

Different Interpretations of Abū Ḥanīfa: the Ḥanafī Jurists and the Ḥanafī Theologians *

Abdullah Demir **

ABSTRACT

Since the spread of Islam in Transoxiana (*Mā-warā' al-Nahr*), religious understandings based on the opinions of Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767) have always been dominant in the region. Therefore, it was not possible for other understandings, which may seem to be opposite to Abū Ḥanīfa's opinions, to be influential in the region. That Najjāriyya and Karrāmiyya could not be perennial in the region may be an example of this case.

* This article is a translated version of the paper presentation at *the International Symposium on Shaykh Sha'ban Walī (Hanafism-Maturidism) held on 05-07 May 2017 in Kastamonu, Turkey*. See Demir, Abdullah. "Farklı Ebū Hanīfe Tasavvurları: Fakih ve Mütakellim Hanefiler Örneği [Different Comprehensions about Abū Hanīfa: A Sample of Jurist and Theologian Hanafīs]". *IV. Uluslararası Şeyh Şa'ban-ı Velī Sempozyumu: Hanefilik - Mâturîdîlik [4th International Symposium on Shaykh Sha'ban Walī: Hanafism-Maturidism (05-07 Mayıs 2017)]*. Ed. Cengiz Cuhadar - Mustafa Aykaç - Yusuf Koçak. 1: 643-658. Kastamonu: Kastamonu University Press, 2017. *I would like to thank Recep Erkmen and Mehmet Bulğen for their support.*

** Assistant Professor, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Faculty of Islamic Sciences, Department of Kalam and History of Islamic Sects, Ankara, TURKEY

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, İslami İlimler Fakültesi, Kalam ve İslam Mezhepleri Tarihi Anabilim Dalı
abdillahdemir@hotmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-7825-6573

Received 25 November 2018

Accepted 31 December 2018

Published 31 December 2018

Cite as Demir, Abdullah. "Different Interpretations of Abū Ḥanīfa: the Ḥanafī Jurists and the Ḥanafī Theologians". *ULUM* 1/2 (December 2018): 259-279.

Similarly, Māturīdiyya, which benefited from Abū Ḥanīfa's treatises of creed and his rational method, could not adequately get the support of people at the time of Abū Maṣṣūr al-Māturīdī (d. 333/944) and Abū l-Mu'īn al-Nasafī (d. 508/1114) because the school was seen as an opposite approach to the prevailing imaginations about Abū Ḥanīfa. Moreover, the Ḥanafī jurists (*Ḥanafī fuqahā'*), who were influential in not only people but also bureaucracy, and the Ḥanafī theologians (*Ḥanafī mutakallimūn*), who followed al-Māturīdī's theological method, did not come to terms on their interpretations of Abū Ḥanīfa. The Ḥanafī jurists who benefited mostly from juridical sources and *manāqib* works were thinking different from the Ḥanafī theologians who relied on the treatises of Abū Ḥanīfa on such issues as the legitimacy of Kalām as a scholarly discipline, the responsibility of people of *fatra* (ahl al-fatra: people having no access to the message of Islam), and the creation of faith (*īmān*). The Ḥanafī jurists took different stance on various issues and argued that faith is not created; the informative (*khbarī*) attributes of God (*ṣifāt Allāh*) mentioned in the Qur'ān cannot be interpreted (*ta'wīl*); no one can be held accountable for faith only based on the intellect unless the message of the Prophet reaches to her or him; the people of *fatra* cannot be responsible for faith. They also stated that Abū Ḥanīfa broke his relationship with the theological (*kalāmī*) issues in the last years of his life. Although these jurists accepted Abū Ḥanīfa's distinction between faith and deeds and his view of the stability of one's faith without increasing or decreasing they condemned theological discussions on these issues by going beyond the limits of the treatise of creed. While the Ḥanafī theologians known as *the Ḥanafī scholars of Samarqand* who adopted the religious views of Imām al-Māturīdī of Samarqand acknowledged the intellect and considered it as an independent source in religion, the Ḥanafī jurists known as *the Ḥanafī scholars of Bukhārā* authorized the intellect only in understanding the transmission (*naql*) and its interpretation. The different opinions of the two groups can be seen clearly on the question of the religious responsibility of the people of *fatra*. When we look at the debates regarding Kalām and the Islamic law, we can see that the difference between these two cities (Samarqand and Bukhārā) stems from their methodological views on the epistemological values of the reason (*'aql*) and the transmission (*tradition*). Māturīdiyya is a school of theology established by the Ḥanafī theologians who upheld the necessity and significance of Kalām. It is possible to say that the Ḥanafī jurists did not contribute to the establishment and systematisation of this school; rather, they tried to prevent it. Our findings show that the Ḥanafī jurists who lived in Transoxiana differ from each other because of their different understandings of Abū Ḥanīfa. In the historical process extending today it is evident that the religious views of the Ḥanafī jurists and their interpretation of Abū Ḥanīfa have been prominent and effective, not that of Māturīdiyya, which is the understanding of the Ḥanafī theologians.

KEYWORDS

Abū Ḥanīfa, Understandings about Abū Ḥanīfa, Māturīdiyya, Hanafī Theologians, Hanafī Jurists.

Farklı Ebû Hanîfe Tasavvurları: Fakih ve Mütekellim Hanefiler Örneği

ÖZ

Māverānnehir'de İslām'ın yayılmasından itibaren her dönemde Ebû Hanîfe'nin (ö. 150/767) fikhî ve itikādî görüşlerine dayanan din anlayışları güçlü oldu. Onun görüşlerine aykırılık taşıdığı düşünülen dinî telakilerin ise halk nazarında güçlenmesi ve bölgede uzun süreli etkili olması mümkün olamadı. Neccârîlik ile Kerrâmîlik'in bölgede kalıcı olamaması buna örnek verilebilir.

Benzer şekilde Ebû Hanîfe'nin akâid risâlelerinden ve akılcı yönteminden beslenen Mâtürîdîlik'in gerek İmam Ebû Mansûr el-Mâtürîdî (ö. 333/944) ve gerekse Ebû'l-Muîn en-Nesefî'nin (ö. 508/1114) hayatta olduğu yıllarda yaygın olan “Ebû Hanîfe tasavvuruna” aykırı görülmesi nedeni ile geniş bir halk desteğine ve baskın bir konuma ulaşamadı. Zira bölgede halk üzerinde açık bir otoriteye sahip olan hatta şehir idarelerine yön veren *Hanefî fakihler* ile Mâtürîdî'nin öncülüğünü yaptığı kelâm yöntemini kullanan *mütekellim Hanefîler*'in Ebû Hanîfe anlayışları tam olarak uyuşmamaktaydı. Daha çok fikhî kaynaklar ile menâkıb eserlerinden beslenen fakih Hanefîler, kelâm ilminin dinî meşruiyeti, fetret ehlinin yükümlülüğü ve imanın yaratılmışlığı gibi konularda Ebû Hanîfe'nin risâlelerine dayanan mütekellim Hanefîler'den farklı düşünmekteydi. Fakih Hanefîler; imanın mahlûk olmadığını, haberî sıfatların te'vîl edilmemesinin daha doğru olduğunu, peygamberin daveti olmadan sadece akla dayanılarak yüce bir yaratıcıya inanma yükümlülüğünün başlamayacağını, fetret ehlinin sorumlu tutulmayacağını ve Ebû Hanîfe'nin âhir ömründe kelâm ile meşguliyeti terk ettiğini savunmaktaydı. Bu kişiler, iman tanımına amelîn dâhil olmadığı ve imanın artıp eksilmeyeceği gibi konularda Ebû Hanîfe'nin itikâdî görüşlerini benimsemekle birlikte, akâid risâlesi muhteviyatını aşacak şekilde bu konularda konuşulmasını yani kelâmî faaliyetleri mekruh kabul etmekteydi. Semerkantlı İmâm Mâtürîdî'nin din anlayışını benimseyen mütekellim Hanefîler ise akla kendi alanında bilgiye ulaşmada bağımsız bir rol tanırken; Buhara Hanefîler'i olarak atıf yapılan fakih Hanefîler, akla sadece nakil bağlamında anlama ve yorumlama yetkisi tanımaktadır. Bu husus, fetret ehlinin dini yükümlülüğü konusunda tarafların ortaya koydukları görüşlerde açıkça görülebilmektedir. Kelâm ve fıkha dair bu tartışmaların geneline bakıldığında, her iki şehir özelinde ortaya çıkan bu farklılığın, aklın ve naklin bilgi değeri konusundaki metodolojik farklılığa dayandığı anlaşılır. Mâtürîdîlik, kelâm ilminin önemli ve gerekli olduğunu düşünen mütekellim Hanefîler'in gayretleri sonucunda teşekkül etmiş itikâdî bir mezheptir. Bu ekolün ortaya çıkmasına ve sistemleşmesine fakih Hanefîler'in yeterince katkı sunmadığı hatta engel bile oldukları söylenebilir. Zira ulaşılan sonuçlar, Mâverâünnehir bölgesindeki Hanefî fakihlerin farklı Ebû Hanîfe tasavvurlarına sahip olmaları nedeni ile ayrıştıklarını göstermektedir. Günümüze uzanan tarihsel süreçte, mütekellim Hanefîler'in din anlayışı olan Mâtürîdîliğin değil fakih Hanefîler'in din anlayışının ve Ebû Hanîfe tasavvurunun etkin olduğu açıktır.

ANAHTAR KELİMELEER

Ebû Hanîfe, Ebû Hanîfe Tasavvurları, Mâtürîdîlik, Mütekellim Hanefîler, Fakih Hanefîler.

INTRODUCTION

A great deal of authors and scholars has written for and against Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767) since his death. Richness of anecdotes and stories about his life and opinions reflects different readings of Abū Ḥanīfa. Some of those readings go further and glorify him as some harshly criticize him. To give an example, those who extolled him attempted to solidify his authority by a clearly fabricated *ḥadīth* saying that “the person named Abū Ḥanīfa or Nu'mān will arrive and be the light for the Umma (community), and will revive the religion and the Sunnah,” while those who showed a hostile attitude towards him even regarded him as *Dajjāl* (a malevolent creature). In this study, I will discuss the Transoxianian Ḥanafīs' different interpretations of Abū Ḥanīfa, who accepted him as their leader in religious issues regarding the Islamic law (*fiqh*) and theology (*kalām*).

As mentioned, the religious approaches based upon the legal and theological ideas of Abū Ḥanīfa have always been prominent in Transoxiana (*Mā-warāʾ al-Nahr*) since the Muslim conquest. Thus it has not been possible for other Islamic schools of law and theology, which stood against his opinions, to gain strength and have influence in the region. Najjāriyya and Karrāmiyya seem to be good examples for this situation, because they ceased to exist against the Ḥanafī schools in the region.

It is understood that there is a distinction between the Ḥanafī jurists' understanding of Abū Ḥanīfa, who had an apparent authority over the public, because they had official administrative positions (*raʾīs/ṣadr*), and that of the Ḥanafī theologians who used the theological method of Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī (d. 333/944). The Ḥanafī jurists, who relied on legal sources and *manāqib* works (biographical genres about miraculous deeds of a charismatic leader), had different opinions on various matters such as the religious legitimacy of the Islamic theology (*ʿilm al-kalām*), the responsibility of the people of *fatra* (*ahl al-fatra*), the creation of faith (*īmān*), and the necessity of consent for faith. They differed from the Ḥanafī theologians, who grounded their opinion on the epistles of Abū Ḥanīfa. The jurists argued that faith is not a creation (*makhlūq*); it would be better not to interpret informative attributes of God; one cannot be held accountable to believe in God without receiving God's message; the people of *fatra* cannot be held responsible; Abū Ḥanīfa abandoned *ʿilm al-Kalām* and theological debates towards the end of his life. They also adopted Abū Ḥanīfa's definition of faith, in which he separates faith from deeds and argues that there is no increase or decrease in one's faith. They, however, determined that it is blameworthy (*makrūh*) to talk about theological matters if it exceeds the scope of the epistle of doctrines. In classical works, one can encounter discussions with regards to the Ḥanafī scholars of Bukhārā and Samarqand having distinct opinions on some legal issues. When examining these discussions in a broader sense on Kalām and law, it can be seen that the distinction between these scholars of the two cities is based on their different methods concerning the knowledge value of reason (*ʿaql*) and of transmitted sources (*naql*), despite exceptions.

DISCUSSIONS AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ḤANAFĪ THEOLOGIANS AND ḤANAFĪ JURISTS

1. Opinion on the discipline of Kalām: Did Abū Ḥanīfa avoid *ʿilm al-kalām* towards the end of his life?

The Ḥanafīs of Transoxiana had different opinion on *ʿilm al-kalām*. Ḥanafī scholars can be divided into two groups: Theologian Ḥanafīs who were interested in *ʿilm al-kalām* and adopted the method of Kalām, and jurist Ḥanafīs who remained distant to Kalām. This difference becomes apparent as the various transmissions (*riwāyāt*) indicated in the *manāqib* works on Abū Ḥanīfa that he is not interested in *ʿilm al-kalām* and even banned his son, Ḥammād, from any debates about the matters of faith.

The theologian Ḥanafīs or Ḥanafī scholars of Samarqand think that Abū Ḥanīfa did not approve discussions by incompetent people, from which there can be no result deduced, but not the discipline and the method of Kalām. This group consists of the Ḥanafī scholars, who were mentioned as "those of us who are truth-seekers" and who had adopted the theological method. The importance and necessity of *ʿilm al-kalām* and its religious legitimacy were advocated by the first period scholars in their works, e.g. al-Māturīdī in

*Ta'wīlāt al-Qur'ān*¹, Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī (d. 493/1100)², Abū Shakūr Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Sayyid b. Shu'ayb al-Sālimī (second half of the 5th century Hijrī /11th century AD) in *Kitāb al-Tamhīd fī bayān al-tawḥīd*³, Abū l-Mu'īn al-Nasafī (d. 508/1114) in *Baḥr al-kalām*⁴, Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Ismā'īl al-Zāhid al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī (d. 534/1139) in *Talkhīṣ al-adilla li-qawā'id al-tawḥīd*⁵, 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Usmānī (d. 552/1157 [?]) in *Lubāb al-kalām*⁶ and Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṣābūnī (d. 580/1184) in *al-Kifāya fī 'l-hidāya*⁷.

For instance, as told by al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī, Abū Ḥanīfa was willing and ambitious to teach this discipline in his first periods of his life and he encouraged his son, Ḥammād (d. 176/792), to learn this discipline. Following his father's advice, Ḥammād learned this discipline. Later, Abū Ḥanīfa forbade his son to discuss the matters of this discipline. Al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī admits that the stories about Abū Ḥanīfa forbidding his son from Kalāmī discussions might be true. However, he implements the theologians' (critical) method to the reports as in the transmission of a *ḥadīth* and reinterprets those stories without understanding them ostensibly and superficially. In this context, another story why Abū Ḥanīfa changed his attitude [towards Kalām] is very interesting: "We used to discuss those matters carefully as if there were birds sitting on our heads and we were behaving with care and caution in order not to scare them. In later periods, the intention was perceived as superseding the person with whom one discusses. The one who aims to cause the opposite to fall into blasphemy (*kufr*) becomes blasphemous himself".⁸ Al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī suggests that Abū Ḥanīfa forbade his son because he did not approve any discussions that do not go beyond obstinacy of parties. Otherwise, it is not possible for Abū Ḥanīfa to completely forbid to learn *'ilm al-kalām* and to discuss theological issues. In order to ground his opinion, he mentions Abū Ḥanīfa's *fatwā* (legal opinion) about two people discussing whether the Qur'ān was created or not (the createdness of the Qur'ān, *khalq al-Qur'ān*): "While we were sitting with Abū Ḥanīfa, a group brought two people before him and said, 'one of these two claims

¹ See Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Māturīdī, *Ta'wīlāt al-Qur'ān*, crit. ed. Bekir Topaloğlu - Ahmet Vanlıoğlu et al. (Istanbul: Mizan Publications, 2005-2010), 2: 165; 8: 217-218.

² Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, crit. ed. Hans Peter Linss (Qāhira: Dār Ihyā al-kutub al-'Arabiya, 1383/1963), 3-4, 258.

³ Abū Shakūr Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Sayyid b. Shu'ayb al-Sālimī, *Kitāb al-Tamhīd fī bayān al-tawḥīd*, Süleymaniye MS Library, Şehit Ali Paşa, 001153, 192a-192b.

⁴ Abū l-Mu'īn Maymūn b. Muḥammad al-Nasafī, *Baḥr al-kalām*, crit. ed. Walī al-dīn M. Şāliḥ al-Farfūr (Dimashq: Maktabat al-Farfūr, 1421/2000), 61.

⁵ Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Ismā'īl al-Zāhid al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī, *Kitāb Talkhīṣ al-adilla li-qawā'id al-tawḥīd*, crit. ed. Angelika Brodersen (Beirut: al-Ma'had al-Almani li'l-abhas al-sharqiyya, 1432/2011), 1: 32-33. See Abdullah Demir, "Mātūrīdī Âlimi Ebû İshâk Zâhid es-Saffâr'ın Kelâm Müdâfaası [Mâtūrīdī Theologian Abū Ishāq al-Zâhid al-Saffâr's Vindication of the Kalām]", *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi - Cumhuriyet Theology Journal* 20/1 (June 2016): 445-502. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18505/cuifd.12582>

⁶ 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Usmānī, *Lubāb al-Kalām*, crit. ed. M. Sait Özervarlı (Istanbul: TDV ISAM Publications, 2005), 37-38.

⁷ Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Kifāya fī 'l-hidāya*, crit. ed. Muhammed Aruçi (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm - TDV ISAM Publications, 1434/2013), 39-41.

⁸ al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī, *Talkhīṣ al-adilla*, 1: 56; al-Muwaffaq b. Aḥmad al-Makkī, *Manāqib al-Imām al-A'zam Abī Ḥanīfa* (Beirut: Dār al-kitāb al-'Arabī, 1401/1981), 1: 183 -184.

that the Qurʾān was created (*makhlūq*) by God, and the other the Qurʾān was uncreated (*ghayr makhlūq*).⁹ Abū Ḥanīfa said, 'Do not perform *ṣalāt* (prayer) behind both of them!' I said, 'Yes for the first one, as he does not accept the eternity of the Qurʾān,' and asked, 'But what is wrong with the second one, so that we cannot perform *ṣalāt* behind him?' Then he said, 'Both of them had disagreements over *al-dīn* (unchanging principles of faith). Disputing over the religion is an innovation (*Bidaʿ*).'¹⁰ For al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī, Abū Ḥanīfa issued this *fatwā* because the disputants were incompetent on the matter, the disagreement would continue as long as they would not back down from their obstinacy, and that it was not possible for the discussion to come to a conclusion.⁹ Al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī states that Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (d. 189/805) has the same opinion on the discussions that ground upon obstinacy and do not have the purpose to reveal the truth.¹⁰ Abū l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī, Abū Shakūr al-Sālimī, and Ḥuṣām al-Dīn al-Sighnāqī (d. 714/1314) mention that if discussions on religious matter are done over ordinary interests, such as gaining position or authority, they become blameworthy.¹¹ We can suggest based on the stories that, in case they are between competent people and its aim is to reveal the truth, theological discussions were supported by Abū Ḥanīfa and the theologian Ḥanafīs that follow his path.

A report attributed to Abū Yūsuf Yaʿqūb b. Ibrāhīm al-Anṣārī al-Kūfī (d. 182/798), in which he held that *ʿilm al-kalām* leads people to disbelief, is a reason for the jurist Ḥanafīs' opposition to Kalām. When al-Māturīdī interprets the verse in the Qurʾān as "[Prophet], they ask you about the spirit (*rūḥ*). Say: 'The spirit is part of my Lord's domain (*amr rabbī*). You have only been given a little knowledge' (al-Isrā' 17/85)", he uses this verse against Abū Yūsuf, and he states that the verse refers to the discussions that are impossible to give any results and lead to deviance, rather than to Kalām itself actually. Besides, al-Māturīdī argues that it is allowed to talk about the matters of faith and to engage with Kalām, by pointing out to the verse "Debate them in the most dignified manner" (al-Naḥl 16/125).¹²

Al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī accepts and conveys the statement of Abū Yūsuf: "He who acquires faith in a hostile manner will become a disbeliever; he who earns assets with chemistry goes bankrupt; and he who demands *gharīb al-ḥadīth* (*the rare words in ḥadīth*) becomes a liar." In addition, he states that in some stories, the statement is conveyed as "He who acquires faith with Kalām will become an disbeliever (*zindīq*)". For him, Kalām as causing a disbelief is no different from the situation of the philosophers, who discuss in a hostile manner with incompetent people. Otherwise, the statements from both Abū Ḥanīfa and Abū Yūsuf regarding debating about religious matters cannot be targeting directly *ʿilm al-kalām*. He grounds his view on the verse "Debate them in the most dignified manner," as al-Māturīdī does. Al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī thinks that, by this verse, discussion to reveal the truth is not forbidden, on the contrary, it is ordained. Therefore, the criticism here is the discussions based on obstinacy and fanaticism, which would not yield any results, and the shallow rivalries between incompetent people.¹³

⁹ al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī, *Talkhīṣ al-adilla*, 1: 56–57.

¹⁰ al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī, *Talkhīṣ al-adilla*, 1: 57.

¹¹ Nasafī, *Baḥr al-kalām*, 61; Ḥuṣām al-Dīn Ḥusayin b. ʿAlī Al-Sighnāqī, *al-Tasdīd sharḥ al-Tamhīd fī qawāʿid al-tawḥīd*, Süleymaniye MS Library, Esad Efendi, 3893, 7b-8a.

¹² al-Māturīdī, *Taʿwīlāt al-Qurʾān*, 8: 349–350.

¹³ al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī, *Talkhīṣ al-adilla*, 1: 57.

Al-Māturīdī, al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī, and other Ḥanafī theologians prefer to interpret single reports (*āḥād*) in the sources by taking their soundness and context into consideration. They apply the same method to the various transmissions (*riwāyāt*) against Kalām conveyed by Abū Ḥanīfa and Abū Yūsuf, and they evaluate these revelations regarding the intent of the owner of the word and other stories and evidences. On the other hand, the jurist Ḥanafīs, who read the same narrations superficially, adopt an understanding of "Abū Ḥanīfa as someone who repented from Kalām and who stood distant from Kalām" in spite of his theological doctrines. In the years that followed, even though the authority of Imām al-Māturīdī gained strength, it is hard to assume that Ḥanafīs, who had remained distant to Kalām, internalized the theological method and approach of al-Māturīdī.

The pioneers of the Ḥanafī theologians are Imām al-Māturīdī primarily, and Abū l-Ḥasan al-Rustufaghni (d. 345/956), Abū l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Bashāgharī (d. 4th/10th century), Abū Bakr al-ʿIyāḍī (d. second half of the 4th/10th century), Abū Salama al-Samarqandī (d. second half of the 4th/10th century), the Commentator of *Jumal uṣūl al-dīn* Ibn Yaḥyā (d. second half of the 4th/10th century), Abū Naṣr Ishāq b. Aḥmād al-Ṣaffār (d. 405/1014), Imām al-Shahīd Ismāʿīl b. Abū Naṣr Ishāq al-Ṣaffār (d. 461/1069), Abū Shakūr Muḥammad al-Sālimī (second half of the 5th/11th century), Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥaṣīrī (d. 500/1107), Abū l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī (d. 508/1115), Aḥmād b. Mūsā al-Kashshī (d. 550/1155), Maḥmūd b. Zayd al-Lāmishī (d. 522/1128), Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Ismāʿīl al-Zāhid al-Ṣaffār al-Bukhārī (d. 534/1139), Abū Ḥafṣ Najm al-Dīn ʿUmar al-Nasafī (d. 537/1141), ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Samarqandī (d. 539/1144), Tāhir b. Aḥmād al-Bukhārī (d. 542/1147), ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Usmāndī (d. 552/1157), ʿAlī b. ʿUthmān Sirāj al-Dīn al-Farghānī al-Ḥanafī al-Ūshī (d. 575/1179) and Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṣābūnī (d. 580/1164). Examining the period when these scholars lived, we can say that this understanding was prominent during the years in which Imām al-Māturīdī was alive and in the period of the Western Qarakhānids (433-608/1041-1212). In any case, this determination is confirmed by Abū l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī, who stated that al-Māturīdī fortified the religion of Islam in the region of Samarqand and saw the result of this while he was alive.

The Ḥanafī jurists, who were the majority in the region in every period, adopted literally the transmissions on Abū Ḥanīfa forbidding his son, Ḥammād to engage in *ʿilm al-kalām* and to discuss on the issue, and they allied on the issue that engagement with *ʿilm al-kalām* is not advisable and they also mentioned their opinions in their books of the Islamic law. The Ḥanafī jurists did not write any theological book by adopting this attitude in their private lives, and avoided involving in theological debates. For example, the famous Ḥanafī jurist Qāḍikhān (d. 592/1196) conveys al-Māturīdī's opinion that the person who claim that he saw God in his dream is worse than a worshipper of idols. He also mentions the view of the Ḥanafī scholars of Samarqand on the matter: "the claim that one can see God in his dream is invalid (*bāṭil*)."¹⁴ He also states his personal opinion that "it is better not to talk about this issue." This shows that he does not prefer to talk about theological matters "more than necessary". He also states openly that redundant engagement with Kalām is blameworthy. In this regard, he is of the opinion that "respecting the Qurʾān and fiqh is obligatory; redundancy in learning and discussing *ʿilm al-kalām* is blameworthy". Likewise, in the same context, he also tells the story of Abū Ḥanīfa forbidding his son, Ḥammād, to engage with Kalām. His attitude is the evidence of that he did not approve the engagement with *ʿilm al-kalām*.¹⁴ It is understood that some Ḥanafī scholars

¹⁴ Qāḍikhān Fakhr al-Dīn al-Ḥasan b. Maṣṣūr b. Maḥmūd al-Awzajandī, *al-Fatāwā Qāḍikhān*, crit. ed. Sālim Muṣṭafa al-Badrī (Beirut: Dār al-kutūb al-ʿIlmiyya, 1865), 3: 329, 331.

that focused on the discipline of Islamic law (*fiqh*) remained distant from Kalām because they thought that Abū Ḥanīfa and Abū Yūsuf had forbidden Kalāmī discussions. Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī mentions this issue in his work, *Uṣūl al-dīn*. Endeavoring to explain the religious legitimacy of Kalām, al-Bazdawī says "the scholars have failed to agree on learning, teaching and writing about Kalām," and states that "the majority of the scholars in Transoxiana" does not permit this discipline and forbids it. He also conveys that in the region people did not favorably consider people engaged with *‘ilm al-kalām*, the theologians were disdained, and that *fiqh* was held more important than Kalām.¹⁵ Considering that Ḥanafī scholars were always dominant in every period in Transoxiana, it is obvious that he refers to the Ḥanafī jurists with the expression of "the majority of the scholars in Transoxiana". As a result of this widespread consciousness among Ḥanafīs, *fatwās* against *‘ilm al-kalām* and the theologians were included even in the Ḥanafī books of law. Some of the examples for these *fatwās* include: "the testimony of a theologians cannot be accepted", "one cannot perform *ṣalā* behind a theologian", "theologians are not considered as scholars", "the names of those who have engaged with Kalām are omitted from the scholars' class", "theological books are not considered as works of *‘ilm* (knowledge)", "the term of 'scholar' only includes jurists (*fuqahā*) and traditionalists (*muḥaddithūn*), not theologians (*mutakallimūn*)", "any redundant engagement with Kalām is blameworthy".¹⁶

It can be said that Abū l-Layth ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Bukhārī (d. 258/872) and Abū l-Qāsim al-Şaffār (d. 336/947), who were contemporaries of Imām al-Māturīdī, are the leaders of the Ḥanafī jurists, who stood distant from Kalām. In the work named *al-Multaqaṭ fi l-Fatāwā al-Ḥanafīyya* by Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Samarqandī (d. 556/1161), a Western Qarakhānid jurist, the statement by Abū l-Layth ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Bukhārī that "The names of those who have engaged with Kalām are written off from the scholars class" and the *fatwā* by Abū l-Qāsim al-Şaffār that "theological books are not considered as scholarly works" are cited.¹⁷ Abū l-Qāsim al-Şaffār, one of the contemporaries of Imām al-Māturīdī, is a Ḥanafī jurist, whose opinions are frequently conferred in the Ḥanafī legal literature of the Western Qarakhānid period, such as *Fatāwā Qāḍikhān*. It is visible that his attitude against Kalām affected the jurists of the region and reflected on his works. Upon this influence, it can be determined that the pioneer of the religious understanding of Ḥanafī jurists is Abū l-Qāsim al-Şaffār. The fact that the abovementioned books followed the understanding of Abū l-Qāsim, rather than that of Abū Ḥanīfa or of Imām al-Māturīdī, on the religious legitimacy of Kalām is important as it reveals the case of the Ḥanafī understanding of religion at the time. A similar account can be seen in the famous *fatwā* corpus named *al-Fatāwā l-Hindiyya* (also known as *al-Fatāwā l-‘Ālamgīriyya*) compiled from various acknowledge sources on Ḥanafī sect between 1664 and 1672 by the joint work of a board of more than forty Ḥanafī scholars under the supervision of Shaykh Nizām of Burhānpūr (d. 1089/1678): "If one bequeaths his property to be given to scholars, this can include the scholars of *fiqh* and of *ḥadīth*; not *ahl al-ḥikma* (philosophers). If one asks whether theologians included in the context, or not?", the answer is 'no'. Abū l-Qāsim al-Şaffār gives a *fatwā* on this issue as follows: It is undoubted that the books of Kalām are not considered

¹⁵ al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 3-4, 258.

¹⁶ Demir, "Zāhid es-Saffār'ın Kelām Müdâfaası", 458.

¹⁷ Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Samarqandī, *al-Multaqaṭ fi l-Fatāwā al-Ḥanafīyya*, crit. ed. Maḥmūd Naşşār-Sayyid Yūsuf Aḥmad (Beirut: Dār al-kutüb al-‘Ilmiyya, 1420/2000), 275, 449.

scholarly works. It is based on the tradition. If one uses the word book, he does not mean any Kalāmī books. Likewise, theologians are not considered as scholars."¹⁸

It can be thought that scholars from Transoxiana, who stood distant from the discipline and the method of Kalām and who did not write any works in that field, adopted the religious understanding of Jurist Ḥanafīs. Abū l-Layth al-Samarqandī (d. 373/983), who did not mention al-Māturīdī even once in his works, can be mentioned in this context. This determination is substantiated by the fact that Abū l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī did not mention Abū l-Layth al-Samarqandī's name in the list of Ḥanafī theologians in his work, *Tabṣirat al-adilla*. The Ḥanafī Qāḍī Šāʿid b. Muḥammad al-Ustuwāʿī (d. 432/1041), who was considered as the leader (*raʿīs*) of Ḥanafīs in the region of Khurāsān in his period, can be included in this list, as he openly states his own opinion as follows in his work titled *Kitāb al-Iʿtiqād*, in which he explained the opinions of Abū Ḥanīfa on faith: "Our predecessors have kept their distance from Kalām. It is praised to satisfy oneself with the transmitted sources on the matters of faith. When someone is engaged in Kalām, he dives into disputed matters. The right way is to stay away from Kalām."¹⁹ In addition, the bottom line of work is that "he who accepts these advices should follow the guidance of scholars whose words and choices are sound by Islam and who keep their distances from Kalām."²⁰ Considering that al-Ustuwāʿī was the ancestor of the Saʿidī family which had the position of judge (*qāḍī*) in Nīshābūr and surroundings for at least a century in the Ghaznavids and Saljūks period²¹ and their sons and grandsons, who had the power of the state, possibly held his advice as to stay away from Kalām. Another reason why al-Māturīdī's views could not gain authority against Ashʿariyya is the Ḥanafī jurists' anti-Kalāmī attitude. In this connection, it must be deeply examined how the Ḥanafī jurists acknowledged a religious understanding against Kalām and how they came to this point, although it is contrary to what is stated in the epistles of Abū Ḥanīfa.

The Ḥanafī jurists of the first period, who did not write any the theological or creedal work, are Abd al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥalwānī (d. 448/1056), ʿAbdullāh b. Ḥusayn al-Nīshābūrī al-Nāṣihī (d. 447/1055), Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Ḥusayn Sughdī (d. 461/1069), Abū l-ʿUsr al-Bazdawī (d. 482/1089), Shams al-Aʿimma Muḥammad al-Sarakhsī (d. 483/1090), Khāharzāda Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn al-Bukhārī (483/1090), Abū Naṣr Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Iṣḥāq al-Rīghadmūnī (d. 493/1100), Šadr ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿUmar b. al-Māza (d. 518/1124), Šadr al-Shahīd ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Māza (d. 536/1141), Sadr Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Māza (d. 551/1156), Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Samarqandī (d. 556/1161), Šadr Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Māza (d. 559/1164), Šadr Maḥmūd b. Aḥmad al-Māza (d. 570/1174), Imāmzāda Muḥammad b. Abū al-Sharghī (d. 573/1177), Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar b. Muḥammad al-ʿAqīlī (d. 576/1180), Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-ʿAttābī (d. 586/1190), Qāḍikhān (d. 592/1196), Burhān al-Dīn al-Marghīnānī (d. 593/1197), Šadr ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Muḥammad al-Māza (d. 593/1197), ʿUmar b. ʿAlī al-Marghīnānī (d. 600/1203) and Šadr ʿUmar b. Mesʿūd b. Aḥmad al-Māza (d. 603/1207).

¹⁸ Shaykh Nizām of Burhānpūr et al, *al-Fatāwā l-Hindīyya: Al-Fatāwā l-ʿĀlamgīriyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1421/2000), 6: 146.

¹⁹ Šāʿid b. Muḥammad al-Ustuwāʿī, *Kitāb al-Iʿtiqād*, crit. ed. Seyit Bahçivan (Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1426/2005), 212.

²⁰ al-Ustuwāʿī, *Kitāb al-Iʿtiqād*, 233.

²¹ Abū Saʿd ʿAbd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr Muḥammad al-Samʿānī, *al-Ansāb*, Crit. ed. Abdullah ʿUmar al-Bārūdī (Beirut: Dār al-Jinān, 1408/1988), 1: 135.

It is understood that the Ḥanafī theologians, who adopted the al-Māturīdī's kalāmī method, lost power in the region after the Western Qarakhānid period. One of the reasons for this is anti-Kalāmī stance of the Banū Māza family (*Āl al-Burhān*), who were assigned to the presidency of the Ḥanafī scholars of Bukhārā after the exile of Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Ismā'īl al-Zāhid al-Şaffār al-Bukhārī (d. 534/1139), who used to be the president of Bukhārā Ḥanafīs (the chiefs/ra'īs of the Ḥanafīs in the town) and adopted the religious understanding of Imām al-Māturīdī, in 495/1102 by the Saljūq Sultan Sanjar b. Malikshāh (r. in Khurāsān 490–552/1097–1157 and as Saljūq overlord 511–52/1118–57). No one among the administrative jurists of this family, which gained a regional leader position under the authority of the Qara Kھیṭāy in the environment created after the Battle of Qatwan, is considered as theologian or approved a theological work. No knowledge supporting the development of 'ilm al-kalām or al-Māturīdī's religious understanding by the Banū Māza, who governed the religious educational institutes in region, was found.²² On the contrary, the religious understanding of the Ḥanafī jurists in this period gained strength and the negative attitude towards the discipline and method of kalām.

The results of the discussions on religious legitimacy and necessity of Kalām among Ḥanafī scholars of Samarqand and Bukhārā can be listed as follows:

- a) Ḥanafīs advocating for Kalām and its method argue for this understanding by relating it to Imām al-Māturīdī. Therefore, he is the pioneer of the Ḥanafī theologians. The Ḥanafīs against Kalām base their views on Abū l-Qāsim al-Şaffār (d. 336/947). It can be said that Abū l-Qāsim was the pioneer of the view that "Abū Ḥanīfa repented from Kalām."
- b) In this discussion, it is stated that the Ḥanafī theologians' interpretation of Abū Ḥanīfa is based on the written sources, the *aqā'id* (creeds) epistles attributed to Abū Ḥanīfa, whereas it is noteworthy that these Ḥanafīs had relied on the verbal stories and the *manāqib*. Being aware of this situation, Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī cites the opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa to argue for the religious legitimacy of Kalām basing his argument on a passage in *al-Ālim wa'l-Muta'allim*: "We argue against those who say that 'the Companions of the Prophet did not dive into such matters and we say that the situation of the Companions of the Prophet is like the community which had no enemy before them, thus, they did not need weapons.; On the other hand,, we are under attack and we need weapons (Kalām)."²³
- c) The scholars, who are called as Ḥanafī jurists in this study, are called Ahl al-Zawāhir by Abū Shakūr Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Sayyid b. Shu'ayb al-Sālimī, who died in the second half of the 5th(11th) century.²⁴ The term "Ahl al-Zawāhir" or "Aşḫāb al-Zawāhir" refers to those who understand the verses and ḥadīths according to the literal meanings understood at first glance without

²² Abdullah Demir, *Ebū İshâk Zâhid es-Saffâr'ın Kelâm Yöntemi [The Kalâm Method of Abū Ishâq al-Zâhid al-Şaffâr]* (PhD Thesis, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Sivas, 2014), 87-93; Id, *Ebū İshak es-Saffâr'ın Kelâm Yöntemi [The Kalâm Method of Abū Ishâq al-Şaffâr]* (Istanbul: TDV ISAM Publications, 2018).

²³ Abū Ḥanīfa, *al-Ālim wa'l-Muta'allim*, In *İmam-ı Âzam'ın Beş Eseri [The Five Works of Imām al-A'zam Abū Ḥanīfa]* (Istanbul: IFAV Publications, 1992), 14.

²⁴ Abū Shakūr al-Sālimī, *al-Tamhīd*, 192a-192b.

considering the facts of meanings and the reasons for judgements and the purpose of statements.²⁵ By using the term "Ahl al-Zawāhir", Abū Shakūr al-Sālimī suggests that the Kalām opposition is the product of a perspective that does not take the meaning and the purposes of the the *naṣṣ* (pl. *nuṣūṣ*: text; the *Qurʾān* and *Sunnah*) into account. This is an expression of the methodological difference that has emerged between jurist and theologian Ḥanafīs.

- d) The results showed that the people who used the theological method had a minority status in the region and the use of this method decreased after al-Māturīdī. As known, al-Māturīdī lived in the city of Samarqand and died in 333/944 during the reign of the Sāmānids (204-395/819-1005), which ruled the regions of Khurāsān and Transoxiana for nearly two centuries. The date of his death coincides with the time in which Sāmānids' power was falling into a sixty-year decline and collapse right after the amīr Nūḥ (I) b. Naṣr (r. 331-43/943-54) came to power in 331/943. In this process, it can be said that the interest in intellectual disciplines, including *ʿilm al-kalām*, decreased in the region, whereas the popularity of the disciplines of fiqh and ḥadīth increased, because the discipline of fiqh gained prominence against *ʿilm al-kalām* after al-Māturīdī. In this context, it is also thought that the Madrasa called Dār al-Jūzjāniya²⁶ where al-Māturīdī taught turned its focus from the teaching of Kalām to teaching fiqh and ḥadīth after al-Māturīdī's death. This conclusion was drawn by examining the biographies of the people who taught in Dār al-Jūzjāniya.²⁷ 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Samarqandī's statements also confirm this situation. Al-Samarqandī states that Imām al-Māturīdī had been neglected in his home town for nearly two centuries and the Ḥanafī jurists had not been interested in the theological discussions of in his works and studied fiqh only.²⁸ Similarly, Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī states that in Transoxiana they abstained from *ʿilm al-kalām* and this discipline was not considered favorably, and instead fiqh was regarded more important.²⁹ After al-Māturīdī, the consolidation of the anti-Kalām stance in Transoxiana led the Ḥanafī scholars to deal with fiqh rather than Kalām and to compile sources for this discipline.³⁰ The Ḥanafī jurists, who refused *ʿilm al-kalām*, even thought that the engagement with kalām was blameworthy, did not promote this discipline nor write a book on Kalām or faith. The fact that Abū l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī did not mention the name of any theologians in the list which he included Imām al-Māturīdī until the IV.th (X.th) century and the fact that not a single noteworthy theologian scholar emerged from the region among Ḥanafīs within a century after the fall of the Sāmānids until the time of Nasafī confirm that no theological work had been written

²⁵ H. Yunus Apaydın, "Zâhiriyye", *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 2013), 44/93-100.

²⁶ Ibn Yaḥyā, *Sharḥ Jumal uṣūl al-dīn*, Süleymaniye MS Library, Şehit Ali Paşa, 1648/2, 161b.

²⁷ Demir, *Ebû İshâk Zâhid es-Saffâr'ın Kelâm Yöntemi*, 41.

²⁸ 'Alā' al-Dīn Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Samarqandī, *Mizān al-uṣūl fī natā'ij al-uṣūl*, crit. ed. M. Zaki Abd al-Barr (Qāhira: Maktaba Dār al-turāth, 1418/1997), 3.

²⁹ al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 258.

³⁰ Maḥmūd b. Sulaymān al-Kafawī, *Katā'ib a'lām al-akhyār min fuqahā' madhhab al-Nu'mān al-mukhtār*, Tehran Kitabhāna-yi Majlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī, 1385, 109b; Şükrü Özen, "V. (X.) Yüzyılda Mâverâünnehir'de Ehl-i Sünnet-Mu'tezile Mücadelesi ve Bir Ehl-i Sünnet Beyannamesi [The 4th/10th Century Conflict between Ahl al-Sunnah and Mu'tazila in Transoxania and a Declaration of Ahl al-Sunnah], *İslâm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 9 (2003): 62-63.

- on the Ḥanafī theology in Transoxania.³¹ In addition, the result is fortified by the fact that, as ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Samarqandī put it, there is no information that a comprehensive work, in which the theological method was used, was written in the two-century period from al-Māturīdī to al-Nasafī.
- e) In the two different periods of Transoxiana, where the Ḥanafī jurists’ understanding of religion was dominant, there are works that were written by the theological method and exceeded the size of an epistle. The first period is the time of al-Māturīdī. These developments were based on the obligation to propose an answer to the Ḥanafī-Mu‘tazilī theologian, Abū l-Qāsim al-Ka‘bī (d. 319/931) and Bāṭini- Ismā‘īlīs, who tried to spread their views over the region and to put forward the misconceptions of Ḥanafīs. In *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd* of al-Māturīdī, it is clear that the views of al-Ka‘bī are tried to be refuted. A similar development based on the argument is seen in the Western Qarakhānids period, as Abū l-Mu‘īn al-Nasafī had to respond to Ash‘arīs, who were in an effort to spread in the region in the second half of the 5th (11th) century, and their serious allegations against Ḥanafīs on the divine attribute of *takwīn* (creation). As a result of his efforts and his putting forward al-Māturīdī, the religious understanding of al-Māturīdī, in which the basic opinions of the Ḥanafīs on faith were based on the transmitted sources and intellectual evidences or the understanding of Abū Ḥanīfa were re-enacted and strengthened in the region. Until this time, ‘ilm al-kalām and the religious understanding of al-Māturīdī, the pioneer of the Ḥanafīs, remained in the background. It is seen that the need for argument is in the foreground in the works written with the theological method in Transoxiana and in the consolidation of the theological understanding in the relevant periods. This situation can be interpreted as the Ḥanafī jurists had the authority and their understanding of Abū Ḥanīfa became widespread when the persistence to struggle and the ability of discussion of a theologian was not needed for the Ḥanafīs. Until the need for the power of debating and arguing of a theologian in the Ottoman society, the fact that ‘ilm al-kalām, Abū Ḥanīfa’s views, and Māturīdīyya was at the background seem to be linked to the fact that the Ottoman Empire was a society guided by jurists. For example, what Muḥammad b. Farāmarz Mollā Khusraw (d. 885/1480), the most powerful figure of his time, says about Kalām is this: “One can leave his home country without his parents’s permission to study disciplines, except Kalām because Imām al-Shāfi‘ī says that ‘It is better for the servant to appear before God with a great sin, rather than the sin of Kalām. When this is the verdict for the discipline of Kalām in his time, imagine the verdict for Kalām that is full of garbled, innovative, and silvered words of philosophers’.³² In modern Turkey, the fact that religious formations or media preachers trying to steer the society through legal *fatwās* are more effective than the religious understanding represented by the departments of theology, which are nurtured by the religious understandings of the scholars, who value reason and thought, such as Abū Ḥanīfa and Imām al-Māturīdī, can be

³¹ M. Sait Özervalı, "Alāeddin el-Üsmendî'nin Kelâmcılığı ve Bilgi Teorisi: Mâverâünnehir Kelâm Düşüncesine Bir Katkı [‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Usmānī’s Theology and Epistemology: A Contribution to Kalām Thought in Māwarā al-Nahr]," *İslâm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 10 (2003): 41.

³² Mollā Khusraw Muḥammad b. Farāmarz, *Durar al-ḥukkām* (Āsitāne: Shirkat Şahāfiya al-Uthmāniya, 1317), 1: 323. See Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Namarī, Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf b. ‘Abdillah, *Jāmi‘ bayān al-‘ilm wa-faḍlihi wā mā yanbaghi fī riwāyatihī wa-ḥamlihī* (Cairo: Maktabah Ibn Taymiyya, nd.), 365-366.

interpreted as the religious understanding of the Ḥanafī jurists or Ḥanafī-like Salafis are widespread. Although scientific research has been made on Imām al-Māturīdī and Māturīdiyya in the Faculty of Theology in the Republican period, it can be said that the religious understanding of al-Māturīdī could not spread due to influence of communities and religious sects in the social life, which are nurtured from the works of the Ḥanafī jurists.

The view that the Ḥanafī jurists began to consider Kalām as blameworthy in the period of the Western Qarakhānids created a basis for the exclusion of other disciplines, especially philosophical disciplines, as there would be no justification for philosophical disciplines if Kalām were to be blameworthy and forbidden. Therefore, the effect of this change in the Ḥanafīs' religious understanding under the decline in the scientific fields after the Sāmānids period (third–fourth/ninth–tenth centuries) is also worth exploring because some Ḥanafīs were driven away from the understanding of Abū Ḥanīfa valuing reason to the understanding of Abū Ḥanīfa forbidding Kalām. In the historical process to the present, it is clear that the religious understanding of the Ḥanafīs and their view of Abū Ḥanīfa have been effective, rather than Māturīdiyya, which is the religious understanding of the Ḥanafī theologians.

f) From the last quarter of the 5th (11th) century (Hijrī 475-550), the religious understanding of Imām al-Māturīdī was revisited by the endeavors and leadership of Abū l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī against the threat of the Ashʿarīs who attempted to gain power in the region. Al-Nasafī's efforts to bring al-Māturīdī to the forefront were supported by the theologians who continued to have this understanding and in the second half of the 6th (12th) century (Hijrī 550-600) after the death of al-Nasafī, Māturīdiyya was accepted as a theological school of the Ahl al-Sunnah. In these years, even by the Ḥanafī jurists, who were distant from Kalām, al-Māturīdī was called the head of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This reminds us of the Ottoman scholars, who had a higher respect for the Ashʿarī Kalāmas they said that they were of Māturīdiyya.

2. The Power and Authority of the Reason (ʿaql): The Discussion on the Necessity of Faith Based on Reason Only

The Ḥanafī theologians or truth-seekers, in other words the theologians of Samarqand who adopted the religious understanding of Imām al-Māturīdī al-Samarqandī, gave an independent role for reason (ʿaql) as a source of knowledge in their field, Kalām, whereas the Ḥanafī jurists, who are also known as the imāms of Bukhārā, reduced the authority of reason only in understanding the revelations. This can be clearly seen in the opinions of the parties concerning the religious responsibilities of the people of *fatra*. According to what is told by Abū Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Samāʿa (d. 233/847) from Abū Yūsuf, Abū Ḥanīfa thinks as follows on the matter: "No one can make an excuse because of his ignorance in acknowledging his creator because the heavens, the earth, His self and the creation of other beings is obvious. In the case of worships (*ʿibādāt*) and other religious rules (*sharāʿi*), the people are excused unless these are proved with evidence." The second part of this word is told with open statements as follows in the work named *al-Muntaqā* of Ḥākim al-Shahīd (d. 334/945), which is not available today: "Those who have no knowledge [of Islam], do not receive the Prophet's message, or have never met any Muslim cannot be held responsible".³³

³³ *al-Ṣaffār al-Bukharī, Talkhīṣ al-adilla*, 1: 132; al-Samarqandī, *Mizān al-uṣūl*, 191-192; al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 207; al-Uṣmandī, *Lubāb al-Kalām*, 47; Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Bidāya fī uṣūl al-dīn*, crit. ed. Bekir Topaloğlu (Ankara: Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Presidency of Religious Affairs, 1998), 85-86; Id, *al-Kifāya*, 347-348;

Imām al-Māturīdī adopts the opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa on this matter and provides proof for his opinion with the theological method. According to him, if God had not sent any messengers, the people would still have to know God's existence and His unity through reason.³⁴ This opinion by Abū Ḥanīfa was adopted by the Ḥanafīs who inclined towards the ideas of the Iraqī Muʿtazilīs, as well as the Ḥanafī theologians of Transoxiana such as Abū l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī (d. 508/1115), Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Ismāʿīl al-Zāhid al-Ṣaffār al-Bukharī (d. 534/1139), ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Samarqandī (d. 539/1144), Maḥmūd al-Lāmishī (d. 552/1157), ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Usmāndī (d. 552/1157) and Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṣābūnī (d. 580/1184) who cited al-Māturīdī.³⁵ Nonetheless, the Ḥanafīs of Transoxiana like Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī (d. 493/1099),³⁶ Shams al-Aʿimma Muḥammad al-Sarakhsī (d. 483/1090) and Qāḍīkhān (d. 592/1196) think that the religious responsibility begins only when God sends a messenger. Abū l-ʿUshr al-Bazdawī (d. 482/1089) thinks that these two opposite views are presumptuous.³⁷ His brother, Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī, attributes the view that no one can be held responsible without any notice of God to the scholars of Bukhārā, whom he stated that he met with Imām al-Ashʿarī. He, however, adopts the opinion of Imām al-Ashʿarī.³⁸ Nevertheless, he knows that Abū Ḥanīfa, Imām al-Māturīdī, and other Ḥanafīs of Samarqand argue that people would be responsible regardless of any divine message. With this preference, Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī differentiates himself from the al-Māturīdī understanding. According to the system of Kalām, which is represented by Imām al-Māturīdī, reason is also a proof and it has primacy in the issues to which it can offer indubitable knowledge. Therefore, people who can realize the existence of God by their intellects are obliged to believe. This view is connected to the power and competence of reason. The Ḥanafī theologians such as Imām al-

Ḥasan b. Abī Bakr al-Ḥanafī al-Maqdisī, *Ghāyat al-marām fī sharḥ Baḥr al-kalām*, crit. ed. Abdullah Muḥammad Abdul-lah Ismāīl – Muḥammed Sayyid Aḥmad Shahhāta (Qāhira: al-Maktabat al-Azhariyya li al-turāth, 1432/2012), 267.

³⁴ Māturīdī, *Taʿwīlāt al-Qurʾān*, 5: 108; 109: 417.

³⁵ Ibn Yaḥyā, *Sharḥ Jumal uṣūl al-dīn*, vr. 19b; Maḥmūd b. Zayd al-Lāmishī, *al-Tamhīd li-qawāʿid al-tawḥīd* (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1995), 86-90; al-Samarqandī, *Mīzān al-uṣūl*, 50-51, 191; al-Usmāndī, *Lubāb al-Kalām*, 47-50; al-Ṣaffār al-Bukharī, *Talkhīṣ al-adilla*, 1: 132; al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Bidāya*, 85-87; Id, *al-Kifāya*, 347-349; al-Maqdisī, *Ghāyat al-marām*, 265-267.

³⁶ al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 207.

³⁷ Abū l-ʿUshr ʿAlī b. Muḥammad Al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-Bazdawī*, In *al-Kāfi fī sharḥ al-Bazdawī*, crit. ed. Fakhr al-dīn S. Muḥammad (Riyāḍ: Maktaba al-Rushd, 1422/2001), 5: 2130-2132.

³⁸ al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 207.

Māturīdī,³⁹ Abū Salama al-Samarqandī,⁴⁰ Ibn Yaḥyā,⁴¹ Abū l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī,⁴² ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Samarqandī⁴³ and Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṣābūnī⁴⁴ accept that intellectual judgements are split in three groups as necessary (*wājib*), impossible (*mumtaniʿ*) and possible (*jāʿiz* [*wāsiṭ/mumkin*]).

- a) Necessary (*Wājib* [*Intellectual Obligation*]): The issues that reason offers necessary knowledge and definitive judgements are these: to understand that the universe has a creator (*ṣāniʿ*), to grasp the necessity of gratitude to the Master, to appreciate truth and justice, and all matters similar to these. In this field, reason is the leader (*matbūʿ*), and revelation follows and supports reason.
- b) Impossible (*Mumtaniʿ* [*Intellectual Impossibility*]): Issues such as the impossibility of uniting the opposites in a single object and the impossibility of attributing futility to God are grasped and

³⁹ According to Māturīdī, theory (*uṣūl*) is divided into three: *Mumtaniʿ* (impossible), *wājib* (obligatory) and *mumkin* (possible). In terms of reason, *wājib* is on the position that there cannot be a report against it, as well as *mumtaniʿ*. However, there can be different positions for *mumkin*. In terms of reason, it is not possible to make any of *mumkin*'s alternatives *wājib* or *mumtaniʿ*. Prophets provide an explanation of the preferred alternative of *mumkin* in every position. See Abū Maṣṣūr al-Māturīdī, *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, 282. Furthermore, Māturīdī explains the fifth verse of the surah Isra by dividing into three, namely a) Those known apparently b) Those known with consideration and deliberation c) Those known with teaching and advice, he thereby mentions about the domains of reason and revelation. See *Taʿwīlāt al-Qurʾān*, 8: 243-244.

⁴⁰ According to Abū Salama al-Samarqandī, belief is divided into three: Intellectually *wājib*, *mumtaniʿ* and *mumkin*. *Wājib* is recognition of who gives blessing and being thankful to Him; *mumtaniʿ* is such matters as intellectually knowing that it is not true disavowal of who gives blessing and showing ingratitude to Him. As for *mumkin*, it is regarding the quantity of religious rules (*Sharāʿiʿ*), such as determining the *zakāt* (*the obligatory payment by Muslims for the benefit of the poor*) giving amount. When the reason remains incapable of directing *mumkin* to *wājib* and *mumtaniʿ*, the need of a prophet for explaining the matters of *mumkin*, directing *mumkin* to *wājib* and *mumtaniʿ*, and teaching the truths of things to people is necessary. Prophets are sent to confirm intellectually *wājib*, to reveal non-occurrence of intellectually impossible, and to explain intellectually *mumkin*. See Abū Salama al-Samarqandī, *Jumal uṣūl al-dīn*, 9.

⁴¹ Ibn Yaḥyā, *Sharḥ Jumal uṣūl al-dīn*, 19a-20a, 123b.

⁴² Abū l-Muʿīn al-Nasafī explains intellectual provisions as *wājib*, *mumtaniʿ* and *wāsiṭ* (*mumkin*). See al-Nasafī, *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, 2: 21; Id, *al-Tamhīd li-Qawāʿid al-tawḥīd*, 232.

⁴³ While ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Samarqandī indicates belief in Allah and necessity of worships as intellectual and legal (*sharʿi*) goodness, he accepts the matters such as forms, amounts and times of worships, merely legally (*sharʿi*) good (*husun bi al-sharʿ*) With this distinction, he specifies the domain of reason similar to other Māturīdīs. See al-Samarqandī, *Mizān al-uṣūl*, 46, 178-183.

⁴⁴ According to Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṣābūnī the provisions of intellect (*qaḍiyya al-ʿuqūl*) are divided into three: *Wājib*, *mumtaniʿ* and *jāʿiz* (possible). Although reason easily rule on *wājib* and *mumtaniʿ*, it hesitates on *jāʿiz* and concludes neither positive nor negative. Reason cannot reach to obligatory (*farḍ*) and prohibited (*ḥaram*) provisions and it requires the explanation of prophets in matters of *jāʿiz*. See al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Bidāya*, 46; Id, *al-Kifāya*, 180, 371. Also see al-Ṣābūnī for examples of intellectual provisions. For him knowing Allah and his attributes, *wājib*; polytheism and attributing child to Him, *ẓulm* (wrong) *mumtaniʿ*; punishments and circumstances of the grave, the resurrection after death, the gathering, the accounting of deeds, the *ṣirāt* bridge, the intercession, heaven and hell are included in *jāʿiz* in terms of intellectual provision. Reason requires transmitted knowledge in such matters. See *al-Kifāya*, 371.

rejected by reason. Reason is also the leader in this field; and revelation follows and supports it.

- c) Possible (*Jā'iz [Intellectual Possibility]*): Issues, in which the existence and nonexistence of something are equally possible, forms the 'possible' field in which the reason cannot reach a definite result. Worshiping and other religious practices (*'umūr al-shariyya*) fall within the scope of the possible in the categories of the intellectual judgements because, reason hesitates to choose between different possibilities on how to conduct worship and other religious practices (*ta-waqquf*). Therefore, reason needs to comply with revelation on these matters. After revelation determines what to do in this field, reason supports and explains what is determined by revelation.⁴⁵

As can be seen, the theologians who adopted the understanding of the al-Māturīdī have used the concepts of necessary, impossible, and possible to express the intellectual judgements accurately by determining the epistemological scopes of reason and revelation based on the judgements of reason. They acknowledge that reason can find the correct information in the fields of *wājib and mumtani'*, which include knowing God (*ma'rifatullah*), and that reason is the leader in these fields. On the other hand, rituals (*'ibādāt*) and religious practices are in the field of possible outside the reach of reason, where it cannot reach definitive knowledge. There is a need for revelation in this field. Therefore, in the absence of revelation, one's responsibility for religious judgements does not begin. Al-Ṣaffār al-Bukharī conveys this understanding from Imām al-Māturīdī as follows: "rituals and other religious practices are learnt through revelations, while the religion can be learned using reason (*Inna sabīla al-shar'a al-sam'; Fa-amma al-dīn fa-inna sabīlahu al-'aql*)".⁴⁶ The decisive factor in this discussion is whether reason is sufficient on the issues of which it has definitive knowledge. Māturīdiyya, the religious understanding of the Ḥanafī theologians, takes into consideration the balance between reason and revelation and gives authority to reason in its own knowledge field. On the other hand, the Ḥanafī jurists are separated from the Māturīdī tradition in this respect, although they say that they are Māturīdī.

3. Discussion on the Creation of Faith

Another issue that led to disagreement between the Bukhārī and Samarqandī Ḥanafīs is whether faith is created or not. Four trends emerged among the Ḥanafī jurists of Transoxiana:

- Faith is created just as any other actions men.
- Faith should not be called "created", because it can lead to the createdness of the Qur'ān.
- Reaching to the grace of God and guidance, which are the actions of God and come to mind when faith is mentioned, are not created. Yet, confession and approval, which are man's actions, are created.
- One should restrain himself from and not state any opinion on this matter.

The opinion that "Faith is created just as any other actions of men" were argued persistently by the Ḥanafīs of Samarqand, such as Abū Mutī' Makhūl al-Nasafī (d. 318/930), al-Māturīdī, Abū Salama al-Samarqandī (d. second half of the 4th/10th century), Ibn Yaḥyā (d. second half of the 4th/10th century) and al-Ṣaffār

⁴⁵ al-Ṣaffār al-Bukharī, *Talkhīṣ al-adilla*, 1: 36-37, 134-135.

⁴⁶ al-Ṣaffār al-Bukharī, *Talkhīṣ al-adilla*, 1: 132. See for Māturīdī's narrated view, al-Māturīdī, *Ta'wīlāt al-Qur'ān*, 4: 112.

al-Bukhārī. These scholars called the Ḥanafīs of Bukhārā, who believed that faith is not created, Ḥashwiyya and even accused them of ignorance.⁴⁷ Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī attributes the opinion that faith is created to all Samarqandī scholars without stating a name.⁴⁸

The view that "it is not permissible (*jā'iz*) to say that 'faith (*īmān*) is created'" is based on a report attributed to Abū 'Iṣma Nūḥ b. Abū Maryam Ja'wana al-Jāmi' al-Marwāzī (d. 173/789), who was appointed as the *qāḍī* of Marw while his mentor was still alive and was mentioned among ten students of Abū Ḥanīfa, who were eligible to be a *qāḍī*. This opinion was argued by Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abd al-Karīm al-Bazdawī, who is the father of Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī who was active in Bukhārā in the 5th (12th) century, Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Faḍl (d. 381/991), Abū Muḥammad Ismā'īl b. al-Ḥusayn al-Zāhid (d. 402/1012), Abū Muḥammad b. Ḥāmid and Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī (d. 493/1100). These people did not accept the idea that faith is created because their concern that the same might be said by some about the Qur'ān. By being persistent in their views, these scholars agreed that one cannot perform *ṣalā* behind those [al-Māturīdī et al.] who argue that faith is created. In fact, they put pressure on these people and those who were hesitant. As told by Nūḥ b. Abū Maryam al-Marwāzī, the reason for the spread of this conception was that Abū Ḥanīfa was attributed by the opinion that "faith is not created" and that he stated that this opinion will lead to the view that the Qur'ān is also created. Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad al-Bazdawī states that his father Muḥammad al-Bazdawī conveyed the same report from Nūḥ b. Abū Maryam. He then states his opinion by saying, "We also adopt this opinion, as the view of Abū Ḥanīfa is what is told by Nūḥ b. Abū Maryam."⁴⁹

Another view is that there are two aspects of faith: God's grace and guidance as being His actions are not created, and man's confession (*taṣḍīq*) and approval (*iqrār*) as being man's actions are created. This view was argued by the Ḥanafī scholars of the first period such as Abū l-Ḥasan al-Rustufaghni (d. 345/956) and Abū l-Layth al-Samarqandī, and Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ghaznawī (d. 593/1197).⁵⁰

Abū l-Mu'īn al-Nasafī (d. 508/1114) and Abū Ḥafṣ Najm al-Dīn 'Umar al-Nasafī (d. 537/1141) preferred to abstain from stating their opinions on the issue. There are interesting points in this discussion:

- a) Abū l-Yusr al-Bazdawī makes a general reference to the scholars as "the Imāms Bukhārā", including his father, who have the same opinion in this regard, and then mentions the names of those who have this opinion by using the expression of respect, *al-Shaykh al-Imām*. However, he does not specify the names of those who argue the other view, and he does not call them scholars or

⁴⁷ Abū Mutī' Makhūl al-Nasafī, *Kitāb al-Radd 'alā Ahl al-Bida' wa l-Ahwā' al-dālla al-muḍilla*, 90-91; Māturīdī, *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, 618-623; Ibn Yaḥyā, *Sharḥ Jumal uṣūl al-dīn*, 29b; al-Ṣaffār al-Bukharī, *Talkhīṣ al-adilla*, 2: 734. See for accusation of ignorance al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 154-155.

⁴⁸ al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 154-155.

⁴⁹ al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 154-155.

⁵⁰ Abū l-Ḥasan al-Rustufaghni, *al-Fawā'id*, Süleymaniye MS Library, Yeni Cami, 000547, 292a-293a; Abū l-Layth Naṣr b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Samarqandī, *Bayān 'aqīda al-uṣūl*, crit. ed. A. W. Juynboll, In *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Landen Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië*, Ser. IV, vol. 5 (1881): 274. This view is not included in the listed sixty one article in *al-Sawād al-a'zam*, but it is included in the commentary of the book "Faith is giving of Allah". al-Ḥakīm al-Samarqandī, *al-Sawād al-a'zam*, 15.

- Imāms, but as scholars from Samarqand. His choice shows that he does not want to speak about the conception represented by al-Māturīdī.
- b) Abū l-Yusr al-Bazdawī states that the scholars of Samarqand accuse those who argue that faith is not created of ignorance. Al-Māturīdī and al-Şaffār al-Bukharī are the ones who explicitly use the word "ignorance" for the jurists of Bukhārā in their works. In fact, al-Şaffār al-Bukharī also accuses those who adopted the view advocated by al-Bazdawī as being *ghabīr* (dense).
 - c) Those who argue that faith is not created by referring to Abū Ḥanīfa agreed that one cannot perform the *ṣalā* (principal prayer of Islam, forms part of the *‘ibādāt*) behind those [al-Māturīdī et al.] who argue that faith is created, in fact, they put pressure on these people and those who were hesitant. This is one of the reasons that the conception of al-Māturīdī, who argues that faith is created, could not gain power in the region.
 - d) In the Western Qarakhānid period, al-Şaffār al-Bukharī embraced al-Māturīdī’s view on the createdness of faith and advocated this opinion by using more explicit and clear expressions. However, Nasafī does not express an opinion on this subject and prefers to abstain. This situation might be linked to the fact that the Ḥanafī jurists who argued the opposite view were influential in the region and Nasafī was afraid of their reaction and repression. In fact, al-Şaffār al-Bukharī, who lived in exile for a long time, maintained Imām al-Māturīdī’s view on the matter.
 - e) The source for the opinion that faith is not created by the scholars of Bukhārā is the opinion that is attributed to Abū Ḥanīfa as told by Abū ‘Işma Nūḥ b. Abū Maryam Ja‘wana al-Jāmi‘ al-Marwazī, one of the students of Abū Ḥanīfa. al-Bazdawī states that this opinion is told from al-Marwazī by al-Bazdawī’s father, Abū Ḥasan Muḥammad al-Bazdawī. It is understood that there were different “interpretations of Abū Ḥanīfa” between the Ḥanafī jurists both on this matter and the attitude of Abū Ḥanīfa towards Kalām, in the Western Qarakhānids period. The Transoxianan scholars of the 5th (12th) century, who are mentioned above, are important jurists whose names are frequently cited in the works of famous jurists such as Qāḍikhān and al-Sarakhsī. The attitudes of the Ḥanafī jurists differ in terms of their understandings of Abū Ḥanīfa .

CONCLUSION

Māturīdiyya is a school that was formed as a result of the efforts of the Ḥanafī theologians, who thought that *‘ilm al-kalām* is significant and necessary. It can be said that the Ḥanafī jurists did not contribute sufficiently to the formation of this school. Instead, they tried to prevent it, as the results show that the Ḥanafī jurists in Transoxiana were divided into groups because they have different understandings of Abū Ḥanīfa. The Ḥanafī Theologians gave an independent role for reason as a source of knowledge in their field, whereas the Ḥanafī jurists, who are referred as the Imāms of Bukhārā, gave reason only the authority to understand and interpret the transmitted sources. The Ḥanafī theologians think that Abū Ḥanīfa did not approve the discussions with incompetent people, which will not yield any result but not *‘ilm al-kalām*. This group includes the Ḥanafī scholars, who possess the kalāmī attitude and are mentioned as “those who are truth-seekers among our people” in sources. The Ḥanafī theologians also accept that reason has the power to reach knowledge in his own knowledge field in terms of methodology. The leaders of this tradition are al-Māturīdī, Abū l-Ḥasan al-Rustufaghni, Abū l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Bashāgharī, Abū Bakr al-‘Iyāḍī, Abū Salama al-Samarqandī and Ibn Yaḥyā. The Ḥanafī jurists, who were the majority in the region,

adopted literally the story that Abū Ḥanīfa forbade his son, Ḥammād b. Abū Ḥanīfa, to engage with *‘ilm al-kalām* and to discuss in this field, and they agreed that it is not permissible to engage with *‘ilm al-kalām* and explicitly stated this opinion in their works of fiqh. The jurists argued that faith is not created; that the definition of faith includes acknowledgement by language; it is more permissible not to derive other meanings from informative attributes; one cannot be responsible to believe in a higher being only based upon reason without the message of the prophet; the people of *fatra* (*Ahl al-fatra*) cannot be held responsible. The Ḥanafī jurists did not write any theological work by adopting this attitude in their private lives, and avoided involving in theological discussions, even tried to prevent to teach *‘ilm al-kalām*.

The fact that the Ḥanafī jurists began to consider *Kalām* blameworthy formed a basis for the exclusion of other disciplines, especially philosophical disciplines, as there was no justification for philosophical disciplines if *Kalām* was blameworthy and forbidden. Therefore, the influence of this change in the Ḥanafī's religious understanding on the decline in the scientific fields after the Sāmānids period (third-fourth/ninth-tenth centuries) is also worth exploring, since some Ḥanafīs were driven away from the understanding of Abū Ḥanīfa valuing reason to the understanding of Abū Ḥanīfa forbidding *Kalām*. Historically speaking, it can be argued that religious understanding of the Ḥanafī jurists have been more influential than the religious understanding of the Ḥanafī theologians.

REFERENCES

- Abū Ḥanīfa. *al-‘Ālim wa’l-Muta‘allim*. critical ed. Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī – trans. Mustafa Öz. *İmam-ı Âzam’ın Beş Eseri [The Five Works of İmām al-A‘zam Abū Ḥanīfa]*. Istanbul: IFAV Publications, 1992.
- Abū l-Layth Naşr b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. İbrāhīm al-Samarqandī. *Bayān ‘aqīda al-uşūl*. critical ed. A. W. Juynboll. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Landen Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië*, Ser. IV, vol. 5: 215ff., 267ff, 1881.
- Abū Mutī‘ Makhūl al-Nasafī. *Kitāb al-Radd ‘alā Ahl al-Bida‘ wa l-Ahwā’ al-dālla al-muḍilla*. critical ed. Marie Bernard. *Le Kitāb al-radd ‘alā l-bida‘ d’Abū Mutī‘ Makhūl al-Nasafī*. Vol. 16, 1980.
- Abū Salama al-Samarqandī, Abū Salama Muḥammad b. Muḥammad. *Jumal uşūl al-dīn. Ebu Seleme es-Semerikandi ve Akaid Risalesi*. critical ed. Ahmet Saim Kılavuz. Istanbul: Emek Matbaası, 1989.
- Abū Shakūr al-Sālīmī, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Sayyid b. Shu‘ayb. *Kitāb al-Tamhīd fī bayān al-tawhīd*, Süleymaniye MS Library, Şehit Ali Paşa, 001153.
- al-Bazdawī, Abū l-‘Usr ‘Alī b. Muḥammad. *Uşūl al-Bazdawī. al-Kāfi fī sharḥ al-Bazdawī*. critical ed. Fakhr al-dīn S. Muḥammad. 4 vols.. Riyāḍ: Maktaba al-Rushd, 1422/2001.
- al-Bazdawī, Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad. *Uşūl al-dīn*. critical ed. Hans Peter Linss. Qāhira: Dār İhyā al-kutub al-‘Arabiya, 1383/1963.
- al-Ḥakīm al-Samarqandī. *al-Sawād al-a‘zam*. Bulak: Dār al-Ṭibā‘a al-Āmira, 1253/1837.
- al-Kafawī, Maḥmūd b. Sulaymān. *Katā’ib al-‘alām al-akhyār min fuqahā’ madhhab al-Nu‘mān al-mukhtār*. Tehran Kitabhāna-yi Majlis-i Shūrā-yi Milli, 1385.

- al-Lāmishī, Maḥmūd b. Zayd. *al-Tamhīd li-qawā'id al-tawḥīd*. critical ed. Abd al-Mājīd Turkī. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1995.
- al-Makkī, Al-Muwaffaq b. Aḥmad. *Manāqib al-Imām al-A'zam Abī Ḥanīfa*. Beirut: Dār al-kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1401/1981.
- al-Maqdisī, Ḥasan b. Abī Bakr al-Ḥanafī. *Ghāyat al-marām fī sharḥ Baḥr al-kalām*. critical ed. Abdullah Muḥammad Abdullah Ismā'il – Muḥammed Sayyid Aḥmad Shahhāta. Qāhira: al-Maktabat al-Azhariyya li al-turāth, 1432/2012.
- al-Māturīdī, Abū Maṣṣūr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad. *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*. critical ed. Bekir Topaloğlu - Muhammed Aruçi. Ankara: TDV ISAM Publications, 2003.
- al-Māturīdī, Abū Maṣṣūr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad. *Ta'wīlāt al-Qur'ān*. critical ed. Bekir Topaloğlu - Ahmet Vanlıoğlu et al. 17 vols. Istanbul: Mizan Publications, 2005-2010.
- al-Nasafī, Abū l-Mu'īn Maymūn b. Muḥammad. *al-Tamhīd li-Qawā'id al-tawḥīd*. critical ed. Habīb Allah Ḥaşan Aḥmad. Qāhira: Dār al-Ṭībā'a al-Muḥammadiyyaa, 1406/1986.
- al-Nasafī, Abū l-Mu'īn Maymūn b. Muḥammad. *Baḥr al-kalām*. critical ed. Walī al-dīn M. Şāliḥ al-Farfūr. Di-mashq: Maktabat al-Farfūr, 1421/2000.
- al-Nasafī, Abū l-Mu'īn Maymūn b. Muḥammad. *Tabşirat al-adilla*. critical ed. Huseyin Atay - Şaban Ali Duzgun. Ankara: Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Presidency of Religious Affairs, 2003-2004.
- al-Rustufaghni, Abū l-Ḥasan. *al-Fawā'id*. Süleymaniye MS Library, Yeni Cami, 000547.
- al-Şābūnī, Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd. *al-Bidāya fī uşūl al-dīn*. critical ed. Bekir Topaloğlu. Ankara: Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Presidency of Religious Affairs, 1998.
- al-Şābūnī, Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd. *al-Kifāya fī l-hidāya*. critical ed. Muhammed Aruçi. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm -TDV ISAM Publications, 1434/2013.
- al-Şaffār al-Bukharī, Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Ismā'il al-Zāhid. *Kitāb Talkhīş al-adilla li-qawā'id al-tawḥīd*. ed. Angelika Brodersen, Beirut: al-Ma'had al-Almani li-abhas al-sharqiyya, 1432/2011
- al-Samarqandī, Muḥammad b. Yūsuf. *al-Multaqaţ fī l-Fatāwā al-Ḥanafīyya*. Ed. Maḥmūd Naşşār-Sayyid Yūsuf Aḥmad. Beirut: Dār al-kutūb al-‘Ilmiyya, 1420/2000.
- al-Samarqandī, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Mizān al-uşūl fī natā'ij al-uşūl*. critical ed. M. Zaki Abd al-Barr. Qāhira: Maktaba Dār al-turāth, 1418/1997.
- al-Sam‘ānī, Abū Sa’d ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr Muḥammad. *al-Ansāb*. critical ed. Abdullah ‘Umar al-Bārūdī. 5 vols.. Beirut: Dār al-Jinān, 1408/1988.
- al-Sighnāqī, Ḥuşām al-Dīn Ḥusayin b. ‘Alī. *al-Tasdīd sharḥ al-Tamhīd fī qawā'id al-tawḥīd*. Süleymaniye MS Library, Esad Efendi, 3893.
- al-Usmāndī, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Abd al-Ḥamīd. *Lubāb al-Kalām*. critical ed. M. Sait Özervarlı. Istanbul: TDV ISAM Publications, 2005.

- al-Ustuwāʿī, Šāʿid b. Muḥammad. *Kitāb al-ʿItiqād*. Ed. Seyit Bahçivan. Beirut: Dār al-kutüb al-ʿIlmiyya, 1426/2005.
- Apaydın, H. Yunus. "Zâhiriyye". *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 44/93-100. Ankara. TDV Publications, 2013.
- Demir, Abdullah. "Mâtürîdî Âlimi Ebû İshâk Zâhid al-Safâr'ın Kelâm Müdâfaası [Mâtürîdî Theologian Abû Ishâq al-Zâhid al-Saffâr's Vindication of the Kalâm]". *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi – Cumhuriyet Theology Journal* 20/1 (June 2016): 445-502. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18505/cuifd.12582>
- Demir, Abdullah. *Ebû İshak es-Saffâr'ın Kelâm Yöntemi [The Kalâm Method of Abû Ishâq al-Saffâr]*. Istanbul: TDV ISAM Publications, 2018.
- Demir, Abdullah. *Ebû İshâk Zâhid es-Saffâr'ın Kelâm Yöntemi [The Kalâm Method of Abû Ishâq al-Zâhid al-Saffâr]*. PhD Thesis, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Sivas, 2014.
- Ibn Yaḥyâ. *Sharḥ Jumal uşûl al-dîn*. Süleymaniye MS Library. Şehit Ali Paşa, 1648/2.
- Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr al-Namarî, Abû ʿUmar Yūsuf b. ʿAbdillāh. *Jāmiʿ bayān al-ʿilm wa-faḍlihi wā mā yanbaghî fi riwāyatihi wa-ḥamlīhi*. Cairo: Maktabah Ibn Taymiyya, nd.
- Mollâ Khusraw, Muḥammad b. Farāmarz. *Durar al-ḥukkām*. 2 vols. Āsitāne: Shirkat Şaḥafiya al-Uthmāniya, 1317.
- Özen, Şükrü. "V. (X.) Yüzyılda Mâverâünnehir'de Ehl-i Sünnet–Muʿtezile Mücadelesi ve Bir Ehl-i Sünnet Beyannamesi [The 4th/10th Century Conflict between Ahl al-Sunnah and Muʿtazila in Transoxania and a Declaration of Ahl al-Sunnah]". *İslâm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 9 (2003): 49–85.
- Özervalı, M. Sait. "Alâeddin el-Üsmendî'nin Kelâmcılığı ve Bilgi Teorisi: Mâverâünnehir Kelâm Düşüncesine Bir Katkı [ʿAlâʿ al-Dîn al-Usmandî's Theology and Epistemology: A Contribution to Kalâm Thought in Mâwarā al-Nahr]". *İslâm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 10 (2003): 39-63.
- Qāḍikhān, Fakhr al-Dîn al-Ḥasan b. Mañşūr b. Maḥmūd al-Awzajandî. *al-Fatāwā Qāḍikhān*. critical ed. Sâlim Muştafa al-Badrî. 3 vols. Beirut: Dār al-kutüb al-ʿIlmiyya, 1865.
- Shaykh Niẓām of Burhānpūr et al. *al-Fatāwā l-Hindiyya: Al-Fatāwā l-ʿĀlamgiriyya*. 6 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1421/2000.