- a bad place to go to!”⁷⁹⁴

Furthermore, al-Buḥārī remarked: “whenever one is encountered with something ambiguous, he/she is to infer about [that matter] with one who knows it [well].” The tradition of Ibn ‘Amr says: “One is not to enter into discussion of the ambiguities, except of what is clear to him.” Finally, al-Buḥārī then adduced the tradition of ‘Ā’isha concerning [the Prophet’s] saying: “If you see those who follow what is ambiguous, [you must know that] they are the ones who preoccupy God. So, beware of them!”⁷⁹⁵

Concerning the way al-Suyūṭī deals with KḤ for his discussion against *kalām*, it can be said that he selected only some of the relevant discussions (viz. one and a half pages out of 180 printed pages).⁷⁹⁶

[d.] *Ṣarīḥ al-Sunna* (forthwith called: SS) of Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī

Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī was born in Amul, the capital city of Ṭabaristān at the end of 224 or the beginning of 225/841. Like other scholars of the time, he specialized in three fields: history, legal theory and Qur’anic science. Besides, al-Ṭabarī was credited with exceptional learning in a variety of disciplines. He was well-versed in grammar, lexicography and philosophy. He was also well-acquainted with exact sciences and his great interest was medicine.⁷⁹⁷ According to Bosworth, he was mostly famous as “the supreme universal historian and the Qur’ān commentator of the first three or four centuries of Islam.”⁷⁹⁸ He died in 310/923.⁷⁹⁹

In spite of its shortness, al-Ṭabarī’s biographical information provided by al-Suyūṭī in SM reveals the reason why al-Suyūṭī incorporated data from SS: al-Ṭabarī was a *mujaddid* of the third Islamic century, whose biography was cited extensively in *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn*. Referring to al-Subkī in *al-Ṭabaqāt*, al-Suyūṭī says that al-Ṭabarī was an independent *mujtahid*, who studied jurisprudence under the guidance of al-Shāfi‘ī and then under that of al-Ja‘farānī and al-Rabī‘ al-Murādī.⁸⁰⁰ Another relevant fact was of course that al-Ṭabarī was a fervent critic of the *Mutakallimūn*. This is confirmed by Gilliot, for instance, whose study of the influence of theological views on al-Ṭabarī’s linguistic approach in his exegesis, lead him to suggest that although al-Ṭabarī has made use of certain arguments and methods of *kalām* in his exegesis,⁸⁰¹ he, as reflected in his works, shares the ideas upheld by other traditionalists, such as Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, al-

⁷⁹⁴ *Al-Nisā’a* (IV): 115. Bell, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 84.

⁷⁹⁵ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 131-2.

⁷⁹⁶ KḤ, *op. cit.*, p. 61, 63.

⁷⁹⁷ GAL, I, 142, 184, S.I, 217; cf. Franz Rosenthal, *The History of al-Ṭabarī, General Introduction and from the Creation to the Flood*, translation and annotated by Franz Rosenthal, (New York: State University Press, 1989), vol. I, p. 5-126.

⁷⁹⁸ See Bosworth, C.E., “al-Ṭabarī,” in EI², X, p. 11-15.

⁷⁹⁹ Al-Suyūṭī provides some biographical information about al-Ṭabarī in his introductory remark on *Kitāb Ṣarīḥ al-Sunna*, SM, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

⁸⁰⁰ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

⁸⁰¹ Claude Gilliot, *Exégèse, Langue et Théologie en Islam : l’Exégèse Coranique de Tabari* (Paris : Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1990), p. 9, 14.

Buḥārī, al-Dārimī, etc.⁸⁰² Setting the position held by al-Ṭabarī in his exegesis, Gilliot further argues that the group which al-Ṭabarī attempted to attack was the one which strictly upheld qadarite theological views as well as the Jahmites.⁸⁰³

According to Rosenthal, SS was known as al-Ṭabarī's creed, in which he explains his theological views as well as religious theory and practice in the service of God.⁸⁰⁴ This work has been edited on the basis of the Istanbul manuscript and translated by D. Sourdél, "Une profession de Foi de l'Historien al-Tabarī" in *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* XXXVI Fas. 2, 1968 in 7 printed pages.

In the work under discussion Al-Ṭabarī narrates some events that occurred after the death of the Prophet, such as the dispute among the *umma* about who was most entitled to the leadership and the caliphate among them, the dispute on "the deeds of the worshippers, both their obedience and their violations; whether [the deeds of the worshippers] are determined by the *qaḍā'* of God and His *qadar* or the affair respecting this question is given to the people;" then follows the dispute on the Koran, viz. whether it was created or not, and on the Divine vision of the believers in the Day of Resurrection. Al-Ṭabarī considered all these disputes as stupidities which only occupied people of stupidity and enmity. Furthermore, he quotes Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal as having said: "He who says that my pronounciation of the Koran is created, is a Jahmite; and he who says that the Koran is not created, is an innovator."

Concluding his discussion, he states: "Not a single saying in that respect is allowed to us to express except his saying: If we do not have a leader in [the discussion on the createdness of the Koran], we look for another person with whom [we are] pleased and satisfied. He is the leader to whom one adheres (*al-imām al-muttaba* ʾ). The discussion on the name: whether it stands for a thing or for nothing is one of the recent stupidities about which not a single tradition to be followed was transmitted. Neither has an opinion from an *imām* been transmitted. Thus, being occupied with [such a discussion] is a disgrace, whereas, being silent of it is a grace."⁸⁰⁵

Based on the comparison of Sourdél's edition of SS, which comprises 7 printed pages, and the SS incorporated into SM which consists of three and a half printed pages, two things are worthy of noting: *First*, it is obvious that Sourdél does not refer to SM when editing SS (in 1968), in spite of the fact that SM was edited much earlier (in 1947). However, a lacuna in Sourdél's edition of SS could have been filled in on the basis of SM.⁸⁰⁶ Likewise, some words in the text of SS in Sourdél's edition could have been corrected and rendered more comprehensible.⁸⁰⁷ *Secondly*, al-Suyūṭī left some pages unabridged due to their

⁸⁰²"Nous avons déjà vu que Tabari avait eu maille à partir avec des ḥanbalites qui l'accusaient d'hérésie..." Gilliot, *op. cit.*, p. 208-210.

⁸⁰³"Tabari s'en prend surtout aux groupes d'obédience qadarite." Gilliot, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

⁸⁰⁴Rosenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 125-6.

⁸⁰⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 136-7.

⁸⁰⁶A lacuna on p. 193, l. 6 of Sourdél's edition, where al-Ṭabarī says: "*al-ḥamdulillah muflīḥ al-ḥaqq wa nāṣiruh...*," can be filled in with more than two pages of SS recorded in SM (p. 134-5). See Sourdél, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁸⁰⁷Just to give a brief example, in Sourdél's edition (p. 194 and 198), *ḥamaqāt* (stupidities) was rather copied as *jama'āt*. This can be clearly read, for instance in a phrase which reads: "*wa amma 'l-qawl fi 'l-ism ahuwa al-musammā am huwa gayr al-musammā fa-innahū mina*

being merely further explanations of major theological issues revolving around (1) the *imāma*, (2) the action of man in relation to God's ordinance, (3) the status of belief (*īmān*) whether it is determined by words (*qawl*) or action or by both of them, (4) the vision of God, (5) the createdness of the Koran and (6) the words of the Koran (*alfāz al-qur'ān*).

[e.] *Al-Gunya 'an al-Kalām of Abū Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaṭṭābī*

At the end of the summary of *al-Gunya*, al-Suyūṭī provides some biographical information about al-Ḥaṭṭābī. He was a leading scholar in the field of jurisprudence, language, etc. and died in 388/988.⁸⁰⁸ According to Günther, al-Ḥaṭṭābī was a Shāfi'ite traditionalist who was born in 319/931 in Bust (now Lashkargāh), a city in Southern Afghanistan. Among his important teachers were Abū Sa'īd b. al-'Arabī (d. 341/952) and Ibn al-Najjād (d. 348/959) and one of his prominent disciples was the Shāfi'ite Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarā'inī (d. 406/1015-6) who was the teacher of al-Gazālī. Al-Ḥaṭṭābī was the author of nine works, six of which have been edited.⁸⁰⁹ According to Brockelmann, the way in which al-Ḥaṭṭābī used to discuss was very critical and argumentative.⁸¹⁰

Apart from the fact that it was quoted by Ibn Taymiyya in *Majmū'at al-Rasā'il al-Kubrā*,⁸¹¹ almost no information can be found about *al-Gunya*. When discussing al-Ḥaṭṭābī's opposition to the Ash'arite *kalām*, Günther, for instance, mentions only that it was written to anathemize *kalām*, without dealing with its content in spite of the fact that this work was incorporated into SM.⁸¹² Likewise, Makdisi suggests that "this work is not extant."⁸¹³

Al-Ḥaṭṭābī's censure of *kalām* is clearly stated in his remarks: "You have established your own opinion, my brother,⁸¹⁴ may God protect you in a fair manner. You have [also] portrayed your attitude to us with respect to the heretical views of the *Mutakallimūn*, to the occupation of those who are involved in vain discourse with [those heretical views], to the tendency of some followers of the *Sunna* towards them and their being deceived by them. [You are also well-informed of] their pretension that *kalām* is a protection for tradition..."⁸¹⁵

Al-Ḥaṭṭābī then remarks: "You asked me to help you with knowledge and evidence which could support us in establishing the truth and refuting the

'l-jama'at al-ḥāditha..." In SM, *op. cit.*, p.137, the phrase reads: "'wa amma 'l-qawl fi 'l-ism ahuwa al-musammā am huwa gayr al-musammā fa-innahū mina 'l-ḥamaqāt al-ḥāditha..."

This also occurs on p. 194

⁸⁰⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

⁸⁰⁹Günther, von Sebastian, 'Der šāfi'itische Traditionalist Abū Sulaimān al-Ḥaṭṭābī und die Situation der religiösen Wissenschaften im 10. Jahrhundert,' in ZDMG, vol. 146, no. I (1996), p. 61-91; Referring to Brockelmann's GAL, Van Donzel however mentions twelve works by al-Ḥaṭṭābī, one of which was published, i.e. *Bayān I'jāz al-Qur'ān* (Aligarh: 1953), ed. 'Abd al-'Alim. See Van Donzel, et al, "al-Khaṭṭābī," in EI², IV, p. 1131-2.

⁸¹⁰GAL, I, 161, 165, S. I, 261, 275.

⁸¹¹Ibn Taymiyya, *Majmū'at al-Rasā'il al-Kubrā* (Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Āmira al-Sharafiyya, 1323/1906), vol. I, p. 439-440.

⁸¹²Günther, *op. cit.*, p. 74-80.

⁸¹³Makdisi, "the Non-Ash'arite," *op. cit.*, p. 255.

⁸¹⁴No information could be found explaining, to whom this word "brother" refers.

⁸¹⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

concept of those people [viz. the *Mutakallimūn*] with the use of argument and demonstration.”⁸¹⁶

Furthermore, he expresses his concern saying: “Then I thought of this affair. In it, I found the greatest reason that the Satan, today, started, with the help of his subtle deceit, to seduce every one who claims to possess a broad knowledge, excellent intelligence and sagacity. The Satan makes him dubious [with the following dilemma:] If for his religious practice and his school, he is only pleased to adopt the literal meaning of the tradition (*al-sunna*) and will be satisfied with taking clear evidence out of it, he becomes an example for the laymen and will be considered one from the mass of the people (*al-jumhūr*) and one among many only!”⁸¹⁷

In another passages, he criticized the *Mutakallimūn* saying: “When they [viz. the *Mutakallimūn*] saw the Book of God the Almighty speaking against what they argue and testifying against the falsity of what they believe, they contrasted some of its verses with other ones and interpreted them according to what exists in their minds. However, [the Book] stands directly against the principles which they established. They then oppose the traditions (*aḥbār*) of the Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace - and his *Sunna* which is adduced from him. They left them [viz. *aḥbār*] out. But they transmitted the speech in an evil manner. [Therefore, the Pious Ancestors] were prejudiced against them and accused them of having committed heresy.”⁸¹⁸

Condemning the *Mutakallimūn*, al-Ḥaṭṭābī reveals the proper attitude of the Pious Ancestors with respect to *kalām*. According to al-Ḥaṭṭābī, the Pious Ancestors “understood well that they had [good] knowledge of the Book and its wisdom and of the apprehension of the Sunna and the evidence deduced therefrom, being in no need of anything else than both of these.”⁸¹⁹

Responding to the accusation of the *Mutakallimūn* that al-Ḥaṭṭābī rejected the use of rational evidences on which the soundness of principles of religion is founded, he remarks: “We neither refute the rational evidences nor their competence to lead us to the knowledge. But when using them, we do not follow the method which you applied during the establishment of the argument with the help of the accidents and by referring these accidents to the essences as well as the transformation of these accidents into the essences for [understanding] the creation of the Universe and the existence of the Creator. We dislike the use of such a method [by turning to] something which has the clearest evidence and soundest demonstration. Because that is a matter which you take from the philosophers and due to which you followed them. The philosophers apply this method, only because they neither affirm the prophethood nor believe that the truth has been already born in [their prophethood]. The strongest thing in the argumentation affirming these affairs, in their opinion, is what they deduced from these things.”⁸²⁰

Asserting that *kalām* is an innovation, al-Ḥaṭṭābī argues: “If some people from among the Companions adhere to the opinion of those [who are occupied

⁸¹⁶Ibidem.

⁸¹⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 138-9.

⁸¹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

⁸¹⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁸²⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 140-1.

with] *kalām* and debate, they would have been regarded as belonging to the group of the *Mutakallimūn*. The names of the *Mutakallimūn* among them would have been known to us as also the names of the jurists, the reciters and the sufists among them. If not, that means that they were not involved in *kalām*.⁸²¹

Concluding his discussion, al-Ḥaṭṭābī says: “If someone says: ‘Thus, it is necessary to respond to this [kind of] proposition that you put forward, [by stating that] the belief in God and the knowledge of His oneness were obligatory for one who possesses the intelligence only after the Messenger has been sent to him. If [the Messenger was not sent to him], avoiding to [believe in God] does not bring down any punishment and chastisement on him,’ the following words should be said [to him]: ‘We are also of the opinion that this is in line with what God - the Majesty – has said: ... We have not been accustomed to punish until We have sent a messenger.’”⁸²²

[f.] *Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa ’l-Jamā’a* (forthwith called: SU) by *al-Shayḥ al-Imām al-Ālim al-Ḥāfiẓ* Abu ’l-Qāsim Hibat Allāh b. al-Ḥasan b. Maṣṣūr al-Ṭabarī al-Lālakā’ī

Al-Lālakā’ī was born in Ṭabaristān and died in Bagdad in *Ramaḍān* 418/1028. He was an expert in tradition, and thus known as *al-ḥāfiẓ*. He studied jurisprudence under the guidance of Abū Ḥāmid⁸²³ and wrote several books. The work to be discussed has been edited by Aḥmad Sa’d Ḥamdān (Riyāḍ: 1985).⁸²⁴

Like other scholars of tradition, al-Lālakā’ī condemns innovation, heresy, and argument. His *Sharḥ* is replete with censures against dispute and *kalām*. In one passage, al-Lālakā’ī states that it is obligatory to refrain from innovations and from listening to what is innovated by those who lead people astray.⁸²⁵ In another, he states that the first innovation to appear in Islam was the dispute on *al-qadar*, concerning which ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar was asked. He then produces the narration on the authority of the Prophet who commanded people to confirm the *qadar*, to believe in it and to refrain from disputing about it. The same question, according to al-Lālakā’ī was also posed to Ibn ‘Abbās, Abū Sa’id al-Ḥudrī and many other scholars.⁸²⁶

Al-Lālakā’ī’s harsh criticism of those who befriend and discuss with a heretic and an innovator is clearly indicated by his remark: “No crime perpetrated by Muslims is bigger than having a discussion with an innovator. No abasement and

⁸²¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

⁸²²Al-Isrā’ (XVII): 16. Bell, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 264; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 147..

⁸²³According to Makdisi, Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarā’īnī was a Shāfi’ite professor who was severely critical of the Ash‘arites and took every opportunity to disassociate himself from them. He was the author of a *Ta’līqā* on *uṣūl al-fiqh*, a commentary of Shāfi’ī’s *risāla*. In this work, Abū Ḥāmid put forth the doctrine of Shāfi’ī and the Shāfi’ites regarding the Koran as uncreated, and declared those who disagree (i.e. Ash‘arites among others) to be unbelievers. See his article “The Non-Ash‘arite Shāfi’ism of Ghazzali” in REI, (1986), p. 239-257.

⁸²⁴*Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa ’l-Jamā’a*, ed. Aḥmad Sa’d Ḥamdān (Riyāḍ: Dār al-Tayyib li Naṣḥ wa ’l-Tawzī’, 1985), vol. I, p. 9-49.

⁸²⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

⁸²⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

vileness can be worse than their negligence of the pious ancestors' method of dealing with heretics."⁸²⁷

Furthermore al-Lālakā'ī quotes 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib as having said: "There will be people who [are coming to] debate you. So, encounter them with the help of the traditions! The adherents of the traditions are more knowledgeable of the book of God." He also quotes the words of Ḥalīl b. Aḥmad⁸²⁸: "It happens very often that a debate is followed by another one which abolishes it." An interesting quotation dealing with the censure of *kalām* by al-Lālakā'ī can also be found in Ḥarim b. Ḥayyān's⁸²⁹ remark: "An author of *kalām* finds himself in one of two positions: When he is ignorant of it, he is defeated [by his opponent]; but when he is deeply rooted in it, he sins."⁸³⁰

Al-Suyūṭī's discussion of al-Lālakā'ī's unfavourable remark on *kalām* is concluded with the latter's reference to Sufyān b. 'Uyayna (d. 196/811)⁸³¹ who used to recite the lines of Ibn Shubruma (d. 144/761):⁸³²

"If you say: Make every effort in religious service and be patient # Persist [in doing it!] they then say: [no'],⁸³³ argumentation is more preferable

That is an opposition to the Companions of the Prophet and also an innovation # they are the blindest and the most ignorant in [observing] the course of truth"⁸³⁴

A great number of persons from the *Ahl al-Sunna* listed by al-Lālakā'ī in his SU are also incorporated by al-Suyūṭī in SM, apparently giving the impression that those individuals can be also regarded as opponents of *kalām*. These people are classified into (1) the first generation, the Companions of the Prophet, (2) the second generation, the Followers, (3) the third generation, the Followers of the Followers, and (4) people from among the residents of Mecca, Syria/Palestine (Shām), Mesopotamia, Egypt, Kūfa, Baṣra, Rayy, Mosul, Ḥurasān, Bagdad and Ṭabāristān.⁸³⁵

As far as the abridgement of SU by al-Suyūṭī in SM is concerned, it is instructive to note several points: *First*, al-Suyūṭī only chose a number of

⁸²⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

⁸²⁸Al-Ḥalīl b. Aḥmad al-Farāhidī was born approximately in the first century of Hijra. He was a teacher of Sībawayhi and the founder of prosody (*ilm al-'arūḍ*). He was the author of *Kitāb al-'Ayn* who died ca. 175/792. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 165, n. 1 (N).

⁸²⁹According to Caskel, Ḥarim b. Ḥayyān was "one of the earliest pietist of Islam and a forerunner of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. See Caskel, W., "Abd al-Ḳays," in EI², I, p. 72-4.

⁸³⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

⁸³¹According to Sectorsky, Sufyān b. 'Uyayna b. Maymūn al-Ḥilālī, born in Kūfa in 107/725 and died in Mecca in 196/811, was known as Qur'ān commentator (*mufasssīr*) and a jurist. His fame, however, rests mainly on his being *muḥaddith*. See Sectorsky, S.A., "Sufyān b. 'Uyayna," in EI², IX, p. 772.

⁸³²Ibn Shubruma, 'Abd Allāh b. Shubruma b. al-Ṭufayl al-Dabbī was referred to by his biographers as a traditionist, jurist and *qāḍī* of Kūfa. His grandfather, Shubruma was a Companion of the Prophet. According to Vadet, "the Ḥanbalis and the Medinens were more indulgent towards him than the ruling orthodox (e.g. 'Abd Allāh b. Mubārak, who taught from 141/758, especially Ibn Sa'd, who mocks Ibn Shubruma severely in the portrait he gives of him)". He died in 144/761. See Vadet, J.C., "Ibn Shubruma," in EI², III, p. 938.

⁸³³The word in the square bracket is taken from SU (p. 149).

⁸³⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 167-8..

⁸³⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 161-5.

arguments against *kalām* by al-Lālakā'ī, which are scattered over pages 9-49, 114, 129-130, 146, and 148-9 of the first volume of the Ḥamdān edition, which covers 369 pages (the 2nd volume comprises 305 pages) and summarized them on only 20 printed pages of SM (p. 148-168). *Secondly*, al-Suyūṭī notes at the end of his abridgement that al-Lālakā'ī was the Shafī'ite *ḥāfiẓ* and jurist who was given a certificate of jurisprudence by Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarā'inī, "a Shafī'ite professor who was severely critical of the Ash'arites and took every opportunity to disassociate himself from them."⁸³⁶

Although al-Suyūṭī does not explicitly mention a reason why he incorporated SU into his SM, it is to recall the suggestion of Ḥamdān that this work exercised very important influence on what he calls the 'Salafi school' (*al-madhhab al-salafī*). This work, he argues, constitutes a significant reference which sheds lights on the knowledge of the religious doctrines (*'aqā'id*) of the scholars among the Pious Ancestors.⁸³⁷

[g.] *Al-Sharī'a* by the *Imām* Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ājurri

Al-Ājurri was born in Ajur, a district in the west-side of Bagdad. He was a Shafī'ite judge and the author of many monographs on Tradition, such as *al-Arba'ūn al-Ājūriyya*, *al-Sharī'a fī 'l-Sunna*, *Aḥlāq al-'Ulamā'*, etc. In 330/942, he embarked on a pilgrimage to Mecca and stayed there until his death in 360/970.⁸³⁸ His *Sharī'a* has been edited by Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Faqī.⁸³⁹

The passages of his work abridged by al-Suyūṭī concern the censure of debate and argumentation in matters of religion by his predecessors. First of all, he quotes al-Ājurri as having adduced from Ma'an b. 'Isā⁸⁴⁰ the words: "A man suspected to be a Murji'ite came to Mālik b. Anas. So he said: 'O Abū 'Abd Allāh! Hear from me about a thing, about which I talk and dispute with you.' He replied: 'If you overcome me?' He said: '[If I overcome you,] you must follow me.' He asked: 'What if another man comes, and he talks with us and then defeats us?' He replied: 'We will follow him.' So, Mālik said: 'O 'Abd Allāh, God delegated Muḥammad - may God bless him and grant him peace - to propagate one religious mission. But I see you converting from one particular faith to another one.' Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz said: 'He who makes his religious tenet(s) the object of disputations, always changes [his faith].'⁸⁴¹

Furthermore al-Suyūṭī quotes another interesting remark of al-Ājurri on the heretics in the following words: "Anyone who upholds Tradition is admonished to abandon all the heretics including the Kharijites, Qadarites, Murji'ites, Jahmites, Mu'tazilites, Rafidites, Naṣībites⁸⁴² and anyone whom the leading scholars of the Muslims identify with an author of a misleading innovation. One is not admonished to talk to him, to greet him, to befriend him, to pray behind

⁸³⁶Makdisi, "the Non-Ash'arite Shafī'ism," *op. cit.*, p. 243.

⁸³⁷See the introduction of SU, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

⁸³⁸GAL, I, 164, S.I, 274.

⁸³⁹*Al-Sharī'a* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya, 1369/1950).

⁸⁴⁰Ma'an b. 'Isā b. Yaḥyā al-Ashja'ī Abū Yaḥyā al-Qazzāz al-Madanī was one of the leading scholars of tradition and died in 198/815. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 169, n. 1 (N).

⁸⁴¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

⁸⁴²Van Ess says that according to the Isma'ilite Abū Ḥātim al-Razī, the Naṣībites (*nawāṣīb*) is a nickname for the Murji'ites. Van Ess, TG, vol. IV, p. 685, n. 15.

him, to give [his daughter] to him in marriage, to get married to him, to accompany him, to deal with him, to argue with him and to debate with him. One is rather to humiliate him. If you meet him on the street, take another road if it is possible.”⁸⁴³

According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Ājurri also refers to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib as having vexed the heretics and said:

When I hear a saying that is reprehensible # I light my fire and I then call
[Qanbara]⁸⁴⁴

By including this poetry, al-Suyūṭī may have wanted to give the impression that when ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib was encountered with a question of *kalām*, he prepared himself for a fight, for the purpose of which he called his *mawla*, i.e. Qanbara to bring to his master all the fighting equipment, such as armor, sword, etc.

In his concluding passages, al-Ājurri reports that ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz sent a letter to ‘Adī b. Arṭāt (d. 102/820-1)⁸⁴⁵ about the Qadarites: “I request them to repent. Unless they repent, you must hit their necks.” Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik is also referred to by al-Ājurri as having hit Gaylān⁸⁴⁶ on his neck and crucified him. The emirs after them used to afflict punishment to the heretics depending on the [evil] viewpoint(s) that they [viz. the heretics] expressed. The learned men do not refuse [this fact]. Then he adduced from Mu‘ādh b. Jabal the words: “The Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace - said: ‘If innovations occur among my *umma*, the learned is told to proclaim his knowledge. He, among them, who does not do so, upon him is God’s curse, the angels’ and all of the people’s curse.’”⁸⁴⁷

No other explicit reason can be found in SM to explain why al-Suyūṭī incorporated *al-Sharī‘a* into his SM than the fact that several pages of the work explicitly deal with the condemnation of *kalām*. However, Brockelmann’s reference to al-Ājurri as a prominent Shafi‘ite jurist who composed several important works⁸⁴⁸ and whose authority is, according to Ismā‘īl, extensively cited by more than fifteen biographers⁸⁴⁹ can be regarded as a major reason.

[h.] *Qūt al-Qulūb* of Abū Ṭālib Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Hārithī al-Makkī

Some biographical information on Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī is provided by al-Suyūṭī at the end of his summary. Referring to al-Dhahabī in *al-‘Ibar*, al-Suyūṭī narrates

⁸⁴³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

⁸⁴⁴ A copying error also occurs in this place. The correct word for *qanīr* is *qanbara* which points to a former slave of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. See *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāga* by Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā’i ‘l-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, 1959), vol. II, p. 70.

⁸⁴⁵ ‘Adī b. Arṭāt al-Fazarī, Abū Wāthla, according to Bearman, was a governor who was appointed by ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz in place of Yazīd b. al-Muḥallab. He received the order from ‘Umar to arrest the sons of al-Muḥallab. He was killed by Mu‘āwiya b. Yazīd in 102/820-1. See Bearman, P.J., “‘Adī b. Arṭāt,” in EI², XII, p. 41.

⁸⁴⁶ Gaylān b. Muslim al-Dimashqī al-Qibtī (probably al-Nabazī) was killed in the era of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik, who reigned from 105 to 125/724-743. See “Hishām,” in EI², III, 493-5.

⁸⁴⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

⁸⁴⁸GAL, I, 164, S.I, 274.

⁸⁴⁹This is mentioned by the editor of al-Faqī, the editor of *al-Sharī‘a*. See the introduction of *al-Sharī‘a*, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

that one of the leading Malikite scholars, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. ‘Aṭīyya al-Ḥārithī al-‘Ajāmī, was resident of a mountainous area in the surroundings of Mecca. He studied *taṣawwuf* and wrote a Sufi book.⁸⁵⁰ Massignon provides additional biographical information about al-Makkī. According to him, al-Makkī was a traditionist and mystic, well-known as the head of the dogmatic school of the Sālimiyya. *Qūt al-Qulūb* is his chief work, whole pages of which were copied by al-Gazālī (d. 505/1111) in his *Iḥyā’*. He died in Bagdad in 386/998.⁸⁵¹

In his discussion of *kalām*, in his *Qūt al-Qulūb*, al-Makkī starts with the history of the composition of books and other collected materials. In his opinion, the first and second generation did not compose any books. The composition occurred only after 120/739, after the death of all the Companions and the Old followers. Furthermore he remarks: “the first books composed in Islam were: *Kitāb ibn Jurayj* on *āthār* and various works on *tafsīr* by ‘Aṭā’, Mujāhid and the companions of Ibn ‘Abbās in Mecca. Then followed a work by Mu‘ammar b. Rāshid al-Ṣan‘ānī, in which he collected scattered traditions and classified them into [several] chapters. Then followed *Kitāb al-Muwatta* on jurisprudence by Mālik b. Anas, in Madina. Likewise, Ibn ‘Uyayna composed *Kitāb al-Jāmi’ wa’l-Tafsīr* dealing with the variant readings in the science of the Koran, and with the variations of traditions (*al-aḥādith al-mutafarriqa*). In the meantime, Sufyān al-Thawrī also composed his works. So, these five books are the first ones which were composed after the death of al-Ḥasan, Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab and the chosen Followers as well as after 120 or 130 H.”⁸⁵²

“After 200 years and after the passage of three centuries, i.e., in the following fourth century,” the composition of books on *kalām* was started by the *Mutakallimūn*, who based their arguments on reason, heresy and analogy. Due to this composition, al-Makkī goes on, some grave conditions came into being. He reports, for instance, that “(then after that the period mentioned above had passed by) the affair became confused at this moment. In time, the *Mutakallimūn* were called learned men. Story-tellers were named knowledgeable men. Likewise, transmitters and narrators were called learned men,⁸⁵³ despite the absence of an understanding of religious rules and of religious truth.”⁸⁵⁴ Therefore, “[people] chose rational [knowledge] and common sense in preference to the literal significances of the Koran and the *āthār*.”⁸⁵⁵

Furthermore, al-Makkī laments that “at the end of the world, there will be learned men to whom the door of religious practice is closed and to whom the door of debate is opened.” Like other scholars of tradition, al-Makkī, by referring to a number of leading scholars, such as Mālik b. Anas, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, etc, devotes a long passage to censure the scholars of debate, argumentation and

⁸⁵⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

⁸⁵¹Massignon, L., “Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī”, EI², I, 153; Brockelmann, G.I, 200, S.I, 359, 366.

⁸⁵²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 174-5.

⁸⁵³This is rendered from the phrase in QQ (p. 37), which reads “*wa ’l-ruwwā wa ’l-naqala yuqālu ’ulamā’...*” In SM, it reads “*wa ’l-ruwwāt al-naqala ’ulamā’ min gayri fiqhīn fī dīnin...*” See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

⁸⁵⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

⁸⁵⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

kalām. One of his censures, for instance, reads that scholars of *kalām* are atheists.⁸⁵⁶

Concluding his discussion of al-Makkī's condemnation of *kalām*, al-Suyūṭī quotes the former as having reported that "a companion of al-Shāfi'ī [d. 203/820] left Abū Thawr [d. 240/854], when he spoke in response to an innovator concerning the rejection of the attributes." Asserting his argument, al-Makkī quotes another example: "When asked about the tradition that God has created Adam in accordance with His image, Aḥmad [b. Abī Du'ād, d. 239/854]⁸⁵⁷ became angry. Hence, Abū Thawr shrank from [the debate] and apologized [for it]."⁸⁵⁸

Concluding his discussion, al-Makkī, according to al-Suyūṭī, remarked: "So, this was the course of life of the pious ancestors. They neither listen to an innovator nor argue against him with the help of debate and argumentation. Because that is an innovation. They rather advice them about the traditions. They [must] shrink [from debate], otherwise they [must] apologize for their innovation and abandon it because of God."⁸⁵⁹

QQ, which the present author consulted, consists of two volumes, each of which comprises two parts. Al-Suyūṭī may have wanted to incorporate QQ into his SM for two reasons: *First*, in order to use al-Makkī's critical remarks against *kalām* and the *Mutakallimūn* as quoted above; and *secondly*, because of al-Makkī's prominence. This is obviously indicated by al-Suyūṭī's reference to the former as one of the leading Malikiite scholars and as the author of many works, as can be read in al-Suyūṭī's concluding remarks in the last passage.⁸⁶⁰

As far as the abridgement of QQ by al-Suyūṭī into SM is concerned, al-Suyūṭī re-arranges al-Makkī's arguments in QQ. He quotes al-Makkī's discussion of the history of knowledge first, after which follows the latter's discussion of the censure of debating. In QQ, the order of the arguments is opposite. *Secondly*, al-Suyūṭī only chose a number of al-Makkī's arguments against *kalām*, which are scattered over pages 6-50 of the 2nd part of the first volume of his work, and summarized them in only 8 printed pages of SM. Al-Suyūṭī can be said to have succeeded in presenting al-Makkī's arguments against *kalām* in a more penetrating manner.

[i.] *Jāmi' Bayān al-'Ilm wa Faḍlih* (fothwith called: JB) of Abū 'Umar Yūsuf b. 'Abd al-Barr al-Nimarī

al-Nimarī was born in Cordoba on 24 Rabi II 368/30 November 978. He studied under the supervision of Abū 'Umar Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Mālik b. Hāshim in Cordoba and became the greatest traditionist in the Magrib. At the very

⁸⁵⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

⁸⁵⁷This probably points to Aḥmad b. Abī Du'ād al-Iyādī, Abū 'Abd Allāh, Mu'tazilite *Qādī*, who was born in Baṣra in ca. 160/776 and referred to by Zetterstéen as a fervent follower of the Mu'tazilite doctrine and as being appointed as Chief *Qādī* during the reign of al-Mu'taṣim. The notorious merit which is always ascribed to him by his biographers is that he played an important role in the examination of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal during the Inquisition. He died at the end of 239/May-June 854. See Zetterstéen, K.V., "Aḥmad b. Abī Du'ād," in EI², I, 271.

⁸⁵⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

⁸⁵⁹Ibidem.

⁸⁶⁰Ibidem.

beginning he was a Zahirite, then a Malikite, and at last he became a follower of the Shafi'ite school of law. He was appointed *Qāḍī* of Lisbon and Santarem during the reign of the Aḫṣid ruler, al-Muẓaffar. He died on 29 *Rabī'* II 463/3 February 1071.⁸⁶¹ His work has been edited by Aḫmad b. 'Umar al-Mahmasānī al-Bayrūtī al-Azhārī and published in Cairo, in 1902.⁸⁶²

In the work, as abridged by al-Suyūṭī, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr discusses two topics: The hatefulness of debate and argumentation;⁸⁶³ and the censuring of speculation on matters of belief in God based on personal opinion and analogy without referring to textual foundations.⁸⁶⁴ Ibn 'Abd al-Barr began his discussion by referring to the tradition of the Pious Ancestors. According to him, the Pious Ancestors prohibited dispute on the Nature of God and His Attributes. In contrast, they allowed dispute and argumentation in jurisprudence, because this is knowledge concerning the rules to be derived from principles.⁸⁶⁵

Like other traditionalists, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr discusses the censure of debate, argumentation and *kalām* by his predecessors which revolves around the following points: (a) That one who subjects his religion to altercation, is likely to move from one religion to another (which implies *ridḍa*). (b) That one has to avoid argumentation, because it foils religious practices; (c) *Kalām* on matters of religion is rejectable. (d) The scholars of tradition and jurisprudence reached a consensus that the scholars of *kalām* are innovators and cheaters.

Interestingly Ibn 'Abd al-Barr associates the debate on the attributes of God with the destruction of the world and that of the safety of the *umma*. This is clearly indicated by the words of Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, which al-Suyūṭī quoted: "The world comes to an end, not before they dispute on [the attributes of] their God." The same holds true for the words of Ibn 'Abbās: "The affair of this *umma* remains almost the same, until they speak about *al-wildān*⁸⁶⁶ and *qadar*."⁸⁶⁷

Furthermore, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr incorporated the famous poetry of Ishāq b. Abī Isrā'īl,⁸⁶⁸ who refused to be occupied with debate and argumentation:

"Do I need to lay in wait after my bones trembled # while death is closest of what is adjacent to me

To debate with any opponent # also rendering his religious belief a target of mine and abandoning what I have already known due to an opinion of one other than me # while personal views do not resemble absolute knowledge (*al-'ilm al-yaqīnī*)

⁸⁶¹GAL, I, 368, S. I, 628.

⁸⁶²The complete title is *Jāmi' Bayān al-'Ilm wa Fadliḥ wa mā Yanbagī fī Riwayatih wa Ḥamlīh*.

⁸⁶³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 182-188.

⁸⁶⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 189-191.

⁸⁶⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

⁸⁶⁶This points to the question on the fate of the children of the infidels, who die before reaching the adult age, whether they will be among the inhabitants of Paradise. Responding to this question, the scholars, according to Wensink, are divided into three groups: *First*, the majority of scholars maintain that the children, like their parents, will go to Hell; *the second group* hold off to give any opinion; *the last ones* are of the opinion that the children will go to Paradise. Wensink, A.J., *The Muslim Creed, Its Genesis and Historical Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), p. 43.

⁸⁶⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

⁸⁶⁸Ishāq b. Abī Isrā'īl b. Kāmiḥr al-Marwazī, whose *kunya* was Abū Ma'yūb, died in 246/861. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 166, n.4 (N).

In my opinion, dispute is nothing but an ambiguity # which moves freely from the left to the right

The upright traditions have been established for us # [the debater] rather errs in his argument in any direction

To the truth does not belong any secrecy # which deceives like the blaze of a clear star
For us, the method of Jahm cannot replace # the method of Son of Amīna the Trustworthy⁸⁶⁹

What I know suffices for me # and what I ignore, let it stay away from me!
I am not one who considers a person who prays an infidel # and I do not harm you if you consider me an infidel⁸⁷⁰

We were brothers, together we reproach # so let us reproach every suspicious skeptic
Thus, mannerism still exists. If it reproaches us # by one case, all cases can be split up
So, a pillar of a house is about to fall down # likewise, one relative is separated from the other.⁸⁷¹

Concluding this chapter, he then recites a poem which reads:

“[When] people get offended, they fabricate innovations # in religious tenets with the help of reason for the sake of which the Messengers were not dispatched
So, most of them value God’s religious teachings lightly # They are rather busy with a matter which drags them away from their religion.”

Then follows another topic in which Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr quotes ‘Awf b. Mālik al-Ashja‘ī as having said: “The Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace - said: ‘My *umma* will split into seventy one denominations, the greatest of which is a fascination. People judge religious [ordinance] with the help of their *ra’y*. They prohibit what God permitted. They also permit what God prohibited.’”⁸⁷² Then, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr quoted the words of ‘Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb: “You have to refrain from authors of personal opinions, because they are enemies of the *Sunan*”. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr also asserts that once expressing a personal opinion, one is led astray and leads others astray.⁸⁷³ The rest of the passages are replete with censures and condemnations of the use of personal opinion and analogy.

In discussing Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s arguments against *kalām*, al-Suyūṭī does not directly refer to JB. He rather relies on its abridgement by al-Qurtūbī, to whom al-Suyūṭī refers as the *Imām al-‘Allāma* Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr al-Ansarī al-Ḥazrajī, a popular author who died in Upper Egypt in 659/1262.⁸⁷⁴

To know in which ways al-Suyūṭī abridges JB and presents Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s arguments against *kalām* in SM, it is imperative to refer to JB, since the *Muḥtaṣar* by al-Qurtūbī is no longer extant. Al-Suyūṭī only took two chapters, covering 32 printed pages in JB, out of 74 chapters consisting of 492 printed pages. He

⁸⁶⁹This probably points to the Prophet Muḥammad, a son of Āmina b. Wahb b. ‘Abd Manāf.

⁸⁷⁰This is rendered from the phrase in SM, which reads “*wa lam uḥrimkum an takfurūnī.*” In JB (p. 365), it reads “*wa mā uḥarrimukum an takfurūnī.*” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

⁸⁷¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 184-5.

⁸⁷²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

⁸⁷³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 189-92.

⁸⁷⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 192; Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr al-Ansarī al-Ḥazrajī al-Andalusī, according to Arnaldez, was a Maliki scholar, an expert in *ḥadīth*, who was known for his commentary on the Koran. He was born in Spain and died in Upper Egypt in 671/1272. See Arnaldez, R., “Al-Ḥaṭṭābī,” in EI², V, 512-3.

abridged those two chapters in merely 10 printed pages of SM. This is obviously the result of the fact that al-Suyūṭī has cut the long chains of transmission of the prophetic narrations and/or arguments of leading scholars, which deal with the censure of *kalām*. on several occasions, al-Suyūṭī mentions only the transmitter closest to the sources themselves.

[j.] *Sharaf Ashāb al-Ḥadīth* (further called: SAH) by the *Ḥāfiẓ* Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ‘Alī b. Thābit b. Aḥmad b. Maḥdī al-Shāfi‘ī, well-known as al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī Al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī was born in Bagdad in 392/1002. He was one of the leading scholars in the field of Tradition, jurisprudence and *uṣūl al-fiqh*. Like his father, he was a Hanbalite at first, then converted to the Shafi‘ite *madhhab*. According to Sellheim, al-Ḥaṭīb’s fame was based on his biographical encyclopaedia of more than 7800 scholars and other personalities, among whom were included women, connected to the cultural and political life in Bagdad. He became an authority on *ḥadīth* because of his profound erudition in this field. His works on *ḥadīth*, Sellheim maintains, have made him the great critical systematiser of *ḥadīth* methodology.⁸⁷⁵

SAH was edited by M.S. Hatiboğlu and published in Ankara in 1971, based on five Mss which are respectively preserved in Istanbul (Mss ‘Āṭif Afandī), Cairo (Dār al-Kutub), Madīna (Maktaba ‘Ārif Ḥikmat), Tübingen, and Damascus (Dār al-Kutub al-Zāhiriyya).⁸⁷⁶ The edited work comprises only one volume which consists of 138 printed pages. From this work, al-Suyūṭī abridged the relevant arguments of al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī against *kalām*, which occupies only five and a half printed pages in SM.

As the title of his work suggests, in SAH al-Bagdādī interestingly identifies the partisans of Tradition with a number of virtues in relation to their attitudes toward debate, reason and argumentation which occupied the *Mutakallimūn*. Before doing so, he starts by identifying some characteristics of the authors of innovation and their personal opinions: (1) that they scorned the adherents of the *Sunan* and *Athār*, refused to study the laws contained in the Koran, discarded the arguments derived from clear verses of the Koran and neglected the *Sunna*; (2) that they legislated in matters of religion by making use of their personal opinions; (3) that the young among them are greedy of words of love,⁸⁷⁷ while the old are fascinated by *kalām* and debate;⁸⁷⁸ (4) they subjected their religion to disputations;⁸⁷⁹ (5) that they are the enemies of the Tradition;⁸⁸⁰ (6) that they seek [religious] truth with the help of *kalām*.⁸⁸¹

⁸⁷⁵GAL, I, 329, S.I, 564; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 197; R. Sellheim, “al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī,” in EI², IV, 1111-2.

⁸⁷⁶SAH, *op. cit.*, p. 2.; GAL, *ibidem*.

⁸⁷⁷This is rendered from the phrase in SA (p. 4) which reads “*fā ‘l-ḥadath minhum manhūm bi ‘l-gazal...*” In SM, it reads “*fā ‘l-ḥadath minhum mathūm bi ‘l-‘adl...*” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

⁸⁷⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

⁸⁷⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁸⁸⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

⁸⁸¹Abū Yūsuf is reported to have said these words. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

Al-Bagdādī also identifies them by quoting the poetry of Abū Muzāḥim al-Ḥāqānī (d. 325/938)⁸⁸² censuring the *Mutakallimūn*:

“The *Mutakallimūn* and the authors of opinion have been deprived of # the knowledge of Tradition with which one is safe

If they know the *āthār* they do not turn away # from them toward [a thing] other than them; nevertheless, they are ignorant”⁸⁸³

By referring to a number of authorities, al-Bagdādī furthermore identifies the traditionists with a number of characteristics which can be summed up as follows: (1) They reprove debate on religious ordinances.⁸⁸⁴ (2) They can understand religious tenets only with the help of the *āthār* and not with the help of *al-ra’y*.⁸⁸⁵ (3) They regard the Book as their outfit and Tradition as their argument, and the Prophet as their affiliation and reference.⁸⁸⁶ (4) They are trustworthy, just and the protectors of religion and its preservers as well as the bearers of knowledge and its custodians.⁸⁸⁷ (5) The truth is always ascribed to them.⁸⁸⁸ (6) “Manliness is in the traditionists, *kalām* is in the Mu‘tazilites and cheatfulness is in the Rafidites.”⁸⁸⁹

The arguments against *kalām* by al-Bagdādī which al-Suyūṭī incorporated in his SM are scattered over several pages of his work (3-9, 32-34, 78-79). When dealing with al-Bagdādī’s arguments against *kalām*, al-Suyūṭī cuts the long chains of transmission. He mentions only the authority closest to the source. On several occasions, he even only mentions the author of an opinion. Al-Suyūṭī only quotes the relevant narrations. Al-Bagdādī in his SAH, for instance, quotes Abū Yūsuf as having said: “Whoever seeks part of a [religious] truth with the help of *kalām*, commits heresy; and whoever seeks *garīb al-ḥadīth*, lies; whoever looks for wealth with the help of alchemy, loses his money (*aflasa*).”⁸⁹⁰ The last two sentences are not quoted by al-Suyūṭī in his SM.⁸⁹¹

The topics which are not abridged by al-Suyūṭī revolve around (1) the exhortation to convey a revealed message (*al-tablīg*), (2) the discussion of the usage of *isnād* for gaining knowledge, (3) general virtues of the partisans of Tradition and of befriending them as well as of the writing of Tradition, (4) the exhortation (for the young) to learn Tradition and to memorize as well as to spread it (5) the auspicious dream on the partisans of Tradition, etc.

[k.] *Al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Ḥadīth* (forthwith called: IAH) by Abū Sa‘d ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr Muḥammad b. Abī al-Muẓaffar al-Manṣūr al-Tamīmī al-Marwazī al-Shāfi‘ī, known as Ibn al-Sam‘ānī

⁸⁸² Abū Muzāḥim Mūsā b. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Yaḥyā b. Ḥāqān was considered by al-Dhahabī as *al-imām al-muqri’ al-muḥaddith*. His father and brother were ministers during the reigns of al-Mutawakkil and al-Mu‘tamid. He died in 325/938). Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XV, 94-5.

⁸⁸³ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

⁸⁸⁴ These words are adduced on the authority of Mālik b. Anas. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁸⁸⁵ Sufyān al-Thawrī is reported to have said these words. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 193-4.

⁸⁸⁶ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

⁸⁸⁷ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

⁸⁸⁸ These are al-Walīd al-Karābīsī’s last words to his son. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

⁸⁸⁹ Hārūn al-Rashīd is reported to have said these words. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

⁸⁹⁰ SAH, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁸⁹¹ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

Ibn al-Sam‘ānī was born in Marw on 21 Shaban 506/10 February 1113. His father was an authority in the field of Shāfi‘ī law. His great biographical works on the Traditionist are *Kitāb al-Ansāb* and *Kitāb al-Taḥbīr fī ‘l-Mu‘djam al-Kabīr*. His literary production centred on the prophetic traditions and their transmission. He died on the 1st of Rabī‘ I 562/26th of December 1166.⁸⁹² That he was affiliated to Shafi‘ite law school is clearly reflected by the fact that al-Subkī devoted 5 printed pages to deal with his biography.⁸⁹³

Hajji Ḥalīfa’s *Kashf al-Zunūn*, according to al-Nashshār, does not record any information about this work.⁸⁹⁴ Brockelmann’s GAL remains also silent about it. Likewise, Sellheim does not indicate the fact that Ibn al-Sam‘ānī has composed IAH.⁸⁹⁵ Hence, al-Suyūṭī’s abridgement of al-Sam‘ānī’s arguments against *kalām*, which occupies thirty-eight and a half printed pages out of 224 printed-pages in SM,⁸⁹⁶ is of special value to understand at least part of this work by Ibn al-Sam‘ānī.

Based on the edition of SM, the present author organizes al-Sam‘ānī’s discussion in IAH as follows:⁸⁹⁷ The numbers in the second column are the page numbers of SM, the 2nd edition.

Chapter (<i>bāb</i>) on the Exhortation to the <i>Sunna</i> and the <i>Jamā‘a</i> and the Observance and on the Abhorrence of Disunity and Innovation	199-204
Chapter (<i>faṣḥ</i>) on the Censure of Debate and Disputations in Religious matters Reported by them and their Abhorrence of these matters	204-209
A Question posed by the <i>Mutakallimūn</i>	209-212
Chapter (<i>faṣḥ</i>) on the Response to their Opinion maintaining that <i>Aḥbār al-āḥād</i> are not accepted as a way to acquire knowledge	212-223
The Root of Religion is Observance	223-231
Chapter (<i>faṣḥ</i>) The Significance of Reason and its Position in Religion according to the Partisans of the Sunna (<i>Ahl al-Sunna</i>)	231-236

In his introductory passages, al-Sam‘ānī explains that there are two groups who condemned the adherents of traditions: The people of *kalām* and people of personal opinions. These two groups used to associate the partisans of traditions with ignorance and a complete lack of knowledge. According to him, they, in fact, are themselves associated with these two qualities.⁸⁹⁸

⁸⁹²Sellheim, R., “al-Sam‘ānī,” in EI², VIII, p.1024-5.

⁸⁹³Al-Subkī, TS, IV, p. 21-26.

⁸⁹⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 198, n. 1 (N).

⁸⁹⁵Sellheim, *op. cit.*, p.1024-5.

⁸⁹⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 198-236.

⁸⁹⁷Al-Suyūṭī does not give any title for al-Sam‘ānī’s discussion in the first one and a half printed pages (SM, p. 198-9) preceding chapter (one). In this discussion, the present author refers to it as the introductory passages. The second editor of SM, Su‘āda, inserts a new sub-title, ‘The Statements of Leading Scholars Censuring *Kalām*,’ (SM, p. 200) presumably due to the fact that al-Sam‘ānī starts his discussion in this passage with “*wa nadhkuru ‘l-āna mā warada ‘ani ‘l-a‘imma fī dhamm al-kalām...*” The present author does not include this new title in the table above.

⁸⁹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

[1] Chapter (*bāb*) on the Exhortation to the *Sunna* and the *Jamā'a*, Towards Observance and on the Abhorrence of Disunity and Innovation

Referring to several Koranic verses,⁸⁹⁹ he exhorts the *Sunna* and the *Jamā'a* and stresses the need for observance (*al-ittibā'*) as well as his abhorrence of disunity and innovation. Relying on DhK by al-Harawī, he also asserts that a number of traditions and *aḥbār* of the Companions have been produced to command people to follow Tradition and to avoid innovation.⁹⁰⁰ Furthermore, he asserts the principle of the followers of the Sunna with respect to the usage of reason as follows: “the course of belief (*al-dīn*) is revelation (*al-sam'*) and tradition (*āthar*); the course of reason and referring to it as well as establishing the *sam'iyāt* on it is legally reprehended and prohibited. We are discussing the position of reason in the *Sharī'a* and the proportion of its usage, which was requested by the *Sharī'a*, as well as the prohibition of trespassing that [proportion].”⁹⁰¹

To strengthen his conviction that *kalām* was prohibited, Ibn al-Sam'ānī, as an apologetic, felt urged to refer to a good number of leading scholars among his predecessors who had argued against it. In so doing, he interestingly lists al-Shāfi'ī first.⁹⁰² He then also adduces the views of Sufyān al-Thawrī, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maḥdī, Sa'īd b. Ḥamīd,⁹⁰³ Abū Bakr b. Abī Dāwud al-Sijistānī, al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Ibrāhīm al-Nuḥa'ī, Ibn 'umar, and Iṣḥāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanzalī.

[2] Chapter (*faṣḥ*) on the Censure of Debate and Disputation in Religious matters Reported of them and their Abhorrence of these matters

Although al-Sam'ānī acknowledges that there are a number of (prophetic) traditions and narrations on this topic, which have been dealt with by al-Harawī

⁸⁹⁹“And seek defence in the bond of Allah as one body, and do not separate ...” (Āli 'Imrān (III): 98. Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 55, v. I), and “He hath made accessible to you in religion what He laid as a charge upon Noah. And that which We have suggested to thee, and what We laid as a charge upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus, (saying): “Establish the religion and do not divide into parties regarding it.” Al-Shu'arā' (XLII): 11a-c. Bell, II, p. 485.

⁹⁰⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

⁹⁰¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

⁹⁰²To him al-Sam'ānī ascribes the words: “Whoever is occupied with debate (*kalām*) on belief or on something pertaining to these heresies, for which is no precedent [at the time of] the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - and his companions, has introduced an innovation in Islām.” The Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - also said: “Whoever introduces an innovation or accepts a novelty in Islām, for him is the curse of God, of the angels and that of all the people. [Any innovation of his] - be it crooked or straight - will not be accepted.” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 200-1.

⁹⁰³To him the following verses are ascribed: “When you expelled me to a people # they are absent but formally exist// [You are] like one who does not use clean water # but satisfied with the *tayammum* with the use of the dust // The belief of the Prophet Muḥammad is *āthār* # the excellent garment for the youth is the *aḥbār*// Do not neglect the tradition and its adherents! # the opinion is night and the tradition is day// The youth sometimes make a mistake in following the courses of guidance # the sun rises and to it belong the lights// The *Mutakallimūn* and the partisans of the opinion have been ignorant about # the science of Tradition with which one is safe//If they knew the *āthārs*, they would have not turned away # from them to the other. But, they have been ignorant//The *Mutakallimūn* called us from your deviation # How many changes you aspire to the religion of God//The people do not produce any innovation # until you make to it approach and interpretation.” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

in his DhK, and also some that have not been dealt with in it, it is less significant, however, to deal with them here, since the arguments against *kalām* that al-Sam‘ānī proposes have also been dealt with in other works abridged by al-Suyūṭī in his SM. The following passages deal only with arguments by al-Sam‘ānī not to be traced in other sources.

To begin with, four chief heresies are identified by al-Sam‘ānī to have emerged at the end of the time of the companions: *al-qadar*, *al-irjā’* and the doctrine of the Harurites (*al-ḥarūriyya*)⁹⁰⁴ as well as that of the Rafidites. Then follows the debate on the belief and disputations in the period of the Followers and that of those who came after them. This happened, he argues, due to the fact that “lies came into view; false testimonies were widespread; ignorance became public; matters pertaining to Tradition became obliterated.”⁹⁰⁵ Al-Sam‘ānī presents a number of narrations dealing with the question on *qadar* posed to some prominent figures, such ‘Umar b. Abd al-‘Azīz, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, etc., and with their unfavourable answer to it.

[3] A Question posed by the *Mutakallimūn*

In this chapter, al-Sam‘ānī records the polemics between the opponents of *kalām* and its proponents. Al-Sam‘ānī makes use of the plural form *qālū*: the proponents of *kalām* who oppose the ideas of their adversaries with the introductory words *inna qawlakum*, referring to the opponents of *kalām*. Al-Sam‘ānī represents himself as an opponent of *kalām*, while explicitly referring to the theological views of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī⁹⁰⁶ as a proponent of *kalām*.

The polemic starts with the refutation of the partisans of *kalām* of the view of their adversaries that “the early generation of the Companions and the Followers did not occupy themselves with introducing rational evidence and with referring to reason for the knowledge of religious [doctrine]. However, they regarded this kind of *kalām* as an innovation, because, they [viz. the Companions and the Followers] were not occupied with it, nor by undertaking *ijtihād* on derivative cases (*al-furū’*) or seeking the legal status of novel cases (*al-ḥawādith*). None of the

⁹⁰⁴Referring to Dozy, McKane identifies the Harurites with the Ḥarijites. The Harurites, according to McKane, earned their appellation from *ḥarūrī*, which signifies strong and generous. See McKane’s translation of *al-Ghazālī’s Book of Fear and Hope* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962), p. 49, n. 1; Daftary, however, suggests that Harurites was the initial appellation for the Ḥarijites. This appellation was taken from the locality Ḥarūra, to which the first seceders (Ḥarijites) from ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib’s forces had retreated. Another appellation of the Ḥarijites, according to Daftary, was the *Shurāt* (the vendors), signifying those who sold their soul for the cause of God. See Daftary, Farhad, *The Ismā‘īlis: Their History and Doctrines* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

⁹⁰⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

⁹⁰⁶Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was referred to by the scholars of Islamic theology as the eponym of the Basrite school of the Mu‘tazilite, to which are affiliated a number of prominent personalities, such as Wāṣil b. ‘Aṭā, ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd, etc. See Amīn, *op. cit.*, III, p. 96; Toshihiko Izutsu, *The Concept of Belief in Islamic Theology: A Semantic Analysis of Īmān and Islām* (Yokohama: Yurindo Publishing co, Ltd., 1965), p. 20. Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī’s theological view becomes clear, for instance, in his remarks: ‘Substances are substances and accidents are accidents before being originated’ (p. 40). According to al-Ḥasan Baṣrī, a grave sinner is a hypocrite. Bagdadi Mu‘tazilite, on the other hand, according to Izutsu, maintains that he belongs to an independent category between the two.

analogies, opinions and reasons to which the jurists paid particular attention was ascribed to them. This has emerged only after the time of the Followers of the Followers...”

Defending their contention that *kalām* is of great significance for matters of religion, they based their argument on the following points: the Prophetic tradition that reads “Anything which the muslims regard as agreeable is also agreeable in God’s view; and anything which is regarded as bad by the muslims, is also bad in God’s view. This is one of the matters which the Muslims regarded as agreeable, so it is agreeable in God’s view.” This is then asserted by al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī’s logical arguments which reads as follows: Innovation is divided into two sorts; Bad and good innovation. Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī said: Narratives [viz. on the prominent figures, places, etc] are innovations. In this case, they are allright. Many people benefit from them. [Likewise,] many calls are responded to, and many requests are fulfilled. Some [scholar related] that he was asked about praying at the end of the recitation of the Koran, as the people want to do at this moment. He replied: It is a good innovation. How could this kind of practice not be regarded as agreeable, when it comprises the refutation of the apostates, the heretics and the proponents of the opinion on the sempiternality of the universe as well as of the partisans of all heresies from this *umma*! If philosophical speculation and reflection are not available, neither can truth be distinguished from falsity, nor goodness from badness.

By means of this knowledge, ambiguity has been removed from the hearts of the apostates, and belief of the *Muwaḥḥidūn* [viz. those who affirm the oneness of God] has become firm. If you refute rational evidences, what do you believe concerning the sound principles of your religion. Which way do you follow to know their truths. All [the people] have known that the truth of the book is known, and the trustworthiness of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - is affirmed only with the help of reason. But, you have refused that fact. If evidence is not available, the meaning is unavailable too.”⁹⁰⁷

The answer of al-Sam‘ānī is clearly that *kalām* is prohibited, not only because of that which has been claimed by their adversaries, as mentioned above, i.e. that the Companions and the Followers had not been occupied with it, but also because God has said: “Today I have perfected your religion for you...”⁹⁰⁸ If He [viz. God] has already perfected and completed it, they argue, a Muslim should believe in it and rely on it. Asserting their contention, they remark: “So, why does one need to refer to rational evidence and their propositions? God by His virtue makes it superfluous and unnecessary to him. He did not introduce [man] to something, due to which one is seized by ambiguity and vaguenesses, and which leads one to destruction and troubles. Man strayed, perished and deviated only because of ideas and rational thoughts and his following the opinions of the past and the present. Man was safe only because he followed the traditions of the Messengers and the leading scholars among the early ancestors, who guide people to the right course.”⁹⁰⁹ Re-emphasizing his hostile attitude to *kalām*, he then

⁹⁰⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 209-10.

⁹⁰⁸Al-Mā’ida (V): 5a. Bell, I, p. 94.

⁹⁰⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 211-2.

quotes the prayer of the Prophet: “O God, I ask your protection against knowledge which has no significance...”⁹¹⁰

[4] Chapter (*faṣl*) on the Response to their Opinion maintaining that *Aḥbār al-āḥād* are not accepted as means to acquire knowledge

His response to this question is clearly indicated in his words: “This is [the opinion of] a chief of the innovators in his refutation of the *aḥbār*, and in establishing evidence by means of speculation and reflection.” Then he points to the Qadarites and the Mu’tazilites, who issued this opinion and whose purpose it was to refuse the *aḥbār*. Furthermore he discusses how each group (Qadarites, Murji’ites, Ḥarijites) tries to argue in favour of the soundness of what they uphold with the help of *al-ḥabar al-wāḥid* with respect to many theological issues such as *al-wildān*.

With regard to this, Ibn al-Sam‘ānī criticized the attitude of every denomination concerning whether *Aḥbār al-Aḥād*⁹¹¹ in matters which are commonly known could be accepted or not. Based on innovations, each sect, Ibn Sam‘ānī argues, claims that what they believe is in accordance with the Tradition of the Prophet; and that it is part of the *sharī‘a* of Islam. To them, he directs the following critical remarks: “none of denominations search for religion by using a single method. For, they consult their reason, minds and personal opinions. So, they search for religion with the help of these. If they hear something from the Book and the Tradition, they examine it according to their rational standard. If it is right, they accept it. On the contrary, if it is not in line with their rational criterion, they refuse it. If they are compelled to accept it, they corrupt it with the help of far-fetched interpretations, and objectionable significances (*al-ma‘ānī al-mustankira*). Therefore they deviate from the truth, and turn away from it. They throw religion away. They also discard Tradition.”⁹¹²

Ibn al-Sam‘ānī then rejects these claims. According to him, the truth and the true belief, as God ordained, exclusively belong to the people of Tradition and the *āthār*, because they followed the footsteps of the Pious Ancestors whose belief was inherited from the Prophet.

[5] The Root of Religion is Observance

In this chapter, al-Sam‘ānī evaluates the view of his adversaries that “God, in the Koran, censures unquestioning imitation and entrusts humans with rational examination and deduction and also commands people to reflect and debate against the infidels with the help of rational evidences.” Al-Sam‘ānī, on the other hand, maintains that “unquestioning imitation of which we are ignorant, [should be] used for something related to the reports (*aḥādīth*) and the sayings (*aqwāl*) of the [pious] ancestors. As far as religious doctrine is concerned, the Book and the Tradition exhorted [us] to observance. They have said: Imitation is accepting [one’s opinion] without argument.”⁹¹³ In sum, he suggests people to obey what God has prescribed in the Koran.

⁹¹⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

⁹¹¹A tradition which goes back to a single authority. See EI², Glossary & Index, to vol. 1-viii (1997), *op. cit.*, p. 166.

⁹¹²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 218-9.

⁹¹³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

[6] Chapter (*faṣl*) The Significance of Reason and its Position in Religion according to the Partisans of Sunna (*Ahl al-Sunna*)

In this chapter, al-Sam‘ānī evaluates the significance of reason. For him “reason neither ascribes any duty to a person, nor exempts anything from him. It has no authority in determining things as lawful or unlawful. Likewise, it cannot determine things as good or bad. If no single tradition is produced, no duty is imposed on anyone.”⁹¹⁴ With respect to the attitude toward reason of his adversaries, al-Sam‘ānī makes the following critical remarks: “Know that what distinguishes us from the innovators is the question of reason. They base their faith on rational thought. They made observance (*al-ittibā’*) and tradition follow rational thought. The adherents of Tradition, on the contrary, said: “The foundation of faith is observance (*al-ittibā’*), and reason (*al-‘uqūl*) is subordinate [to it]. If the foundation of faith is built on rational thought, creatures may regard revelation and the prophets - may God bless them - as superfluous. The significance of command and prohibition becomes worthless.”⁹¹⁵

[I.] Abū al-Ma‘ālī ‘Abd al-Mālik al-Juwaynī, known as *Imām al-Ḥaramayn*

Al-Juwaynī was born at Bushtanikan, a village on the outskirts of Nishāpūr, on 18 Muḥarram 419/17 February 1028. He was connected to the school of *‘ilm al-kalām* inaugurated by Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī at the beginning of the fourth/tenth century. The title *Imām al-Ḥaramayn* resulted from four years of teaching in Mecca and Madīna. His scholarly research was divided between *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *‘ilm al-kalām*. His two principle works on *uṣūl al-fiqh* are *al-Waraqāt fī uṣūl al-fiqh* and *al-Burhān fī uṣūl al-fiqh*. According to Brockelmann, it is in the role of doctor in *kalām* that al-Juwaynī made his deepest impression on Muslim thought. Unfortunately, his great work, *al-Shāmil*, has not been published. He died in the village of his birth on 25 Rabī‘ II 478/20 August 1085.⁹¹⁶

The *Madrasa Niẓāmiya* of Nisabur in which the Shafi‘ite jurist al-Juwaynī became a professor, as Makdisi maintains, was a college of law which was established to produce doctors of law. One of his students was Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī. *Kalām* was not admitted as part of the curriculum.⁹¹⁷ Therefore it can be implied that al-Juwaynī’s professorship was one of Shafi‘ite law. This could be one of the reasons why al-Suyūṭī incorporated al-Juwaynī into his list of the opponents of *kalām*.

In summarizing the words of al-Juwaynī against *kalām*, al-Suyūṭī relies respectively on three authorities: *First*, Ibn al-Sam‘ānī in his *Ta’rīḥ* in which he quotes al-Juwaynī as having said: “When I go about my business, I do not turn to, and occupy myself with, *kalām*,” *Secondly*, al-Asnawī (d. 772/1371) who in his *Ṭabaqāt* quotes Abu ‘l-Ganā’im b. Ḥusayn al-Urmawī, who had attended the circle of Imām al-Ḥaramayn. The latter had asked al-Juwaynī “to read for him something pertaining to the knowledge of *kalām*. He, however, prohibited him to

⁹¹⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

⁹¹⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

⁹¹⁶Brockelmann, C., “al-Djuwaynī,” in EI², II, 605-6.

⁹¹⁷G. Makdisi, “Law and Traditionalism in the Institutions of Learning” in *Theology and Law in Islam*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971), p. 75-88.

do so, and said: When I go about my affair, I do not turn to [it], and I do not teach it;” *Thirdly*, Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201) who quotes al-Juwaynī in *Talbīs al-Iblīs* as having said: “I had abandoned the authorities of Islam and their knowledge. I then travelled over the greatest sea. Each time I sought the truth and fled from unquestioning imitation, I was choked [by the water]. Then I returned from all these things to the word of the truth: You must follow the faith of the old men (*dīn al-‘ajā’iz*). So, if the truth does not come to me by [God’s] grace, I will die with the faith of the old men. You impose upon me my affair with sincere words. So, woe unto Ibn al-Juwaynī!” Regretting with the fact that he had been occupied with *kalām*, Abu ‘l-Ma‘ālī al-Juwaynī, according to Ibn al-Jawzī, repented and lamented: “Do not be occupied with *kalām*! So, if you would know how *kalām* occupied me up to its highest point, you would not be occupied with it!”⁹¹⁸

[m.] *al-Tafrīqa Bayn al-Īman wa ‘l-Zandaqa*⁹¹⁹ and *Iḥyā’ ‘ulūm al-Dīn*⁹²⁰ by Ḥujjat al-Islām Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī

Al-Gazālī was born in Ṭūs in 450/1058. There he studied under the supervision of Imām Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Radhānī. In 470/1077, he went to Nishāpūr and studied under the supervision of al-Juwaynī for two years. In 484/1091 he was appointed professor in the Niẓāmiyya College. He died on the 14th of *Jumāda* II 505 in Ṭūs, his birthplace.⁹²¹

The reason why al-Suyūṭī included al-Gazālī into the list of predecessors who were against *kalām* and why he abridged his work in SM, is presumably, first of all, that he was a professor and a great authority of Shafī‘ite law in the Niẓāmiyya College, where *kalām* and philosophy, according to Makdisi, were not admitted as part of curriculum.

Secondly, al-Suyūṭī even regarded al-Gazālī as the *mujaddid* of the 4th/10th century.⁹²² Al-Suyūṭī defends him against his opponents, who accused him of being influenced by the theological creeds of the Mu‘tazilites and indebted to their logical instruments. According to al-Gazālī’s opponents, al-Suyūṭī says, Mu‘tazilite influence was reflected in his work, *Tamhīd al-Arkān*.⁹²³ Asserting that al-Gazālī had spent his life refuting the Mu‘tazilites and other sorts of innovations, al-Suyūṭī felt the urge to demolish such false accusations. In so

⁹¹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 236-7.

⁹¹⁹The alternative title of this work, which is edited by Dr. Sulaymān Dunyā, is *Fayṣal al-Tafrīqa bayn al-Islām wa ‘l-Zandaqa* (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, 1381/1961), 1st ed. The present author consults this edition to translate some passages quoted by al-Suyūṭī in his SM. The passages quoted in SM can be found on p. 202-4.

⁹²⁰For the discussion of al-Suyūṭī’s dealing with *Iḥyā’*, the present author consulted Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī’s *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn* (IU) (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Azhāriyya al-Miṣriyya, 1302/1885) 1st ed. The passages quoted by al-Suyūṭī in SM can be found in vol. I, p. 37.

⁹²¹M. Bouyges, *Essai de Chronologie des oeuvres de al-Gazali (Algazel)* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1959), p. 1-6.

⁹²²According to al-Suyūṭī, all the *mujaddids* revived in the centuries before ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Azīz were of the shāfi‘ite juridical denomination: al-Shāfi‘ī, Abu ‘l-‘Abbās b. al-Surayj, Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfara‘īnī, Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī, Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Shayḥ* Taqī al-Dīn b. Daḥīq al-‘Īd, etc. See *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁹²³Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

doing, he composed two works, *Tashyīd al-Arkān* and *Daraj al-Ma‘ālī fī Naṣrati ‘l-Gazālī ‘alā al-Munkir al-Mutaḡālī*.⁹²⁴

As suggested by Makḡisi, al-Gazālī, moreover, was one of those who censured *kalām* vehemently. This was reflected by his words in *al-Tafrīqa*: “The most excessive and extravagant people are a group among the *mutakallimūn* who accuse the laymen of the Muslims of being infidels. They claim that whoever does not know *kalām*, the way they do, and whoever does not know the evidence of the *sharī‘a*⁹²⁵ together with the evidence which they have drawn up, is an infidel.”⁹²⁶

Furthermore, al-Gazālī remarks “If we would abandon hypocrisy and observe the side effects [of being occupied with *kalām*], we could declare that the involvement in *kalām* is prohibited because of a lot of evil, except for one of two persons: [The first person] is one to whom befalls doubt which will not leave his heart with the help of simple words (*kalām qarīb*) or with a tradition related from the Messenger...⁹²⁷ The second person is one possessing perfect intelligence, rooted belief in [his] religious faith, which has become firm due to the lights of the soul. He is desirous to deal with this occupation, so as to heal sickness, when doubt befalls him, and to silence the innovator – when the latter comes [to argue against] him. He is also to protect his belief, when an innovator intends to tempt him.”⁹²⁸

However, al-Gazālī concludes by saying: “Therefore it is known that a *mutakallim* who comes close to the present life and fights desperately for it, does not obtain the truth of the *ma‘rifā*. If he obtains it, he must certainly have shunned *dār al-gurūr*.”⁹²⁹

Al-Suyūṡī also quotes some passages from *Iḡyā’* which comply with his own agenda. The passages quoted, for instance, read: “The purpose of *kalām* is nothing but to protect the believes which the adherents of the *sunna* transmitted from the [pious] ancestors.”⁹³⁰ However when al-Gazālī became aware of its danger for the (common) people, he warned them not to be occupied with it, saying: “They regarded [*kalām*] as a defense of the faith and protection for the Muslims. But, actually it corrupts creatures and establishes innovation in their souls.”⁹³¹

As far as the pages of *al-Tafrīqa* and *Iḡyā’* which have been incorporated into SM are concerned, one thing is worth mentioning here: Al-Suyūṡī took only three printed pages (p. 202-4) of the 85 printed pages of FT in the Duniyā edition (1962);

⁹²⁴Al-Suyūṡī, *al-Taḡadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 187-8; *Tashyīd al-Arkān man Laysa fī ‘l-Imkān Abda‘a mim mā kāna* is preserved at the Mingana Collection in Birmingham (MS. No. 772 III) see www.idc.nl/faid/441faiddb.html; Mss of *Tashyīd*, according to Brockelmann (GAL, G.II, 155, S. II, 196) were preserved in Cairo (ENL, Majāmi‘, 416), Rāmpūr, etc. So far, *Tashyīd al-Arkān* has not been edited yet. GAL is silent about *Daraj al-Ma‘ālī*.

⁹²⁵The typing error also occurs in this place. *Al-adilla al-shar‘iyya* (in *Faysal al-Tafrīqa* (FT), p.202) is rendered here as *al-‘aqā‘id al-shar‘iyya*.

⁹²⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

⁹²⁷This is rendered from “...laysat tazūl bi kālam qarīb ‘an qalbih wa ‘azā wa lā biḡabar naqliyyin ‘an rasūl...” (FT, p. 204). In SM, it reads “...laysat tazūl bikalām qarīb ‘an qalbih wa ‘azā wa lā biḡabar naqliyyin ‘an rasūl...”

⁹²⁸Ibidem.

⁹²⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁹³⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁹³¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 237-243.

while he took only one printed page from the 1400 printed pages of the *Ihyā'* in the 1885 edition.

[10]. The Debate between Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus (256-328/870-940) and Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfi (280-368/893-979)

Al-Suyūṭī must have understood well that he was making use of the summary of the debate meant to illustrate the conflict between the proponents of Logic, an inheritance of the Greeks, and the partisans of the language of the Arabs. He must have adumbrated that Mattā represented his opponents,⁹³² while al-Sīrāfi represented the position he was defending in the face of his opponents. Judging from the contents of the debate, al-Suyūṭī found in al-Sīrāfi a personality who presented himself as the champion of the truth of language, as well as one concerned with the fact that the instrument of the truth is ordinary language and the power of reasoning available to all men willing to apply themselves, and not Mattā's logic. The apparent motive of al-Suyūṭī to incorporate this summary of the debate between Mattā and al-Sīrāfi is similar to that of the vizier Ibn al-Furāt, who asserted in his opening statements that Mattā's view of logic was contrary to religion as well as to the truth.

Furthermore, al-Suyūṭī quoted the whole text of the debate which he had already incorporated in his much earlier work, QM.

[11]. The Learned Men's Refutation of those who Introduced Logic into *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*

Before concluding his discussion, al-Suyūṭī put forth the remarks that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1254), Abū Shāma (d. 665/1268), al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277) and Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329)⁹³³ refuted the introduction of logic into *uṣūl al-fiqh*. Because of fact that al-Suyūṭī had discussed this before in his QM and JQ, he does not deal with their arguments against logic in this chapter.

In QM, however al-Suyūṭī deals either, directly or indirectly, with their refutation of al-Gazālī's introduction of logic into *uṣūl al-fiqh*. According to al-Suyūṭī, in his *Ṭabaqāt al-Nawawī* (676/1277), for instance, said that al-Gazālī's attempt to mingle logic with *uṣūl al-fiqh* was considered a heresy.⁹³⁴ Likewise, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1254) was of the opinion that as far as using "logical terms in formulating divine laws is concerned, it is one of the reprehensible actions and of new stupidities."⁹³⁵

Abū Shāma's implicit refutation of al-Gazālī's introduction of logic into *uṣūl al-fiqh* is found in al-Suyūṭī's quotation of his words in Abū Shāma's *al-Tawakkul fī al-Radd ila 'l-Amr al-Awwal*, namely that it is better to avoid the

⁹³²Contextually speaking, to the best of my knowledge, al-Suyūṭī's opponents were the ones who claimed that mastering logic is one of the requirements of *ijtihād*.

⁹³³According to al-Nashshār, al-Gazālī's adoption of Aristotelian logic in his work on legal theory drew fervent criticism from a number of scholars of the traditionalist group, such as Abū Ishāq al-Marginānī (d. 513/1119), al-Qushayrī, al-Ṭurtūshī (d. 520/1127), al-Māzirī, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1246) and al-Nawawī (d.631/1238). See al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 143-4.

⁹³⁴"*wa laqad atā bi ḥultihī al-mantiq bi uṣūl al-fiqh bid'atan fī ḍammi shu'mihā 'ala 'l-manfā'a ḥattā kathura ba'da dhālika fahm al-falsafa wa 'llāh al-musta'ān.*" QM, p. 2, l. 9-

11.

⁹³⁵Ibidem.

destructive effects and the logical complexities of *kalām* which drive people away from virtues.⁹³⁶

Ibn Taymiyya's refutation of al-Gazālī's introduction of logic into *uṣūl al-fiqh* is discussed in al-Suyūṭī's JQ. This is clearly indicated in IT's words, as quoted by al-Suyūṭī: "Those who introduced this [essential definition] are the ones who wrote on the principles of religion and law after Abū Ḥāmid [al-Gazālī] - towards the end of the fifth century - and it is they who have discoursed on definitions according to the doctrine of the Greek logicians. Scholars of all other denominations - the Ash'arīs, Mu'tazilīs, Karrāmīs, Shī'īs, and others - hold that the function of definition is to distinguish between the definiendum and other things. This is well-established in the writings of Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī, al-Qāḍī Abū Bakr [al-Bāqillānī], Abū Ishāq [al-Isfarā'inī], Ibn Fūrak, al-Qāḍī Abū Ya'lā, Ibn 'Aqīl, Imām al-Ḥaramayn, Nasafī, Abū 'Alī [al-Jubbā'ī], Abū Hāshim [al-Jubbā'ī], 'Abd al-Jabbār, al-Ṭūsī, Muḥammad b. al-Hayṣam, and others."⁹³⁷ Accordingly, it is also reflected by IT's reference to al-Gazālī as the one who was responsible for spreading the logicians' method, through his inclusion in the beginning of his work *al-Mustaṣfā* of an introduction to Greek logic, and as the one who alleged that the learning of those who do not know this logic is not to be trusted.⁹³⁸

[12]. The Refutation of those who Introduced Logic into Grammar

Al-Suyūṭī then concludes his SM by discussing the refutation against those who introduced logic into grammar. In this regard, he refers to *Kitāb al-Masā'il* of the Imām Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. al-Sīd al-Baṭalyawsī (d. 531/1137).⁹³⁹ Apart from a minute quotation, al-Suyūṭī does not elaborate his discussion of *Kitāb al-Masā'il*. According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Baṭalyawsī stated: "A discussion on grammatical questions occurred between him and a literary man. He started mentioning incessantly an accident (*al-maḥmūl*), a substance (*al-mawḍū'*) and the logical expressions [which were related] to him: Metaphors and euphemisms are used in the art of Grammar but not by the logicians. The philosophers have said: It is obligatory to categorize every art according to the rules practiced by its experts. They have also been of the opinion that the mixing of one art with another is the result of the ignorance of the *mutakallim* or bears the purpose of

⁹³⁶ "wa qad nabaga āḥarūn yarawna anna 'l-awlā al-iqtisār 'alā nukath ḥilāfiyya waḍa'ūhā wa ashkāl manṭiqiyya allafūhā a'raḍū 'an al-maḥāsīn wa sammū fuqahā'a 'l-madhhab kawāḍīn wa dhālika min 'alāmati 'l-ḥudhlān na'ūdhu bi 'llāh min taḍyī' al-zamān fi 'l-jidāl wa 'l-marā' wa nas'aluhū al-thabāt 'ala 'l-tamassuk bi 'l-athar." QM, p. 3, l. 24-6.

⁹³⁷ JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 12-3.

⁹³⁸ JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 111-12.

⁹³⁹ Al-Suyūṭī gives al-Baṭalyawsī's (b. 444/1053) biographical account in his BW, *op. cit.*, p. 218; According to Lévi-Provençal, al-Baṭalyawsī was "a celebrated Andalusian grammarian and philosopher," who composed more than twenty works. He was born in Badajoz (Baṭalyaws) in 444/1052 and died in the middle of Rajab 521/end of July 1127 in Valencia." Lévi-Provençal, however, does not mention *Kitāb al-Masā'il*. GAL also remains silent about it, in spite of the fact that it deals with *Risāla fī Ru'ūs Masā'il al-Falsafa*. However, attention to it has been drawn by al-Nashshār, who said that *Kitāb al-Masā'il* is *al-Masā'il al-Manthūra fī 'l-Naḥw*. See GAL, I, 427, S. I, 758; Lévi-Provençal, E., "al-Baṭalyawsī," in EI², I, 1092; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 255, n. 3 (N).

making an error and ease, by the transference from one art to another when the discourse against them is cornering them.”⁹⁴⁰

3.5. Conclusion

3.5.1. Analysis of the Sources

Two interesting things should be noted here with respect to al-Suyūṭī’s composition of SM. *First*, that he was a historian who arranged his topics very systematically. *Secondly*, that he attempted a prosopographical approach (borrowing Humprey’s and Van Ess’ term) to the sources he claimed to oppose logic and/or theology, in order to establish as many facts as possible about all those seemingly connected to a particular subject, and then to convert these facts into a collective portrait of this subject.⁹⁴¹ The aim of a prosopographical approach is closely connected to what Van Ess calls an attempt to provide ‘ein statistisches Bild.’⁹⁴² What al-Suyūṭī attempted in SM was to explain to his readers that theology and/or logic had been subjected to opposition by many leading scholars whose works he incorporated into SM.

However, the sources to which al-Suyūṭī refers as the opponents of logic and/or theology cannot be accepted at face value. Using Makdisi’s words, one ‘cannot dispense with a critical analysis of the prejudices of the sources.’⁹⁴³

Based on the death of their authors, the (written) sources which al-Suyūṭī made use of in composing SM can be set in the following chronological order:

1. *Al-Ri‘āya* by al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/858)
2. a. *Al-Ta’rīḥ al-Kabīr*⁹⁴⁴
b. *Kitāb Halq Af‘āl al-‘Ibād* by al-Buḥārī (d. 256/870)
3. *Ta’wīl Mushkil al-Qur‘ān*⁹⁴⁵ by Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnawarī (d. 276/890)
4. *Musnad*⁹⁴⁶ by al-Dārimī (d. 282/895)
5. *Ṣarīḥ al-Sunna*⁹⁴⁷ by al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923)
6. *Kitāb al-Sharī‘a* by al-Ājurri (d. 360/972)
7. *Al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*⁹⁴⁸ by al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)⁹⁴⁹

⁹⁴⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 255-6.

⁹⁴¹Humphreys, *Islamic History*, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

⁹⁴²Van Ess, TG, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. ix.

⁹⁴³Makdisi exhorts scholars to be critical about the prejudices of the sources. Because this, according to him, is a fundamental principle of historical methodology, especially ‘when dealing with authors who belong not only to a religious movement but also to a particular group within this movement.’ Makdisi, ‘Hanbalite Islam,’ *op. cit.*, p. 228.

⁹⁴⁴GAS, I, 116, 132, 178, 319.

⁹⁴⁵Brockelmann refers to this work as *Mushkilāt al-Qur‘ān*. GAL, G. I, 120, S. I, 186.

⁹⁴⁶Brockelmann registers this work as *al-Musnad al-Jāmi‘*. GAL, G. I, 164, S.I, 270.

⁹⁴⁷GAS, I, 328.

⁹⁴⁸GAL, S. I, 279.

⁹⁴⁹Abu ‘I-Qāsim Sulaymān b. Ayyūb b. Muṭṭayyir al-Laḥmī al-Ṭabarānī, one of the most important traditionists of his age, became well-known for his three works on Tradition: *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* (Beirut: 1983 in 10 vols.), *al-Mu‘jam al-Awsaṭ* and *al-Mu‘jam al-Ṣagīr*. He was also the author of a number of other works: *Manāsik Kitāb al-Sunna*, *al-Radd ‘ala ‘I-Mu‘tazila*, *Musnad Shu‘ba*, *Kitāb al-Nawādir*, *Kitāb Dalā‘il al-Nubuwwa*, etc. See Fierro, M., “al-Ṭabarānī,” in EI², X, 10.

8. The Debate between Abū Sa‘id al-Sirāfī (d. 368/ 979) and Mattā b. Yūnus (d. 328/940)
9. *Ta’rīḥ Miṣr*⁹⁵⁰ of Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. Ya‘qub al-Kindī (d. 350/961)
10. *Qūt al-Qulūb* by Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 383/994)
11. *Ta’rīḥ Miṣr*⁹⁵¹ by Ibn Zūlāq al-Laythī (d. 387/997)⁹⁵²
12. *Al-Gunya ‘an al-Kalām*⁹⁵³ by al-Ḥaṭṭābī (d. 388/988)
13. *Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunna* by al-Lālakā’ī (d.418/1028)
14. *Al-Ba‘th wa ‘l-Nushūr*⁹⁵⁴ by Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī al-Nisabūrī (d. 458/1067)
15. *Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth*⁹⁵⁵ by al-Ḥaṭṭīb al-Bagdādī (d. 463/1071)
16. *Jāmi‘ al-Bayān*⁹⁵⁶ by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Nimarī (d. 463/1071)
17. The Shafi‘ite al-Juwaynī (d. 478/1085)
18. *Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih*⁹⁵⁷ by Abū Ismā‘īl al-Anṣārī al-Harawī (d. ca. 481/1089)
19. *Al-Ḥujja ‘alā Tārik al-Maḥajja* by the *Shayḥ* Naṣr al-Maqdisī (d. 490/1098)⁹⁵⁸
20. a. *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn*
b. *al-Tafriqa bayna ‘l-Islām wa ‘l-Zandaqa* by al-Gazālī (d. 505/1112)
21. *Kitāb al-Masā‘iP*⁹⁵⁹ by ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Sīd al-Baṭalyawsī (d. 531/1138)
22. *Al-Milal wa ‘l-Niḥal* by al-Shahrastānī (d. 548/1154)
23. a. *Dhayl Ta’rīḥ Bagdād*⁹⁶⁰
b. *al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Ḥadīth* by Ibn al-Sam‘ānī (d. 562/1166)
24. *Ta’rīḥ Madīnat Dimashq*⁹⁶¹ by Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1176)
25. *Talbīs al-Iblīs* by Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201)
26. *Fatāwā* by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1254)
27. *Ṭabaqāt al-Fuqahā*⁹⁶² by al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277)
28. *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fi ‘l-Radd ‘alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān* by Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329)
29. *Tadhkira*⁹⁶³ by the Shafi‘ite Badr al-Dīn b. Jamā‘a (d.733/1333)
30. The Shafi‘ite Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 744/1344)
31. *Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ajam*⁹⁶⁴ by al-Ṣalāḥ al-Ṣafadī (d. 746/1345)

⁹⁵⁰GAL, G. I, 149.

⁹⁵¹GAL, S.I, 230.

⁹⁵²Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Laythī, born in 306/919 and died in 386/996, was an Egyptian historian, the author of a number of biographical, historical and topographical works on Egypt in the time of Iḥsidid and early Fatimids. See Lewis, B., *et. al.*, “Ibn Zūlāq,” in EI², III, 979.

⁹⁵³GAL, G. I, 165.

⁹⁵⁴GAL, S.I, 618-9.

⁹⁵⁵GAL, G. I, 329, S. I, 564.

⁹⁵⁶ GAL, G. I, 367.

⁹⁵⁷GAL, G. I, 433.

⁹⁵⁸This work was edited by Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Hārūn as part of his thesis in the University of Madīna in 1409/1988.

⁹⁵⁹GAL, G. I, 427, S.I, 758.

⁹⁶⁰GAL, G.I, 330.

⁹⁶¹GAL, G. I, 331.

⁹⁶²Brockelmann refers to this work as *Ṭabaqāt al-Fuqahā’ al-Shāfi‘iyya*. GAL, G. I, 397.

⁹⁶³*Tadhkirat al-Sāmi’*. GAL, G. II, 75, S. II, 81.

32. a. *Al-Mizān*⁹⁶⁵
 b. *Ta'riḥ al-Islām*⁹⁶⁶
 c. *al-Ibar*⁹⁶⁷ by al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348)
 33. *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyya*⁹⁶⁸ by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Asnawī (d. 772/1371)
 34. *Ta'riḥ*⁹⁶⁹ by Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/.1373)

The Arabic sources against logic and theology, some passages (or pages) of which are incorporated into SM, can be classified in two categories: *First*, the works which deal incidentally with the opposition to logic and/or theology; and *secondly*, those which deal explicitly and elaborately with that issue. No. 1, 2b, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15, 16, 20a, and 20b are works against theology, which can be classified into the first category. In these works, the censure of theology occupies only several paragraphs and/or a few pages. No. 12, 18, and 23b are the works in which the authors deal explicitly and elaborately with the opposition to theology.

The following works dealing explicitly with the opposition to logic are cited in SM: The discussion between Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfi (d. 368/979) and Mattā b. Yūnus (d. 328/940) (no. 8),⁹⁷⁰ and *Naṣiḥa* (no. 28). The *Fatāwā* (no. 26) only deals incidentally with the opposition to logic.

Why did al-Suyūṭī, in building up his arguments against his opponents in SM, only base himself on the works mentioned above? Why did he not, for instance, use *Tarjih Asālib al-Qur'ān 'alā Asālib al-Yūnān* (against logic) by the Zaidite Ibn al-Wazīr al-Ṣan'ānī (d. 840/1436) who, according to al-Nashshār, was influenced much in his composition by Ibn Taymiyya;⁹⁷¹ *al-Radd 'alā Ahl al-Kalām* by al-Sulamī (d. 412/1022) and *Tahrīm al-Nazar fī Kutub Ahl al-Kalām* by Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī (d. 620/1224) (both against theology);⁹⁷² *Miftāḥ Dār al-*

⁹⁶⁴ *Al-Gayth al-Musajjam fī Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-'Ajam* is referred to by Brockelmann as *al-Gayth al-Musajjam* or *Gayth al-Adab alladhī 'Nsajam*. GAL, S. I, 439-40.

⁹⁶⁵ *Mizān al-I'tidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl* (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyya, 1963), ed. 'Alī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī, 4 vols. GAL, G. II, 47, S. II, 46.

⁹⁶⁶ GAL, G. II, 46.

⁹⁶⁷ *Al-Ibar fī Aḥbār al-Bashar mimman 'Abar*. GAL, G. II, 47, S. I, 46.

⁹⁶⁸ GAL, G. II, 91.

⁹⁶⁹ Probably this refers to the most important of Ibn al-Kathīr's works on the history of Islam, *al-Bidāya wa 'l-Nihāya*. On Ibn Kathīr, see Loust, H., "Ibn Kathīr," in EI², III, 817-8; GAL, G. II, 49, S. II, 48.

⁹⁷⁰ D.S. Margoliouth edited the arabic text of the debate and translated it into English, "The Discussion between Abū Bishr Matta and Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfi on the Merits of Logic and Grammar" in JRAS, (London: 1905), 79-130. The text of this discussion can also be found in *al-Imtā' wa 'l-Mu'ānasa* (Cairo: Lajna al-Ta'lif, 1953), ed. Aḥmad Amīn and Aḥmad al-Zayn, vol. I, p.107-128.

⁹⁷¹ *Manāhij*, *op. cit.*, p. 223

⁹⁷² I failed to obtain information concerning the fact why al-Suyūṭī, when discussing the censure against *kalām*, did not refer to the Hanbalite Ibn Qudāma al-Makdisī with his *Tahrīm al-Nazr fī Kutub Ahl al-Kalām*, in spite of the fact that he dealt with Ibn Qudāma's biography in his TH (p. 504). However, one may speculate about the fact that al-Suyūṭī could have regarded *Tahrīm* only as Ibn Qudāma's personal criticism against his fellow muslim, a member of his own school, Ibn 'Aqīl, as confirmed by one of the three titles for *Tahrīm*, i.e. *Kitāb fih al-Radd 'alā Ibn 'Aqīl*, (Makdisi, *op. cit.*, p. xi) and, hence, it is plausible that al-Suyūṭī thought it insignificant for his discussion.

*Sa'āda*⁹⁷³ by the Hanbalite Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1351) and *Kasr al-Manṭiq* by the Shi'ite Abu 'l-Najā al-Farīd (both against logic)?

One might suggest two answers to this question: *First*, that al-Suyūṭī did not have at his disposal any other works against logic and/or theology than the ones discussed in SM, presumably as a result of their limited circulation. *Secondly*, as an apologist, al-Suyūṭī had to refine his arguments by selecting his sources in such a manner that he would convince his opponents. Probably, it is the second answer which deserves more affirmation for two obvious reasons.

First of all, in his autobiographical work, *al-Taḥadduth bi Ni'mati 'llāh*, al-Suyūṭī maintains that all the *mujaddids* of preceding centuries, apart from 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz,⁹⁷⁴ were of the Shafi'ite juridical school: Al-Shāfi'ī, Abu 'l-'Abbās b. al-Surayj, Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarā'inī, Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī, Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, the *Shayḥ* Taqī al-Dīn b. Daqīq al-'Īd and Sirāj al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī.⁹⁷⁵ This is confirmed by Hallaq, who suggests that nearly all of the jurists bearing the task of *tajdīd* were Shafi'ites.⁹⁷⁶ In the second place, attention should also be paid to the fact that eleven out of thirteen authors whose works were abridged in SM were affiliated to the Shafi'ite juridical school,⁹⁷⁷ despite the fact that al-Suyūṭī mentions only their being prominent leading figures (*a'imma*).⁹⁷⁸

By composing SM, Al-Suyūṭī demonstrated to his adversaries that he was deeply knowledgeable about the origin and the foundation of logic, the history of its introduction into the religious community of Islam, the origin of the connection to logic of the books of *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *uṣūl al-dīn*, and the beginning of its spread among later scholars. He also wanted to tell his adversaries that not a single science could escape his attention, including logic, because he was "the greatest scholar of his time,"⁹⁷⁹ thereby proving that he possessed the necessary conditions to fulfill his ambition to be qualified as a renewer (*mujaddid*) of tenth/sixteenth century.⁹⁸⁰ Finally he showed that all the preceding

⁹⁷³Although al-Suyūṭī did not mention this work in SM, he deals with it in his biographical work, *Buḡyat al-Wu'āt* when discussing its author. See al-Suyūṭī, BW, (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda, 1326/1908), 1st ed., p. 25.

⁹⁷⁴In asserting the central role of Shafi'ism among the revivers, al-Suyūṭī suggests that 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, as the first reviver, shares al-Shāfi'ī's being a member of the Prophet's family (*min āli rasūl allāh*). See *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 217.

⁹⁷⁵'*Wa wajadnā jamī'a man qīla innahū mab'ūth fī ra's kulli mi'a mimman tamadhhaba bimadhhab al-shāfi'ī wa inqādī liqawlih, 'alimnā annahū al-imām al-mab'ūth alladhī 'staqarra amr al-nās 'alā qawlih, wabu'itha ba'dah fī ra's kulli mi'a man yuqarrir madhhabah.*' See *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 218; This topic was also dealt with by Goldziher in "Zur Charakteristik Ğelāl ud-dīn us-Sujūṭī's und seiner literarischen Thätigkeit," G.S. I (1967), 52-73.

⁹⁷⁶Hallaq, W.B., *The Gate of Ijtihad: A Study in Islamic Legal History*. Ph.D. Diss. University of Washington (University Microfilms International, 1983), p. 79.

⁹⁷⁷The two who are of non-Shafi'ite denomination are al-Harawī (Hanbalite) and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Barr (Malikite).

⁹⁷⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁹⁷⁹Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁹⁸⁰In the last two chapters of his books, respectively *mā an'ama 'llāh bihī 'alayya min al-tabaḥḥuri fī 'l-'ulūm wa bulūgi ratbati 'l-ijtihād* and *dhikr al-mab'ūthīn 'alā ra'si kulli mi'a*, one can clearly find al-Suyūṭī's explicit ambition to be qualified as *mujaddid* of the tenth century of Hijra. This is reflected in his last words in this book: "*qultu wa qad*

mujaddids, and the Shafi‘ite *madhhab* in general, fiercely opposed logic and *kalām*.

3.5. 2. Al-Suyūṭī’s Sources against *Kalām*

Although al-Suyūṭī’s motivation to compose SM was markedly to prove that he mastered logic better than his opponents,⁹⁸¹ his discussion also emphasizes *kalām*. He incorporates in it twelve works he claimed to be against *kalām*. It seems, however, that the apologetic nature of SM lies in the sense that it was intended to defend his claim to be the *mujaddid* of the tenth century of Hijra in the face of his adversaries, who questioned his expertise in logic. Thus, the accuracy of the identification of particular historical figures as being in favour of al-Suyūṭī’s claims apparently was not always so important as the prominence of these historical figures themselves. Especially when questioning al-Suyūṭī’s inclusion of al-Juwaynī, who was deeply connected to the school of *‘ilm al-kalām* inaugurated by Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī and whose deepest influence on Muslim thought was due to his role in *kalām*, one finds one more indication of the apologetic nature of SM.

Nevertheless, SM remains an important source which enables us to find clues for the development of the ideas of the opponents of *kalām*.

Referring to a number of (written) sources, in SM al-Suyūṭī discusses how speculative reasoning, *kalām*, was rejected and opposed by Muslims since the period of the Companions, the forerunners of the Jurists among the Followers, the third generation, such as ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Muslim b. Yasār, Ibrāhīm al-Naḥa‘ī, Abū Qulāba, Yaḥya b. Abī Kathīr, Sulaymān b. Dāwūd, Yaḥya b. Sa‘īd, Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik and ‘Amr b. Qays, and then the fourth generation such as Ishāq b. ‘Isā, Mālik b. Anas, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, Sufyan al-Thawrī, ‘Abd Allāh b. Dāwūd al-Ḥuraybī, Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī, Ḥasan b. ‘Atiyya, al-Awza‘ī, al-Fuḍayl b. ‘Iyād, Abū Ja‘far al-Nāfilī, Sa‘īd b. Abī Marḥam, Shu‘ba, Salām b. Abī Muṭī‘, Aḥmad b. Mahdī and Ya‘qūb b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Mājishūn, and so on until the ninth generation which includes, to mention only some, Yaḥyā b. ‘Ammār, Muḥammad b. ‘Umar, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn, al-Ḥusayn b. Shu‘ayb, etc. He also discusses the censure of *kalām* by a number of prominent historical figures ranging from al-Shāfi‘ī, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Mālik b. Anas, Imām al-Buḥārī, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī, Abū Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaṭṭābī, Abu ‘l-Qāsim b. Manṣūr al-Lālakā‘ī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ājurrī, Abū Ṭālib al-Ḥārithī al-Makkī, Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Nimarī, al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī, and Imām al-Ḥaramayn al-Juwaynī to al-Gazālī.⁹⁸²

Discussing the names of the opponents of *kalām* mentioned above, al-Suyūṭī also tells us about the variety of their arguments concerning *kalām*. He explains to us, for instance, how the authors of *kalām* in the first generation, the

ṣahha qawluḥū: “yaḥtamīlu an yabqā tāsi‘ ‘alā ra’si ‘l-tāsi‘a...”, fanaḥnu ‘l-ān fi sanat sitta wa tis‘īn wa thamani mi’a wa lam yajī’ al-mahdī wa lā ‘isa wa lā ashrāṭa dhālika. Wa qad tarajjā al-fāqir min faḍli ‘llāh an yun‘ama ‘alayhī bikawnihī huwa al-mujaddid ‘alā ra’si ‘l-mi’a wa mā dhālika ‘ala ‘llāh bi ‘azīz.” See al-Suyūṭī, *al-Tahadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

⁹⁸¹This was asserted by al-Suyūṭī himself in the introduction of SM. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 33-

4.

⁹⁸² Ali, *op. cit.*, (2005), p. 1-25.

Companions of the Prophet, were excluded from the community and no one was allowed by the authorities to befriend him. Abridging al-Harawī's work, al-Suyūṭī also leads us to understand how the authors of the innovations in the second generation, the forerunners of the jurists among the Followers, were considered to be the followers of the Dajjāl and found themselves living with Jews and Christians. In the following generation, the third one, the authors of *kalām* are said to have been avoided because they were exercising evil influence on others and lead them astray. In the fourth generation, the authors of *kalām* were identified by its opponents with those who had been destined by God to commit evil and from whose hearts the light of Islam had been blotted out. In the following generation, the fifth one, the argument posed by the opponents of *kalām* against the authors of *kalām* was interestingly exemplified by the story of Abū Ḥanīfa who was asked about *a'rāḍ* (accidents) and *ajsām* (substances) and said that both of them were the affair of philosophers. It was further interestingly exemplified by Abū Yūsuf's identification of the author of *kalām* with atheists. An interesting tendency of the arguments against *kalām* in the following generation, the sixth one, was embodied in al-Shāfi'ī's fervently hostile attitude against *kalām*, which was reflected by his words that the heads of the authors of *kalām* should be beaten with a palm-stalk, and that they should be driven away from their homeland. The arguments which seem to represent the basic foundation of the opponents of *kalām* can be discerned in the members of the seventh generation of the opponent of *kalām*, especially in Ayyūb al-Saḥṭiyānī's statements that one is not to dispute with people on a matter one does not know about, because this leads one to corruption. The diversity of the arguments of the opponents of *kalām* in the eighth generation can be seen in the identification of *kalām* with astrology, in the sense that they both lead to ignorance. The arguments of the ninth generation of the opponents of *kalām* was marked by the words of Yaḥyā b. 'ammār, stating that the books on *kalām* should be burnt.⁹⁸³

In his attempt to give his readers the impression that *kalām* was also subjected to fervent opposition from a great number of prominent individuals, al-Suyūṭī incorporates a number of works against *kalām* in his SM. The first is *Kitāb Dhāmm 'Ilm al-Kalām wa Ahlih* by al-Harawī. The significance of this work for this kind of study is highlighted by al-Suyūṭī's remark that this book is the most excellent work on the rejection of *kalām*. Every single piece of information is given with its chains of transmission.⁹⁸⁴

Al-Ri'āya by al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī is another work abridged by al-Suyūṭī. Arnaldez concluded that this work is al-Muḥāsibī's masterpiece, as it is the longest and most comprehensive of his writings.⁹⁸⁵ This work discusses the eagerness of the people to debate and to argue as well as to refute the adherents of different religions. The author, according to al-Suyūṭī, was a leading scholar in the field of jurisprudence, *taṣawwuf*, tradition, *kalam*, *zuhd*, *wara'* and *ma'ārif*. He was included by *al-Ustādḥ* Abū Maṣṣūr al-Tamīmī in the first generation of the companions of al-Shāfi'ī.⁹⁸⁶

⁹⁸³ Ali, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁹⁸⁴ Suyuti, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁹⁸⁵ Arnaldez, "al-Muhasibi," in EI², VII, p. 124.

⁹⁸⁶ Suyuti, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

Kitāb Ḥalq Af'āl al-'Ibād by al-Buḥārī is also indispensable for the identification of the opponents of *kalām*. This work provides a number of narrations censuring debate, argumentation and *kalām*. This is exemplified in the narration of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and other scholars, who appear to have hated inquiring and scrutinizing ambiguous matters of faith and did not mingle with the *mutakallimūn*.⁹⁸⁷

Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī's *Sarih al-Sunna* is likewise referred to by al-Suyūṭī in his discussion against *kalām*. In this work, al-Ṭabarī relates some events that occurred after the death of the Prophet, such as the dispute among the *umma* about those who among them is most entitled to the leadership and the caliphate, the dispute on whether [the deeds of the worshippers] are determined by the *qaḍā'* of God and His *qadar* or whether this question is determined by the people; then follows the dispute on the Koran, viz. whether it was created or not, and on the Divine vision of the believers in the Day of Resurrection. Al-Ṭabarī considered all these disputes as stupidities which only occupied people of ignorance and enmity. In concluding his discussion, he quotes the words of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal stating that he who says that the Koran was created is a Jahmite; and he who says that it is not created, is an innovator.⁹⁸⁸

Al-Ḥaṭṭābī's *al-Gunya 'an al-Kalām* (which is no longer extant) also discusses the opposition to *kalām*: "We neither refute the rational evidence nor its competence to lead us to knowledge. But when using them, we do not follow the method which you applied during the establishment of the argument with the help of the accidents and in referring these accidents to the essences as well as in the transformation of these accidents into the essences for [understanding] the creation of the Universe and the existence of the Creator. We dislike the usage of such a method [by turning to] something for which the clearest evidence and soundest demonstration exist. Because that is a matter which you take from the philosophers and according to which you followed them. The philosophers apply this method, only because they neither affirm the prophethood nor believe that the truth has already been born in [the prophethood]. The strongest argument affirming these affairs, in their opinion, is what they deduced from these things."⁹⁸⁹

Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa 'l-Jamā'a by al-Lālakā'ī is replete with the condemnation of dispute and *kalām*. Al-Lālakā'ī, for instance, states that it is obligatory to refrain from innovations and from listening to what is innovated by those who lead people astray. Elsewhere, he states that the first innovation was the dispute on *al-qadar* about which 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar was asked. The Prophet commanded people to confirm the *qadar*, to believe in it and to refrain from disputing on it.⁹⁹⁰

In his *Sharḥ*, al-Lālakā'ī also lists a great number of persons whom he considered to belong to the *Ahl al-Sunna*. That number includes the first generation (the Companions of the Prophet), the second generation (the Followers), the third generation (the Followers of the Followers), as well as people

⁹⁸⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 131-2.

⁹⁸⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 136-7.

⁹⁸⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 140-1.

⁹⁹⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 148-150.

from among the residents of Mecca, Syria and Palestine (*al-Shām*), Mesopotamia, Egypt, Rayy, Mosul, Kūfa, Baṣra, Bagdad and Ṭabāristān.⁹⁹¹

Al-Sharī'a by al-Ājurri is also replete with the condemnation of debate and argumentation in matters of religion. The author, first of all, provides a number of traditions and words of the Ancestors, who condemned *kalām*, debate and argumentation. He then lists a number of personalities who censured *kalām*: Ma'an b. 'Īsa, Hishām b. Ḥasan, 'Abd al-Karīm al-Jazarī, Ayyūb al-Saḥtiyānī, al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz.⁹⁹²

In his *Jāmi' al-Bayān*, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr discusses two topics: the hatefulness of debate and argumentation; and the condemnation of speculation about matters of belief in God based on personal opinion and analogy without a textual foundation. Like other scholars of tradition, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr discusses the censure of debate, argumentation and *kalām* by his predecessors which revolves around the following points: (a) That one who subjects his religion to altercation, is likely to move from one religion to another (which implies *ridā*); (b) that one has to avoid argumentation, because it nullifies the religious practices; (c) *Kalām* on matters of religion is rejectable; (d) The scholars of tradition and jurisprudence reached a consensus that the scholars of *kalām* are innovators and cheaters. He then lists a number of personalities who condemned debate, argumentation and *kalām*: 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, Mu'āwiyya b. 'Amr, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya, Ibn 'Abbās, Mālik b. Anas, Abū 'Amr, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, etc.⁹⁹³

Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth of al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī was incorporated in SM because it could serve al-Suyūṭī's objective in his mission against *kalām*: Al-Bagdādī discusses the condemnation of *kalām* by a number of scholars: Iṣḥāq b. 'Īsā, Mālik b. Anas, Sufyān al-Thawrī, al-Faḍl b. Ziyād, al-Awzā'ī, Yazīd b. Zarī', Muḥammad b. al-'Abbās al-Ḥazzāz, Abū Mazāhim al-Ḥaqqānī.

In *al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Ḥadīth* by Ibn al-Sam'ānī (which is no longer extant), we can read the author's discussion of the condemnation of *kalām* by a number of personalities: Sa'īd b. Ḥamīd, Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfi'ī, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maḥdī, etc. He quotes, for instance, the words of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal on *kalām*, that the authors of *kalām* are atheists. He also explains the attitude of Sufyān al-Thawrī towards *kalām*, as it is exemplified in his statement saying: 'you should be in line with *athar*, and beware of dispute on God and his Attributes.'⁹⁹⁴

The last main sources, incorporated by al-Suyūṭī into SM, are some passages of *al-Tafrīqa* and *Iḥyā'* by al-Gazālī. These works reflect al-Gazālī's deep-seated distrust of the art of disputation. In speaking against *kalām*, Makdisi maintains, al-Gazālī marshals evidence of its harmful character from the dicta of the great leaders among the doctors of the law: Shāfi'ī, Mālik b. Anas, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Abū Ḥanīfa, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and others. Al-Gazālī, for instance, cites the second Caliph 'Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal as those who closed the gate of *kalām* and dispute.⁹⁹⁵

⁹⁹¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 161-5.

⁹⁹²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 170-1.

⁹⁹³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 182-8.

⁹⁹⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 200-1.

⁹⁹⁵Makdisi, "The Non-Ash'arite...", *op. cit.*, p. 239-257.

Interestingly, al-Juwaynī is also referred to by al-Suyūṭī as the one who repented from his occupation with *kalām*. Despite al-Suyūṭī's reference to Ibn al-Sam'ānī's *Ta'rīḥ*, Ibn al-Jawzī's *Talbīs Iblīs* and al-Asnawī's *Ṭabaqāt*, al-Juwaynī's argument(s) against *kalām* are incorporated in SM and treated in the same way as al-Suyūṭī does with the arguments of the scholars whose works are explicitly directed against *kalām*.