



## 'ABD-AL-RAḤĪM ḲAYYĀṬ

'ABD-AL-RAḤĪM B. MOḤAMMAD B. 'OTMĀN AL-ḲAYYĀṬ, ABU'L-ḤOSAYN, Mu'tazilite theologian of Baghdad. He must have been born before 220/835, since he began his theological studies still under the Mu'tazilite Ja'far b. Mobaššer (d. 234/848-49). His chief teacher of *kalām* (theology) seems to have been 'Isā b. Haytam Šūfī. He was also noted for his learning in Hadith and the law of inheritance (*farā'ez*) and is known to have transmitted traditions from the renowned Kufan traditionist Yūsuf b. Mūsā Qaṭṭān (d. 253/867). After the death of his teacher 'Isā Šūfī in 245/859, he belonged to the circle of Abū Moǰāled Baǧdādī, now the chief of the Mu'tazilites of Baghdad. When Abū Moǰāled died in 268 or 269/881-83, Ḳayyāṭ in turn came to be recognized as the head of the Mu'tazilite school of Baghdad. His reputation as a Mu'tazilite theologian was, however, in his own lifetime overshadowed by that of his prime student, Abu'l-Qāsem Balkī Ka'bī, the initiator of the later phase of the Mu'tazilite school of Baghdad. Ḳayyāṭ appears to have taken pride in the success of his student: When Balkī took leave of him in Baghdad, before 287/900, Ḳayyāṭ asked him not to visit Abū 'Alī Jobbā'ī, the head of the Basran Mu'tazilite school, so that he would remain known as Ḳayyāṭ's student. Later they maintained a regular correspondence, Ḳayyāṭ answering the questions of Balkī. The date of his death is not given in the sources. Balkī, however, referred to him as still alive in his *Ketāb al-maqālāt* written between 291 and 297/903-10 (on this work, see [Abu'l-Qāsem Balkī](#)). He probably died not much later.

Ḳayyāṭ's literary activity was directed in particular to the refutation of the



heretical books of Ebn al-Rāwandī. The latter, before becoming a freethinker and an Emāmī Shi‘ite, had been a student of ‘Īsā Ṣūfī, like Ḳayyāṭ, and was evidently personally well known to the latter. Ḳayyāṭ’s only extant work is the *K. al-Enteṣār*, a refutation of Ebn al-Rāwandī’s *K. Faẓīḥat al-Mo‘tazela*, an attack on the Mu‘tazilites in defense of Emāmī doctrine (ed. H. N. Nyberg, Cairo, 1925; ed. and Fr. tr. by A. Nader, Beirut, 1957). It was written after the death of Abū Moǧāled and Ebn al-Rāwandī. This makes it unlikely that Ebn al-Rāwandī died as late as 298/910-11 or 301/913-14, as some sources state, though the early date given for his death by Mas‘ūdī (245/859) is also untenable. Other works of Ḳayyāṭ mentioned in the sources include a refutation of the *K. al-Jārūf* of Abū Ḥaḥṣ Ḥaddād, another Mu‘tazilite who turned heretic; a refutation of a *K. fi’l-‘aks* of the Basran Mu‘tazilite ‘Abbād b. Salmān; a book on analogical reasoning about God (*Estedlāl al-šāhed ‘ala’l-ġā‘eb*, see ‘Abd-al-Jabbār, *al-Moḥīṭ bi’l-taklīf*, ed. ‘Omar Sayyed ‘Azmī, Cairo, 1965, p. 167); a book repudiating the validity of reports of single transmitters (*ḵabar al-wāḥed*) which was refuted by his student Balkī; a refutation of a *K. al-Borhān*. Ḳayyāṭ engaged in disputations with the Mu‘tazilite Abu’l-Ḥosayn Ṣāleḥī about the doctrine of *erǧā‘* to which the latter inclined. He was reputed to be, and frequently quoted as, an authority on the history and doctrines of the early Mu‘tazela.

Ḳayyāṭ generally espoused the doctrine of the Mu‘tazilite school of Baghdad, and only a few of his specific views are mentioned in the sources. Most often noted was his thesis that the non-existent (*al-ma‘dūm*) is not only a thing, substance, or accident in the state of non-existence, as the Basran Abū ‘Alī Jobbā‘ī held, but also a body (*jesm*), though it can not have motion. Jobbā‘ī wrote a refutation of this doctrine, arguing that it implied the eternity of bodies, and Balkī disassociated himself from his teacher’s view. Other opinions ascribed to him show that he admitted a greater degree of causality in nature than the Basran Mu‘tazilites, thus anticipating Balkī in this regard. In concordance with the general attitude of the school of Baghdad he affirmed that ‘Alī was the most excellent of the Companions of the Prophet, arguing that all the virtues dispersed in other men were assembled in him. At the same time he maintained that the Companions had evidently been right in supporting the imamate of Abū Bakr, as ‘Alī did not object to it. His position on the imamate is thus close to some Zaydī (Batrī) theses. He sharply denounced, on the other hand, the Emāmī repudiation of the caliphate of Abū Bakr and ‘Omar and defended ‘Oṭmān’s conduct as caliph against his critics. (See the quotations from a book of his in ‘Abd-al-Jabbār’s *K. al-Moǧnī* as cited by Ebn



Abi' l-Ḥadīd, *Šarḥ nahī al-balāḡa*, ed. Ḥasan Tamīm, Beirut, 1963, I, pp. 523-40; in the edited text of *K. al-Moḡnī* [XX/2, ed. S. Donyā and 'A. Maḥmūd, Cairo, n.d.] the corresponding passages appear to be abridged.)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aš'arī, *Maqālāt al-eslāmīyīn*, ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul, 1929-33, pp. 314, 353, 518.

Abu'l-Qāsem Balkī and 'Abd-al-Jabbār, *Faḏl al-e'tezāl wa ṭabaqāt al-mo'tazela*, ed. Fo'ād Sayyed, Tunis, 1974; see index and p. 51.

*Fehrest*, p. 184; ed. M. T. Houtsma in *WZKM* 4, 1890, pp. 223-24; ed. J. W. Fück in *ZDMG* 90, 1936, p. 32; idem in *Professor Mohammad Shafi Presentation Volume*, Lahore, 1955, pp. 61, 71.

*Ta'rik Baḡdād* XI, p. 87.

Zereklī, *A'lām*, Beirut, 1389/1969, IV, p. 122.

Maqdesī, *Bad'* II, p. 121. 'Abd-al-Qāher Baḡdādī, *Farq*, pp. 163-65.

Šahrastānī, pp. 19, 53. Ebn Jawzī, *al-Montaḡam*, Hyderabad, 1357-59/1938-41, VI, p. 99f.

Ebn al-Mortaḡā, *Ṭabaqāt*, see index. *Lesān al-mīzān* IV, p. 8f.

H. Nyberg, ed. of Ḳayyāṭ, *K. al-Entešār*, Cairo, 1925, intro.

A. S. Tritton, *Muslim Theology*, London, 1947, pp. 155-57.

Brockelmann, *GAL* S. I. p. 341.