

Kalām: Rational Expressions of Medieval Theological Thought

Mustafa Shah,

School of Oriental and African Studies, London University

Mustafa Shah, «*Kalām*: rational expressions of medieval theological thought», in Houari Touati (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mediterranean Humanism*, Spring 2014, URL = <http://http://www.encyclopedie-humanisme.com/?Kalām>

- *Contents*
- *Abstract*
- *Introduction*
- *Early Theological Deliberations*
- *Hegemony of the Mu‘tazilites*
- *Coalescence of Kalām Strategies*
- *Gestation of Sunni Kalām Discourses*
- *Reactions to kalām and Inter-Sunni Polemics*

Abstract

The discipline of kalām encompasses not only the rational exposition of religious doctrine and dogma, but it also extends to a panoply of subsidiary topics and genres, many of which were deemed relevant to the theoretical and conceptual resolution of doctrine and dogma. A key element of kalām discourses resides in their resort to dialectical strategies and rational frameworks which are used to explicate theological doctrine and interrelated constructs. Initially, the term kalām may have been exclusively used to exemplify the technique of using dialogues to flesh out theological propositions and postulates, whereby through a sequence of questions and corresponding answers, logical contradictions were identified in an opponent’s doctrines. However, over subsequent centuries such techniques were just one aspect of the schema of kalām, which came to represent the discipline of rational theology in a much more comprehensive sense. In this essay an attempt will be made to introduce some of the broad characteristics of the kalām discourses and the individuals and movements who contributed to them, locating their place within the framework of classical Islamic scholarship.

Introduction

While modern scholarship may differ over the origins of the science of theology (*ʿilm al-kalām*) and even its historical remit, during the formative periods of Islamic thought this discipline was characterised by its rigorous adoption of dialectical paradigms and select rational and linguistic analogues for the defence, explication and synthesis of the theological doctrines of Islam. Historically, in one of its earliest derived senses the term *kalām* was mostly applied to denote the resort to the adversarial employment of sophisticated dialectical techniques constellated around forms of dialogue in which an opponent's premises were critiqued through the process of drawing attention to perceived flaws and logical inconsistencies perceived inherent in them. Those individuals whose repute issued from their expertise in this specific brand of dialectical theology were referred to as *mutakallimūn* or *ahl al-kalām*, and in the early historical tradition these were individuals who often engaged in debates with non-Muslim antagonists (Pines, 1997 9-19). Over the centuries, in a broader collective sense it was the compound term *ʿilm al-kalām* (philosophical theology) which became synonymous with the rational explication of theological doctrines and creeds, together with the array of technical discussions deemed theoretically pertinent to their synthesis. Such was the extensive compass of *kalām* discourses that topics covered were diverse and distinctive. Conventionally, forms of scholarship which were principally concerned with the treatment of faith and beliefs were subsumed under a number of generic labels, including *uṣūl al-dīn* (the fundamentals of belief), *ʿilm al-naẓar wa'l-jadal* (the science of disputation and polemics), *ʿilm al-tawḥīd* (the theology of God's unicity), and even *al-fiqh al-akbar* (the grand science), although the term *ʿilm al-kalām* conjured up an approach to the treatment of doctrine and dogma in which intuitively rational theological discourses dominated. Later scholarship also used the terms *jalīl al-kalām*, which was concerned with cardinal doctrinal issues, and *latīf* or *daqīq al-kalām*, whose sphere of interest was concentrated on rationally imbued discussions which were viewed as being technically less divisive, such as definitions and terminological nuances germane to cosmological and physical theory (Dhanani, 1994: 3-4).

The range of literary genres fostered under the general rubric of *kalām* was truly prolific: works included theological summae and super-commentaries; apologia and epistles; doxographies and heresiographies covering historical surveys of the movements and influential cynosures of *kalām*; polemical treatises on Christianity, Zoroastrianism, Manicheism and Judaism; and works devoted to fleshing out isolated theological topics. There were also theologically based treatments of exegetical, legal and ethical subjects; indeed, it was not infrequent that scholars devoted commentaries to the Qurʾān and the Prophetic traditions as a foil to showcasing theological perspectives. Some indication of the philosophical aspect and scope of *kalām* based topics can be gleaned from the contents of theological works which include disquisitions on general epistemology and the definitions of necessary and acquired knowledge; arguments for the existence of God; the originated nature of world; the theory of atoms and matter; the divine attributes; the theodicy; causality; origins of language; leadership of the community; deserts and punishments; the inimitability of the Qurʾān; eschatology; the epistemic value of historical reports and dicta; and even topics such as human autonomy and the nature of the soul. Equally significant is the fact that much literature was generated by critiques and responses to arguments. Over the centuries, despite the exponential expansion of the discipline's remit and coverage, the *kalām* dialectical procedure remained a ubiquitous feature of most rationally based theological discourses. The field of *kalām* never quite matched the formal status achieved by traditions of learning such as jurisprudence (*fiqh*), the Qurʾānic sciences (*al-qirāʾāt waʾl-tafsīr*), the study of Prophetic traditions and narrators (*hadīth* together with *ʿilm al-rijāl*) and the linguistic sciences (*nahw wa-lughā*), although its literary output and influence were phenomenal. However, it remained such an important discipline not least because of the religious significance of its subject matter but also the dominance of its contribution to Islamic intellectual thought, to the extent that analogues gleaned from theological dialectical strategies infiltrated discussions across a range of disciplines, including legal and linguistic thought. And its influence over the development of scholastic theological thought in other religious traditions is not to be underestimated (Davidson, 2006; Hegedus, 2013).

Early Theological Deliberations

Discussions about the origins of the literary sciences of the early Islamic tradition are always fraught with questions about the reliability and authenticity of the available

sources (Berg, 2003: 259 ff) The chronological gaps which separate the earliest archival records and the periods to which they refer present something of an obstacle to reaching definitive conclusions about the historical appearance and gestation of theological ideas (van Ess, 1995 IV, 320-1; Stroumsa: 1999 16-17). It is often surmised that later authors presented idealised views of past debates and controversies which were coloured by developed doctrinal beliefs. And in such works there is a predisposition to presenting prejudiced accounts of adversaries' doctrines, particularly the non-mainstream groups, whose doctrinal musings are preserved in fragmented form. Objections are sometimes raised that even works which are dated to a particular historical period were actually distilled from later texts, passing through sinuous processes of transmission which may impinge upon the integrity of the original materials (Calder, 2000: 40 ff). Unfortunately, such overall concerns do tend to deflect attention from the creativity and vitality of the actual scholarship associated with early theology as so much of the classical scholarship in theology is predicated on its being a response to earlier discussions and musings. Despite reservations about the historical configuration of the development of early *kalam*, having reached maturity as a discipline over a remarkably short period of time, its intellectual achievements straddled extended periods of early and medieval Islamic thought with succeeding periods in its history being just as fecund and illustrious as the earlier ones. A brief review of the personalities, issues and themes which feature in theological discourses in the extant sources will provide some sense of the dynamics of the discussions and their overall import within the overarching framework of Islamic thought.

One text which preserves an arresting variety of theological materials is the *Maqālat al-Islāmiyyīn wa-ikhtilāf al-muṣallīn*, the doxography authored by Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī (d. 324/935). Notwithstanding the fact that al-Ash'arī is a seminal figure insofar as his contribution to the crystallisation of Sunni rational theological discourses is colossal, his text provides an indispensable survey of the principal theological movements and the ideas and views to which they subscribed in the context of the genesis and flourishing of *kalām* discourses (van Ess, 2010: 1, 454-501). This is achieved in the text with admirable levels of objectivity and insight, revealing in the process the sheer scope and variety of perspectives which informed the discussions. Significantly, many of the sources to which al-Ash'arī had access are no longer extant. In gauging some of the issues raised in the *Maqālāt* the aim here is not to provide a causal account of the disputes and debates which galvanised the early

development of theological thought, but simply identify underlying currents and themes which go some way to introducing the discipline of *kalām* and shedding light on the character of its discourses and the doctrines and debates which defined them and played a role in their later evolution. Interestingly, in the exordium to his *Maqālāt al-Ash‘arī* actually refers to his wanting to provide an objective account of the sects and movements of Islam in which he would seek to avoid the denigration of opponents on account of their beliefs. He states that such approaches were reprehensibly evident in the works of his peers, whereas he was of the view that there was little to be gained by the raptorial disparagement of one’s adversaries.

As far as explaining the genesis of theological topoi is concerned there exists a tendency in the sources to identify an axiomatic connection between early theological ideas and the political dissension and turmoil which ensued in the wake of the death of the Prophet Muhammad in 632; and this train of thought is redolent in the *Maqālāt*. Couching his discussions in a slightly irenic tone, al-Ash‘arī identifies the disputes about the leadership of the community as symbolising the first instances of *khilāf* (discord) among Muslims, singling out discussions germane to justifying the assassination of the third caliph ‘Uthmān as being a point over which the community remained bitterly divided (Madelung: 1997, 28 ff; van Ess, 1991-7: 4, 695-717). In the text attention then switches to a series of interrelated historical episodes and these include: disagreements about leadership of the community between the fourth caliph ‘Alī (d. 40/661) and the Companions, Ṭalḥa (d. 36/656) al-Zubayr (d. 36/656) and Mu‘āwiya (d. 60/680); the Battle of Ṣiffīn (37/657), where ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiya’s forces clashed; the divisive impact of ‘Alī’s decision to accept arbitration (*tahkīm*); the emergence of the Khārījites or seceders, who deemed the acceptance of arbitration as an act of wanton disbelief (*kufīr*) and much later the murder of ‘Alī’s son al-Ḥusayn (d. 61/680). The focus on historical events is not irrelevant to understanding the genesis of *kalām*: firstly, the quandaries thrown up by these tumultuous events in the early tradition witnessed theologians attempting to give political context to their unfolding, while also proposing solutions which might explain their occurrence in the framework of the paradigms and teachings of the faith; indeed, early theological epistles do preserve attestations of dialectical disputation and concerns about issues which have a dogmatic countenance, although suspicions about whether they are the products of pseudepigraphy mean that reservations persist regarding their overall import for the early history of *kalām*. (Mourad: 2006: 8 ff; Cook, 1983: passim). A case in point is the famous *Risāla fi’l-qadar* (epistle on predestination) attributed to al-Ḥasan

al-Baṣrī (d. 112/728) in response to questions about predestination raised by the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān (d. 86/705); in the *Risāla* al-Ḥasan distances himself from the doctrine of predestination. Suleiman Mourad has argued that the epistle is probably a product of the fourth/tenth century and was designed to muster support for the Mu‘tazilite doctrine of freewill, appealing to al-Ḥasan’s status as a revered figure (Mourad, 2005: 189-92; cf. review Shah, 2010: 128 ff). And similar arguments are made regarding the epistle on the doctrine of *irjā’*, the idea of postponement, which was ascribed to al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyya (d. c. 100/718) and was later associated with theologians referred to as al-Murji‘ites (van Ess, 2010). It basically connotes deferring judgement on contentious issues to God’s discretion, but later encompassed other doctrines. Although traditional narratives which emphasise the link between politics and theology have been described by some modern scholars as being ‘speculative reconstructions’, the fact remains that political episodes unquestionably serve as a cue for much more developed discussions and these are ruminated over in theological based arguments and preserved in later doxographical sources such as the *Maqālāt*, giving genuine weight to their import (Stroumsa, 1990: 291 cf. Marenbon, 2010: 60 ff). Moreover, the dispute about origins should not deflect attention from the import of the issues and the overall intellectual vitality of the discussions they inspired.

Among the first groups mentioned in the *Māqālāt* are the Shī‘ites and when discussing their basic doctrines al-Ash‘arī indicates that at stake in Shī‘ism is not simply the issue of political accession but the inalienable rights of the family of the Prophet and the belief that ‘Alī and his offspring had been invested by divine right (via *naṣṣ*) with the spiritual and political leadership of the community (van Ess, 2010: I, 479-87). The general point made about Shī‘ism and the Imāmate is the idea that it was considered inconceivable that the Prophet Muḥammad could have passed away without designating a successor from his family or that an *Imām* would deliberately spurn the office of the caliphate in deference to an opponent: the concept of the infallibility of the Imām and the recourse to dissimulation are used to reconcile such vested claims to political jurisdiction with the historical reality that political power actually lay in the hands of their adversaries (Halm, 2004: 1-7). Intriguingly, the central doctrine of the *Imāmate* within Shī‘ism is not derived exclusively from a rationally derived construct but is apodictically accepted as a religious truth, yet in *kalām* discourses the doctrine along with others which issued from it would have been expounded upon and defended by Shī‘ite luminaries, where necessary, through the

use of dialectical and rationally devised strategies. This would also have been the case for Shī'ite views on an assorted range of *kalām* topics, including the debate about the originated *contra* unoriginated status of the Qur'ān; the notion of the indivisibility of atoms, and even discussions on quantum leaps, all of which are mentioned by al-Ash'arī as he records the position taken by key Shī'ite personalities on these issues. A similar pattern is found in al-Ash'arī's review of the Khārijites: primary doctrinal theses are introduced, such as their justification of the assassination of 'Alī together and some inferences are made about the theological arc it provides for disagreements among Khārijites about the formal status of major sinners. Yet, having isolated key doctrinal shibboleths of the various Khārijite groups, their views on a spectrum of topics and themes salient in rational theological discourses are introduced. In the *Maqālāt* al-Ash'arī actually listed books which were authored by leading Shī'ite and Khārijite scholars, and it was these important compilations to which he probably had access. Similar patterns pertain for his review of the remaining movements including the Murji'ites, the Mu'tazilites, the *Ashāb al-hadīth* (or traditionists), the ascetics, and then finally the Kullābiyya or companions of 'Abd Allāh ibn Kullāb (d. 258/854); once more, basic doctrinal tenets are presented followed by standpoints taken by scholars on doctrinal topics and issues. Many of the discussions are revisited in greater depth in the ensuing parts of the *Maqālāt* al-Ash'arī. Traditionally defined creeds and articles of faith did furnish the contextual framework for the attendant discourses of philosophical theology yet in its strictest formulation *ʿilm al-kalām*'s distinctiveness was animated not only through its rationally inspired discussion of theological theses and constructs as applied to a wide range of theological and subsidiary topics, but also via the disputatious and reactive tone which pervaded *kalām* works. Recently, some scholars have actually argued that many of the topics of *kalām* were not exclusively 'theological' or concerned with the nature of God but rather belonged to the realm of 'philosophical metaphysics', suggesting that in the Islamic tradition the *mutakallimūn* were 'intellectual rivals' of the philosophers (Dhanani, 1994: 2-5; cf. Leaman, 2002: intro.). This is a reasonable conclusion, although even those subjects which were deemed 'non-theological' had relevance within a broader dogmatic context and hence attracted the attention of the *mutakallimūn*. Critically, all the main dominations and movements of Islam were participants in the craft and discourses of rational *kalām*, significantly contributing to its discourses. And over the centuries, as a diligent reading of the *kalām* sources will show, the ability of the discipline to sustain a steady accretion of new theological

themes, many of which had their antecedents in the earlier debates and ruminations, allowed it to reach new levels of conceptual complexity, which at the same time made it increasingly relevant as an instrument of classical Islamic thought. The venture of *kalām* should not be seen as a derivative endeavour that listlessly recycles the musings of early discourses, but rather a discipline which made itself relevant to concurrent concerns and discussions. A useful analogy here is provided by the discipline of Qur'anic exegesis which was initially based around referring to the earliest dicta and interpretive statements linked to the pious ancestors; the later exegetes built on this substratum, devising exegetical strategies and theories which could be used to uncover all sorts of meanings within the text and make them applicable to new contexts and settings, developing new modes of analysis in the process. A similar arrangement ensued within the framework of *kalām*. Today rational theological discussions remain an integral element of modern Islamic discourses.

Hegemony of the Mu'tazilites

It might be useful at this juncture to consider the prominence of the Mu'tazilites given their importance to the development of rational theological discourses. In the words of one scholar the history of early Islamic theology 'is primarily a history of the Mu'tazila' (van Ess, 1980: 53). Van Ess was referring to the set of revolutionary principles and experimental ideas which dictated their approach to theological issues and the reaction their theological ideas provoked among their opponents; for, among all the major Islamic movements a not insignificant proportion of theological discussions together with their theoretical bases feed off and react to their distinctive brand of rational theology, a fact borne out by recent studies (Vasalou, 2007; Heemskerk, 2000). In the *Maqālāt*, at the end of his discussion of the doctrinal creeds of the Mu'tazila, al-Ash'arī refers to the five principles upon which their theological beliefs are founded, including *tawhīd* (divine unity), *ʿadl* (divine justice), *manzila bayn al-manzilatayn* (the intermediate station between stations), *ithbāt al-waʿd* (the reality of threats) and the notion of *al-amr bi'l-maʿrūf* (enjoining good). Al-Ash'arī does not offer an eponymous classification of the Mu'tazilites into schools of thought, as was sketched for the Shī'ites and the Khārijites, who are presented as fissiparous movements, but instead he presents a select series of *kalām* topics and themes on which their professed opinions are shared. Impressively, al-Ash'arī is rarely judgmental or condemnatory in the text; he simply maintains a strict scholarly

objectivity, refraining from fully disclosing his affiliations, with few notable exceptions. As far as the historical roots of the Muʿtazilites are concerned, recent scholarship has suggested that one needs to proceed with caution when referring to links between them and the earlier movement referred to *ahl al-qadar* (libertarians), for the semantic compass of the phrase *qadarī* in early contexts remains nebulous, despite its eventually been associated with those who were proponents of freewill (Murad, 1991: 117 f). Deference to the primacy of reason and the doctrines of divine justice and unity were to form axial theses which defined the theology of the Muʿtazilites, although it is critical to bear in mind one scholar's remark that in the formative periods among them there exists an 'extreme diversity of people and doctrines' (Gimaret, 1987: 784). With regards to the doctrines of divine unity and justice, the former was informed by a trenchant rejection of scriptural anthropomorphism, configured around arguments for the transcendence of God; while, the latter was a rejection of the doctrine of predestination. It is Wāṣil ibn ʿAṭāʾ (d. 131/748), alongside one of his peers ʿAmr ibn ʿUbayd (c. 144/761), who is legendarily associated with founding Muʿtazilism, at least in the later sources (Pines, *Studies*, 1997, pp. 142-50). He supposedly proposed the initial construct of the *manzila bayn al-manzilatayn*, which was designed to bring conceptual resolution to the question of whether a grave sinner is a believer or a non-believer, in order to dissipate the force of the Khārijite thesis of grave sinners being disavowed; Wāṣil was inferring that they were neither believers nor non-believers. The *Fihrist*, the bibliographical-biographical compendium composed by Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 380/990 or d. 393/1003), lists a rich vein of works tackling a convoluted range of theological topoi and themes authored in the third/ninth century, and his views are mentioned by him. Suggestively, in the heresiographical sources one does find abruptly interspersed among Wāṣil's views on the status of sinners an argument which vitiates the traditional affirmation of the reality of God's separate attributes and their entitative status, which predicate that God is hearing, speaking, living, willing, listening, all knowing ect., the anthropomorphic implications of which were viewed as being all too serious. The logical train of Wāṣil's claim is that whoever acknowledges the existence of a hypostatic attribute in God's essence has created a plurality in the Godhead. It is hinted that his thoughts on the subject were linked to his having acquainted himself with the works of the ancient philosophers. On predestination (*qadar*) Wāṣil is said to have passionately rejected that God could be the author of evil, insisting that man must be a free and responsible agent; he reasoned that it was logically absurd and

contradictory for God to decree and determine for man the minutiae of his destiny but then hold him to account for his actions; he even refers to a human being's realisation that he possesses within him the capacity to act. Still, the dominant theme which interweaves through the matrix of Wāṣil's arguments is the significance of the primacy of human reason: it prevails as the arbiter of truth which can be used in conjunction with religious truths, enabling humans to distinguish between the intrinsic qualities of good and evil. Still, generalizations of Mu'tazilite approaches to doctrines need to be avoided as individual scholars tend to show intellectual independence when delivering their verdicts on contentious topics. This much is evident from the studies by Richard Frank and Daniel Gimaret who examined the autonomy of the human agent in Mu'tazilite thought with regards to the agent's ability to act, the notion of motivation, volition and the consequences of intentional and non-intentional acts, concluding that the idea that the Mu'tazilites taught a doctrine of unconditioned free will' needs to be qualified in certain respects (Frank/Gimaret). In the case of Wāṣil, whether such early theological thoughts and ideas and their epistemological bases can be definitively traced to him is seemingly of subsidiary importance for the simple reason that the conceptual edifices of Mu'tazilite thought were based on such precepts and ultimately shaped later *kalām* discourses (Pines, 1997: 147). Theological responses to professed views and opinions, and indeed Shī'ite, Zaydite, and Khārijite standpoints, imposingly provided the main canvas on which the panoply of discourses on *kalām* were circumscribed and eventually supplemented with dialectical argument and counter argument augmenting the range of discussions.

Staying with the subject of origins, while Wāṣil is held up as a pioneer of theological ideas, another figure from the period whose dogmatic views exemplify the intertwining of political and theological motifs in the early periods is Jahm ibn Ṣafwān (d. 147/746). In al-Ash'arī's survey, initially, he is classified as a member of the Murji'ites, who were defenders of the doctrine of postponement (*irjā'*) and the idea that faith is an indivisible quality and contingent upon neither acts or deeds. Jahm is mentioned in a subsequent section of the *Maqālāt* among the corporealists. In the later heresiographical works he is excoriated and his doctrinal musings are treated with opprobrium. Still, his ideas are arresting in terms of their theoretical complexity (Ash'arī *Maqālāt*, 1: 338; cf. (Pines, *Studies*, 1997, pp. 142-50), as they augur debates which dominated in successive historical periods. In contrast to Wāṣil, Jahm is portrayed as an arch-determinist: alongside his espousal of the thesis that the

duration of heaven and earth was finite, Jahm is said to have dismissed the idea that humans had the capacity to act freely (Abrahamov, 2002:). In rationalising the acts of man Jahm allegedly professed that his actions had no basis in reality but were ascribed to mankind by way of ‘metaphor’ (*majāz*); he used the example of the setting of the sun and the turning of the stone mill as his analogues, neither of which possesses the power or innate capacity to act as described; interestingly, it was only in the third/ninth century that the term *majāz* came to denote metaphor. Jahm argued that faith was an indivisible quality which was determined by one’s belief in God alone, while disbelief constituted the denial of God, whom he insisted cannot be described using terms employed to refer to created entities. Jahm accepted that God was uniquely powerful, originating, acting, creating by giving both life and death. The determinist bent of Jahm’s theological ideas did not appear to curtail his activity as an insurrectionist; he took up arms and was killed by government forces. Fascinatingly, it is reported that Jahm subscribed to the thesis that God’s speech was created, postulating that He was not a speaker in the physical sense of the term, a doctrine which became a pillar of Mu’tazilism and was an expression of their comprehension of God’s unity and transcendence, although later biographical sources do associate the notion with earlier figures such as Ma’bad al-Juhanī (d. 86/705) and Ghaylān al-Dimashqī (d. 125/743). The thesis of the createdness of the Qur’ān was to play an important part in the unfolding of events surrounding the *miḥna* (inquisition), when, under Mu’tazilite influences, the ‘Abbāsīd caliph al-Ma’mūn (ruled 198-218/813-833) imposed the doctrine as official state policy. The importance of the *miḥna* for the galvanisation of *kalām* discourses is huge, although recent research differs over its wider significance and the role of the Mu’tazila during this episode (Cooperson, 2000: 339; Hurvitz, 2002; van Ess, 1995: 3, 456-60). With regards to the gestation of ideas, the lack of early sources together with the tendency of the later materials to furnish Procrustean accounts of personalities and their theological ideas means it is impossible to pinpoint the historical role of figures such as Jahm and Wāṣil, nor indeed the precise origins of the ideas with which they are associated. Nevertheless, debates which were to feature in later theological discourses are consistently set against the backdrop of early deliberations. Moreover, the debates and arguments of the different camps are what epitomise *kalām* discourses, which cover such a copious spread of topics.

Even when one attempts to examine the legacy of individuals who are historically noted for having a much more productive and innovative role in the

evolution of theological theses and arguments within Muʿtazilism, the fact that there is no contemporary surviving record of their legacy means that conclusions about their endeavours remain tentative. Still, the very substance of the ideas and thoughts with which they are associated is unquestionably impressive. For example Abūl-Hudhayl al-ʿAllāf (d. circa. 226-36/840-850) was supposedly a pupil of one of Wāṣil's disciples, and referred to as the 'head' of the Muʿtazilite school in his heyday: his influence is certainly discerned in later literary sources which preserve many of his opinions, although despite his being the putative author of numerous tracts and treatises, none of his oeuvre is extant. Abūl-Hudhayl is retrospectively identified with giving definition to the idea of five essential principles of Muʿtazilism, and, as van Ess points out these 'five principles have determined the structure of Muʿtazilī theological work for centuries' (van Ess, 1987: 224; van Ess, 2010: I,133). It is also Abūl-Hudhayl who is prominent among those credited with giving further resolution to Muʿtazilite discussions on the Islamic theory of atomism, which were used to explain 'the relationship between God and creation' (van Ess, 1987: 226; cf. Frank; Sabra, 2009: 205 ff). The original theory posits that the universe is made up of atoms, the smallest of which is a corporeal particle that is essentially indivisible (Sabra, 2009: 204 ff). The substances (*jawāhir*) of the world are formed from a conglomeration of atoms and accidents (*ʿarād/aʿrād*), which inhere in them, with the latter possessing no capacity for infinite endurance (*baqāʾ*) but rather it is God who sustains them through his constant and direct intervention in the world. Arguments about atoms being defined with reference to *taḥayyuz* (spatial occupation) were later incorporated into the discussions by prominent Muʿtazilite figures (Dhanani, 1994: 62 ff; Frank; Fakhry). The corollary of the concept of atomism was that natural or efficient causality was denied, although, Sholomo Pines explains that despite their cosmology on atomism, freedom of human action was retained as a basic principle of the Muʿtazilite system (Pines, 1997: 32). Discussions on atomism appear to have been initially devised by the inventive Ḍirār ibn ʿAmr (d. circa. 200/815) and developed by other Muʿtazilite figures, including Muʿammar ibn ʿAbbād (d. 215/830) and Bishr ibn Muʿtamir, with Greek, Iranian, and possible Indian philosophical analogues informing the discussions. The maturity of the discussions is reflected in the fact that topic appears as 'a given' in early *kalām* discourses (Pines, 1997: 108 ff and 128ff). The theory of atomism was even the subject of a critique by Abūl-Hudhayl's nephew, al-Nazzām (d. c. 220-30/835-45) (Pines, 1994: 11-25; Dhanani, 1994: 5 and 9). Again, the paucity of extant sources means that reconstructions of the explanations of the

earliest origins of the theory in the Islamic milieu are principally informed by materials found in later texts. Yet despite this, the sheer complexity and creativity with which the theory is broached by different scholars are hugely significant both in terms of the configuration of ideas in these early periods and their impact upon later theological discourses. Significantly, Gimaret explains that it was Abūl-Hudhayl who is credited by later sources with devising the connected notion of the 'adventitiousness' of substances (*hudūth al-jawahir*). Gimaret also notes that it was taken up 'with alacrity' by Sunni theologians (Gimaret: 1987:). Indeed, over successive historical periods the concept was innovatively used by rational theologians in conjunction with suppositions about infinite regress and particularization as arguments for the existence of God (Madelung, 2005: 273 f; Hoover, 2004, p. 287). On a somewhat related note, as Gimaret has explained, despite rejecting *tashbīh* (anthropomorphism), in the Mu'tazilite conception, it was possible for man to know God through a process of intuitive reasoning which was referred to as 'inferring the invisible from the visible' (*qiyās al-ghā'ib 'alā al-shāhid*), by which the attributes, acts and even the very existence of God can be logically inferred by reference to the physical world and its constituents (Gimaret: 1990; cf. Frank, 1992: 31-2). And this construct was avidly assimilated by later Sunni rational theologians in their discussions, although disputes about its pertinence as an analogue for making inferences about the attributes of the Almighty can be found in later theological texts. Furthermore, rational theologians may well have enthusiastically embraced such forms of reasoning and thinking in the context of arguments for the existence of God and *qiyās al-ghā'ib 'alā al-shāhid*, but within arch-traditionist expressions of Sunni orthodoxy there were also individuals who fervently objected to the use of such analogues, arguing that they had no bases in the scriptural sources, arguing that nor were they approved by the pious ancestors.

Notwithstanding the immense geographical and historical spread of the movement, over successive periods such was the scale of the exponential development of the theories and doctrines among Mu'tazilite scholars that nominal labels were later devised to distinguish the scholarship and interests associated with various luminaries. Figures such as Dirār ibn 'Amr, Abū Bakr al-Aṣamm (d. 201/816), Mu'ammār ibn 'Abbād (d. 830), Abū'l-Hudhayl al-'Allāf, Hishām ibn 'Amr al-Fuwaṭī (d. 227/842?), al-Nazzām, and even the belle lettrist al-Jāhīz (d. 255/868-9), were identified as Basrans. While, the Baghdādīs included Bishr ibn al-Mu'tamir (d. 825 or 840), Thumāma ibn Ashras al-Numayrī (d. 828), Ja'far ibn Ḥarb

(d. 850) and later influential individuals, including Abū-Qāsim al-Balkhī (d. 319/913). Placing aside the somewhat arbitrary element to the classification of scholars from these early periods, the richness and diversity of the materials are truly staggering. Even a scholar such as al-Jāhīz, whose forte is literature, appears as a formidable theologian and thinker, epitomizing the strength and depth of *kalām* discourses (van Ess, 2009: 3 ff; cf. Pellat, 1969). There is a misleading tendency to attribute the efflorescence of Muʿtazilite thought to the political ascendancy and influence it exercised in the third/ninth century, but even following the decline in their political clout, an abundance of theological ideas and theoretical frameworks to support them is attested in the literature of subsequent centuries. The Basran Muʿtazilites could boast figures such as al-Jubbāʾī (d. 303/915), who was al-Ashʿarī's former mentor, and his son Abū Hāshim (d. 321/933), whose followers were known as the Bahshimiyya. The views and musings of early Muʿtazilite protégés were preserved in the later works of scholars such as al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār, and his students, Abū Rashīd al-Nayṣābūrī (fl. 5th/11th century), Abū'l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī (d. 426/1044) and Abū Muḥammad Ibn Mattawayhi (fl. 5th/11th century). Some idea of the magnitude and wealth of materials from the formative periods can be gauged from a review of the contents of al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār's voluminous *Kitāb al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd*. Despite issues surrounding the quality of the printed edition and its incompleteness, and its author's use of abstruse language, it is a veritable encyclopaedia of philosophical theology. Yet, in reality, it represents just a fraction of the overall Muʿtazilite literary legacy. Discussions about the originality of Muʿtazilite thought and ideas do take on board the question of whether Greek philosophical concepts exercised an extraordinary influence on aspects of the genesis and synthesis of ideas. The sophistication and rapidity of the translation movement meant that 'from the middle of the eighth century to the end of the tenth (750-998) almost all non-literary and non-historical secular Greek books that were available throughout the Eastern Byzantine Empire and the Near East were translated into Arabic.' (Gutas, 1998: 1-2). Still, most modern writers take the view that while analogues from such materials were unquestionably utilized, the conceptual frameworks and constructs within which ideas were contextualized and developed remained highly original. It was Frank who remarked in a study on Ashʿarite ontology that certain features of their brand of theology was 'like that of al-Jubbāʾī and his Muʿtazilite followers, a Muslim science originally thought out and elaborated in Arabic with no

commitment to and little or no direct influence of prior, non-Muslim traditions' (Frank, 1999: 163).

Coalescence of *Kalām* Strategies

In the formative periods the sense of purpose with which Khārijite, Shī'ite and Mu'tazilite scholars defended doctrines is in some respects obscured by the prominence of Sunni rational discourses. Although admittedly much of the material has not survived, the *Fihrist* does provide tantalizing lists of theological works authored in the third/ninth century. Thus, for example Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam (d. c. 179/795-6) is enumerated among Shī'ite luminaries and included among the many works he is said to have composed are critiques of the natural philosophers, the dualists, and the Mu'tazilites; furthermore, he is credited as being the author of several expositions which treat diverse topics such the concept of *al-imāma*, arbitration at Ṣiffin, the epistemology of narration, the temporality of matter, and even a work covering Aristotelian theory (van Ess, 2010: 210-14). The gamut of topics subsumed within theologians' works intimates an interest in areas which were deemed pertinent to the theoretical and conceptual thrust of their own *kalām* discourses. This applied whether such areas related to the refutation of the doctrines of adversaries and the explication of their own positions, or even the overall pertinence of broader philosophical constructs. Political themes retained their importance: one doctrine of compromise on the subject of the caliphate developed by Zaydī and Mu'tazilite theologians was based around the idea that while 'Alī was the preferred legitimate caliph, the rule of both Abū Bakr and 'Umar could be deemed valid and this topic was apparently the subject of a refutation composed by Ibn al-Ḥakam; it also featured among the repertoire of writings authored by a talented Shī'ite theologian Abū Ja'far al-Aḥwal, otherwise known by his sobriquet, Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, who also authored a study of the *imāma*. Ibn al-Nadīm reports that such was the pre-eminence of al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī (d. circa 300/912) that despite his Shī'ite affiliations he was claimed by the Mu'tazilites as one of their own. He is described as being both a theologian and a philosopher who authored works on both topics; one of the texts he composed, *al-Ārā' wa'l-diyānāt* (convictions and faiths), part of which has survived, confirms the extensive historical sweep of surveys. It was heavily drawn upon by the Sunni traditionist and Ḥanbalite scholar Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200) in his *Talbīs Iblīs* (Deceit of Satan), a text which casts a critical eye over the so-called

mischievous exploits and excesses of scholars and systems of belief and practices. Most prominent among al-Nawbakhtī's works is a survey of Shī'ite groups (*Firaq al-Shī'a*) which details their doctrinal affiliations and specific religious convictions, listing doctrinal positions taken by both moderate and extreme sects, the latter being referred to as the *ghulāt* (van Ess, 2010: 1.220-60). When discussing the Khārijite groups, Ibn al-Nadīm explains that with regards to their works on *Kalām* he notes that they boast many leading figures but that they were not all the authors of books, inferring that their literary legacy is often 'hidden and protected'. Works attributed to Khārijite authors would appear to betray an avid interest in pursuing the similar range of themes which so captivated peers and predecessors among the other theological movements. Ibn al-Nadīm records that al-Yamān ibn Ri'āb authored refutations of the Murji'ites and Mu'tazilite teachings on *qadar*, confirming the level of participation in the dialectical discourses by all parties (van Ess, 2010: 1, 118-120). While, the Khārijite Yaḥyā ibn Kāmil authored a work entitled *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd wa'l-radd 'alā'l-ghulāt wa-ṭawā'if al-Shī'a* (the doctrine of the unicity of God and a refutation of the extremists and groups among the Shī'ites) (van Ess, 2010: 1, 121). The attention paid to polemical treatments of non-Muslim faiths is also prominent to the extent that even in instances where scholars were preoccupied with defending their own doctrines and ideas in the face of criticism and review, considerable intellectual effort was devoted to the authorship of treatises in which scholars examined the dogma and doctrines of Christianity, Judaism, and Manichaeism (Demiri, 2013).

One figure who enjoys a somewhat tarnished reputation in the biographical sources, but whose works embody the reactive thrust of *kalām* discourses, is Abū 'Īsā al-Warrāq (fl. early third/ninth century) (Thomas, 2002; van Ess, 2010: 167-79). Despite ambiguities surrounding his life, his alleged beliefs, and disputed links with Mu'tazilism and Shī'ism, living sometime in the mid-third/ninth century he gained quite a reputation as freethinker, skeptic and maverick. He was undoubtedly a proficient theologian and may have been ostracized for his heretical or unconventional views, although there are even references to his professing dualist beliefs, although he is paradoxically said to have written a critic of such doctrines; it has been suggested that such was the objectivity that he applied when studying non-Muslim groups that it was misconstrued as being indicative of his sympathies (Thomas, 2002: 11). Among the repertoire of works credited to him are several critiques of Christian doctrine, refutations of Judaism, Magians, Manichaeism, and he composed a doxography. A much more extensive collection of works is attributed to

a figure said to have heavily influenced al-Warrāq, namely Ibn al-Rawandī (fl. third/ninth century). Again, biographies emphasize his expertise and competence as a *mutakallim*, yet excoriate most of his literary legacy and denounce him for his heretical views (Stroumsa, 1999: 37-46; van Ess, 2010: 190-95). The sheer range of topics covered by his works is impressive: he authored some twenty different works, including texts on the *Imāma*, *khalq al-Qurʾān*, a refutation of the Muʿtazilite concepts of threats, and the notion of the intermediate station, and two works on narration, the first of which apparently tackled issues surrounding the authority of reports transmitted on the authority of a single narrator, while the second defended the notion of *tawātur*. This was linked to the idea of broad authentication issuing from multiple transmission, a topic which traditionist scholars (*ahl al-ḥadīth*) were to revisit in the context of *ḥadīth* authentication. Despite the tendentious nature of the biographical sources on him, one does detect a somewhat tempestuousness trait to his scholarship for he was the author of works such as the *Kitāb al-zumurrud* (*the Sublime Emerald*) and the *Kitāb al-marjān* (*Book of Pearls*), against which he subsequently authored refutations, although placing his works and ideas within a fixed historical framework remains illusive (Stroumsa, 1999:38; cf. Lindstedt, 2011:131 ff). He also wrote a work entitled the *Dāmigh* (*the Demolisher*), which supposedly criticized the composition of the Qurʾān. Glimpses and references to these works are strewn across classical theological literature. So incensed were the Muʿtazilites regarding his critiques of the school, that one of their luminaries, al-Khayyāṭ (d. ca. 300/913) responded by composing the *Kitāb al-intiṣār waʾl-radd ʿalā Ibn al-Rawandī* (*The Book of Defence and Repudiation of Ibn al-Rawandī*) in reaction to his *Kitāb faḍāʾil al-Muʿtazila* (*the Doctrinal Disgraces of the Muʿtazilites*). Ibn al-Rawandī's work was actually composed in response to a treatise by al-Jāḥiẓ entitled *Faḍāʾil al-Muʿtazila* (*the (Theological) Virtues of the Muʿtazilites*) which vexed Ibn al-Rawandī and it is the text he authored from which al-Khayyāṭ adduces passages in the course of his withering critique (Nader, 1957). In the text Ibn al-Rawandī takes issue with what he perceived to be the indiscriminate criticism of the Shīʿites, and argues that there were graver errors to be discerned in the thoughts of the Muʿtazilites, before rebuking their propositions. His critique of the concept of *tawallud* (generated secondary acts), a corollary to the theory of atomism, which various Muʿtazilite figures such as Abūl-Hudhayl were at pains to clarify, displays his mastery over the technicalities of his opponents' discourses. The tenor of the discussions in the *Intiṣār* provides a good indication of the strength of the disagreements not only between the Sunni camps and their ideological opponents but

also among the various non-Sunni groups, among whom rational theological debates were equally frenetic. It should be noted at this juncture that in al-Māturīdīs *Kitāb al-tawḥīd*, Ibn al-Rawandī is not chided for his heretical thoughts but rather his opinions on arguments appear valued and this fact has led some to question the historical design and provenance of the criticism his work attracted (Rudolph: 1997). Subjects pored over in al-Khayyāt's *Intiṣār* and al-Ash'arīs *Maqālāt* provide a firm indication of the cut and thrust of *kalām* discourses during the course of the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries. One might tentatively conclude that the entrenched nature of the defence and clarification of theological positions during these periods betrays a profounder stage of gestation and development through which discussions had already passed. Incidentally, Abū 'Alī al-Jubbā'ī composed texts which refuted Ibn al-Rawandī, Ibn Kullāb and his Mu'tazilite cohort, Abūl-Hudhayl, who was, according to heresiographical sources, berated by his Mu'tazilite peers for postulating the terminal status of heaven and hell, which classical heresiographers said was an inevitable consequence of his thesis on the finiteness of contingent matter. The prevalence of refutations in these periods and beyond gives some indication of the profusion of literary works in which arguments and sinuous counter-arguments were articulated among the various proponents of *kalām*. It also marks a *terminus a quo* for the development of more intricate discussions and deliberations which made the discipline appear somewhat casuistic and rarefied, being removed from the seemingly uncomplicated creedal statements of the scriptural sources; however, its advocates would argue that it nevertheless remained an indispensable instrument for intellectual expression and the defence of doctrine. This is certainly unsurprising as in his work entitled *Iḥṣā' al-'ulūm*, which offers a summation of the classical sciences, the Islamic philosopher al-Farābī (d. 339/950) defined *kalām* as 'a craft which empowers individuals to defend beliefs'.

Gestation of Sunni *Kalām* Discourses

Within the overarching framework of traditionally defined creeds, the elaboration of what is conventionally presented as rational Sunni theological doctrine is to a large degree defined through the dialectics of reactive and generative discourses: doctrinal positions are formulated and anticipated in response to and in light of creedal statements and rational theological theses already in circulation; in specified instances it is a case of orthodoxy defining its doctrines in response to views and positions with

which it disagrees or wants to qualify. Some have contended that the Sunni theological position should not be viewed as being a default one, but one among a brand of conflicting rational ideologies, although such a view underestimates the sheer impact and influence of Sunni rational discourses and their historical saliency, a fact which very much brought the Sunni position to the fore (Reinhart, 2010: 25 ff). In the introductory outline provided in the *Maqālāt* al-Ash‘arī refers to the community of Muslims being divided into ten theological groupings, although eleven are actually listed. The mainstream Sunni groups are separately represented by the traditionalists or *ahl al-ḥadīth* and the Companions of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Kullāb (d. 258/854), the progenitor of Sunni *kalām* discourses. The fact that the *Maqālāt* highlights the doctrines of Ibn Kullāb, even taking the opportunity to mention his views on the divine attributes in a section of his book which weighs up Mu‘tazilite views, is a reflection of the pre-eminence of his contribution to the various *kalām* debates (Watt: 1990: 306; van Ess, 199-96:4, 200-2; van Ess, 2010:). Ibn Kullāb came to prominence due to the fact that his whole rational system of theology was based on a critique of key Mu‘tazilite doctrines, providing a substrate from which later Sunni dialectical discourses could emerge and it is clear that even in the late fourth/tenth centuries the Kullābiyya continued to be recognized for their theological beliefs: the geographer al-Muqaddisī (d. 390/1000) refers to their activities (Basil, 2001). During the period of the *mihna*, Ibn Kullāb promoted the thesis that the divine attributes existed hypostatically within God’s essence, by which he sought to eviscerate the Mu‘tazilite concept of a created Qur’an, leading to the proposition that His speech existed eternally (van Ess: 98-103). Ibn al-Nadīm describes Ibn Kullāb as one of the *Hashawiyya*, a pejorative term used to denote crude anthropomorphism, and it is alleged that he used to assert that ‘God’s speech is God’ (*‘kalām Allāh huwa Allāh’*). The allegations of anthropomorphism may be a subtle way of criticizing his avowal of the distinctness and reality of the attributes, although another contemporary writer, al-Khawārizmī, in his *Ma‘rifat al-‘ulūm (Knowledge of the Classical Sciences)*, which offers a summation of the tradition of learning in the fourth/tenth centuries, also uses the term *Hashawiyya* when referring to the Kullābiyya and other Sunni groups. Ibn Kullāb was also associated with the idea that accidents cannot inhere in the divine essence, which was heavily criticized by arch-traditionist camps for in their view it undermined a much more personal conception of God as predicated in the scriptural sources. Ibn al-Nadīm credits him with the authorship of works such as a refutation of the Mu‘tazila (*al-Radd ‘alā al-Mu‘tazila*), a work on the divine attributes (*Kitāb al-*

ṣifāt) and a treatise on human agency (*khalq al-afʿāl*), but it is evident that the brand of dialectical theology, which he promoted alongside his peers al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/857), and al-Qalānīsī (fl. third/ninth century), was to rouse the suspicions of traditionalist scholars. In reality, if Kullābite theological thought, and the Ashʿarite tradition which followed in its wake, owes its origins to the attempts to counter Muʿtazilite theological doctrines and dogma, then the very brand of religious orthodoxy associated with the traditionists or *aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth* was to be one which eschewed the rational and dialectical defences of dogma, and the theses which such expressions of faith generated. The dissonance between the arch-traditionalist camps and those of the Sunni rational theologians was not confined to the formative periods but continued over extended periods of Islamic intellectual thought and engendered a rich stream of literature which matches in sophistication and measure the theological treatises and texts which were composed against ideological opponents of the non-Sunni camps.

It has been conventional to associate the flourishing of Sunni rational discourses with the work of Abūl-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī for he became the eponym of one of the most dominant schools of scholastic theology in Islamic thought. Although in many ways his achievements industriously built upon the structural edifices of the accomplishments of figures such as Ibn Kullāb and al-Qalānīsī, through his own intellectual legacy he left an indelible print on the course taken by classical and medieval Islamic Sunni theological thought; it was described by Frank as representing the most ‘important and influential tradition of systematic theology in Sunni Islam’ (Frank, 1991). Any attempt to appreciate the historical construction and elaboration of *kalām* needs to bear in mind the magnitude of his contribution to its discourses. Biographical reports suggest that he had been a confidant and leading luminary among the Muʿtazilites, being a disciple of the outstanding theologian al-Jubbāʿī. It is reported that having disagreed with his mentor over the notion of whether God has to do what is best for man (*al-aṣlah*), he renounced Muʿtazilism and spent the rest of his career perfecting a rationally inspired critique of Muʿtazilite doctrine. While in the *Fihrist*, Ibn al-Nadīm speaks of his repentance for having professed the doctrine of ‘divine justice’ and the ‘doctrine of a created Qur’an’. He supposedly ascended the pulpit, duly pronouncing that he was severing all links with the Muʿtazilites and that ‘exposing their fallacies and deficiencies’ was to be his goal in life. Whatever the historical reality of the circumstances of his split with them, through his works and ideas he animated groups of Sunnī theologians who

synthesized and propounded his legacy, constructing a school around his theological teachings. It is unfortunate that only a small proportion of his works has survived, including the *Maqālāt*; one later author, Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1176), who listed his oeuvre, ascribed over fifty texts and treatises to him. Some idea of the reaction his works provoked can be gauged by the fact that the Basran grammarian, al-Rummānī (d. 384/994), a renowned Mu‘tazilite, who, notwithstanding his impressive range of grammatical compositions, authored a number of theological treatises which offered critiques of al-Ash‘arī’s doctrines, although interestingly he even composed texts which criticized theses advanced by influential Mu‘tazilite scholars.

In the *Maqālāt* al-Ash‘arī precedes his brief discussion of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Kullāb with a section offering a conspectus of the creeds of the *aṣḥāb al-hadīth* and *ahl al-Sunna*, which is markedly formulaic in its countenance. And it is striking that at the end of the section on creeds al-Ash‘arī pronounces ‘and we profess and affirm all of their doctrines which we have just recounted’, apparently nailing his theological allegiances to their doctrinal mast (al-Ash‘arī, *Maqālāt*, 1. 350). The inclusion of this summary, particularly given its appearing as a culminating statement, was deemed conspicuous by some. The suggestion was that this credal segment might have been inserted subsequently into the *Maqālāt* in order to flaunt the traditionalist credentials of al-Ash‘arī and to appease the arch-traditionalists with whom he was seeking ideological reconciliation. However, it should be noted that there is a cohesive consistency to the structure of the *Maqālāt* in that the unfolding of the work’s contents is anchored to its introductory pitch: the idea that the text might have been composed while al-Ash‘arī was still a Mu‘tazilite, is improbable. One of his surviving texts which is frequently identified with the orthodoxy of the traditionists and was reported to have been one of the last works he authored, *al-Ibānā ‘an uṣūl al-diyāna*, opens with a statement in which al-Ash‘arī declares himself to be a staunch follower of the brand of religious traditionalism espoused by Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal; in the text he posits his doctrinal tenets within the vector of traditionally defined creeds. Yet even a circumspect review of the *Ibānā*’s contents and the structuring of its arguments reveals the adeptness and precision with which he was able to build his treatment around a confluence of traditional as well as rational motifs and strategies. From a more general perspective what is important in this context for the significance of *kalām* and its development are the tension and hostility that the resort to dialectical methodologies and the doctrinal theses generated by them provoked among the more conservative scholarly circles. Indeed, even the nature of al-Ash‘arī’s doctrinal

loyalties was disputed by classical scholars: some claimed that there were two modes to his life, namely a Mu‘tazilite and post-conversion position; other speculated that there existed several complex layers to his theology following his conversion and enshrined in the *Ibāna* was an expression of his ultimate doctrinal affiliation: namely, that he had reconciled himself to the orthodoxy of the pious ancestors and traditionists, renouncing the truculent rationalism not only of his erstwhile colleagues from among the Mu‘tazilites, but also the doctrinal paradigms supported by rational Sunni theologians such as Ibn Kullāb, although with regards to the use of rationally derived paradigms, the countenance of the *Ibāna* does not support such a thesis. For example, notwithstanding his proficient use of dialectical techniques in the *Ibāna*, he refers to God’s being not only the creator of all acts, but also the creator of the effective efficacy through which an act is actualised. In the *Ibāna* it is stated that ‘no one has the capacity to do something prior to God’s actualization (of the act)’, and one finds a similar statement in the *Maqālāt*, in which it is pronounced that ‘no one has the capacity to do something prior to His/his actualization of it (act)’. (*Māqālāt*: 346; *Ibāna*: p. 44). The notion that man has no immediate power over the object of his actions smacked of ultra-determinism and certain traditionist scholars recoiled at the notion; it became a standard Ash‘arite standpoint, although interesting variations and explanations of the issue pervaded the works of many later scholars (Shihadeh, 2006: 17-29). This would suggest that the statements expressed in the *Maqālāt* are commensurate with post-conversion views, underpinning the unified nature of his theological positions which are consistently maintained in compositions such as *al-Maqālāt*, *al-Ibāna*, and other works of which he was the author, including the *Luma‘* (*the Resplendent*) and the *ḥathth ‘alā al-baḥth* (*Encouraging Rational Theological Enquiry*), otherwise known under the title *Risalat istiḥsān al-khawḍ fī ‘ilm al-kalām* (Frank, 1988). With regards to the last two works, the *Luma‘* offers a dialectical examination of themes such as affirming the existence of a creator; divine will; the *ḥathth ‘alā al-baḥth*, which serves as an apologetic treatise, argues for the mandatory importance of *kalām* (Frank, 1994, 141-43). Frank argued that one could certainly discern a conceptual unity among these post-conversion works, including the *Ibāna* (Frank, 1994: 171-5). In this respect much has been made of al-Ash‘arī’s use of the term *bi-la-kayf* (without qualification) when broaching questions about the divine attributes and acts; for example, Frank does argue that the term which has a currency among arch-traditionists did mean ‘without comment’ but he contends that when al-Ash‘arī and the later Ash‘arites used this term they intended something much more subtle:

namely, that ‘one does not ascribe to God ‘characteristics and properties of creatures’ (Frank, 1994: 155). The suggestion is that the use of the term should not be seen as a concession to the arch-traditionists on the part of al-Ash‘arī or his later followers.

The *ahl al-ḥadīth* and the sub-groups loyal to them such as *ahl al-zāhir* or literalists are generally presented as fostering an aversion to speculatively derived *kalām* based strategies for the defence of faith. This is the case for the Zāhirites who were founded by Dāwūd ibn Khalaf al-Zāhirī (d. 270/884), and who took their name from an approach to law which necessitated the rejection of analogical reasoning, but whose theological perspectives were closely aligned with those of the traditionists, although the valid point has been made the Zāhirī approach to law is ultimately a form of rationalism (Sabra, 2007: 10-11). Their most famous adherent was the Andalusian jurist Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064), who was the author of a celebrated doxography entitled *al-Fiṣal (faṣl) fīl-mīlāl wa’l-ahwā’ wa’l-niḥāl*, in which he rails against Ash‘arite doctrinal views with stinging rebukes, although Mu‘tazilite, Shi‘ite, and even Khārijite theological views are assailed with equal disdain. The Zāhirites take a very critical view of Ash‘arite defences of orthodoxy and the key doctrinal theses which they espoused and a summary glean through the *Fiṣal* reveals the overwhelming contempt which its author has for Ash‘arism and its theological expressions of orthodoxy (Schmidtke, 2013). Similarly, members of the group referred to as the Sālīmiyya, who were devotees of Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Sālīm and his son Aḥmad, both of whom incidentally studied under the tutelage of the mystic Sahl al-Tustarī (d. 282/896), were ardent critics of Ash‘arī, and composed diatribes against him and even Ibn Kullāb and later Ash‘arites; on the question of Qur’ān they were advocates of the view that the physical letters and sounds of the Qur’ān had existed eternally (*azaliyya*). And, remaining with the dynamics of internal-Sunni tensions, in the medieval periods heresiographers devote much attention to debating the beliefs of the Karrāmites, who were followers of Muḥammad ibn Karrām (d. 259/869) (van Ess, 2010: 1, 625 f). He led an ascetic Sunni movement but, along with his later followers, is frequently derided in the works of the Ash‘arites and other Sunni theologians for his crude anthropomorphism views. None of his original works is extant, although quotations from a book he authored on the ‘Punishment of the Tomb’ do appear in the heresiographical literature. The author of the famous heresiographical text *al-Farq bayna al-fīraq*, ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037-8) recounted debates he had with figures who were members of the movement and even later medieval writers speak of the egregious views of later

adherents of the Karrāmiyya movement (cf. van Ess, 2010: 1, 667-716 for a review of al-Baghdādīs legacy).

The school of theology associated with the legacy of Abū Manṣūr al-Māturidī (d. 333/944) has much in common with Ash‘arism: firstly, it was formulated around a rationally defined defence of traditionalist Sunni orthodoxy; secondly, notwithstanding the strength of the theoretical bases of its theological framework, it was later figures who constructed an historical school out of al-Māturidīs legacy; thirdly, the criticism of Mu‘tazilite dogmatic views preoccupied much of its early discourses. However, it also took positions on a range of issues which differed with standard Ash‘arite standpoints such as the eternal nature of the Divine act (*ṣifāt al-af‘āl*) and al-Māturidī used the presence of evil in the world as a unique argument for the existence of God. (Rudolph, 176, 1997; Cerić, 1995; van Ess, 2010: 1, 447 f). Al-Māturidī hailed from Samarqand in Central Asia and although little data are preserved about his life, he was a student of two key figures: Abū Bakr al-Juzjānī (d. 285/897) and Abū’l-Naṣr al-Iyāḍī (d. circa. 261-279/874-892) who had connections with key Ḥanafī legal scholars. In the later biographical sources ideological links between al-Māturidī and the Ḥanafī school of jurisprudence, and even its eponym Abū Ḥanīfa, are always accentuated (Rudolph, 1997:25 ff). Although al-Māturidī is credited with the authorship of a significant number of treatises, some of which offered polemical treatments of Ismā‘īlite, Shī‘ite, and Mu‘tazilite beliefs, only two of al-Māturidīs principal works survive: the *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd* and his monumental commentary on the Qur’an, *Ta’wīlāt al-Qur’ān*, sources which jointly delivered the foundational materials relied upon by later luminaries of the school. One of the striking features of Māturidīs rational discourses is the primacy which al-Māturidī attached to reconciling reason and revelation in his theological thought, in ways not matched within the Ash‘arite theological schema. The strength of his legacy is reflected in the fact that along with distinctive theological arguments which al-Māturidī advanced, his structuring of theological topics in the *Kitāb al-tawḥīd* ‘provided a template which most subsequent Sunni *mutakallimūn* followed in their own independent treatises and textbooks’ (Wisnovsky, 2005: 66; cf. Rudolph). The history of the emergence of the Māturidī school remains somewhat vague but in the efforts of figures such as Abū’l-Layth al-Samarqandī (d. 375/983-4 or 393/1002-3), Abū’l-Yusr al-Bazdawī (d. 493/1085), whose great-grandfather was one of al-Māturidī’s students, Abū’l-Mu‘īn al-Nasafī (d. 508/1115), and ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Samarqandī (d. circa. 540/1145), who produced a commentary on the *Ta’wīlāt*, and

acolytes such as al-Khabbāzī (d. 691/1292), the author of *al-Ḥādī*, a summa of Māturīdīte theological thought, the teachings of al-Māturīdī were preserved and promulgated. Significantly, it has been claimed that the abstruseness of al-Māturīdī's writing style meant in the immediate periods following his death, his work did not receive the attention it merited and even later Māturīdī adherents preferred the more accessible treatments of his theology written by later acolytes (Aldosari, 2013). Still, it would appear that in Transoxania the scholastic theology championed by al-Māturīdī was competing with traditionalist based approaches to theology and creeds supported by certain Ḥanafites which eschewed the themes and approaches covered in a work such as the *Kitāb al-tawḥīd* (*the Book of 'Divine' Unity*). For example the *Sawād al-a'zam* (*The Vast Majority*) composed by al-Ḥākim al-Samarqandī (d. 342/953), whose author is listed as one of al-Māturīdī's students and even described as being a Māturīdīte, is not concerned with rational theological themes but general creedal statements and there are even issues as to whether he was a direct student of al-Māturīdī (Aldosari, 2013: 197-9; cf. van Ess, 2010: 1, 448; Watt). In respect of the traditionist tendencies of scholars from this region links are often made with the legacy of the Egyptian scholar al-Ṭahāwī (d. 321/933), whose creedal tract was the subject of a number of commentaries, becoming revered among opponents of *kalām*. The fact that the projection of the historical depth of the Māturīdī school of thought was part of a narrative promoted by later scholars should not detract from the pre-eminence of al-Māturīdī's work and the vigour and depth of his approach to rational theology, a fact which allowed a school of thought to be configured around his legacy. In the context of the history of classical *kalām* discourses the Māturīdī contribution to their elaboration is substantial. Comparisons between al-Māturīdī and al-Ash'arī are often made: Frank concluded that al-Māturīdī's thought shows a 'unique mix of elements and attitudes' but that he appears less rigid in his system of rational thought when compared with a figure such as al-Ash'arī, who set out to demonstrate that his 'speculative system was founded, and in all matters validated through, the traditionally authenticated sources.' (Frank, 1991)

Turning to the later heirs of al-Ash'arī's theological legacy, Ibn Fūrak (d. 406/1015) is prominent among individuals who preserved his doctrinal ideas and theses. He was born in the city of Isfahan and spent time in Baghdad, Rayy, and Nishapur, where a seminary was established for him. As a student of individuals who had studied with al-Ash'arī, Ibn Furak authored a number of important works included among which are the *Mujarrad maqālat al-shaykh Abī'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī*, which

represented a summary of the basic theological beliefs of al-Ash‘arī; a work on technical definitions used in theology, *Kitāb al-ḥudūd*; a critique of the anthropomorphic interpretation of Prophetic traditions, *Ta‘wīl mushkil al-āthār* (*Exposition of Ambiguous Dicta*); an exposition of a treatise attributed to Abū Ḥanīfa, *Kitāb al-‘Ālim wa’l-muta‘allim*, and he is even credited with compiling a biographical compilation devoted to the ‘classes of theologians’. Among Ibn Fūrak’s pupils were distinguished individuals such as Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066), the traditionist and Abū’l-Qāsim al-Qushayrī (d. 465/1072). Equally influential among early Ash‘arite figures is al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1013) who is credited with having authored fifty works, including the *Kitāb al-Tamhīd* (*the Book of Theological Preliminaries*) and the *Kitāb al-inṣāf fīmā yajibu i‘tiqāduhu* (*Scrupulousness Regarding Requisite Matters of Religious Belief*); he was also the author of a defence of the Qur’an (*al-Intiṣār li’l-Qur‘ān*); a further treatise on its inimitability, *Iḥzāz al-Qur‘ān*, and even a text which examined the phenomena of miracles, magic and divination, confirming the eclectic flavour of *kalām* discourses. Some indication of the extent of his expertise is reflected in his composition of a hugely important legal work entitled *al-Taqrīb wa’l-irshād*, which provided a detailed synthesis of the sources of law. Interestingly, ‘Abd al-Jabbār and his student Abū’l-Ḥusayn al-Basrī both produced similar treatments: the former was the author of the *Kitāb al-‘umad* and the latter produced a commentary on the text entitled *Kitāb al-mu‘tamad fī uṣūl al-fiqh*. It was in such works that legal discourses were often appraised through the lens of theological constructs; al-Bāqillānī’s work is without question a seminal contribution to the field. Perhaps among the most influential of classical Ash‘arite theologians is al-Juwaynī (d. 478/1085), and among his outstanding works included the *Kitāb al-Shāmil* (*the Compendious ‘on Matters of Theology’*), the *Kitāb al-Irshād* (*the Book of Guidance*), the *Aqīdah al-Niẓamiyya* (*The Creed of the Niẓāmiyya*), a work on disputation (*al-Kāfiyya fī’l-jadl*) and his *Burhān fī uṣūl al-fiqh* which effectively fuses the theory of law making use of theological paradigms (Walker, 2000: xx-xxx). Both al-Juwaynī and al-Bāqillānī composed commentaries on al-Ash‘arī’s works and such was the standing of the *Kitāb al-Irshād* that it was subject of a number of exhaustive commentaries which, from the standpoint of historian of the Ash‘arite school, are helping to define major conceptual developments within classical and late medieval expressions of Ash‘arism.

Al-Juwaynī was the mentor of Abū Ḥamid al-Ghazālī (555/1111) whose legacy to classical Islamic thought is prodigious. It should be noted that notwithstanding his celebrated legal and related works, his impressive repertoire of

texts includes the famous *Tahāfut al-falāsifa* (*the Incoherence of the Philosophers*); the *Maqāsid al-falāsifa* (*Aims or Propositions of the Philosophers*); theological treatises such as *al-Iqtisād fi'l-i'tiqād* (*Moderation in Belief*); *Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn* (*Revival of the Religious Sciences*), *Fayṣal al-tafrīqa bayna al-Islām wa'l-zandaqa* (*the Distinctive Criterion between Faith and Heresy*); and, notably, his last work, *Ijām al-'awāmm 'an 'ilm al-kalām* (*Restraining the Common Folk from the Science of Speculative Theology*) (Griffel, 2009: 361-67 for an annotated listing of his works). Assessments of al-Ghazālī's contribution to classical Islamic thought have gone through a sea change over the past few decades, although discussions about his legacy are critical for a broader contextual understanding of the history of *kalām*. Ironically, his legacy is inextricably linked with the philosopher he spent so much time criticising and disavowing, Ibn Sīnā, or Avicenna (d. 428/1037). It used to be surmised that as a result of al-Ghazālī's critique of the philosophers and their systems of thought, interest in the discipline declined in the Islamic world. However, circumspect analyses of his various works have revealed that he himself had made extensive use of Avicennan analogues in his own abstractions across a range of contexts and that far from presaging a period of stagnation in the study of philosophy, the post-Ghazalian world was one in which the philosophical sciences flourished and proliferated. Differences do exist among modern scholars about the framework governing al-Ghazālī's use of Avicennan theses and their place within the wider schema of his thought and the genuine nature of his attitude to philosophy (Frank, 1992: 86; Griffel, 2009: 107-9 and 276-7; Marmura, 2002: 107-8). Robert Wisnovsky referred to his 'assiduous incorporation of basic metaphysical ideas into central doctrines of Sunni *kalam*', but contended that the so-called 'Avicennan turn' in Sunni *kalām* was initiated before al-Ghazālī through the preceding work of al-Juwaynī and al-Pazdawī, and that even Avicenna's formulation of the central notion of the necessary of existence is linked to responses to Sunni theological discussions on the eternity of the divine attributes (Wisnovsky, 2005: 65-6). In addition to highlighting al-Ghazālī's appropriation of significant Avicennan theses, Frank did maintain that his commitment to Ash'arite theology was 'tenuous in the extreme', referring to doctrinal inconsistencies regarding his views on occasionalism (the denial of natural causality), and the metaphysics of resurrection; Frank even questioned whether his system of theology was sufficiently thought through, although significant aspects of his argument were contested by both Michael Marmura and Frank Griffel (Frank: 1994: x; Marmura, 2002: McGinnis, 2006, 441 ff). Furthermore, in the attempt to achieve an understanding of his legacy and approach which places

inconsistencies and contradictions in his thought within the vector of broader Ash‘arite epistemological paradigms and limitations, Griffel refers to al-Ghazālī setting out to achieve ‘the naturalization of the philosophical tradition into Islamic theology; and that in his writings can be found ‘an attempt to integrate Aristotelian logics into the tradition of *kalām*.’ (Griffel, 2009:7).

Certainly, it should be noted here that classical scholarship had alluded to incongruities in al-Ghazālī’s system of thought: the Ḥanbalite trained scholar Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) regularly speaks of Avicennan influences and analogues which underpin al-Ghazālī’s work; and Ibn Rushd (d. 595/1198), who was persistently critical of the Ash‘arites, actually accuses al-Ghazālī of adopting an emanationist theory in the latter’s *Mishkāt al-anwār* (*Niche of Lights*), which contradicts the widely trumpeted view among rational theologians that the world was created *ex nihilo* (Treiger, 2007: 1-6). The Andalusian scholar al-Ṭurṭūshī (d. 520/1126) likewise speaks of al-Ghazālī being learned but qualifies this by mentioning his perilous fusing of philosophical and mystical concepts in his work, particularly the *Ihyā’*. The historian Ibn Khaldūn had referred to the *kalām* of the later Ash‘arite cynosures as constituting a philosophically absorbed enterprise. And on that point, as far as charting the later trajectories of *kalām* discourses is concerned, particularly in their Sunni environment, much has been made of the fact that in the post-Ghazālīan world, such was the level of integration of philosophical constructs and concepts in *kalām*, that individuals such as Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210) and the Shī‘ite scholar Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī (d. 762/1274) together with other scholars ‘must be considered philosophers as well as theologians’ (Griffel, 2009: 7). Similarly, Ayman Shihadeh refers to these shifts in terms of the ‘rise of neo-Ash‘arism’, and suggests that they were given ‘definitive formulation in the thought of al-Rāzī’, but he also makes the important distinction that the classical Ash‘arite theological tradition which continues the legacy of the pre-Ghazālīan theologians, ‘until the third quarter of the sixth/twelfth century’, can be found to be represented in the works of scholars such as Abū’l-Qāsim al-Anṣārī (d. 512/1118), al-Kiyā al-Harrāsī (d. 504/1110) and others (Shihadeh, 2012: 434-5). Some sense of the richness of *kalām* discourses can be demonstrated through reference to an area such as ethics: Lenn Goodman refers to the monumental contribution to ethics by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī and notes that the independence of his thought is demonstrated through his theory of human actions which displays distinct and inventive departures from the classical Ash‘arite position and takes on board an eclectic range of influences (Goodman, 2003; cf. Shihadeh,

2006: 44). Within the context of these sorts of transitions in the study of *kalām*, Demitri Gutas did comment that ‘the development of philosophical thought after Avicenna and its relation to *kalām*, just like its correlative, the philosophical turn of *kalām* after al-Ghazālī’s “Avicennization” of it, are taking centre stage in contemporary research’, even predicting that ‘in all likelihood will occupy it for the rest of this century’. Still, such subject areas represent a proportion of the many facets of *kalām* discourses, which as outlined in the introduction to this essay, cover such a variegated selection of theological themes and issues, especially as there remains so much to be discovered about the periods which precede these historical paradigmatic changes and shifts within the discipline and even those which proceed them. Moreover, in a work such as the *Sharḥ al-mawāqif*, the theological commentary composed by al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (816/1413), a circumspect review of the topics covered in the work underlines the sheer theoretical depth and maturity that the discourses of *kalām* had achieved in the late medieval periods, although research on these later periods is still developing.

Reactions to *kalām* and Inter-Sunni Polemics

As has been evident from the brief discussions of reactions to the legacy of Ibn Kullāb, al-Ash‘arī, and even al-Māturīdī, scholars of a conservative and arch-traditionalist bent who favoured the more elementary promotion of expressions of the articles of faith and doctrine through reference to catechisms and creeds were highly critical of *kalām* discourses. Questions were raised about the validity of rationally derived theological theses which were generated through the use of theoretical paradigms; and there were criticisms voiced about the usefulness of conclusions derived from discursive and intuitive use of logical strategies. This appears to be replicated among later figures who often pejoratively equate the theological discourses devised by the Ash‘arites with forms of Mu‘tazalism; over subsequent centuries the epithet *jahmī* was to become a derogatory label used to denigrate theological opponents and was even used by traditionists to criticise Sunni figures whose doctrinal positions were viewed as being compromised by Mu‘tazilite influences. For example, al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), who is renowned for his pre-eminence in the exegetical, historical, and legal sciences, was criticized by the traditionist Ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (d. 316/928) for harbouring *jahmī* views on account of contentious theological topics and opinions he included in his

commentary on the Qurʾān; and much of the hostility he encountered to his work was linked with theological and other related issues (Shah, 2013: 102 ff). To stress the simplicity of the traditionists' creed, al-Sijistānī composed a versified summary of doctrinal statements which he referred to as the *Manzūma al-Hāʾiyya*. Aversion to philosophical theology among traditionist scholars led George Makdisi to question the accepted narrative in western academic studies regarding Ashʿarism being the principal representative of Sunni orthodoxy, chiefly in terms of its close association with the Shāfiʿite school of jurisprudence (Makdisi, 1962 and 1963). Makdisi argued that in the medieval periods many leading Shāfiʿite and Mālikite jurists distanced themselves from Ashʿarism. Makdisi's arguments were formulated on the basis that one should not confuse the traditionalist orthodoxy of al-Ashʿarī, as championed in the *Ibāna*, with the forms of philosophical theology enhanced and preserved by his acolytes over subsequent centuries, although it could be argued that Makdisi's own arguments were heavily influenced by Ḥanbalī narratives. It has been noted that Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal was averse to the defences of orthodox doctrine mounted by Ibn Kullāb, al-Muḥāsibī and al-Qalānīsī and the doctrinal theses generated by them; and over the centuries, Ḥanbalism and the traditionists associated with them became renowned for their championing of traditionalism and shunning of *kalām* discourses. The antithesis between advocates and detractors of *kalām* is a recurring theme throughout the history of theology, although, the opposition between attitudes towards *kalām* is not simply an expression of orthodox versus non-orthodox tensions, but constitutes a debate within traditionalism about methods and the actual validity of the theological theses being defended, although it is also conducted in light of an on going ideological tussle between Sunni and non-Sunni groups. The works of traditionist figures such as Ibn Manda (d. 301/911), Ibn Khuzayma and, in later years, Ibn Baṭṭa al-ʿUkbarī (d. 387/997) are emblematic of such tensions. Legend has it that when al-Ashʿarī composed the *Ibāna* he presented it to the Ḥanbalī al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Barbahārī (d. 329/941), who scorned at it (Frank, 1994:91-2). However, al-Barbahārī is on record as speaking of the 'baleful nature of the *kalām*-based procedure', commenting that 'such a method led to the igniting of doubts in the heart even though its proponent may arrive at truth and the *sunna*' (Shah, 2013:108). And therein lies the disjunction which separates *kalām* from traditionist discourses. In a work entitled *al-Radd ʿalā Bishr al-Marīsī*, the traditionist ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd al-Dārimī (d. 280/868) actually produced a treatise which retrospectively castigated the speculative theological doctrines promulgated by Bishr al-Marīsī (d. 218/833). And

texts which set about explicating staunch traditionist views on basic doctrinal issues do abound in these periods: for example, Abū Bakr al-Khallāl (d. 311/926) who preserved substantial portions of Ibn Ḥanbal's legal legacy in his *Kitāb al-Sunna*, also includes materials which are intrinsic to traditionist theological narratives such as discussions affirming the heavenly throne, intercession and other basic creedal points, but his treatment is driven by an aversion to philosophical theology. This is also the case for the *Kitāb al-sunna wa'l-radd 'alā 'l-Jahmiyya*, which was composed by 'Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 290/903), and includes discussions on the heavenly vision; the divine throne and the reality of God's being seated upon it; and even the coming of the anti-Christ (Shah, 2013: 112). Specific treatises and tracts devoted to admonishing *kalām* and its proponents do abound in the medieval periods: the famous mystic Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī was the author of a tract entitled *aḥādīth fī dhamm al-kalām wa-ahlihi* (*Disquisitions on the Censure of Speculative Theology and its Proponents*); while in a much more extensive treatment another eminent mystic al-Harawī (d. 481/1088) compiled a similarly titled text which adduced a stream of statements ascribed to principal traditionist figures admonishing *kalām*; he included sections in which successive classes of Ash'arite and Kullābite theologians are traduced for their rationally derived theological views, adopting an innovative biographical arrangement to deliver his condemnation of *kalām*. Certainly, some early mystics' aversion towards *kalām* is viewed as a reflection of their preferring to direct their energies to matters of the heart (Karamustafa, 2007: 20 f). The composition of texts which criticized *kalām* continued over successive historical periods: Ibn Qudāma (d. 620/1223), the renowned Ḥanbalī jurist, composed a treatise entitled: *Taḥrīm al-naẓar fī kutub 'ilm al-kalām* (*The Prohibition of Studying Books on Speculative Theology*) (Makdisi, 1960: passim). It was apparently aimed at censuring the activities of Ibn 'Aqīl (d. 513/1119), a distinguished Ḥanbalite jurist and theologian, who in his own lifetime had been compelled to sign a retraction having been censored for harbouring Mu'tazilite and Sufi sympathies. Ibn 'Aqīl was a student of the influential al-Qāḍī Abū Ya'lā (d. 458/1066), who was the author of a number of theological treatises which unapologetically used rationally based theological techniques to defend traditionalist and Ḥanbalite theology, although, to an extent, he seems to have avoided the pique of his Ḥanbalite peers. Traditionist texts which censured *kalām* such as those authored by Ibn Qudāma and al-Harawī appealed principally to the authority of incriminatory statements made by the Pious Ancestors and later prominent scholars in which *Kalām* in all its guises and formats is denounced, but

such texts seldom engage in a rationally based critique of its theoretical arguments and theses, but simply stress that scholars noted for their pious religiosity, would not have approved of such rationally focused endeavours. Hostility to philosophical theology and its methodologies was presented in such approaches as a default position of traditionalism (Makdisi, 1990: 13). The criticism of the arguments and paradigms advanced by rational theologians did inform the works of scholars such as Ibn Rushd and Ibn Taymiyya and, although, somewhat paradoxically, they show a mastery of the subtleties of *kalām* techniques and arguments which enables them to partake in debates and discussions. Ibn Rushd is particularly critical of the Ash‘arites and expends much of his condemnatory remarks drawing attention to flaws in their premises and theses, including a rebuttal of their cosmological argument for proving the existence of God, which is based on deductions made about the adventitiousness of matter and he broadens the scope of his attack by rejecting the validity of the *ghā‘ib ‘alā al-shāhid* analogy used by them. Ibn Tumart (d. 524/1129), who exerted an intellectual influence on Ibn Rushd, actually used parts of his seminal treatise *A‘azzu mā uṭlab* (*the Most Precious Aspiration*), a work which combines an inquisitive discussion of theological and jurisprudential topics, to argue for a critical reassessment of Ash‘arite and Mu‘tazalite theological constructs, despite the fact the works and thought of Ash‘arite scholars such as al-Juwaynī and al-Kiyā al-Harrasī are cited as shaping his ideas. The study of *kalām* had been proscribed by the dynasty he succeeded, *al-Murābiṭūn* (Almoravids), who ruled Spain and N. Africa from 1090-1147, but he reintroduced it along with the study of philosophy, which, as a subject, he argued was never in conflict with the general premises of religion. He argued that any perceived contradiction between the two could be reconciled through the resort to reason. This was a theme taken up by Ibn Rushd in two important treatises: *Faṣl al-maqāl* (*the Definitive Profession*) and *al-Kashf ‘an manāhij al-adilla* (*Revealing the Trajectories of Proofs*), which both, in certain respects, aim at drawing attention to perceived shortcomings in philosophical theology. Ibn Tumart’s also composed a creed, referred to as *Murshida* (*The Guide*), which, incidentally was the subject of a legal edict (*fatwā*) issued by Ibn Taymiyya which condemned the tract for peddling the philosophical concept that God’s existence was in effect an entirely abstract bare unity and he took him to task for other perceived theological indiscretions, all based on the criticism that such positions are not authenticated by the scriptural sources (Ibn Taymiyya: 14, 488 f; Griffel, 2005: 753 ff). In the works of Ibn Taymiyya critiques of rational theological doctrines, theses, and frameworks defined by all the

major rational theological movements and personalities are relentlessly pursued. His works preserve a treasure trove of materials, including quotations from sources emanating from the early and classical tradition which are no longer extant. Historically, it is important to bear in mind that he sustains the line of attack against philosophical theology which has its origins in the circles of the traditionists of the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries, although in his oeuvre the scale, depth and vigour of the coverage remain daunting. Ibn Taymiyya remarked that the Pious Ancestors do not loathe *kalām* simply because of its innovative nomenclature, which enshrines terms such as *jawhar* and *ʿarad*, but rather due to the fact that the connotations intended by the use of these terms are reprehensibly erroneous and in conflict with established religious teachings (Ibn Taymiyya, *Majmūʿ*: 3.307). Centuries earlier in the introduction to his *Taʿwīl mukhtalif ḥadīth* (*The Exposition of Variances in the Traditions*), Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889) voiced similar reservations, stating that when it comes to fathoming the import and intended meaning of the scriptural sources, theories about ‘quantum leaps (*tafra*), generated acts (*tawallud*), accident (*ʿarad*), substance (*jawhar*), quiddity (*kayfiyya*), quantity (*kamiyya*) and the notion of how (*ayniyya*) are of no utility. The responses by rational theologians to the criticisms of figures such as Ibn Qutayba and Ibn Taymiyya are animated in equally elaborate terms as the very critiques composed against them, furnishing the discipline of *kalām* with another lucrative chapter in its intellectual history; and this pattern continues over successive centuries. For example, when Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 750/1350) composed his poem, *al-Nūniyya*, devoted to extolling the standard creeds upheld by traditionist scholars, it was subsequently greeted with a withering verse by verse critique entitled *al-Sayf al-ṣaqīl* (*The Polished Sabre*) by Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 756/1355). Yet within traditionist circles laudatory commentaries and super-commentaries on the original poem flourished over the centuries. Finally, one might also draw attention to the ‘internal dynamics of *kalām* polemics’ by noting the dispute between two ‘Ashʿarite’ scholars, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī and Ibn Ghaylān (d. circa. 590/1195). Ibn Ghaylān composed a refutation entitled *Ḥudūth al-ʿālam* (*the Temporality of the World*) in which he rebutted Ibn Sīnā’s arguments for the eternity of the world, taking his cue from al-Ghāzālī’s arguments in the *Tahāfut*. Yet he was involved in acrimonious exchanges with al-Rāzī over the efficacy of his approach and its scriptural bases, which generally highlights the role that intellectual rivalry and the appeal to the authority of revelation played in the fleshing out of arguments, even among adherents of the same ‘ideological’ tradition (Griffel, 2009: 116-120). While

kalām may have sprung from putatively ambiguous beginnings, among its enduring qualities was its consistent ability to devise, adapt and integrate modes of thinking. So although defending and explicating fundamental religious beliefs and political conceptions may have lain at the heart of its genesis, over time the ever increasing range of its remit as a discipline together with the sophistication of the paradigmatic frameworks and methodologies it employed serves as a measure of the strength of its historical legacy. Moreover, the fact that it inexorably influenced the discourses of the other Islamic sciences bespeaks volumes about its importance within the Islamic tradition.

MUSTAFA SHAH

Mustafa Shah, «*Kalām*: rational expressions of medieval theological thought», in Houari Touati (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mediterranean Humanism*, Spring 2014, URL = <http://http://www.encyclopedie-humanisme.com/?Kalām>

Bibliography

Allard, Michel. *Le Problème des attributs divins dans la doctrine d'al-Ash'arī de ses premiers grands disciples* (Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1965).

Ayedh Saad Aldosari. A Critical Edition of al-Hādī in Māturīdī Doctrine of the Ḥanafite-Māturīdī Imām 'Umar al-Khabbāzī (d. 691/1292)' (unpublished PhD Dissertation: Trinity Saint David University of Wales, 2013).

Athamina, Khalil. 'The Pre-Islamic Roots of the Early Muslim Caliphate: the Emergence of Abū Bakr', *Der Islam* (1999:76), pp. 1-32.

Collins, Basil. *The Best Divisions for Knowledge of the Regions (Aḥsan al-taqāsīm fī ma'rifat al-aqālīm)*. A translation of: Al-Muqaddasī, Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allah Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, *Great Books of Islamic Civilization* (Reading: Garnet Publishing, 2001).

Belo, Ibn Rushd on God's Decree and Determination (*al-qaḍā' wa'l-qadar*), *al-Qanṭara* (2006: XXVII 2) pp. 245-64.

Berg, Herbert. 'Competing Paradigms in the Study of Islamic Origins: Qur'ān 15:89-91 and the Value of *isnāds*.' pp. 259-290, in *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins*. Edited by Herbert Berg (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003).

Bernards Monique and John Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005.

Brock, Sebastian, 'Syriac Translations of Greek Popular Philosophy' in P. Bruns (ed.), *Von*

Athen nach Bagdad. Zur Rezeption griechischer Philosophie von der Spätantike bis zum Islam
(Bonn:
Borengässer, 2003), pp. 9–28.

Calder, Norman. ‘The Limits of Islamic Orthodoxy.’ In *Intellectual Traditions in Islam*.
Edited by
Farhad Daftary, 66–86. London and New York: I. B. Tauris in association with
Institute of
Ismaili Studies, 2000.

Calverley, Edwin E., and James W. Pollock, eds. and trans. *Nature, Man, and God in
Medieval
Islam: ‘Abd Allah Baydawi’s Text, Tawali‘ al-Anwar min Matali‘ al-Anzar, along with
Mahmud
Isfahani’s Commentary, Matali‘ al-Anzar, Sharh Tawali‘ al-Anwar*. Leiden, The
Netherlands:
Brill, 2001.

Cook, Michael. ‘The Origins of *Kalām*’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
(1980), pp. 32-43.

Cook, Michael. *Early Muslim Dogma* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Cook, Michael. *Commanding Right and Forbidding Wrong in Islamic Thought*. Cambridge,
UK:
Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Crone, Patricia and Fritz Zimmermann. *The Epistle of Sālim ibn Dhakwān* (Oxford:
Oxford
University Press, 2001).

Daiber, Hans. *Bibliography of Islamic Philosophy*. 2 vols. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill,
1999.

Daftary, Farhad. *A Short History of the Ismailis* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998).

Davidson, Herbert, *AlFarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes on Intellect* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Davidson, Herbert, *Moses Maimonides: the Man and his Words* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Demiri, Lejla. *Muslim Exegesis of the Bible in Medieval Cairo. Najm al-Dīn al-Ṭūfī's (d. 716/1316) Commentary on the Christian Scriptures. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation with an Introduction..* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2013.

Dhanani, Noor. *The Physical Theory of Kalām: Atoms, Space, and Void in Basrian Mu'tazilī Cosmology* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994).

El-Bizri, Nader. 'God: Essence and Attributes' in Tim Winter (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Classical Islamic Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 121–40.

Endress, Gerhard. 'The Debate Between Arabic Grammar and Greek Logic in Classical Islamic Thought', *Journal for the History of Arabic Science* (1977), pp. 339–51 (English summary, pp. 320–2).

Fakhry, Majid. *Ethical Theories in Islam* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994).

Fakhry, Majid. *Philosophy, Dogma, and the Impact of Greek Thought in Islam* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994).

Frank, Richard. Al-Ash'arī's *Kitāb al-Ḥathth 'alā'l -baḥth'*, *Institut Dominicain d'Etudes Orientales*

du Caire: *Melanges (MIDEO)*, (1988:18) pp. 83-152.

Frank, Richard. 'Elements in the Development of the Teaching of al-Ash'arī', *Le Muséon*:

Revue D'Études Orientales 104 (1991), pp. 141-90.

Frank, Richard. 'The Science of Kalām'. (*Resume: La science du kalam.*) *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* (1992:2), pp. 7-37.

Frank, Richard. *Creation and the Cosmic System: al-Ghazālī and Avicenna*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1992.

Richard Frank 'Ghazālī's Use of Avicenna's Philosophy', *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* 57 (1989), pp. 274-75.

Frank, Richard. 'The Science of Kalām'. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* (1992:2), pp. 7-37.

Frank, Richard. *Al-Ghazālī and the Ash'arite School* (London: Duke University Press, 1994).

Frank, Richard. *Philosophy, Theology and Mysticism in Medieval Islam : Texts and Studies on the Development and History of kalām*, edited by Dimitri Gutas. (Aldershot: Ashgate, Variorum, 2005). (Vol 1).

———. 1978. *Beings and Their Attributes: the Teaching of the Basrian School of the Mu'tazila in the Classical Period*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Frank, Richard.' Reason and Revealed Law: a Sample of Parallels and Divergences in *Kalām* and *falsafa*'. *Recherches d'Islamologie: recueil d'articles offert à Georges C. Anawati et Louis Gardet*, (Louvain: 1978), pp. 123-138.

Gilliot, Claude, *Exégèse, langue, et théologie en Islam: l'exégèse coranique de Tabarī (m. 311/923)* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1990).

Fyzee, A. A. A. *A Shi'ite Creed. A Translation of Risālatu'l-i'tiqādāt of Muḥammad b. 'Alī Ibn Bābawayhi Al-Qummī, Known as Shaykh Sadūq.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Gimaret, Daniel. 'Cet autre théologien Sunnite: Abū l-'Abbās al-Qalānisi', *Journal Asiatique* 277 (1989), pp. 227–61.

Gimaret, Daniel. *Dieu à l'image de l'homme: les anthropomorphismes de la sunna et leur interprétation par les théologiens* (Paris: Cerf, 1997).

Gimaret, Daniel, *Les noms divins en Islam: exegese lexicographique et theologique* (Paris: Cerf, 1988).

Gimaret, Daniel. Entry on the "Mu'tazila" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill,) 2nd edi., pp. 783-793.

Gimaret, Daniel. *La doctrine d'al-Ash'arī* (Paris: Cerf, 1990).

Gimaret, Daniel, 'Pour un rééquilibrage des études de théologie musulmane', *Arabica* (1991:38), pp. 11-18.

Gimaret, Daniel and Guy Monnot, *Shahrastani, Livre des religions et des sectes*, i, Louvain-Paris 1986.

Griffel, Frank *Al-Ghazālī's Philosophical Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

Griffel, Frank, 'Ibn Tūmart's Rational Proof for God's Existence and Unity of and His Connection to the Nizāmiyya madrasa in Baghdad.' In *Los Almohades: problemas y perspectivas* . Edited by Patrice Cressier, Maribel Fierro, and Luis Molina. 2 vols. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2005, vol. 2 pp. 753–813.

Gutas, Dimitri. *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early 'Abbāsīd Society (2nd–4th/8th–10th Centuries)* (London & New York: Routledge, 1998).

Gwynne, Rosalind. 'Al-Jubbā'ī, al-Ash'arī and the Three Brothers: the Uses of Fiction' *Muslim World* (1985:75), pp. 132-161.

Hälm, Heinz. *Shi'ism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004).

Heemskerck, Margaretha. *Suffering in the Mu'tazilite Theology: 'Abd al-Jabbār's Teaching on Pain and Divine Justice* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000).

Hegedus, Gyongyi. *Saadya Gaon: The Double Path of the Mystic and the Rationalist* (Leiden: E.J Brill, 2013).

Hoover, Jon. 'Perpetual Creativity in the Perfection of God: Ibn Taymiyya's *Hadith* commentary on God's Creation of this World'. *Journal of Islamic Studies* 15:3 (2004) pp. 287–329

Hourani, George. *Reason and Tradition in Islamic Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985). 'Islamic Theology and Muslim Philosophy' pp. 6-14.

Hurvitz, Nimrod. *The Formation of Hanbalism: Piety into Power* (Richmond: Curzon Press, 2002)

Hussein Nasr and Oliver Leamen (eds), *History of Islamic Philosophy. Routledge History of World Philosophies* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).

Laoust, Henri *La Profession de foi d'Ibn Baṭṭa* (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1958)

Jarrar, Maher 'Some Aspects of Imāmī Influence on Early Zaydite Theology' in Rainer Brunner, Monika Gronke, Jens P. Laut and Ulrich Rebstock (eds), *Islamstudien ohne Ende. Festschrift für Werner Ende* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2002), pp. 201–23).

Murad, Hasan Qasim 'Jabr and qadar in Early Islam: A Reappraisal of Their Political and Religious Implications' in Wael Hallaq and Donald Little (eds), *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), pp. 117–32.

Karamustafa, Ahmet. Ahmet T. Karamustafa. *Sufism: The Formative Period*. Edinburgh University Press, 2007).

Kazi, A.K. and J.G. Flynn (trans.), *Muslim Sects and Divisions: The Section on Muslim Sects and Divisions by Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm Shahrastānī (d. 1153)* (London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley: Kegan Paul International, 1984).

Kohlberg, Etan. *Belief and Law in Imamī Shi'ism* (Aldershot: Variorum; Brookfield, 1991).

Kukkonen, Taneli. 'Al-Ghazālī on the Signification of Names', *Vivarium* 48 (2010), pp. 55–74

Leaman, Oliver. *Introduction to Classical Islamic Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Lindstedt, Ikka. 'Anti-Religious Views in the Works of Ibn al-Rawandī and Abū'l-Alā' al-Ma'arrī'. *Studia Orientalia* 2001: 111, pp 131-58.

Madelung, Wilferd. 'The Spread of Maturidism and the Turks' in Actas IV congresso de estudos arabes e islamicos 1968, pp. 109-168, 1971.

Madelung, Wilferd. 'The Origins of the Controversy Concerning the Creation of the Qur'ān' in Félix M. Pareja Casañas (ed.), *Orientalia Hispanica: sive studia FM, Pareja octogenaria dicata* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974). Pp. 504-525.

Madelung, Wilferd. 'Al-Qāsīm Ibn Ibrāhīm and Christian Theology', *ARAM* (1991:3.1 and 2), pp. 35-44.

Madelung, Wilferd, and Paul Walker. *An Ismailī Heresiography, the bāb al-shayṭān from Abū Tammām's Kitāb al-Shajara* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998).

Madelung, Wilferd. 'Abū'l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī and Ashʿarī Theology', *Studies in Honour of Clifford Edmund Bosworth*. Volume II. *The Sultan's Turret: Studies in Persian and Turkish culture*. Ed. Carole Hillenbrand (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), pp. 318-330.

Madelung, Wilferd and Sabine Schmidtke. Abū'l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī. *Taṣaffuh al-adilla*. The extant parts introduced and edited. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006).

Wilferd Madelung. *The Succession to Muhammad: A Study of the Early Caliphate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 28–56.

Mahdi, Muhsin. 'Science, Philosophy, and Religion in Al-Farābī's Enumeration of the Sciences', *The Cultural Context of Medieval Learning, Proceedings of the First International Colloquium on Philosophy, Science, and Theology in the Middle Ages*. (Dordrech, Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1975), pp. 113-147.

Makdisi, George. 'Ashʿarī and the Ashʿarites in Islamic Religious History' (Part I and II) *Studia Islamica* (1962:17), pp. 37-80 and (1963:18), pp. 19-39.

Makdisi, George. 'The Juridical Theology of Shāfiʿī: Origins and Significance of *Uṣūl al-fiqh*', *Studia Islamica* (1984:59), pp. 5–47.

Marenbon, John. *Medieval Philosophy: an Historical Introduction*. London; New York: Routledge. 2010.

Marmura, Michael. 'Ghazālī and Ashʿarism Revisited', *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* (2002:12), pp. 91-110.

McCarthy, Richard. *The Theology of al-Ashʿarī*, The Arabic texts of al-Ashʿarī's *Kitāb al-Lumaʿ and Risālat Istiḥsān al-Khawḍ fi ʿilm al-kalām* with briefly annotated translations, and appendices containing material pertinent to the study of al-Ashʿarī. (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1953).

McDermott, Martin. *The Theology of al-Shaykh al-Mufid* (Beirut: 1978).

McGinnis, Jon. "Making Abstraction Less Abstract: The Logical, Psychological, and Metaphysical Dimensions of Avicenna's Theory of Abstraction." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association* 80 (2006): 169–83.

McGinnis, Jon. 'Occasionalism, Natural Causation and Science in al-Ghazālī.' In *Arabic Theology, Arabic Philosophy. From the Many to the One. Essays in Celebration of Richard M. Frank*. Edited by James E. Montgomery. Leuven: Peeters, 2006, pp. 441–63.

Melchert, Christopher. *Aḥmad ibn Hanbal* (Oneworld: Oxford, 2005).

Mourad, Suleiman Ali. *Early Islam between Myth and History: Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110H/728CE) and the Formation of his Legacy in Classical Islamic Scholarship* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006).

Suleiman Ali Mourad. 'The Revealed Text and the Intended Subtext: Notes on the Hermeneutics of the Qur'ān in Mu'tazila Discourse as Reflected in the *Tahdhīb* of al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī (d. 494/1101).' In *Islamic Philosophy, Science, Culture, and Religion: Studies in Honor of Dimitri Gutas*. Eds. Felicitas Opwis & David Reisman. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2012. Pp. 367–395.

. Suleiman Ali Mourad. 'The Survival of the Mu'tazila Tradition of Qur'anic Exegesis in Shī'ī and Sunnī *tafāsīr*.' *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* (2010:12), pp. 83–108.

Suleiman Ali Mourad. 'Ibn Khallāl (d. after 377/988) and his Oeuvre on the Problematic Verses of the Qur'ān *Kitāb al-radd 'alā al-jabriyya al-qadariya* (Refutation of the Predestinarian Compulsionists'.' In *A Common Rationality in Islam and Judaism*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2008, pp. 81-99.

Murad, Hasan Qasim. '*Jabr* and *qadar* in Early Islam: A Reappraisal of their Political and Religious Implications' in *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams*. Edited by Wael Hallaq and Donald Little (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), pp. 117-132.

Al-Khayyāt, Abū'l-Ḥusayn ibn 'Uthmān. *Kitāb al-Intiṣār* (edited and translated), Albert Nader (Beirut: Les Lettres Orientales, 1957).

Nawas, John. 'A Re-examination of Three Current Explanations for Al-Ma'mūn's Introduction of the *Mihna*', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (1994:26.4) pp. 615-629.

Obermann, Julian. 'Political Theology in Early Islam: Ḥasan al-Baṣrī's Treatise on *Qadar*', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1935:55).

El-Omari, Racha, 'Accommodation and Resistance: Classical Mu'tazilites on *Ḥadīth*,' *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (2012:72), 231-256.

Pellat, Charles. (ed.) *The Life and Works of Jāhīz*, translated by Hawke, D.M. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969).

Peters, J.R., *God's Created Speech: a Study in the Speculative Theology of the Mu'tazilī Qādī al-Qudāt Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Abd al-Jabbār ibn Aḥmad al-Hamadānī* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976).

Perler, Dominik and Ulrich Rudolph (editors). *Logik und Theologie: Das Organon im arabischen und im lateinischen Mittelalter* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2005)

Pines, Shlomo. 'A Note on an Early Meaning of the Term *Mutakallim*' *Israel Oriental Studies* (1971:1) pp. 224-240.

Pines, Shlomo. 'A Study of the Impact of Indian, Mainly Buddhist, Thought on Some Aspects of Kalām Doctrines' *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* (1994:17).

Pines, Shlomo, *The Collected Works of Shlomo Pines. Volume III*, Edited by Sarah Stroumsa (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1996).

Pines, Shlomo. 'Some Traits of Christian Theological Writing in Relation to Moslem *Kalām* and to Jewish Thought' in *The Collected Works of Shlomo Pines, Volume III*, Edited by Sarah Stroumsa (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1996).

Reinhart, Kevin. 'Sunni Sectarianism'. In Yasir Suleiman (ed.), *Living Islamic History: Studies in Honour of Professor Carole Hillenbrand* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), pp. 209–25).

Rippin, Andrew. www.Oxfordbibliographiesonline: entry on theology

Rudavsky, T. (ed.), *Divine Omniscience and Omnipotence in Medieval Philosophy* (Dordrecht:1985).

Rudolph, Ulrich. *Al-Māturīdī und die sunnitische Theologie in Samarkand* (Leiden: Brill, 1997). See the translation of this work:

Sabra, Adam, 'Ibn Ḥazm's Literalism: a Critique of Islamic Legal Theory'

(I) *al-Qantara* (AQ) 2007: XXVIII. 1, pp. 7-40

Sabra, Abdelhamid, 'The Simple Ontology of *kalām* Atomism', *Early Science and Medicine* (2009:14), pp. 68–78.

Schmidtke, Sabine. *A Muʿtazilite Creed of az-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144) (Al-Minhāj fi uṣūl al-dīn)* Edited and Translated (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997).

Schmidtke, Sabine. 'Ibn Ḥazm's Sources on Ashʿarism and Muʿtazalism'. In *Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba: the Life and Works of a Controversial Thinker*. Edited by Camilla Adang, Maribel Fierro and Sabine Schmidtke (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2013), pp. 375-402.

Schöck, Cornelia 'Name (*ism*), Derived Name (*ism mushtaq*) and Description (*wasf*) in Arabic Grammar, Muslim Dialectical Theology and Arabic Logic' in Shahid al-Rahman, Tony Street and Hassan Tahiri (eds), *The Unity of Science in the Arabic Tradition: Science, Logic, Epistemology and their Interactions* (n.p.: Springer, 2008), pp. 329–60

Schwarz, Michael. 'The Letter of al-Hasan al-Baṣrī', *Oriens* (1967:20), pp. 15-30.

Al-Shāfiʿī, Ḥasan Maḥmūd. *Al-Madkhal ilā dirāsāt ʿilm al-kalām*. Cairo: Maktabat Wahba, 1991.

Shah, Mustafa. 'Mustafa Shah, 'Classical Islamic Discourse on the Origins of Language: Cultural Memory and the Defense of Orthodoxy', *Numen: International Review for the History of Religions*, 58:2-3 (2011), pp. 314-43.

Mustafa Shah. 'Trajectories in the Development of Islamic Theological Thought: the Synthesis of Kalām'. *Religion Compass* (2007: 1/4), pp. 430-454.

www.blackwell.com/religioncompass.

'Review Article of Mourad, Suleiman Ali. *Early Islam between Myth and History: Al-Hasan al-Basri (d. 110H/728CE) and the Formation of His Legacy in Classical Islamic Scholarship* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006). *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 11.2 (Edinburgh University Press: 2009), pp. 93-119.

Shihadeh. Ayman, 'From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī: 6th/12th Century Developments in Muslim Philosophical Theology', *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* (2005:15:1), pp. 141-79.

Shihadeh, Ayman 'Classical Ash'arī 'Anthropology: Body, Life and Spirit', in *Muslim World* (2012:102), pp. 433-77.

Sourdel, Dominique 'Une profession de foi de l'historien al-Ṭabarī', *Revue des Études Islamiques* 36 (1968), pp. 177-99.

Stroumsa, Sarah. 'The Beginnings of the Mu'tazila Reconsidered', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* (1990:13), pp. 265-293.

Stroumsa, Sarah. *Freethinkers of Medieval Islam: Ibn al-Rawandī, Abū Bakr al-Rāzī and their Impact on Islamic Thought* (Leiden, Boston: E.J. Brill, 1999).

Thiele, Jan. *Kausalität in der mu'tazilitischen Kosmologie: Das Kitāb al-Mu'aththirāt wa-miftāḥ al-muškilāt des Ṣaydīten al-Ḥasan ar-Raṣṣās (st. 584/1188)* Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2011.

Thomas, David. *Early Muslim Polemic against Christianity: Abū 'Isā al-Warrāq's "Against the Incarnation"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Thomas, David (ed.). *Christians at the Heart of Islamic Rule* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003).

Treiger, Alexander. 'Monism and Monotheism in al-Ghazālī's *Mishkāt al-anwār*.' *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 9 (2007): 1–27.

Van Ess, Joseph. 'The Logical Structure of Islamic Theology' in Grunebaum, G.E., (editor.), *Logic in Classical Islamic Culture*, Giorgio Levi Della Vida Biennial Conference (University of California, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970). Pp. 21-50.

Van Ess, Joseph. *Anfänge muslimischer Theologie. Zwei antiqadaritische Traktate aus dem ersten Jahrhundert der Hira* (Beiruter Texte und Studien, 14), Franz Steiner (Beirut-Wiesbaden, 1977).

Van Ess, Joseph. 'Early Development of Kalām' in *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society*, ed. G.H.A. Juynboll (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1982). Pp. 109-123.

Van Ess, Joseph. 'Wrongdoing and Divine Omnipotence in the Theology of Abū Ishāq an-Nazzām', in Rudavsky, T. (ed.), *Divine Omniscience and Omnipotence in Medieval Philosophy* (Dordrecht:1985), pp. 53-67.

Van Ess, Joseph. 'Mu'tazila' *Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan Press, 1987). pp. 22-29.

Van Ess, Joseph. 'Ibn Kullab und de *Mihna*' translated by Claude Gilliot. *Arabica* (1990:37), pp. 173-233.

Joseph van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991–7)

Joseph van Ess, 'Al-Jāhīz and Early Mu'tazilī Theology' in *Al-Jāhīz: A Muslim Humanist for our Time*. Edited by A. Heinemann, J. Moly, T. Khalidi and M. Kropp (Beirut, 2009), pp. 3-11

Josef van Ess, *Der Eine und das Andere. Beobachtungen an islamischen häresiographischen Texten* (2 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010).

Walker, Paul. and *Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī: Ismaʿīlī Thought in the Age of al-Ḥākim* (London, New York: I.B. Taurus, 1999).

Walker, Paul. *A Guide to Conclusive Proofs for the Principles of Belief* (A Translation of al-Juwaynī's *Kitāb al-Irshād ilā qawāṭiʿ al-adilla fī uṣūl al-iʿtiqād*) (Reading: Garnet Publishing, 2000).

Watt, Montgomery. *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 1998 (first published in 1973 by Edinburgh University Press)).

Wilson, Brett. 'The Failure of Nomenclature: The Concept of Orthodoxy in the Study of Islam', *Comparative Islamic Studies* 3:2 (2007), pp. 169–94.

Wisnovsky, Robert. 'One Aspect of the Avicennian Turn in Sunnī Theology'. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 14:1(2004), pp: 65-100.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *The Philosophy of the Kalām* (Cambridge, Mass., London : Harvard U.P., 1976).