



## JOBĀ'Ī

---

**JOBĀ'Ī**, the name of two Mu'tazilite theologians, Abu 'Ali Moḥammad b. 'Abd-al-Wahhāb (849-915) and his son Abu Hāšem 'Abd-al-Salām (890-933).

Abu 'Ali was born in 849-50 in Jobbā in Khuzestan (for biographical details, see Gwynne, 1982, pp. 7-31). He came to Baṣra as a youth, presumably before 868, where he studied with Abu Ya'qub Yusof b. 'Abd-Allāh Šaḥḥām (ca. 800-71?), who is singled out as his most significant teacher. Šaḥḥām is said to have been "the youngest and most perfect" of the students of [Abu'l-Hoḍayl al-'Allāf](#) (ca. 752-841?), and, according to later sources, the leadership of the Mu'tazilites fell to him after the death of Abu'l-Hoḍayl ('Abd-al-Jabbār, 1974, pp. 280-81; Ebn al-Mortazā, pp. 71-72). Abu 'Ali left Baṣra for Baghdad some time between 871 and 873. It is reported that [Abu'l-Qāsem Balki Ka'bi](#), the leading Mu'tazilite in Khorasan, visited Abu 'Ali's salon (*majles*) for some time before 887, yet the anecdote of a meeting of Abu 'Ali and the heretic Mu'tazilite theologian [Ebn al-Rāvandi](#) is without foundation. Some time before 890 or 892, Abu 'Ali left Baghdad and took up residence in 'Askar Mokram in Khuzestan, where he stayed for the rest of his life. In a mosque in 'Askar Mokram, Abu 'Ali held public sessions that were open to the general public, and he held classes in which he taught his special students (Koşaym, p. 77). It was probably during these years that he met and debated with Abu'l-Qāsem Ḥāreṭ Warrāq in Suq al-Ahvāz (Ebn al-Nadim, pp. 218-19, tr. p. 425). Abu 'Ali died in Ša'bān 303/February-March 916.

Abu 'Ali had two children, a son, Abu Hāšem 'Abd-al-Salām, and a daughter who is reported to have been well versed in Mu'tazilite doctrine and to have



propagated its teachings among women (‘Abd-al-Jabbār, 1974, p. 330; Ebn al-Mortazā, p. 109). Abu Hāšem was born 890 (Ḳoṣaym, p. 306), and, following his father’s death in 916, he became the leader of the Baṣran Mu‘tazilites. Abu Hāšem apparently spent most of his life in ‘Askar Mokram and in Baṣra (Ḳoṣaym, p. 310), and in 926-27 or 928-29, he took up residence in Baghdad (Ebn al-Nadim, p. 222, tr., p. 434), where he died in 933.

*Works.* Abu ‘Ali authored numerous works, none of which, with the exception of the first volume of his *Ketāb al-maqālāt* (see Anṣārī), have survived. His oeuvre must have been enormous. Ebn al-Nadim’s (d. 995) *Fehrest* is said to have contained a work list comprising seventy titles, yet the relevant portion is not preserved. The Mu‘tazilite biographical (*ṭabaqāt*) literature does not provide any information on Abu ‘Ali’s writings. The most detailed information on his oeuvre is provided by the numerous scattered references in later works, particularly by Mu‘tazilites (see Gimaret, 1976; idem, 1984). Apart from numerous independent works devoted to specific issues, responses to questions addressed to him by his students and to refutations, Abu ‘Ali wrote a Qur’ān exegesis (Kohlberg, 1992b, p. 342), which was reportedly, together with the commentaries by Abu Bakr Aṣamm (d. 816), Abu’l-Qāsem Balkī Ka‘bi (d. 931) and Abu Moslem Eṣfahāni (d. 934), among the most significant Mu‘tazilite Qur’ān commentaries at that time. It was a massive work of more than 100 parts (*joz*) that was unprecedented in comprehensiveness. Ebn Ṭāwus (d. 1266) offers very precise specifications when he quotes from Abu ‘Ali’s Qur’ān commentary (*tafsir*). According to Ebn Ṭāwus, it consisted of ten volumes (*mojalladāt*), each volume comprising two parts (*joz’ān*). Each part must have consisted of at least thirteen quires (*korrās*), which at the time comprised, as a rule, either eight or ten folios. Excerpts of Abu ‘Ali’s commentaries are to be found scattered among numerous later exegeses, most significantly in the *Tahḍib fi tafsir al-Qor’ān* of Ḥākem Joṣami (d. 1101), Abu Ja‘far Moḥammad Ṭusi’s (d. 1067) *al-Tebyān fi tafsir al-Qor’ān*, Abu ‘Ali Faḏl b. Ḥasan Ṭabarsi’s (d. ca. 1153) *Majma‘ al-bayān fi tafsir al-Qor’ān*, and Faḳr-al-Din Moḥammad Rāzi’s (d. 1209) *al-Tafsir al-kabir*. Further references to Abu ‘Ali’s Qur’ān commentary are to be found in ‘Abd-al-Jabbār Hamadāni’s (d. 1025) *Motašābeh Qor’ān*, Moḥammad al-Šarīf al-Rāzi’s (d. 1016) *Ḥaqā‘eq al-ta’wil fi mota-šābeh al-tanzil*, ‘Ali b. Ḥosayn al-Šarīf al-Mortazā’s (d. 1045) *Amāli*, and ‘Ali b. Musā b. Ṭāwus’ (d. 1266) *Sa‘d-al so‘ud* (Gwynne, 1982; Kohlberg, 1992b, p. 342; Gimaret, 1994; Nabḥā).

Ebn Ṭāwus accused Abu ‘Ali of deficiencies in his knowledge of Arabic, and



Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Ali Aš'ari (q.v.) states in his own Qur'ān commentary (of which only the introduction is preserved by Ebn 'Asāker, p. 138) that Arabic was not Abu 'Ali's mother tongue and that he interpreted the Qur'ān in the spoken language of Jobbā. It was the latter's statement that induced some modern scholars (e.g., see Brockelmann, *GAL*, S I, p. 342) to conclude that Abu 'Ali's commentary was in fact a translation of the Qur'ān, either in the dialect spoken at Jobbā or into Turkish. These accusations, however, belong to the realm of polemics (Gimaret, 1994, pp. 32-35). Similarly without foundation is Ebn Ṭāwus' accusation that Abu 'Ali would neither have addressed any historical issues, be it stories of the prophets (*qeṣaṣ al-anbiā'*) or the circumstances leading to the revelation of a verse (*asbāb al-nozul*). The same applies to Aš'ari's and Ebn Ṭāwus' accusation that Abu 'Ali completely refrained from taking into account earlier Qur'ān commentaries (Kohlberg, 1992a; idem, 1992b, p. 342). It is from preserved quotations of Abu 'Ali's commentary that some indications as to his school affiliation in legal matters might be gleaned. In most cases, Abu 'Ali opted for Ḥanafī positions, although at times he prefers the view of the Shafī'ites or the Malikites (cf. Gimaret, 1994, pp. 40 ff.).

Abu Hāšem authored numerous works, none of which have survived. The early bio-bibliographical sources give different numbers as to the total number of his writings. Ebn al-Nadīm (p. 222, tr. I, p. 434) mentions a list of ten titles, whereas according to Malaṭi (p. 40), Abu Hāšem had authored 160 works in debates (*fī'l-jadal*). The bio-bibliographical notice by Šehāb-al-Dīn 'Abd-Allāh Yāqut on Abu Hāšem (s.v. 'Abd-al-Salām) is presumably among the lost parts of the book. The Mu'tazilite biographical (*ṭabaqāt*) literature does not contain any information on Abu Hāšem's writings. The most detailed information on his writings is provided by the numerous scattered references in later Mu'tazilite works (for references, see the worklist by Gimaret, 1976; idem, 1984). He composed a number of theological summa-type works, the most important among them were apparently *al-Abwāb* (or: *Naqz al-abwāb*), *al-Jāme'* (or *al-Jāme' al-kabir*), and *al-Jāme' al-ṣaḡir*, upon which 'Abd-al-Jabbār wrote a commentary ('Abd-al-Jabbār, 1960-69, IX, p. 69), numerous independent treatises devoted to specific theological issues, responses, and refutations.

*Doctrine.* Abu 'Ali played a crucial role in the development of Mu'tazilite doctrine formulating a refined theological framework that served as the doctrinal basis for the Basran school of the Mu'tazilites. His theological views apparently underwent some modifications during his life. Since, with the



exception of his *Maqālāt*, none of Abu 'Ali's writings are known to be extant, his doctrine can only be learned through the scattered references in later works, particularly those by later Mu'tazilites as well as the *Maqālāt al-eslāmiyin* of his former student Abu'l-Ḥasan Aš'ari. Abu 'Ali saw himself in the tradition of the ideas of Abu'l-Ḥoḍayl al-'Allāf, whose doctrines he set out to revive and to refine, thereby formulating a comprehensive theological system, yet not without disagreeing with Abu'l-Ḥoḍayl's views regarding a number of issues; he is known to have composed a treatise entitled *Masā'el al-ḵelāf 'alā Abi'l-Ḥoḍayl*.

Abu Hāšem disagreed with his father on a number of doctrinal issues, with regard to which he formulated his own views. The differences of opinion between the two were apparently dealt with by 'Abd-al-Jabbār in his *al-Ḳelāf bayn al-šayḵayn*, which is lost. He developed the notion of states (*ḥāl*, pl. *aḥwāl*) as an attempt to create a conceptual framework for analysing the ontological quality of God's attributes and their relation to His essence within the established Mu'tazilite view of divine attributes. For this purpose, Abu Hāšem adapted the concept of state employed by the grammarians for a complement in the case of the accusative occurring in a sentence that consists of a subject and a form of *kāna* (to be) as a complete verb. In this case, the accusative cannot simply be taken as a predicate to *kāna* as it would be if *kāna* were incomplete and transitive; it must rather be understood as a *ḥāl*. On this foundation, Abu Hāšem elaborated a system of five different categories of states which he applied to both God and man. These categories are distinguished by the different ontological basis, which brings forth their actuality. According to Abu Hāšem, a state is not an entity or a thing (*dāt*, *šay*) and can thus neither be said to be existent (*mawjud*) nor non-existent (*ma'dum*). Not being entities themselves, the states can likewise not be known in isolation. Rather, the essence is known to be qualified through them. Thus, Abu Hāšem speaks of the actuality (*ḥoṣul*) of the states and their initiation (*tajaddod*), while he refrains from asserting for them a coming to be (*ḥodut*) that would imply their coming into existence (Frank, 1978; idem, 1980; Gimaret, 1970; Alami).

The first category is the attribute of essence (*ṣefat dātiya*, *ṣefat al-dāt*, *ṣefat al-nafs*) through which the essences (*dawāt*) differ from each other. The atom (*jawhar*), for instance, is described as an atom not through its essence but through its attribute of essence. The same applies to God, who does not differ from other essences through His mere essence, but rather through His



attribute of essence. The second category of states are the essential attributes (*ṣefāt moqtaḏāt ‘an ṣefat al-dāt*), which are by necessity entailed by the attribute of essence as soon as it becomes existent. The attribute of essence of being an atom that is attached to an essence entails the spatiality of the atom whenever it exists. Thus, occupying a space is an essential attribute of an atom. In regard to God, the specific divine quality of His attribute of essence entails His essential attributes. These are His being powerful, knowing, living, and existing. Thus, God must necessarily and eternally be described by these attributes, which cannot cease as long as His eternal attribute of essence lasts. Man’s attributes of being powerful, knowing, and living differ in their quality from the corresponding attributes in God. They belong to the third category of states which gain actuality through an entitative determinant (*ma’nā*) or cause (*‘ella*) in the subject. Thus, the qualification of these attributes in man differs from the corresponding attributes in God. Since man’s states are caused by entitative determinants, he cannot be described as permanently or necessarily powerful, knowing, etc. Moreover, since these determinants inhere in parts of man’s body, he needs his limbs as tools for his actions and his heart in order to know. The determinant itself is therefore not sufficient to actualize man’s being powerful and knowing. Further conditions like the health of heart and limbs have to be fulfilled for them to serve as tools in carrying out actions. Thus, the realms of man’s power and knowledge are limited by the natural deficiencies of his body. God, in contrast, is unconditionally powerful and knowing since His attributes of being powerful and knowing are essential attributes which do not inhere in any locus and, thus, do not require any limbs. Yet, Abu Hāšem applied this category to God when he reportedly asserted that God is willing or disapproving through a determinant that is His will or His disapproval. Since it is impossible that a determinant may inhere in God, he maintained that God is willing or disapproving through a determinant which does not inhere in a substrate (*lā fi maḥall*).

The fourth category of states are those which are actualized by the action of an agent (*be’l-fā’el*), in particular the existence of a temporal thing which is founded in its producer’s capability. This category is inadmissible in God. While the existence of all created beings is considered as belonging to this category, God’s existence is counted as an essential attribute entailed by His attribute of essence. The fifth category are states which gain actuality neither by virtue of the essence nor by an entitative determinant (*lā le’l-dāt wa-lā le-ma’nā*). To this category belongs the attribute of “being perceiving” (*kawnohu modrekan*), which is entailed by the perceiver’s being living. In regard to God,



it gains actuality when the condition (*šart*) of the presence of the perceptible is fulfilled. Man, in order to perceive, must possess healthy senses in addition to the existence of the perceptible. This is not required for God, whose being alive is an essential attribute. Thus, He perceives without senses.

Abu Hāšem reportedly further differed from Abu 'Ali on the issue of how God knows things in their state of non-existence and existence. Abu 'Ali taught that things are not things prior to their being existent since existence (*kawn*) means being found (*wojud*). Yet, a thing may be called a thing and may be known prior to its existence insofar as it is possible to make a statement about it (Aš'ari, pp. 161-62). Owing to his notion of states, Abu Hāšem was not confronted with the issue of whether a thing may be known prior to its existence. The attribute of essence, through which it is what it is, is always attached to it, regardless of whether the thing exists or not (Schmidtke, pp. 197-98, n. 137).

Abu Hāšem is further reported to have differed from his father when arguing that it is good to inflict pain even on the mere supposition that the pain is deserved, as in many cases in which blaming is considered good, the blame is in fact based on supposition rather than knowledge (Heemskerk, pp. 136-37). Abu 'Ali held, by contrast, that supposition cannot take the place of knowledge with respect to deserved pain. He is reported, however, to have made an exception for blame, considering it good to blame someone on the supposition that the person deserved to be blamed. He reportedly explained that this act of blaming is good, not because of the blaming person's supposition (*zann*) but because of the benefit that the blamed person derives from the blame; it may prevent him from committing the offence for which he, perhaps undeservingly, has been blamed (Heemskerk, pp. 136-37).

In regard to whether God may inflict illnesses or other calamities upon men because they are deserved, Abu 'Ali held that illnesses inflicted upon infidels and sinners may serve either as a punishment or a trial. This punishment could, in his view, be appropriate in so far as God would render to man there and then some of the punishment he deserves in the hereafter. Abu Hāšem, in contrast, maintained that every illness inflicted by God on men, regardless of whether they are morally obliged or not, can only have the purpose of a trial and never of a deserved punishment. He supported this view by pointing to the principal difference between undeserved pains and deserved punishment: men must be content with their illnesses and bear them patiently, and they are not allowed to be distressed about them just as in regard to favors that God



bestows on them. This is, however, not necessary in regard to pains which are a deserved punishment. Owing to these different characteristics, man would therefore be unable to recognize whether a specific illness or calamity is inflicted upon him as a trial or as a deserved punishment. Thus, Abu Hāšem concluded that illnesses can be inflicted by God only for the purpose of trial (‘Abd-al-Jabbār, 1960-69, XIII, pp. 431 ff.). Abu ‘Ali is further reported to have maintained that God may inflict pain upon man for the sake of mere compensation (Mānkdim Šašdiv, p. 493). In arguing against his father’s position, Abu Hāšem had reportedly admitted that pain ceases to be unjust when it is compensated. Even with compensation, however, it would by itself still be futile (*abat*) and thus evil is inadmissible for God. Pain inflicted by God thus must result in some kind of benefit (*maṣlaḥa*) in addition to compensation (Mānkdim Šašdiv, p. 493).

On the issue of the nature of passing away and restoration (*fanā’ wa-e’āda*), Abu Hāšem had to assert the possibility of passing away without infringing two other vital notions of his teachings. One of these was that all atoms (*jawāher*) and most accidents (*a’rāz*) endure by themselves. The second notion which he had to take into consideration was that an agent may effect only production (*ijād*) but not annihilation (*e’dām*). This also applies to God. Thus, He can undo something only through the creation of its opposite. The solution of Abu Hāšem, therefore, was that God causes the passing away of the atoms through the creation of a single accident of passing away (*fanā’*). This accident is the opposite of all atoms and, thus, is capable of annihilating any atom. It must itself be existent (*mawjud*), but it cannot inhere in a substrate (*lā fi maḥall*). Furthermore, it does not endure. Most of the points of this concept had been introduced already by Abu ‘Ali, but Abu Hāšem disagreed with his father on a number of details. Abu ‘Ali is reported to have maintained in his earlier works that there are different types of passing away, each of which causes the annihilation of only the corresponding type of atoms. He is also reported to have revised his position in a later version of his *Naqz al-tāj*, stating that only one passing away is required for all atoms, and that is why the atoms will in fact pass away. Abu Hāšem and his followers disagreed. If it were not for scriptural evidence, there would be no indication that the passing away will actually occur. Abu ‘Ali further rejected on principle that anything which does not subsist in a substrate may be defined as an accident. Thus he refrained from classifying passing away as an accident. Abu Hāšem and his school admitted a category of accidents which do not inhere in a substrate (Schmidtke, pp. 211-22).



On the issue of mutual cancellation (*tahāboṭ*) of man's acts of obedience and disobedience upon which a person's fate in the hereafter is founded, Abu Hāšem disagreed with Abu 'Ali about how this cancellation works. While the latter maintained that the smaller amount of reward or punishment will simply be cancelled by the larger amount, Abu Hāšem adhered to the principle of *mowāzana*, which means that the smaller amount will be deduced from the larger (Mānkdim Šašdiv, pp. 627 ff.).

Abu Hāšem furthermore disagreed with his father whether, and on what grounds, repentance is incumbent upon man for all his sins. Abu 'Ali reportedly held that a sinner is always, by virtue of reason and scriptural evidence, obliged to repent for major and minor sins. Abu Hāšem, on the other hand, considered repentance as obligatory only for the grave sinner (*šāheb al-kabira*). In respect to minor sins, he denied that repentance is rationally obligatory and held that scriptural authority also does not definitely indicate this obligation. He compared repentance for a minor sin with a supererogatory act (*nāfela*), which is not obligatory in itself. It is, however, good to perform it, since it helps man to perform his duties or, in this case, to repent for his major sins ('Abd al-Jabbār, 1960-69, XIV, pp. 393-94). Abu Hāšem is further reported to have held that it is impossible to repent of some sins while still carrying on with others when the penitent is aware of the evil nature of the acts which he is persisting. He reportedly argued that man repents because of the evil nature of the major sin in question. Since the characteristic of evil is shared by all major sins it would be inadmissible that one repents only of some major sins because of their evil, while carrying on with others that are of the same gravity. With this position, Abu Hāšem disagreed with Abu 'Ali who admitted the possibility of repenting of some sins while carrying on with others. The only condition set by Abu 'Ali was that the sin repented and that which was continued must not be of the same kind (*jens*). It would, therefore, be impossible to repent of drinking wine from one pot, while continuing to drink from another, whereas it would be possible to repent of drinking wine, while at the same time carrying on with adultery (Mānkdim Šašdiv, pp. 794-95).

*Influence.* Apart from his son Abu Hāšem, who was rejected by a number of former followers of his father as his successor, Abu 'Ali had many students. It was apparently Abu 'Ali's student Moḥammad b. 'Omar Šaymari (d. 927) who led the group of the adversaries of Abu Hāšem. This group later became known as the Eḳšidiya, so called after the name of a student of Šaymari, Abu



Bakr Aḥmad b. ʿAli b. Maʿjur Ekšid (or Ekšād; d. 932 or 937). Another famous student of Abu ʿAli was Abuʿl-Ḥasan ʿAli Ašʿari (873-935), who, around the year 912-13, repented from Muʿtazilite doctrines; the earliest report about his conversion is given by Ebn al-Nadim, according to whom, Ašʿari’s publicly renounced his affiliation with the Muʿtazilites in the congregational mosque of Baṣra on a Friday, but without indicating any reasons or motives on his side. (Ebn al-Nadim, p. 231, tr., pp. 450-51). Later Ašʿari sources relate that Abu ʿAli and his former student Ašʿari engaged in public debates prior to the latter’s conversion from Muʿtazilitism around 912, in the course of which Abu ʿAli was defeated which induced Ašʿari to abandon Muʿtazilism; those reports are certainly later inventions designed to inflate the reputation of Ašʿari (cf. Allard, 1965, pp. 37-46; Gwynne, 1985). Other students of Abu ʿAli were ʿAbd-Allāh b. ʿAbbās Rāmahormozi; Abu ʿOmar Saʿid b. Moḥammad Bāheli (d. 912-13); Ebn Abi ʿAllān; Abuʿl-Qāsim Ḥāreṭ Warrāq; Abuʿl-Qāsem ʿAli Tanuḳi; Abu ʿAbd-Allāh Wāseti; Abuʿl-Ḥasan ʿAli b. Farzawayh; Ebn Ḥarb Tostari; Abu Aḥmad ʿAskari ʿAbdaki; Abuʿl-Ḥasan Esfarāʿini; Abu ʿAbd-al-Raḥmān Ṣaydalāni; Abuʿl-Ḥosayn Ḥosayni; and the three Khorasanis Abuʿl-Faḏl Kašši, Abuʿl-Faḏl Kojandi, and Abu Saʿid Ošrusani (Heemskerk, pp. 21 ff.).

Among the students of Abu Hāšem mention should be made of Abu ʿAli Moḥammad b. Ḳallād (d. 961 ?), Abu ʿAbd-Allāh Baṣri (d. 902 or 905 or 920-79), Abu Eshāq Ebrāhim b. ʿAyyāš Baṣri, Abu Bakr Bokāri, Abuʿl-Ḥosayn Ḳawāʿefi Baḡdādi, Abuʿl-Ḥasan Farzawi (who formerly had been a student of Abu ʿAli), Abuʿl-Qāsem Sirāfi (initially a follower of the Ekšidiya), Abu ʿOmrān Sirāfi (who later on became a follower of the Ekšidiya), Abuʿl-Ḥosayn Azraq, Abu Moḥammad ʿAbdaki, Abuʿl-Ḥasan b. Najih (who was also a student of Abu Eshāq b. ʿAyyāš). It is not clear who succeeded Abu Hāšem as leader of the Bahšamiya following Abu Hāšem’s death. ʿAbd-al-Jabbār reports that a group of well-advanced disciples (*motaqaddemun*) transmitted the Muʿtazilite knowledge that they had received from Abu Hāšem, but he mentions by name only Abu ʿAli b. Ḳallād and Abu ʿAbd-Allāh Baṣri. By contrast, Ebn al-Mortaḏā and Abu Moḥammad Esmāʿil Farrazādi mention only one authority to have transmitted knowledge from Abu Hāšem, but they differ on his identification. Ebn al-Mortaḏā indicates the chain of transmission as: Abu Hāšem and his generation, Abu Eshāq b. ʿAyyāš, Abu ʿAbd-Allāh Baṣri, and ʿAbd-al-Jabbār Hamadāni (ca. 932-1025). The chain of transmission, according to Farrazādi, was: Abu Hāšem, Ebn Ḳallād, Abu ʿAbd-Allāh Baṣri, ʿAbd-al-Jabbār, Abu Rašid Nisāburi (before 970-after 1029), Abu Moḥammad Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. Mattawayh, Moḥammad b. Mazdak, and Farrazādi (Gimaret, 1979, pp. 60 ff.).



It can be surmised that, some years after Abu Hāšem's death, Abu 'Abd-Allāh became the leader of the Bahša-miya, who in turn was succeeded after his death by 'Abd-al-Jabbār Hamadāni. The latter's successor as leader of the Bahšamiya was Abu Rašid Nisāburi, who in turn was followed by Ebn Mattawayh (Heemskerck, pp. 29 ff.). One of the disciples of 'Abd-al-Jabbār, Abu'l-Ḥosayn Bašri (d. 1044), disagreed with his teacher on a number of doctrinal points and later became known as the founder of his own school.

The doctrines of the Bahšamiya were very influential among a number of groups outside Sunni Islam, namely the Zaydiya and the Imamiya, as well as among the Jews, the Karaites, and to a lesser degree, the Rabbanites. Numerous Zaydi scholars were students of representatives of the Bahšamiya, such as the brothers Emām Aḥmad b. Ḥosayn Mo'ayyad Be'llāh (d. 1020) and Abu Ṭāleb Nāteq (d. ca. 1033), who studied with Abu 'Abd-Allāh Bašri and, in the case of Mo'ayyad Be'llāh, also with 'Abd-al-Jabbār, as well as Mānkdim Šašdiw, who was a student of Mo'ayyad Be'llāh, and possibly also of 'Abd-al-Jabbār. During the 11th century, the theological thought of the Caspian Zaydis reached the Zaydis in Yemen, who strove systematically to copy and collect Mu'tazilite, preferably Bahšami, texts. Mention should be made in particular of Imām al-Manšur Be'llāh 'Abd-Allāh b. Ḥamza (d. 1217), who founded a library in Zafār that was the founding stone of the Motawakiliya, the library of the Great Mosque in San'ā'. It was from this library that the Egyptian scientific expedition, headed by Ḳalil Yaḥyā Nāmi, in 1951 procured microfilms of numerous theological texts of adherents of the Bahša-miya, such as 14 out of 20 volumes of 'Abd-al-Jabbār's *Moğni*, Mānkdim's critical paraphrase (*ta'liq*) of 'Abd-al-Jabbār's *Šarḥ al-oṣul al-ḳamsa*, several works by Abu Rašid Nisāburi, Ebn Mattawayh's critical paraphrase (*ta'liq*) of 'Abd-al-Jabbār's *al-Moḥiṭ fi'l-taklif*, entitled *al-Majmu' fi'l-monḥiṭ be'l-taklif*, and his *al-Taḍkera fi aḥkām al-jawāher wa'l-a'rāz*. Among the Imamis, mention should be made in particular of al-Sharif al-Mortažā (967-1044), who was a student of 'Abd-al-Jabbār and who introduced Bahšami doctrine into Twelver Shi'ism (Madelung, 1970, pp. 25 ff.). On the long run, however, the influence of the doctrines of Abu'l-Ḥosayn Bašri exceeded that of the Bahšamiya by far among the Imamis. The doctrines of the Bahšamis furthermore significantly influenced Jewish thinkers. This holds true for some representatives of the Rabbanites, such as Samuel Ben Ḥofni (d. 1013; see Sklare, 1996), and on a significantly larger scale for the Karaites. The most prominent representative of this current was Yusof Bašir (d. after 1040; Sklare, 1995; Sklare and Ben-Shammai). Moreover, as was the case with the Zaydis, the Karaites systematically copied Mu'tazilite



writings, partly in Hebrew script and partly in Arabic script. One of the very rich, though so far virtually untapped, sources for Bahšami texts in particular, is the Abraham Firkovitch-collection in the Russian National Library of St. Petersburg. It has rich holdings of copies of Bahšami texts produced by the Karaites between the 11th and 13th centuries, part of which was not found in Yemen, such as some further portions of ‘Abd-al-Jabbār’s *Moğni* as well as the latter’s *al-Muḥiṭ be’l-taklif* (Borisov; Ben-Shammai; Schmidtke, 2007).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

‘Abd-al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad Hama-dāni, “Faḏl al-e’tizāl wa-ṭabaqāt al-Mo’tazila wa-mobāyanatehem le-sā’er al-mukālefin,” in idem, *Faḏl al-e’tezāl wa-ṭabaqāt al-Mo’tazela*, ed. Fo’ād Sayyid, Tunis, 1974, pp. 136-350.

Idem, *al-Moğni fi abwāb al-tawḥid wa’l-‘adl*, ed. Moḥammad Moṣṭafā Ḥelmi et al., 14 vols. in 16, Cairo, 1960-69.

Abu Rašid Sa’id b. Moḥammad Nišāburi [attributed to], *Fi’l-tawḥid [Diwān al-oṣul ?]*, ed. Moḥammad ‘Abd-al-Hādi Abu Rida, Cairo, 1969.

Idem, *Ketāb al-masā’el fi’l-ḳelāf bayn al-Baṣriyyin wa’l- Bağdādiyyin: Al-ḳalām fi’l-jawāher*, ed. Arthur Biram as *Die atomistische Substanzenlehre aus dem Buch der Streitfragen zwischen Basrensern und Bagdadensern*, Berlin, 1902; ed. M. Ziāda and R. Sayyed, Beirut, 1979; tr. Max Horten as *Die Philosophie des Abu Raschid*, Bonn, 1910; repr. as *Studien zur Philosophie des Abu Rashid al-Nisāburi: Nachdruck von Schriften von A. Biram (1902) und M. Horten (1910, 1911)*, ed. Fuat Sezgin, Frankfurt am Main, 1986, pp. 82-170.

Ahmed Alami, *L’ontologie modale: étude de la théorie des modes d’Abu Hāšim al-Ğubbā’i*, Paris, 2001.

M. Allard, *Le problème des attributs divins dans la doctrine d’al-Aš‘ari et de ses premiers grands disciples*, Beirut, 1965.



H. Anṣāri, “Abu ‘Ali al-Jubbā’i et son livre *al-Maqālāt*,” in Camilla Adang, Sabine Schmidtke, and David Sklare, eds., *A Common Rationality: Mu‘tazilism in Islam and Judaism*, Würzburg, 2007, pp. 21-37.

Abu’l-Ḥasan ‘Ali Aṣ‘ari, *Ketāb maqālāt al-eslāmiyyin wa eḳtelāf al-moṣallin*, ed. Hellmut Ritter as *Die dogmatischen Lehren der Anhänger des Islam*, 3rd ed., Wiesbaden, 1980.

Yusuf Ben Abraham Baṣir, *al-Ketāb al-moḥtawi*, ed. and tr. George Vajda as *al-Kitāb al-muḥtawi de Yusuf al-Baṣir: Texte, Traduction et Commentaire*, ed. David R. Blumenthal, Leiden, 1985.

Abu’l-Ḥosayn Moḥammad b. ‘Ali Baṣri, *Ketāb al-mo‘tamad fi oṣul al-feqh*, ed. Moḥammad Ḥamid-Allāh, Damascus, 1965.

H. Ben Shammai, “A Note on Some Karaite Copies of Mu‘tazilite Writings,” *BSOAS* 37, 1974, pp. 295-304.

A. Ya. Borisov, “Mu‘tazilitskie rukopisi Gosudarstvennoĭ Publichnoĭ Biblioteki v Leningrade (Mo‘tazilite manuscripts in the State Public Library of Leningrad),” *Bibliografiya Vostoka* 8-9, 1935, pp. 69-95.

Michael Cook, *Commanding Right and Forbidding Wrong in Islamic Thought*, Cambridge, 2000.

Ebn ‘Asāker, *Tabyin kaḍeb al-moftari fi mā noseba elā al-Emām Abu’l-Ḥasan al-Aṣ‘ari*, Damascus 1928-29.

Ebn Mattawayh, *Ketāb al-majmu‘ fi’l-moḥiṭ be’l-taklif*, ed. Jean Joseph Houben, Daniel Gimaret, and J. R. T. M. Peters, 3 vols., Beirut 1965-99.

Idem, *al-Taḍkera fi aḥkām al-jawāher wa’l-a’rāz*, ed. Sāmi Naṣr Loṭf and Fayṣal Bodayr ‘Awn, Cairo, 1975.

Ebn al-Mortaḏā, *Ṭabaqāt al-Mo‘tazela*, ed. Susanna Diwald-Wilzer as *Die Klassen der Mu‘taziliten*, Wiesbaden, 1961.

Ebn al-Nadim, *Ketāb al-fehrest*, ed. Reḏā Tajaddod, Tehran, 1971; tr. Bayard Dodge as *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm: A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*, 2 vols., New York and London, 1970.

Richard M. Frank, “Abu Hāshim’s Theory of States: Its Structure and Function,”



in *Actas do IV Congresso de Estudos Arabes e Islâmicos, Coimbra-Lisboa 1 a 8 setembro de 1968*, Leiden, 1971a, pp. 85-100.

Idem, "Several Fundamental Assumptions of the Baṣra School of the Mu'tazila," *Studia Islamica* 33, 1971b, pp. 5-18.

Idem, *Beings and Their Attributes: The Teaching of the Baṣrian School of the Mu'tazila in the Classical Period*, Albany, 1978.

Idem, "al-Ma'dum wa'l-mawjud: The Non-Existent, the Existent, and the Possible in the Teaching of Abu Hāshim and his Followers," *Mélanges de l'Institut Dominicain de Études Orientales du Caire* 14, 1980, pp. 185-210.

Idem, "Attribute, Attribution, and Being: Three Islamic Views," in Parviz Morewedge, ed., *Philosophies of Existence Ancient and Medieval*, New York, 1982, pp. 258-78.

Idem, "Moral Obligation in Classical Muslim Theology," *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 11, 1983, pp. 204-23.

Idem, "Can God Do What Is Wrong?" in Tamar Rudavsky, ed., *Divine Omniscience and Omnipotence in Medieval Philosophy: Islamic, Jewish and Christian Perspectives*, Dordrecht, Boston, and Lancaster, 1985, pp. 69-79.

Johann Fück, "Neue Materialien zum Fihrist," *ZDMG* 90, 1936, pp. 298-321.

Daniel Gimaret, "La théorie des aḥwāl d'Abu Hāšim al-Jubbā'i d'après des sources aš'arites," *JA* 258, 1970, pp. 47-86.

Idem, "Matériaux pour une bibliographie des Jubbā'is," *JA* 264, 1976, pp. 277-332.

Idem, "Les uṣūl al-ḥamsa du Gādī 'Abd al-Ġabbār et leurs commentaires," *Annales Islamologiques* 15, 1979, pp. 47-96.

Idem, *Théories de l'acte humain en théologie musulmane*, Paris 1980, pp. 39 ff.

Idem, "Matériaux pour une bibliographie des Jubbā'i: Note complémentaire," in Michael E. Marmura, ed., *Islamic Theology and Philosophy: Studies in Honor of George F. Hourani*, 1984, pp. 31-38.

Idem, "Comment al-Jubbā'i interprétait les versets 'prédestinationnistes' du



Coran,” *Annales du Département des Lettres arabes* 5, Université Saint-Joseph (Beyrouth), 1990, pp. 5-22.

Idem, *Une Lecture Mu'tazilite du Coran: le Tafsir d'Abu 'Alī al-Djubbā'i (m. 303/915) partiellement reconstitué à partir de ses citateurs*, Louvain and Paris 1994.

Rosalind W. Gwynne, “The Tafsir of Abu 'Ali al-Jubbā'i: First Steps toward a Reconstruction with Texts, Translation, Biographical Introduction and Analytical Essay,” Phd diss., University of Washington, 1982.

Idem, “Al-Jubbā'i, al-Ash'ari and the Three Brothers: The Use of Fiction,” *Muslim World* 75, 1985, pp. 132-61.

Margaretha T. Heemskerk, *Suffering in the Mu'tazilite Theology: 'Abd al-Jabbār's Teaching on Pain and Divine Justice*, Leiden, 2000.

'Ali Fahmi Koşaym, *al-Jobbā'iyān: Abu 'Ali wa Abu Hāšem*, Tripoli, 1968.

Etan Kohlberg, “Ali b. Musā Ibn Ṭāwus and His Polemic against Sunnism,” in Bernard Lewis and Friedrich Niewöhner, eds., *Religionsgespräche im Mittelalter*, Wiesbaden, 1992a, pp. 325-50.

Idem, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work: Ebn Ṭāwus and His Library*, Leiden, 1992b.

Wilferd Madelung, “Imamism and Mu'tazilite Theology,” in Toufic Fahd, ed., *Le Shī'isme imāmīte*, Paris, 1970, pp. 13-30.

Moḥammad b. Aḥmad Malaṭi, *al-Tanbih wa'l-radd 'alā ahl al-ahwā' wa'l-beda'*, ed. Moḥammad Zāhed Kawṭari, Baghdad and Beirut, 1968.

K. M. Nabhā, *Tafsir Abi 'Ali al-Jobbā'i*, Beirut, 2007.

'Abd-al-Karim 'Oṭmān, *Qāzi al-qozāt 'Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad al-Hamaḍāni*, Beirut, 1968.

Dominik Perler and Ulrich Rudolph, *Occasionalismus: Theorien der Kausalität im arabisch-islamischen und im europäischen Denken*, Göttingen, 2000.

J. R. T. M. Peters, *God's Created Speech. A Study in the Speculative Theology of the Mu'tazilite Qāzi al-Quzāt Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad al-Hamaḍāni*,



Leiden, 1976.

Mānkdim Šašdiw, *Šarḥ al-oṣul al-ḵamsa le-Qāzi'l-Qoṣāt 'Abdal-Jabbār . . . al-Hamaḍāni al-Asadābādi*, ed. 'Abd al-Karim 'Oṭmān [as being by 'Abd-al-Jabbār], Cairo, 1965.

F. Sayyed, "Maḵṭuṭāt al-Yaman," *Majallat ma'had al-maḵṭuṭāt al-'arabiya* 1, 1955, pp. 194-215.

Sabline Schmidtke, *The Theology of the 'Allāma al-Ḥilli (d. 726/1325)*, Berlin, 1991.

Idem, "Mu'tazilite Manuscripts in the Abraham Firkovitch Collection," in Camilla Adang, Sabine Schmidtke, and David Sklare eds., *A Common Rationality: Mu'tazilism, Islam and Judaism*, 2007, pp. 377-462.

David E. Sklare, "Yusuf al-Baṣir: Theological Aspects of His Halakhic Works," in Daniel Frank, ed., *The Jews of Medieval Islam: Community, Society, and Identity: Proceedings of an International Conference Held by the Institute of Jewish Studies, University College London, 1992*, Leiden, 1995, pp. 249-70.

Idem, *Samuel Ben Ḥofni Gaon and His Cultural World: Texts and Studies*, Leiden, 1996.

Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums I: Qur'ānwissenschaften, Ḥadīṭ Geschichte, Fiqh, Dogmatik, Mystik bis ca. 430 H*, Leiden, 1967, pp. 621-24.

David Sklare and H. Ben-Shammai, *Judaeo-Arabic Manuscripts in the Firkovitch Collections: The Works of Yusuf al-Basir, A Sample Catalogue. Texts and Studies*, Jerusalem, 1997.

Josef Van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra: Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1991-97.

'Abd al-Salām 'Abbās Wajih, *Maṣāder al-turāt fī'l-maktabāt al-ḵāṣṣa fī'l-Yaman*, 2 vols., Ṣan'ā', 2002.

Šehāb-al-Din 'Abd-Allāh Yāqut Ḥamawī, *Eršād al-arib elā ma'refat al-adib: al-ma'ruf be Mo'jam al-odabā'*, ed. David Samuel Margoliouth, 7 vols., Leiden 1907-27.

'Adnān Moḥammad Zarzur, *al-Ḥākem al-Jašami wa-manhājohu fī tafsir al-*



*Qor'ān*, Beirut, 1972, pp. 133-34.