TITLE: The Basic Matters in the Formative Period of Kalam

AUTHORS: Ayhan ISIK,Mustafa Selim YILMAZ

PAGES: 111-132

ORIGINAL PDF URL: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1227237

ULUM

علوم

The Basic Matters in the Formative Period of Kalām *

Ayhan Işık **

Mustafa Selim Yılmaz ***

Abstract

In contrast to other fields of scholarship, Kalām possesses a clear structure that has influenced the development of Muslim thought. This normative structure of kalām is analysed the fact of the structuring of the social imagination of the Muslim society. So, kalām reflects a character entirely derived from life and shaped within this framework. As much as the basic aim of kalām may be to systematically defend a religious doctrine, due to the contexts in which it has emerged, primarily socio-political backgrounds have an essential role in the formation of the identity of this science. The purpose of this paper is to explain this background and to achieve an analysis based on a contextual reading. In this regard, the matters that need to be methodologically focused on are the main issues that arose *within the first three generations of Islam. These issues can be listed as the matter of caliphate (imāmah), the grave sinner (murtakib al-kabīrah), and the discussions on the question of predestination (qadar).* Outstanding theses have been produced in response to these issues, which in a way are responsible for the political schisms in Muslim societies, and afterwards, these theses have led to the formation of the deeply rooted scholarly traditions of Islamic thought.

Keywords

Kalām, Politics, Caliphate, Grave Sinner, Predestination

** **Author and Translator:** Assistant Prof., Karabuk University, Faculty of Theology, Department of Kalām and Islamic Sects, Karabuk, Turkey | Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Karabük Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi, Kelam ve İtikadi İslam Mezhepleri Anabilim Dalı i.ayhan555@gmail.com | **ORCID** 000-0002-7017-2583

*** **Corresponding Author and Translator:** Associate Prof., Karabuk University, Faculty of Theology, Department of Kalām and Islamic Sects, Turkey | Doç. Dr., Karabük Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi, Kelam ve İtikadi İslam Mezhepleri Anabilim Dalı s.mutekellim@gmail.com | **ORCID** 0000-0002-2346-804X

Kelām İlminin Teşekkül Sürecindeki Temel Sorunlar

Öz

Kelâm ilminin diğer ilmi disiplinlere nazaran İslâm düşünce geleneğinin seyrini etkileyen belirgin bir yapısı vardır. Muhtemelen bu normatif yapısı, kelâmın Müslüman toplumun sosyal muhayyilesini şekillendiren vakıanın değerlendirildiği temel ilmi alan olmasından kaynaklanmaktadır. Bu itibarla bu ilim, tamamen hayatın içinden çıkan ve bu çerçevede şekillenen bir karakteri yansıtmaktadır. Her ne kadar kelâmın, temel hedefi akideyi sistematik olarak savunmak olsa da mayalandığı ortam itibariyle sosyolojik ve en önemlisi de siyasal arka planın bu ilmin, kimliğinin oluşumunda ciddi bir etkisi vardır. Esasında bu çalışmanın amacı, bu arka plana ışık tutmak ve bağlamsal bir okuma temelinde tutarlı bir analiz sunmaktır. Bu bakımdan metodolojik olarak odaklanılması gereken nokta, Müslüman toplumun ilk üç nesli döneminde ortaya çıkan temel problemlerdir. Bunları da *hilâfet meselesi*, *mürtekib-i kebîre* ve *ḳader* meselesi etrafındaki tartışmalar şeklinde sıralamak mümkündür. Bir nevi siyasal hizipleşmenin de kökeni olan bu meselelerin çözümüne ilişkin önemli tezler ortaya atılmış ve daha sonra bu tezler İslâm düşünce geleneğinin köklü ilim geleneklerinin teşekkülüne yol açmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Kelâm, Siyaset, Hilâfet, Mürtekib-i Kebīre, Ḳader

Introduction

Kalām, among Islamic sciences, holds a significant and determinative position. This is due to its characteristic that affects the course of the Muslim thought as well as its normative nature. The science (as being a principal thought activity) can be defined as a union of the attempts to produce a God-human-universe centred existential understanding. Kalām, on the other hand, fulfils an essential, universal, and a central function in terms of discovering and systemizing the primary constants that on which the science depends. It must be for this reason why kalām scholars described the science using such comprehensive names as "*ashraf al-ʿulūm*" and "*tāj al-ʿulūm*".[1]

What are the factors that lead to the emergence of the science of kalām? In the first place, this matter needs to be accentuated. In the context of the historical experience of the end time (*ākhir al zamān*)[2] *for* Muslims (who have a past and legacy of approximately 1400 years) it is indispensable, in methodical terms: to turn back to the time of Muḥammad *the Messenger of Allah* (who is the last and integral ring of the Daʿwah of Islam beginning with Adam) and of His Companions (*Sahābah*), and their successors (*Tābiʿūn*) and to do a reading starting from here. This period, which it's also called as "reference period"[3] in the words of the late

---

[1] For example, see. Saʿd al-Dīn Masʿūd al-Taftāzānī, *Sharh al-Maqāṣid*, ed. Abd al-Raḥmān ʿUmayra (Beirut: Ālem al-Kutub, 1998), 1/175 ff.; Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ghazālī, *al-Mustaṣfā min ʿilm al-uṣūl*, ed. Ḥamza b. Zuhayr Ḥāfiẓ (Medīna: s.n., n.d.), 1: 11 ff.

[2] It is a term preferred to be used for the Muslims antecedent him because Muḥammad is the last Messenger of Allah.

[3] For a detailed analysis, see. Mustafa Selim Yılmaz, "Din-Siyaset ilişkisi Bağlamında M. A. El-Cabiri'nin Müslüman Geleneğe Yönelttiği Eleştiriler", *Dini Araştırmalar* 11/32 (September-December 2008), 220.

Muḥammad 'Ābid al-Jābirī (d. 2010), is a time when the primary tokens of the Muslim thought tradition became clear.

Why was there no sect in the time of Muḥammad, the Messenger of Allah, and why did they emerge after him? This question has always been the first question that is vital and whose answer is the most anticipated. Indeed, the correct answers that can be provided for this question will bring the essence of the matter into light. At this point, to avoid to the utmost a fragmentary approach and deviations that it will cause; first, it is necessary to adopt a contextual reading[4] based on "time-space-phenomenon." The basic method of this paper also aims to be in this manner.

With this preliminary information, the Qur'ān and Sunnah's perception will be the key determinants. First of all, the Qur'ān, for an individual to find guidance both in this world and afterlife, which are two elements of an order and a system completing each other, is one of the primary guides.[5] This construction can be defined as a model form concerning individuals in the example of the Muḥammad the Messenger of Allah and with regard to society in the example of the Companions who united around the Messenger of Allah. When considering this point, it can be understood the reason why there was not a concept of a sect in the time of Muḥammad the Messenger of Allah. For the first teacher of a life that would be formed through being kneaded with revelation and the communicating face of the revelation with people was alive. Also, the society, which he ensured to be established with a struggle, were be able to resolve the problems they faced under the guidance of the revelation, under the leadership of the Messenger of Allah, and based on consultation (*shūrā*). In this respect, the first generation was advantageous since they were educated by the first teacher, while they were at a disadvantage considering the possibility of the revival of the residues of the Age of Ignorance (*Jāhiliyyah*) (because these were the only experiences of them before the coming of revelation), whose traces were being attempted to be erased. Furthermore, if we were to refer to the attestation of our history, the generation of the Companions had the responsibility to the next generations for being a figure that conveys the principles that the Messenger of Allah taught. Therefore, so to speak, with pros and cons, they constituted the determinative codes of the traditions of the following generations. In fact, this situation can also be observed in the main problems, which will be elucidated in this study.

Muḥammad, the Messenger of Allah began to form the core of the first Muslim society by guiding his Companions based on the main principles of the Qur'ān, i.e., Oneness of God (tawhīd), Messengerhood of Allah (nubuwwāt) and Afterlife[6] (which are the three fundamental principles in the Ahl al-Sunnah tradition), and established this society in Madīnah. Every individual of the Companions, in proportion to their experience and intellectual reasoning, contributed to the growth of this society. Because the Messenger of Allah was a common sense for Muslims, during his lifetime, who had experienced serious disagreements to

---

4   For an illustrative analysis regarding this method, see. Mehmet Kalaycı, *Tarihsel Süreçte Eşarilik Maturidilik İlişkisi* (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2013), 11 ff.

5   For example, see. Al-Baqarah 2/2-5; Tā-hā 20/2-3.

6   It is possible to interpret these principles in terms of founding a life: *Tawhīd:* Acknowledging only Allah as the one who lays down all the values that humans possess. *Messengerhood of Allah:* Admitting Muḥammad, the Messenger of Allah as the sole source for combining the transcendent and the earthly context and learning its method from him. *Afterlife:* Building a virtuous life in the world by knowing the possible outcomes in a certain future.

such an extent that would normally divide the society did not occur.[7] This situation might generally cause relaxation in the Companions' minds since the Messenger of Allah was the ultimate authority in solving problems. It can be seen that at the point of the death of the Messenger of Allah, and eventually after his departure from life, the Companions underwent a severe depression. In this regard, the main trouble they encountered was "adapting to a life without the Messenger of Allah".[8] The most obvious example of this can be seen in the accounts that are reported in our sources, which we can summarize in ʿUmar ibn al-Khattāb's (d. 23/644) bewilderment and Abū Bakr al-Siddīq's (d. 13/634) wise talk over this.[9]

The Companions, who had to adjust to a life without the Messenger of Allah, determined the course of the next generations through their conduct, probably with the sense of responsibility they felt deeply. So, they consulted to the experiences of their life before becoming a Muslim (perhaps the ones they did not consider to be contradictory to principles of Islam) as well as what they had learned from the Messenger of Allah. Moreover, their use of the concept of "amirate" in the words of the late Mohammad Abed Al-Jābirī (d. 2010)[10], which was in their mind following the discussions they engaged in to choose the first caliph, can be given as an example to this case. It must be kept in mind that the Companions completely acted with a human reflex while solving their problems instead of being a superhuman even though different explanations are given about their experiences. This assessment is critical to understand the incident experienced [at that time]. In a sense, this situation will provide an opportunity to derive lessons from life experiences. Given that human is the main actor that forms the life; the fact that behind each life experience there are psychological, sociological, political, etc. factors, which constitute the mental background of human, is another point that should not be overlooked as well.

When considering the previously described framework, it is possible to enumerate the most pressing problems of that period as follows:

1. The problem of leadership *(Caliphate)*

2. The grave sinner (*murtakib al-kabīrah*) and related matters

3. The problem of predestination (*qadar*)

These topics, as it were, have become the factors that determine the essential characteristic of Islamic thought tradition. It can be seen that these matters, which are basically founded on politic disputes, have been addressed in the way rereading history by tracing back and systemizing it in theological context since the abovementioned political setting disappeared with the century of compilation (*tadwīn*).[11] Generally, it can also be realized that each look at these topics shapes the methodology of sects in a manner that indeed

---

[7]   For analysis regarding the issue, see. Halil İbrahim Bulut, *İslam Mezhepleri Tarihi* (Ankara: DİB Yayınları, 2016), 120.

[8]   See. Ahmet Akbulut, *Sahabe Devri Siyasi Hadiselerinin Kelami Problemlere Etkisi* (İstanbul: Birleşik Yayınları), 1992, 340 ff.

[9]   For example, see. Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī-Tārīkh al-rusul wa al-mulūk*, ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1962), 3/200-201.

[10] See. Muhammed Ābid el-Cābirī, *Arap Siyasal Aklı*, trans. Vecdi Akyüz, First Printing (Istanbul: Mana Yayınları, 2018), 441 ff.

[11] For an illustrative analysis, see. Mehmet Evkuran, "Ehl-i Sünnet ve'l-Cemâat", *Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri*, ed. Mehmet Evkuran (Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018), 219-220.

reflects the political standing of the period. Besides, it can be understood that the extent of these matters has turned into main starting points where the "God-human-universe" relationship presented with respect to its explanation of an existential course. Thus, first, explaining these significant matters in a descriptive way and then making a brief evaluation of them are going to be the primary method of this article.

1. The Problem of Caliphate

First of all, it is possible to note the followings concerning the etymology of the word *khilāfah*: This word means "s/he who comes after someone," "s/he who succeeds," "s/he who represents someone due to his death or incapacity," and "s/he who runs the business of a person he replaces." Terminologically, in our literature, the person who observes the commands of Islam, preserves the religion, and conducts the religious and worldly affairs in the name of the Messenger of Allah is defined as "*khalīfah.*" The public authority he governs is denoted the word "*khilāfah*". The point regarding the use of this word while describing the head of a government can be summarized as follows: When Abu Bakr al-Siddīq was chosen as the head of the state, he said "I am not the *khalīfah* of Allah but Muḥammad the Messenger of Allah" and preferred to use the title "*khalīfatu Rasūlillāh.*"[12] Based on this statement of him, it can be said that he wanted to emphasize the fact that he did not represent the God in the earth; conversely, he was only a follower of the message of the Messenger of Allah and his successor in the political sense. ʿUmar ibn Khattāb used the title "*khalīfatu khalīfati Rasūlillāh*".[13] However, because it was a phrase that is long and difficult to say, eventually, the expression "*amīr al-mu'minīn*"[14] was more preferred and became common usage.[15] Nevertheless, as of Umayyads, the ancient eastern political understanding, which was formed based on the "shepherd-herd" metaphor and which was founded on the idea that the source of the legitimacy is God, began dominating. Accordingly, such descriptions as "*khalīfatullāh*"[16] and "*ẓillullāh fi al-arḍ*"[17] came to be used by Muslim rulers.[18]

Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Shahristānī (d. 548/1153) indicated that the most severe disagreement among *ummah* was about the caliphate by saying, "Sides has not taken up arms against each other in none of the religious matters as much as the matter of *imāmah*".[19] Indeed, the Qur'ān on the grounds of being a universal discourse, instead of explicitly stating the identity of the head of a state, emphasizes the principles that a Muslim ruler should adopt such as justice, merit, consultation, order, the supremacy of law,

---

[12]   The Caliph of Muḥammad the Messenger of Allah.

[13]   The Caliph of the Caliph of Muḥammad the Messenger of Allah.

[14]   The Ruler of Muslims (Amīr).

[15]   For detailed information about the word "khilāfah" and its derivatives, see. Akbulut, *Sahabe Devri Siyasi Hadiselerinin Kelami Problemlere Etkisi*, 90-96.

[16]   God's Caliph.

[17]   God's Shadow in the Earth.

[18]   See. Rabiye Çetin, "Hilafet", *İslamiyet ve Hıristiyanlık Kavramları Sözlüğü*, ed. Mualla Selçuk and et al. (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2013), 1/318-319.

[19]   Muḥammad al-Shahrastānī, *Milal wa niḥal*, trans. Mustafa Öz (İstanbul: Litera Yayınları, 2008), 36.

and the protection of human freedom.[20] Therefore, Muḥammad the Messenger of Allah did not specify who was to take over the state after him despite all insistence to teach his companions a principal stand.[21] Nonetheless, such cases as, at the time of his death disease, the Messenger of Allah's request from Abū Bakr to perform the prayers were later used in the context of the legitimacy of the caliphate of this prominent companion, who is the first of the *Rāshidūn* Caliphs.[22]

The Companions, by taking the conditions of the neighbourhood they lived into account, probably because of the idea that *ummah* should not encounter with chaos, resorted to choosing the head of the state as soon as possible while the preparation and the funeral procedures of the Messenger of Allah were continuing. Accordingly, the *Ansār* (who are consisted of *Khazraj* mostly) gathered at *Banī Saʿīdah* canopy without *Muhājir* and wanted to appoint Saʿd ibn ʿUbādah (d. 14/635) as caliph. However, the *Aws* from the *Ansār* informed ʿUmar ibn Khattāb about this meeting since they were afraid of the leadership of *Khazraj*, who had been their rivalry in the Age of Ignorance. Thereupon, after ʿUmar, Abū Bakr, and Abū ʿUbayda ibn Jarrāh (d. 18/639), upon whom the former two stumbled on the road, joined this meeting and took part in it, the appointment of Abū Bakr as caliph was procured and they pledged allegiance to him on the ground of the narration "Imams are from Quraysh"[23] in contrast to *Ansār*'s argument that "one imam should be from the *Ansār* and the other from *Quraysh*".[24]

Abū Bakr appointed ʿUmar to his place before he passed away at the end of his caliphate duty lasted around two years. Later, with the allegiance of the Companions to him, ʿUmar served as the political leader of the *ummah* for more than ten years. Eventually, after a slave of Iranian descent, wounded ʿUmar during one *fajr* prayer by a dagger, he left the solution of the problem of the caliphate to a counsel committee of six people consisting of ʿUthmān ibn Affān (d. 35/656), ʿAlī (d. 40/661), ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn ʿAwf (d. 32/652), Talhā ibn ʿUbaydillāh (d. 36/656), Zubayr ibn Awwām (d. 36/656), and Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqās (d. 55/675) (and he added his son ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿUmar (d. 73/692) to this committee given that he would not be chosen as caliph), on condition that they had to pick out someone among themselves within three days. Afterwards, he died. As a result of the counsel, ʿUthmān was designated as caliph, and mainly due to some of his wrong political decisions at the second six-year of his caliphate, he provoked a strong adverse reaction; consequently, he was martyred. In place of ʿUthmān, ʿAlī had to accept the caliphate duty because of the insistent demands of the Companions. His opponents revolted against him on the grounds that ʿUthmān's murderers must be found and punished, and then the *Jamal* and *Siffīn* battles, which are considered disastrous for Muslim society, took place. Subsequently, the power of ʿAlī weakened, and he was martyred during a *fajr* prayer by Kharijites, who charged him with unbelief along with Muʿawiyāh ibn Abī Sufyān (d. 60/680), ʿAmr ibn As (d. 43/664), and quite a few Companions. After this, even though the people of Madīnah

---

[20] For example, see. al-Nisā 4/58; al-Nahl, 16/90; Āl-i İmrān 3/159; al-Shūra 42/38.

[21] See. Akbulut, *Sahabe Devri Siyasi Hadiselerinin Kelami Problemlere Etkisi*, 341 ff.

[22] See. al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, 3/221.

[23] For controversies around this ḥadīth, see. Mehmet Kubat, *İslam Mezhepleri Tarihi* (İstanbul: Kitap Dünyası Yayınları, 2015), 71-72; Ziya Kazıcı, *İslam Medeniyeti ve Müesseseleri Tarihi* (İstanbul: Kayıhan Yayınları, 1999), 83-84.

[24] For detailed information, for example, see. al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, 3: 218-223. Also see. Hasan Gümüşoğlu, *İslam'da İmamet ve Hilafet* (İstanbul: Kayıhan Yayınları, 1999), 215-220.

chose Ḥasan (d. 80/669) as caliph, under certain conditions, he stepped down as caliph in favour of Mu'awiyāh because of his lack of trust in his supporters, who contain many different and problematic fractions. Upon this incident, Hijrī 41ˢᵗ year called "'ām al-jamā'ah".[25] Therefore, the period of "ordinance/wasāyah in political life"[26] began.

In this process where the disputes on caliphate were continuing, the Battle of Siffīn happened to be the breaking point, and the following three discourses became predominant:

1. The Shi'ī discourse, which advocated the imāmah of 'Alī and his descendants.

2. The Kharijite discourse, which left the imāmah to the opinion of ummah due to their hatred toward Quraysh.

3. The Sunnī discourse, which acted with the motive of being comprehensive, wished for the union of ummah and practiced a combinative method.[27]

This political partition proceeded into sharp divisions. Then, due to more severe disagreements, this matter was transferred to a theological dimension, and a ground for discussion was established. Moreover, in consequence of the battles above, another debate appeared. Later, at the centre of the status of dying and murdered people in these wars between Muslims, there emerged a setting, where two opposite views stood out, i.e., on the one hand, the accusative mind-set exalting the Kharijite mentality,[28] and on the other hand, the Murjī point view[29] that leaves the ultimate decision to Allah.

2. Grave Sinner (Murtakib al-Kabīrah) and the Related Matters

The grave sin, which is conceptualized in Muslim literature with the word "kabīrah," is described terminologically as a misdeed to which the religious law (sharī'ah) ascribes a menacing text (nass), a threat and punishment. Besides, it can be seen that several definitions have been provided [for this term],[30] for example, all kinds of behaviours that are contrary to the natural disposition and entail suffering in the afterlife, everything that God declared unlawful through the text (nass), each sin on which a person insist (though the one which he repents of called minor sin [saghīrah]), and the only sin that Allah will not forgive unless it is repented of, i.e., polytheism[31]. There have been conflicts[32] regarding the question of which sins

---

[25] "The year of unity". See. Mehmet Azimli, "Hilafet/Halifelik", İslam Kurumlar Tarihi (Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2017), 55- 69.

[26] Akbulut, Sahabe Devri Siyasi Hadiselerinin Kelami Problemlere Etkisi, 133 ff.

[27] For a detailed analysis, see. Akbulut, Sahabe Devri Siyasi Hadiselerinin Kelami Problemlere Etkisi, 97-131.

[28] See. Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu, Siyasi-İctimai Hadiselerle Hadis Münasebetleri (Ankara: Otto Yayınları, 2016), 62.

[29] See. Harun Çağlayan, "Mürcie", Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri, ed. Mehmet Evkuran (Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018), 114 vd.

[30] See. Jamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Faḍl Muḥammad Ibn Manẓūr, "كبر", Lisān al-'Arab, Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, n.d.), 5: 65-70; Sayyid Sharīf al-Jurjānī, "كبر", Kitāb al-Ta'rīfāt, ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mar'ashli (Beirut: Dār al-Nefāis, 2003), 230; Adil Bebek, "Kebîre", Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (Ankara: TDV Yayınları, 2002). 25/163-164.

[31] Based on al-Nisā 4/116.

[32] See. Ali Aslan Aydın, "İslam'da Büyük Günah ve Tekfir Meselesi", Diyanet İlmi Dergi 14/4 (1975), 200.

are grave as well as their numbers. However, sins such as polytheism, unjustly murder of a human, adultery, escape from war, consuming the possessions of an orphan[33] are enumerated in the first ranks.

As previously described, the main factors in the emergence of such a discussion are the battles of *Jamal* and *Siffin*, which took place amongst the Companions, the first generation of the end time Muslims. In consequence, the fact that this first-generation, regarded as the founding generation in Islamic thought, because they underwent the training of the Messenger of Allah, faced off against each other, fought, and intended to kill each other, created a significant trauma in the mind of Muslims. These also caused a centuries-long and an inherently political issue to evolve into a much-debated process by way of transferring it to a theological realm. Even going beyond the concept of grave sin, the matter has been treated in the context of "*asmā'-ahkām*," (names-judgments) and the faith of an individual committing murder has been questioned. Eventually, it has reached to the extent of whether deeds/acts are a part of belief given that sinning is also an action.[34]

Kharijites, who attempted to define infidelity before faith and accordingly infidel before faithful[35] and who differed from other sects based on this structure of them, can be described as the group that has opened this issue up for a discussion. In general, *Kharijites* acted upon the acceptance that each sin removes a person from religion without making a grave-minor sin distinction. Furthermore, they declared the sinner as infidel on the grounds of their fragmentary or very selective approach to the texts, and they led to the emergence of a chaotic environment. Based on this point of view, (even though they had disagreements over in which category of infidelity the people they charged with unbelief included regarding their identities in the afterlife), they accused the prominent figures of the Companions, particularly 'Alī and Mu'āwiyah, and numerous Muslims of infidelity,[36] and they moved their political opinions to the ground of belief.[37]

Against this rigid approach of *Kharijites*, an intense adverse reaction occurred in the eyes of *ummah*, and this adverse reaction brought about the emergence of *Murjī* movement based upon the idea of referring the judgment about the grave sinner to Allah, in other words deferring it to the afterlife. *Murjī* groups, which were consisted of many fractions in contrast to *Kharijites*, did not consider deeds to be a part of faith and did not remove anyone who committed either a grave or a minor sin from the circle of Islam and counted them as believers. However, they described a sinner who does not repent of his sins as "*fāsiq*".[38]

---

[33] For example, see. Muslim, "Īmān", 143-146.

[34] For analysis on the issue, see. Akbulut, *Sahabe Devri Siyasi Hadiselerinin Kelami Problemlere Etkisi*, 268-276.

[35] See. İsmail Şık - Hamdi Akbaş, "Düşünce Hareketleri ve İnanç Grupları", *Kelâm I Kelâm Tarihi/Kelâm Okulları* (Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı Yayınları, 2017), 64 ff.

[36] See. 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayn al-firāq (Mezhepler Arasındaki Farklar)*, trans. Ethem Ruhi Fığlalı (Ankara: TDV Yayınları, 1991), 54.

[37] For detailed information on *Kharijites*, which is the first group that spoke of about the grave sin and the first group emerged within the Muslim society, also on their main principles, and their impacts on the Islamic thought, see. Rabiye Çetin, "Haricilik", *Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri*, ed. Mehmet Evkuran (Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018), 57-75.

[38] For detailed information, see. Çağlayan, "Mürcie", 108-133.

In response to the understanding of these groups of the grave sinner and dependently of belief, as a third group, Muʿtazilah, which is qualified to be the first kalām school, (which also affects *Shiʿah* especially *Zaydī*s in terms of their theological viewpoints) entered into the picture. The basis of the foundation of this school, which started with Wāsil ibn ʿAtā (d. 131/748) as such, pertinent to this matter exactly so much that they make their analysis based on one of the principles of their "*usūl al-khamsah*", that is, "*al-manzila bayn al-manzilatayn*".[39] Accordingly, they apply the concept "*fisq*"[40] as a new status between belief and disbelief. Indeed, the perception of *Kharijites* had an exclusionary effect on people; whereas, *Murjiʾah*'s point of view led to excessive relaxation and failed to ensure the fulfilment of the requirement of belief. Thus, they named the grave sinner as "*fāsiq*" instead of a believer or unbeliever to establish a social order based on the principle of justice.[41] If *fāsiq* does not ask forgiveness (*tawbah*) for his wrongdoings in this life, he will remain in eternal hell (even if his suffering will not be as severe as the suffering of an unbeliever). It is possible to say that this expression serves as a warning to a person who has sinned instead of excluding him from the community and that it has been created to make sure the reintegration of him into the society in a manner that enables him to repent. Even though they seem to have a shared perspective with *Kharijites* in terms of their acceptance of actions as a part of belief, due to their aims described above, this situation stands before us, indicating to the point where [*Muʿtazilīs*] differ from the [*Kharijite*] understandings that cause a chaotic environment.

Despite this, it can be said that *Ahl al-Sunnah*, which differs from the Adherents of Ḥadīth in using the kalām method to explain the creed of the *Salaf*, and which has been formed on the grounds of *Māturidism* and *Ashʿarism*, due to its inclusiveness, has adopted the *Murjī* perception in general as can also be inferred from their motto "People of the *qiblah* (*Ahl al-qiblah*) cannot be accused of infidelity". It is also apparent that they developed the notion "being between fear and hope" (*bayn al-khawf wa al-rajāʾ*) to separate himself from the conception "when together with belief, disobedience would not harm", which is expressed as "*Khabīth Murjiʾah*".[42] It can also be said that, especially in terms of *Māturidite* tradition, Abū Ḥanīfa's (d. 150/767) understanding of faith (who is claimed to be a *Murjī*)[43] played a vital role in *Ahl al-Sunnah*'s perception of this matter. According to this viewpoint, which does not count actions as a part of belief in general, a person, who commits sins apart from polytheism and dies without repenting, is described as a believer. This person, who is defined as "*Fāsiq* Believer"[44] is left up to God's volition if He wishes He forgives him. If He wants, He

---

[39] Between two states (belief and unbelief).

[40] For detailed information, see. Ömer Aydın, *Kuran-ı Kerim'de İman-Amel İlişkisi* (İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 2007), 59-120; İbrahim Kaplan et al., "İmanla İlgili Teolojik Problemler", *Kelâm III Sistematik Kelâm/İman ve İlâhiyât*, ed. İsmail Şık ve Nail Karagöz (Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı, 2017), 58.

[41] See. Fethi Kerim Kazanç, "Muʿtezile", *Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri*, ed. Mehmet Evkuran (Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018), 173; Recep Önal, "İman ve Mahiyeti Konusunda Muʿtezile İle Ehl-i Sünnet Polemiği", *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 39 (2015), 125 ff.

[42] For example, see. ʿAlī b. Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Qārī, *Sharḥ al-fiqh al-akbar li-Abī Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān*, ed. Marwān Muḥammad al-Shaʿār (Beirut: Dār al-Nafāis, 1998), 161.

[43] For detailed analysis, see. al-Qārī, *Sharḥ al-fiqh al-akbar li-Abī Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān*, 160.

[44] For example, see. al-Qārī, *Sharḥ al-fiqh al-akbar li-Abī Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān*, 159 ff.

sends him to Heaven after He punishes him in proportion to his sins[45] or with the intercession of Muḥammad, the Messenger of Allah.[46]

Consequently, general opinions concerning the grave sin within Islamic thought can be listed as follows:

1. *Kharijiyyah*: He is removed from religion and deserves eternal suffering in hellfire.

2. *Mu'tazilah*: He is removed from religion; however, he does not become an infidel. He is called "*fāsiq*" between these and stay in the eternal hell even though not like infidels.

3. *Murji'ah*: He is faithful, and his judgment is referred to Allah in the afterlife.

4. *Ahl al-Sunnah*: He is faithful as long as he does not regard the sin as lawful; however, his judgment depends on God's will.

5. It is reported from Ḥasan al-Basrī (d. 110/728) that once he used to describe such a person as "*munāfiq*".[47]

Lastly, because it has a direct relation to the present topic, the viewpoints on the definition of belief can be summarized as follows:

1. Jahm ibn Safwān (d. 128/745), who defines belief as the cognizance of heart and some *Murjī* groups.

2. *Karrāmites*, who define belief as a confession with tongue and some *Murjī* groups.

3. *Ash'aris* and *Māturīdī*s, who emphasize that what is essential in faith is an affirmation (*taṣdīq*) by heart.

4. Some Hanafī practitioners of Islamic jurisprudence, such as especially Abū Hanīfah, Abū al-Yusr al-Pazdawī (d. 493/1100), Shams al-A'immah Sarakhsī (d. 483/1090), and Kamāladdīn al-Bayādī (d. 1098/1687), who state that the main elements of faith are an affirmation by heart and confession with tongue.

5. *Kharijiyyah*, *Mu'tazilah*, *Zaydiyyah*, *Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth*[48] and some of *Ahl al-Sunnah*, who define faith as an affirmation by heart, confession with tongue, and performing deeds by organs.[49]

3. The Problem of Predestination

Predestination is expressed with the concept of *qadar* in Muslim culture. The term *qadar* means "measuring, planning, ordination (*taqdīr*), decreeing (*qadā*) and judgment, having power, appointing,

---

[45]   See. Kaplan et al., "İmanla İlgili Teolojik Problemler", 62-70.

[46]   See. İsmail Şık, "Şefaat", *Kelâm IV Sistematik Kelâm 2 Nübüvvet Mead*, ed. İsmail Şık – İsmail Yürük (Ankara: Araştırma Yayınları, 2016) 225 ff.

[47]   For example, see. Kaplan et al., "İmanla İlgili Teolojik Problemler", 57-58.

[48]   For analysis on *Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth*, see. Sönmez Kutlu, *İslam Düşüncesinde İlk Gelenekçiler Hadis Taraftarlarının İman Anlayışı Bağlamında Bir Zihniyet Analizi* (Ankara: Kitabiyat Yayınları, 2002), 69.

[49]   For example, see. A. Saim Kılavuz, *Anahatlarıyla İslâm Akâidi ve Kelâm'a Giriş*, Fourteenth Printing (İstanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 2009), 36-44.

shortening sustenance,[50] acting wisely, designated time and place of a thing, the very limit thereby something ends"[51] in the lexicon. Terminologically, it is described in our literature as "the fact that created beings and incidents are within the knowledge and decree of God." There are other significations of this word, such as "the shift of possible things from the state of inexistence into the state of existence" and "knowing the actuality, scale, and essence of a thing".[52] Generally in Muslim literature, this matter has been discussed on the basis of God's attributes especially His Knowledge and Will, and it is understood in the way that God knows time and place, characteristics and all kinds of properties of everything that has happened and will happen from eternity *a parte ante* to eternity *a parte post*, and that He decrees and ordains in eternity based on this. This decree and ordination include qualities such as benefit, harm, good, and evil on the one hand, and time, place, reward, and punishment, which apply to created beings, on the other.[53] Therefore, in *Māturīdī* scholarly tradition, "*qadar*" has been interpreted as the ordination of everything that created beings do including good and evil; while the term "*qadā*" has been construed as God's creation of things that He has decreed in accordance with His knowledge and will. In contrast with this interpretation, *Ashʿarī* tradition has used the term "*qadā*" in place of "*qadar*" and the term "*qadar*" in place of "*qadā*" but retaining the same explanation.[54] Considering that the arguments arousing around the concept of predestination (*qadar*), on which opinions in opposite poles clash, are a human phenomenon (as it is everywhere humans exist), it is possible to encounter similar disagreements in the Arabs of the Age of Ignorance. Particularly, an understanding presented in this context based on the term "*dahr*", which can be defined as "that which actualizes the things previously decreed, and the cause of good and bad fortune" draws attention.[55] Indeed, there are claims indicating that this understanding has also been effective on the interpretations made after Muslim culture.[56]

---

[50]   See. Ibn Manẓūr, "قدر", *Lisān al-ʿArab*, 5: 74-75; Muḥammad ʿAlī Najjār, "قدر", *al-Muʿjam al-wasīṭ*, ed. Ibrāhīm Muṣṭafā et al. (Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1992), 718; Abū al-Ṭāhir Majd al-Dīn al-Fīrūzābādī, "قدر", *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ* (Beirut: Dār al-ʿĀlamī al-Jāmiʿ, n.d.), 2: 114.

[51]   See. Ibn Manẓūr, "قدر", *Lisān al-ʿArab*, 5: 74-75; al-Fīrūzābādī, "قدر", *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ,* 2: 114; al-Jurjānī, "قدر", *Kitāb al-Taʿrīfāt*, 250; Masʿūd Jubrān, "قدر", *al-Rāʾid* (Beirut: Dār al-ʿIlm li al-Malāyīn, 1962), 1157-1159; Abū l-Fayḍ Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī, "قدر", *Tāj al-ʿArūs,* ed. ʿAbd al-Munʿim Khalīl Ibrāhīm et al. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2007), 3: 481; al-Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī, "قدر", *Mufradāt alfāẓ al-Qurʾān,* ed. Safwān ʿAdnān Dāwūdī (Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 2002), 657-658.

[52]   See. ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. ʿAlī Shaykhzāde, *Naẓm al-farāʾid wa Jamʿ al-fawāʾid* (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Taqaddum, n.d.), 21.

[53]   For example, see. Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Bidāya fī uṣūl al-dīn*, ed. Bekir Topaloğlu (Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1995), 77-78.

[54]   For example, see. Nail Karagöz, "İnsanın Fiilleri (Efʿâl-i İbâd)", *Kelâm III Sistematik Kelâm/İman ve İlâhiyât,* ed. İsmail Şık - Nail Karagöz (Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı, 2017), 219 ff.

[55]   For analysis on this issue, see. H. Musa Bağcı, *İnsanın Kaderi Hadislerin Telkin Ettiği Kader Anlayışı* (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2009), 289 ff.; Ramazan Biçer, *Akıl ve İrade Kapısı İmam Mâtürîdî* (İstanbul: Erdem Yayınları, 2018), 91 ff.

[56]   See. Toshihiko Izutsu, *Kur'an'da Allah ve İnsan,* trans. Süleyman Ateş (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1975), 117; Hanifi Şahin, "İlk Dönem Kader Tartışmalarında Siyasetin Rolü", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 36 (2011), 49-50.

Qadar is a Qur'ānic concept. It appears approximately in one hundred thirty sections, along with its derivatives.[57] Differently from the significations given in Muslim literature, the meaning that stands out in a sense used in the Qur'ān is the measure.[58] In the verses where this meaning is stressed, mainly the fact that the universe has been created by God in a particular order and measure is underlined.[59] Moreover, in case of the adoption of a fragmentary interpretation style, opposite meaning settings can be inferred, for instance, that a human is free or that he is never free. Thus, while reading the verses, following a specific method and making a remark within the frame presented below will allow of having a consistent perspective:

1. The frame of verse

2. The frame of context (*siyāq-sibāq*)

3. The frame of the integrity of the Qur'ān

4. The frame of social and physical laws in the universe

5. The frame of common sense[60]

On the other hand, when looked at the literature of ḥadīth, although there is a great emphasis indicating that discussing this issue is forbidden, ḥadīths reflecting both determinism and human freedom attract attention.[61] Surely, even if it may be thought that this issue was addressed at the time of the Messenger of Allah, it is possible to say that it frequently appears with its current meaning in the political environment of Umayyad period. Afterwards, it attains a conceptual form, as it will be explained below. Besides, taking into consideration that ḥadīth reports recorded after this period where such a discussion took place, it will be a more accurate attitude to have a precautionary approach to these [ḥadīths].[62] Numerous accounts are given as well in Muslim sources regarding that this matter discussed at the time of *Rāshidūn* Caliphs. To provide some examples, the following reports are essential in terms of pointing out to the first discussion ground of the problem of predestination: The fact that a theft incident, which happens at the time of 'Umar ibn Khattāb, was responded in the way that "This the decree (*qadar*) of Allah"; the fact that when 'Umar ibn Khattāb cancelled his visit to Damascus because of the plague, he answered the question of "Are you escaping from the decree of Allah?" as "I am escaping from the decree of Allah again to the decree of Allah."; the fact that in response to the ones who wanted him to quit caliphate, 'Uthman ibn Affān, brought forward the divine providence, saying "I will not remove the clothing that Allah put on me.",

---

[57] See. Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī, "قدر", *al-Muʿjam al-mufahras li-alfāz al-Qurʾān al-Karīm* (Istanbul: Tebliğ Yayınları, 1985), 536-537.

[58] See. Yusuf Şevki Yavuz, "Kader", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 2001), 24/58.

[59] For example, see. al-Qamar 54/49; al-Anʿām 6/96; al-Hijr 15/21; al-Muʾminūn 23/18; al-Furqān 25/2; al-Shūra 42/27; al-Ṭalāq 65/3; al-Mursalāt 77/23; al-Muddaththir 74/18-20. For an analysis on this issue, see. Rabiye Çetin, "Kur'an-ı Kerim Bağlamında Kader-İmtihan İlişkisi", *Journal of the Human and Social Science Researches* 5/4 (2016), 780-789.

[60] See. Ahmet Akbulut, "Allah'ın Takdiri-Kulun Tedbiri", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 33/1 (1994), 138.

[61] For analysis on this issue, see. Bağcı, *İnsanın Kaderi Hadislerin Telkin Ettiği Kader Anlayışı,* 291 ff.

[62] For analysis on this issue, see. Akbulut, "Allah'ın Takdiri-Kulun Tedbiri", 133 ff.; Bağcı, *İnsanın Kaderi Hadislerin Telkin Ettiği Kader Anlayışı,* 292-293.

and then opponents responded by attacking him with stones while saying "Allah makes us throw these stones."; the fact that 'Alī ibn Abī Tālib, at the time of his caliphate, associated the Battles of *Jamal* and *Siffīn*, in which he was also present, with predestination. Accordingly, in the period of four caliphs, it is possible to say that the problem had a theological and political content; however, a sharp distinction did not occur around the concept of predestination, and it did not turn into factionalism.[63]

It can be realized that, as is with our other two headings, there is a political ground at the root of the controversies. Besides, the Battles of *Jamal* and *Siffīn* on which the discussion regarding the grave sinner stand out here. The fact that both killer and the killed are the founding generations of the Islamic thought, i.e., the Companions, increased the importance of the issue, and it started to be argued within the framework of human freedom and responsibility in his actions. Later it began to be handled in an ontological and epistemological setting. In this context, the following questions have made up of the core of the controversy, and later in the process, the views of the sects are formed: What is predestination? What are the states of the killer and killed in the afterlife? Do these incidents occur within the frame of predestination? If so, do human actions possess a responsibility? Does a human have an unchangeable destiny? If so, what is the meaning of a human being responsible for what he does and does not? Does a human act with his will when it comes to the action he performed? What is the will? What is the relationship between God's will and human will? What is freedom, and what are its limits? Is it possible to speak of absolute freedom for humans?[64]

It is possible to say that the issue, even though it began to be discussed on the grounds of *Jamal* and *Siffīn*, turned into a problem in itself. For in this period, it can be noticed that the matter of predestination or human freedom was exploited on account of political interests. The idea that what was being done was as a result of divine decree, and that the rulers were not responsible, tried to be brought forward to the fore. Even it was not refrained from reporting ḥadīths related to this issue. Because it is narrated that Muʿāwiyah said, "If Allah did not see that I was competent in this task, He would not leave it to me. If Allah were not content with our actions, He would change the state which we are in".[65] The rulers of Umayyad attributed their actions to Allah to lessen the negative responses from people and to justify themselves. With this deterministic view, human freedom was ignored, and it was tried to avoid responsibility by ascribing everything by God's decree.[66]

When Muʿāwiyah started the Umayyad sultanate, with a deterministic attitude, he claimed that the one who directs him in his administrations was Allah, just as the one who gave him the duty of being the head of the state was Allah.[67] It is known that many sects were formed in the period of Umayyad's, that there

---

[63]   See. Muḥammad Abū Zahra, *İslâm'da Siyâsî ve İtikâdî Mezhepler Tarihi*, trans. Hasan Karakaya et al. (İstanbul: Hisar Yayınları, n.d.), 103-104.

[64]   See. Mevlüt Özler, "Kelam Tarihi", *Kelam El Kitabı*, ed. Şaban Ali Düzgün (Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2016) 33-34. (21-40).

[65]   See. Abdülhamit Sinanoğlu, "İslâm'ın İlk Siyasallaştırılma Sürecinde Kader İnancı*", Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 43/2 (2002), 255.

[66]   See. Halife Keskin, *İslam Düşüncesinde Kader ve Kaza* (İstanbul:Beyan Yayınları, 1997), 74.

[67]   See. Sinanoğlu, "İslâm'ın İlk Siyasallaştırılma Sürecinde Kader İnancı", 262.

were riots against the government, and there were also reactions to the current administration. To obliterate these reactions and to establish a legitimate ground, they attempted to impose the idea that God's will manifested in this direction. A great deal of Umayyad sultans and governors made use of the concept of predeterminism with such content to legitimize their political power. Consequently, the determinist view has found a place for itself in the Umayyad period. This situation, named as "determinism ideology"[68] by researchers, stands out as an essential point in justifying the validity of the Umayyad rule. The only answer can be given the question of why the concept of predestination was employed for such an attempt of legitimization is the fact that rulers came to power unquestioned or by way of handing from father to son, which does not take the competency into consideration. Because they could not attain validity from the people based on justice, they tried to gain political influence and legitimatize their status by claiming that their power is owing to the divine ordination of God[69].

It must be told that the first systematic view on the concept of predestination was introduced by *Jabriyyah*. This understanding, which is turned into a motto in the form of the statement "Human is the same as a leaf in wind; wherever the wind blows, s/he goes there," is a natural result of a methodological view concerning the problem of attributes particularly.[70] With this opinion, this sect differs from the Umayyad rule that used the concept of predestination in accordance with their political objectives. When the problem is addressed considering their overall frame of mind, it can be said that they were also against the regime in question. Indeed, the leaders of this movement were murdered because of their ideas (especially on the matter of createdness of the Qur'ān/*khalq al-Qur'ān*).[71] Moreover, it should be noted that the fact that perspectives respecting attributes were adopted by *Mu'tazilah*, who emphasized human freedom, is very telling.[72]

According to this view, which can be described as extremely unantropomorphic perception, to establish the Oneness of God, on the one hand, God must be exempted from all the characteristics attributed to created beings, on the other hand, no attributes of Him should be ascribed to created beings. Based on this perspective, for them, actions must be attributed to God instead of humans. In other words, no will should be brought up in the face of God's will since the will is an attribute unique to God. On this issue, *Jabriyyah*, who abstract action from human and attaches it to God, claims that everything happens by God's decree and will. Yet, humans possess neither power nor will by any means. *Jabriyyah*, while not giving humans any will or power, maintains that God's decree is unavoidable for humans, and they have to submit

---

[68] For example, see. İrfan Aycan, *Saltanata Giden Yolda Muaviye bin Ebi Sufyan* (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2010), 208.

[69] See. Yavuz, "Kader", 24: 59-60; Resul Öztürk, *Cebri Düşüncenin Yaygınlaşmasında Siyasi İktidarın Etkisi (Akara:* Ankara University, PhD Thesis, 2002), 115-125.

[70] For analysis on this issue, see. Akbulut, *Sahabe Devri Siyasi Hadiselerinin Kelami Problemlere Etkisi*, 289-292.

[71] For detailed analysis on this issue, see. Rıza Korkmazgöz, "Cebriyye", *Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri,* ed. Mehmet Evkuran (Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018), 137-162.

[72] *Mu'tazilah*'s objection to the idea of an attribute separate from the essence based on their principle of tawhīd (with a heritage adopted from *Jabriyyah*) is a systematic reaction against Christian conception of God, as their defence of the idea of the absolute freedom of human in his acts based on their justice principle (with a heritage adopted from *Qadariyyah*) is a systematic reaction against the predestination concept of the political administration.

to what is destined for them. As stated by them, humans do not have any function or responsibility apart from being a locus for the act.[73] The scholar who first raised this matter is Jaʻd ibn Dirham (d. 124/742), and following him, Jahm ibn Saffān systemized these views. According to him, also, humans do not own any power and will; rather they are obligated to their actions. Everything takes place by God's ordination. Reward and punishment are fixed as is fate. Therefore, the religious obligation becomes compulsory. The only agent is God.[74]

Besides *Jabriyyah*, which is the first group that emerged as a result of the predestination controversy, another significant formation is the sect called *Qadariyyah*.[75] *Qadariyyah* is a common name both for those who do not accept a conception of predestination restricted to a deterministic interpretation and for those who put this idea at the centre of their ideology. To put it another way, it is the name of the group that emerged at the time of the administration of ʻAbd al-Malik ibn Marwān (d. 86/705) as a reactionary movement against the deterministic understanding of divine decree. This group, led by Maʻbad al-Juhanī (d. 83/702), opposed the fact that they pretended as if the origin of their legitimacy and their practices were God's ordination by saying "There is no predeterminism."[76] They criticized *Umayyad*s systematically and consistently because the latter group depicted their oppressions as God's predestination. A heated debate took place between Hajjāj ibn Yūsūf (d. 95/714), governor of *Umayyad*s famous for his title tyrant, and Maʻbad stated that he refuses the deterministic understanding. Furthermore, another name that stands out due to his opinions on this problem is Ghaylān al-Dimashqī (d. 120/738), who is an emancipated slave of ʻUthmān. He had a series of dialog and correspondence with his friend ʻUmar ibn ʻAbd al-Azīz (d. 101/720) called with the nickname "second ʻUmar," and they discussed the issue of predestination. However, he quitted speaking of this matter upon the caliph's warning, at least until the caliph passed away. Ghaylān, who defined the predestination as human acts performed freely, believed that unless humans bring their actions into being, God does not intervene in this action.[77]

Even though he is not counted among *Qadariyyah*, Ḥasan al-Basrī, one of the prominent figures of the Tābiʻūn generation, should be included here in terms of his condemnation of the deterministic perception of divine decree. Ḥasan al-Basrī was born in Madīnah, and in his youth, he witnessed the martyrdom of ʻUthman ibn Affān and the Battles of *Jamal* and *Siffīn*. He attracted attention with his understanding of asceticism and expressed the wrongdoings of *Umayyad* rulers concerning the matter of predestination.[78]

---

[73] See. Muḥammad Abū Zahra, *Taʾrīkh al-madhāhib al-Islāmiyya* (s.n.: Dār al-Fikr al-ʻArabī, n.d.), 182.

[74] See. al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayn al-firāq*, 281; al-Shahrastānī, *Milal wa niḥal*, 86; Şerafettin Gölcük, *Bâkıllânî ve İnsanın Fiilleri* (Ankara: TDV Yayınları, 1997), 124.

[75] See. İlyas Çelebi, "İlk Kelam Tartışmaları ve İnanç Grupları," *Kelam El Kitabı*, ed. Şaban Ali Düzgün (Ankara, Grafiker Yayınları, 2016), 56.

[76] There is no predeterminism; what happens, happens right now.

[77] For analysis on this issue, see. Akbulut, *Sahabe Devri Siyasi Hadiselerinin Kelami Problemlere Etkisi,* 289-294.

[78] See. Cemalettin Erdemci, "İlk Dönem (Hicri 1. asır) Kader Tartışmaları Ǧaylan ed-Dımaşkî-Ömer b. Abdülaziz", *Tezkire: Journal of Thought, Politics and Social Science* 43-44 (April-September 2006), 198-223.

Also, he asserted his comments on the concept of predestination as a response to the threatful letter of 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān and did not submit to political oppressions.[79]

Mu'tazilah inherited their perception of predestination, which they systematized based on their principles of justice, and the related concepts from *Qadariyyah*. Considering that they organized *Jahmiyyah*'s heritage regarding the issue of attributes on the ground of their perception of *tawhīd*, the fact that *Mu'tazilah* constructed their methodologies in a manner that completes each other is noteworthy in terms of their receiving the honour of being the first school of kalām. They made an impression within the kalām literature, especially in connection with the fact that they did not acknowledge attributes separate from the essence of God[80] and that they defended the absolute human freedom. Also, it can be said that *Ahl al-Sunnah kalām* tradition, which draws attention with their uniting and inclusive attitude, has a combinatory approach.[81] Both *Ash'arism* and *Māturīdism* have sought to find an intermediary way with the concept of "*kasb*" (acquisition). It is possible to notice that even though both positions set a common ground, later on, their perspectives differed from each other. *Ash'arism* approached the issue from the point that *Mu'tazilah*'s idea of "human's creating his actions" will cause an imperfection in God's power, and prioritized the perception of an "Omnipotent God." Accordingly, in this way of explanation, the concept of human freedom is left ambiguous[82], and it has led to an impression close to the determinist view. Therefore, *Ash'arism* is described as "intermediary determinism".[83] In contrast, *Māturīdism*, which started out from the basis of "the universal-particular will" distinction[84], when compared to *Ash'arism*, could explain human freedom in a more precise way. Also, they clarified the issue using the idea of attachment of two powers to one object of power and ascribing the action to God in terms of creation and to humans in terms of the acquisition.[85] Consequently, *Māturīdism* is regarded as "the intermediary entrust (tafwīz)" interpretation.[86]

To conclude, it is observed that in the history of kalām, three main views are advanced concerning the problem of predestination:

1. The position defends that human does not have power and freedom: *Jabriyyah*.

---

[79] See. Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad Ibn Sa'd, *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr*, ed. Adnan Demircan, trans. Ahmet Aslan and at al. (İstanbul: Siyer Yayınları, 2015), 7: 157-159.

[80] For different examples on the views of *Mu'tazilis* regarding the attributes, which is also called as concept of *ta'tīl*, cf. Emre Köksal, "İlk Dönem Mu'tezile Kelamında Zât-Sıfat İlişkisi -Sıfat, Mânâ ve Ahvâl Kavramları Üzerinden Bir Değerlendirme-", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 40 (2018/1), 235-249; Recep Önal, "Ebü'l-Berekât en-Nesefî'nin İlahî İsim ve Sıfatlara Yaklaşımı", *Journal of Ondokuz Mayıs Univsersity Faculty of Theology* 42 (2017), 147-152.

[81] See. Bağcı, *İnsanın Kaderi Hadislerin Telkin Ettiği Kader Anlayışı*, 289; Recep Önal, *Ebü'l-Berekât en-Nesefî ve Kelamî Polemikleri* (Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2017), 261-265.

[82] See. Mevlüt Özler, *İslam Düşüncesinde İnsan Hürriyeti: Cüveyni Eksenli bir Tetkik* (İstanbul: Nun Yayınları, 1997), 94.

[83] See. Nail Karagöz, "İnsanın Fiilleri (Ef'âl-i İbâd)", 237-240.

[84] See. Nail Karagöz, "İnsanın Fiilleri (Ef'âl-i İbâd)", 226-227.

[85] For example, see. al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Bidāya fī uṣūl al-dīn*,, 64-67.

[86] See. Karagöz, "İnsanın Fiilleri (Ef'âl-i İbâd)", 240-242; Recep Önal, *İmam Birgivî'de Bilgi ve İnanç Paradigması* (Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2019), 220-221.

2. The view defends that human has power and freedom: *Qadariyyah* and *Mu'tazilah*.

3. The combination of the positions abovementioned: *Ahl al-Sunnah*

   a. Intermediate determinisim (*al-jabr al-mutawassit*)

   b. Intermediate *Tafwīz* (*al-tafwīz al-mutavassit*)[87]

Assessment and Conclusion

Even though there are theological factors and the purpose of defending religion at the basis of the formation of the perspectives of the schools of kalām or sects, the major determinants are political and social reasons. It is granted that, not only with Muslims but also as a human reality and scientific fact, intellectual movements and sects undoubtedly get affected by the social and political events of the society in which they emerge and that this effect leaves its mark on the ways of thinking, ideas and solution suggestions. When the issue is handled by using a contextual reading regarding the Muslim society, it will be noticed that the political controversies that occurred in the first period and the viewpoints that took shape accordingly stood out. Notably, the fact that the boundaries of the sects became definite with the century of compilation gives the impression that in the first place a position was taken according to the preferred view out of the views in question, that the past was reread, and that then based on the position taken methodologies were built. With an objective assessment, it is possible to say that our science tradition put forward a commendable collection of knowledge and method to eliminate the distortion that social and political areas created and address the problems on a scientific platform. However, it could not exclude itself from the determinative nature of the factors of the aforesaid areas. It may be said that it is always at the risk of being a basis for the formation of misunderstandings. This is also the time when we, today, are going to further read again on the roots of the perceptions diverging from our source text, the Qur'ān and Muḥammad the Messenger of Allah. In fact, the existence and standing of the Messenger of Allah, who sets forth a model of experience by absorbing the central message of the Last Covenant, which, unlike the texts of other religious traditions, bases the emphasis of being chosen on the character building, cannot be imagined separately from the Qur'ān. When imagined, it may cause some misperceptions. Indeed, in the caliphate-centred debates, putting an emphasis on 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and his descendants and while criticizing this emphasis, approaching to the political administration with a tribal focus and using the argument that the caliphate is from *Quraysh* bring along some chronic complications. It should be kept in mind that the century of compilation, in which Muslims created their political traditions, took place around the convolution of *Banī Hāshim-Banī Umayyah*. It should not be forgotten that as truths can be advanced, wrongs can also be developed.

If the issue of caliphate was handled in an institutional context not on the basis of a specific individual and social identity, the message of Islam could have reverberated across further regions, and even Islamic civilization could have gained more considerable momentum. In fact, the caliphate, in the way it is established in our tradition, does not exist in the Qur'ān, but it is founded on the ḥadīth literature. At this point, it should be strongly pointed out that the caliphates of *Umayyad*s and *'Abbāsid*s, which started out

---

[87] Metin Özdemir, *Allah'ın Bilgisinin Ezelîliği ve İnsan Hürriyeti* (Istanbul: İz Yayınları, 2013), 30-121.

from the same point following *Rāshidūn* Caliphs, have been a great misfortune for Muslims. Because the caliphate, at the time of the compilation of ḥadīths, with the impact of the pro sultanate power, an area open to fabricating ḥadīths was created, both because of the desires of sultans and for the purpose of ingratiating themselves with the sultans.[88]

As to the condition of caliphate being *Quraysh* origin, around the ḥadīth, which is reported in the way of Abū Bakr al-Sıddīq stress over the caliphate's belonging to *Quraysh* at the canopy of *Banī Saʿidah*, some controversies arisen in the historical process. Some regarded this statement of Abū Bakr as ḥadīth and claimed that the caliphate is the right of the people of *Quraysh*. Indeed, it might be said that Abū Bakr's emphasis on *Quraysh* was originating from its influence, whose social impact was dominant at that time and which was prestigious in that area. In other words, the caliph might have been chosen from *Quraysh*, considering the political and social conditions of the period. Later on, the efficiency of *Quraysh* faded, and this condition was not taken into account and enforced.

The events taking place as a result of the conception of *Khārijites* concerning belief, disbelief, and deeds, which was caused by the disagreements on the grave sinner, has been an incident that narrows the boundaries of Muslim societies. Every Muslim or anyone adopting an attitude outside of *Khārijites*' interpretations eliminated from the frame of Muslim, excluded from the *ummah* circle, and they were got rid of in one way or another. Therefore, *Khārijites*' attitude gave rise to anarchy inside the society, and it affected each segment of the community at different levels. This situation, which can be described as a kind of deviation from the effort of establishing a consistent understanding concerning the integrity of the Qurʾān and the Messenger of Allah, for each individual of *ummah*, stroke a severe blow for the culture of tolerating each other even though they did not share the same opinion (but agreed on the principles) or with a broader expression the mores of living together as a society. The *Murjiʿah* movement, which emerged as a reaction to this divergence with the motto "leaving the judgment to Allah, its deferral," has been considered an attitude that relieved the society. It must be due to the purpose of focusing on the unity of *ummah* that later on, the tradition *of Ahl al-Sunnah* essentially adopted this understanding. Consequently, the tradition *of Ahl al-Sunnah* can be regarded as a perception that widens the boundaries of *ummah* and that cares about the communal unity since they accept those who commit a misdeed as a believer and refrained from accusing any believer with infidelity unless they confess it themselves and except a few particular cases.

The matter of predestination has a broader and more central impact than the previously treated two issues. Perceptions formed in this area, the essential element that affects the imagination and civilization of an individual, a society, even more than that a community constituting a significant amount of the world. In a sense, this issue has shaped the Muslim society in terms of demonstrating human's purpose of existence and creating the axis of his conduct related to this.

Unfortunately, politics, by definition, has a nature that prioritizes power and legitimacy before everything, and that does not abstain from sacrificing everything at a time of danger. This fact is an experience that humanity has profoundly witnessed since its coming to existence. In this context, many solutions proposed within the historical process have not had the desired results. The conclusion that Jābirī

---

88   For analysis on the issue, see. Azimli, "Hilafet/Halifelik", 55- 69.

reached, when he analysed this context in detail, was in the form of moralizing the politics. Considering the reality, regrettably, this solution offer appears as a utopia in front of us. Instead of moralizing systems, giving those who establish policies an opportunity to build themselves as qualified and virtuous individuals seems to be the most consistent way. The fact that the political tradition of the Muslim community was formed at wrong hands such as *Umayyad* and *'Abbāsid* rules, and that *Umayyads* conceptualized of predestination in a way that eliminates the ontological purpose of human to ensure their political legitimacy, and that even worse they drew the Muslim thought tradition into a chronic debate in a theological ground in the context of whether it was a principle of faith, have created the most destructive effect in *ummah* mind. The end time Muslims, who have a 1400-year past, unfortunately, still have not been able to get rid of this effect.

Against this destructive impact, the intellectuals of *ummah* have been reacting, since the beginning, on the basis of moving the discussions over the problems *ummah* has been encountering into a healthy and natural ground. In this regard, the contributions of *Jabriyyah*, *Qadariyyah*, *Mu'tazilah*, which systemized the heritage of the previous two, and lastly, *Ahl al-Sunnah*, which had the claim of finding the middle way, to the intellectual thought is evident. It is possible to infer that, even though the shortcomings they left are open to all kinds of constructive criticism, attempted to find solutions to the problems of society and that kalām has been formed through life. To conclude, this situation shows that today's Muslims, who are facing more complicated and menacing issues, must act with a similar concern.

References

'Abd al-Bāqī, Muḥammad Fu'ād. *al-Mu'jam al-mufahras li-alfāz al-Qur'ān al-Karīm.* Istanbul: Tebliğ Yayıncılık, 1985.

Abū Zahra, Muḥammad. *Ta'rīkh al-madhāhib al-Islāmiyya.* s.n.: Dār al-Fikr al-'Arabī, n.d.

Abū Zahra, Muḥammad. *İslâm'da Siyâsî ve İtikâdî Mezhepler Tarihi.* trans. Hasan Karakaya et al. Istanbul: Hisar Yayıncılık, nd.

Akbulut, Ahmet. *Sahabe Devri Siyasi Hadiselerinin Kelami Problemlere Etkisi.* Istanbul: Birleşik Yayıncılık. 1992.

Akbulut, Ahmet. "Allah'ın Takdiri-Kulun Tedbiri". *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 33/1 (1994), 129-156.

Aycan, İrfan. *Saltanata Giden Yolda Muaviye bin Ebi Sufyan.* Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2010.

Aydın, Ali Aslan. "İslam'da Büyük Günah ve Tekfir Meselesi". *Diyanet İlmi Dergi* 14/4 (1975), 197-201.

Aydın, Ömer. *Kuran-ı Kerim'de İman-Amel İlişkisi.* Istanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 2007.

Azimli, Mehmet. "Hilafet/Halifelik". *İslam Kurumlar Tarihi.* 55-72. Second Printing. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2017.

Bağcı, H. Musa. *İnsanın Kaderi Hadislerin Telkin Ettiği Kader Anlayışı.* Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2009.

al-Baghdādī, 'Abd al-Qāhir. *al-Farq bayn al-firāq (Mezhepler Arasındaki Farklar).* trans. Ethem Ruhi Fığlalı. Ankara: TDV Yayınları, 1991.

Bebek, Adil. "Kebîre". *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* 25/163-164. Ankara: TDV Yayınları, 2002.

Biçer, Ramazan. *Akıl ve İrade Kapısı İmam Mâtürîdî.* Istanbul: Erdem Yayınları, 2018.

Bulut, Halil İbrahim. *İslam Mezhepleri Tarihi.* Second Printing. Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2016.

el-Cābirī, Muhammed Ābid. *Arap Siyasal Aklı.* trans. Vecdi Akyüz. First Printing. Istanbul: Mana Yayınları, 2018.

Çağlayan, Harun. "Mürcie". *Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri.* ed. Mehmet Evkuran. 107-133. Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018.

Çelebi, İlyas. "İlk Kelam Tartışmaları ve İnanç Grupları". *Kelam El Kitabı.* ed. Şaban Ali Düzgün. 49-62. Ankara, Grafiker Yayınları, 2016.

Çetin, Rabiye. "Hilafet", *İslamiyet ve Hıristiyanlık Kavramları Sözlüğü.* ed. Mualla Selçuk and et al. 1: 318-319. Ankara: Ankara University Yayınları, 2013.

Çetin, Rabiye. "Kur'an-ı Kerim Bağlamında Kader-İmtihan İlişkisi". *Journal of the Human and Social Science Researches* 5/4 (2016), 780-800.

Çetin, Rabiye. "Haricilik", *Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri,* ed. Mehmet Evkuran. 57-75. Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018.

Erdemci, Cemalettin. "İlk Dönem (Hicri 1. Asır) Kader Tartışmaları Ğaylan ed-Dımaşkî-Ömer b. Abdülaziz". *Tezkire: Journal of Thought, Politics and Social Science* 43-44 (April-Semptember 2006), 198-223.

Evkuran, Mehmet. "Ehl-i Sünnet ve'l-Cemâat". *Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri.* ed. Mehmet Evkuran. 211-234. Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018.

al-Fīrūzābādī, Abū al-Ṭāhir Majd al-Dīn. *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ.* Beirut: Dār al-ʿĀlamī al-Jāmiʿ, n.d.

al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad. *al-Mustaṣfā min ʿilm al-uṣūl.* ed. Ḥamza b. Zuhayr Ḥāfiẓ, 4 Vols. Medīna: s.n., n.d.

Gölcük, Şerafettin. *Bâkıllânî ve İnsanın Fiilleri.* Ankara: TDV Yayınları, 1997.

Gümüşoğlu, Hasan. *İslam'da İmamet ve Hilafet.* First Printing. Istanbul: Kayıhan Yayınları, 1999.

Hatiboğlu, Mehmed Said. *Siyasi-İctimai Hadiselerle Hadis Münasebetleri.* Ankara: Otto Yayınları, 2016.

Ibn Manẓūr, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Faḍl Muḥammad. *Lisān al-ʿArab.* 15 Vols. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, n.d.

Ibn Saʿd, Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad. *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr.* ed. Adnan Demircan. trans. Ahmet Aslan and et al., Second Printing. Istanbul: Siyer Yayınları, 2015.

al-Iṣfahānī, al-Rāghib. *Mufradāt alfāz al-Qurʾān.* ed. Safwān ʿAdnān Dāwūdī. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 2002.

Izutsu, Toshihiko. *Kur'an'da Allah ve İnsan.* Trans. Süleyman Ateş. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1975.

Jubrān, Masʿūd. *al-Rāʾid.* Beirut: Dār al-ʿIlm li al-Malāyīn, 1962.

al-Jurjānī, Sayyid Sharīf. *Kitāb al-Taʿrīfāt.* ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Marʿashli. Beirut: Dār al-Nefāis, 2003.

Kalaycı, Mehmet. *Tarihsel Süreçte Eşarilik Maturidilik İlişkisi.* Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2013.

Kaplan, İbrahim and et al. "İmanla İlgili Teolojik Problemler", *Kelâm III Sistematik Kelâm/İman ve İlâhiyât,* ed. İsmail Şık ve Nail Karagöz, 49-77. Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı, 2017.

Karagöz, Nail. "İnsanın Fiilleri (Efʿâl-i İbâd)". *Kelâm III Sistematik Kelâm/İman ve İlâhiyât.* ed. İsmail Şık - Nail Karagöz. 209-255. Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı, 2017.

Kazanç, Fethi Kerim. "Muʿtezile". *Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri.* ed. Mehmet Evkuran. 163-212. Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018.

Kazıcı, Ziya. *İslam Medeniyeti ve Müesseseleri Tarihi.* Istanbul: Kayıhan Yayınları, 1999.

Keskin, Halife. *İslam Düşüncesinde Kader ve Kaza.* Istanbul: Beyan Yayınları, 1997.

Kılavuz, A. Saim. *Anahatlarıyla İslâm Akâidi ve Kelâm'a Giriş.* Istanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 2009.

Korkmazgöz, Rıza. "Cebriyye". *Kelam Tarihi ve Ekolleri.* ed. Mehmet Evkuran. 137-162. Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018.

Köksal, Emre. "İlk Dönem Muʿtezile Kelamında Zât-Sıfat İlişkisi -Sıfat, Mânâ ve Ahvâl Kavramları Üzerinden Bir Değerlendirme-". *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 40 (2018/1), 235-249.

Kubat, Mehmet. *İslam Mezhepleri Tarihi,* Second Printing. Istanbul: Kitap Dünyası Yayınları, 2015.

Kutlu, Sönmez. *İslam Düşüncesinde İlk Gelenekçiler Hadis Taraftarlarının İman Anlayışı Bağlamında Bir Zihniyet Analizi.* Second Printing. Ankara: Kitabiyat Yayınları, 2002.

Najjār, Muḥammad ʿAlī. *al-Muʿjam al-wasīṭ.* ed. Ibrāhīm Muṣṭafā et al. Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1992.

Önal, Recep. "İman ve Mahiyeti Konusunda Muʿtezile İle Ehl-i Sünnet Polemiği". *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 39 (2015), 121-146.

Önal, Recep. *Ebü'l-Berekât en-Nesefî ve Kelamî Polemikleri.* Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2017.

Önal, Recep. "Ebü'l-Berekât en-Nesefî'nin İlahî İsim ve Sıfatlara Yaklaşımı". *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 42 (2017), 135-161.

Önal, Recep. *İmam Birgivî'de Bilgi ve İnanç Paradigması.* Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2019.

Özdemir, Metin. *Allah'ın Bilgisinin Ezelîliği ve İnsan Hürriyeti.* Istanbul: İz Yayınları, 2013.

Özler, Mevlüt. *İslam Düşüncesinde İnsan Hürriyeti: Cüveyni Eksenli bir Tetkik.* Istanbul: Nun Yayınları, 1997.

Özler, Mevlüt. "Kelam Tarihi". *Kelam El Kitabı.* ed. Şaban Ali Düzgün. 21-40. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2016.

Öztürk, Resul. *Cebri Düşüncenin Yaygınlaşmasında Siyasi İktidarın Etkisi.* Ankara: Ankara University, PhD Thesis, 2002.

al-Qārī, ʿAlī b. Sulṭān Muḥammad. *Sharḥ al-fiqh al-akbar li-Abī Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān.* ed. Marwān Muḥammad al-Shaʿār. Beirut: Dār al-Nafāis, 1998.

al-Ṣābūnī, Nūr al-Dīn. *al-Bidāya fī uṣūl al-dīn.* ed. Bekir Topaloğlu. Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1995.

Sinanoğlu, Abdülhamit. "İslâm'ın İlk Siyasallaştırılma Sürecinde Kader İnancı". *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 43/2 (2002), 249-276.

Şahin, Hanifi. "İlk Dönem Kader Tartışmalarında Siyasetin Rolü". *Atatürk Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 36 (2011), 48-70.

Shahrastānī, Muḥammad. *Milal wa niḥal.* trans. Mustafa Öz. Istanbul: Litera Yayınları, 2008.

Shaykhzāde, ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. ʿAlī. *Naẓm al-farāʾid wa Jamʿ al-fawāʾid.* Second Printing. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Taqaddum, n.d.

Şık, İsmail. "Şefaat". *Kelâm IV Sistematik Kelâm 2 Nübüvvet Mead.* ed. İsmail Şık – İsmail Yürük. 217-231. Ankara: Araştırma Yayınları, 2016.

Şık, İsmail – Akbaş, Hamdi. "Düşünce Hareketleri ve İnanç Grupları". *Kelâm I Kelâm Tarihi/Kelâm Okulları.* 59-92. Second Printing. Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı, 2017.

al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad b. Jarīr. *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī-Tārīkh al-rusul wa al-mulūk.* ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. 11 Vols. Second Printing. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1962.

al-Taftāzānī, Saʿd al-Dīn Masʿūd. *Sharh al-Maqāṣid.* ed. Abd al-Raḥmān ʿUmayra. 5 Vols. Beirut: Ālem al-Kutub, 1998.

Yavuz, Yusuf Şevki. "Kader". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* 24/58-63. Istanbul: TDV Yayınları, 2001.

Yılmaz, Mustafa Selim. "Din-Siyaset ilişkisi Bağlamında M. A. El-Cabiri'nin Müslüman Geleneğe Yönelttiği Eleştiriler". *Dini Araştırmalar* 11/32 (Eylül-Aralık 2008), 215-227.

al-Zabīdī, Abū l-Fayḍ Murtaḍā. *Tāj al-ʿArūs.* ed. ʿAbd al-Munʿim Khalīl Ibrāhīm et al. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 2007.