# Ibn al-Khallāl al-Baṣrī (d. after 377/988) and His Œuvre on the Problematic Verses of the Qurʾān *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā al-jabriyya al-qadariyya* (Refutation of the Predestinarian Compulsionists)[*]

*Suleiman A. Mourad*

The Muʿtazilite theologians paid special attention to the genre of *mutashābih al-qurʾān* (the ambiguous verses of the Qurʾān), partly in an attempt to provide a foundation for the doctrine of *ʿadl* (God's Justice), one of the five principles of Muʿtazilite theology. The doctrine of *ʿadl* can be simply stated as the belief that God, because he is just, does not predestine sins and then punish humans for acting them out. It thus denies predestination and asserts free will, which is upheld by most Muʿtazilite theologians, who consider the free will creed to be an integral component of the doctrine of *ʿadl*.[1] The Qurʾān does not exclusively endorse either of these two opposing creeds, predestination and free will; it does, however, contain verses that support both creeds, such as, for instance, Qurʾān 7:179 and 18:29, which read respectively:

> We have created for Hell many of the Jinns and humans … (*wa-laqad dharaʾnā li-jahannam kathīran min al-jinn wa-l-ins …*).[2]

> Say: Here is the truth from your Lord, it is to you to believe [it] or disbelieve [it] … (*wa-qul al-ḥaqq min rabbikum faman shāʾa fa-l-yuʾmin wa-man shāʾa fa-l-yakfur …*).

Nevertheless, both predestinarians and believers in free will refused to acknowledge that this is actually the case. They often resorted to the *mutashābih al-qurʾān*[3]

---

[1]   Needless to say, prior to the systematization of Muʿtazilite theology, which started around 850 CE, there were a number of early Muʿtazilite theologians who did not accept this position, such as, for instance, Ḍirār b. ʿAmr (d. ca 200/815), who introduced the notion of *kasb* (acquisition), which was later elaborated by theologians, including al-Ashʿarī (d. 324/936) and his school: see Josef van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra. Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam* 1-6, Berlin 1991-97, vol. 3, pp. 45-48, and vol. 4, pp. 502-3. For a general overview of the formation and development of Muʿtazilism, see van Ess, "Muʿtazila," in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 9, pp. 6317-25. For an overview on the development of the concept of *kasb* in early Islam, see Michael Schwarz, "'Acquisition' (*Kasb*) in early *Kalām*," in *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition. Essays presented by his friends and pupils to Richard Walzer on his seventieth birthday*, Columbia 1973, pp. 355-87.

[2]   All translations of the Qurʾān are mine.

[3]   For an overview of the genre of *mutashābih al-qurʾān*, see Leah Kinberg, "*Muḥkamāt* and *Mutashābihāt* (Koran 3/7). Implication of a Koranic Pair of Terms in Medieval Exegesis,"

in order to dismiss any possibility that the Qurʾān might provide legitimacy for their adversaries' beliefs. Thus a predestinarian theologian would declare any verses that might be viewed as sanctioning the belief in free will to be ambiguous (*mutashābih*) and provide, by resorting to other qurʾānic verses, *ḥadīth*s, and lexi-cographical and grammatical tricks, an interpretation that would make these verses endorse predestination. Similarly, a theologian who upheld the free will creed would categorize any verses that sanction predestination as ambiguous and use a similar approach to assert that they actually imply free will. One such theo-logian is Ibn al-Khallāl al-Baṣrī, who flourished in the fourth/tenth century. Ibn al-Khallāl, a member of the Muʿtazilite movement, authored a *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā l-jabriyya al-qadariyya fima taʿallaqū bih min mutashābih āy al-qurʾān al-karīm* (Refu-tation of the Predestinarian Compulsionists with respect to what they uphold about the ambiguous verses of the glorious Qurʾān). This contribution is a pre-liminary study of Ibn al-Khallāl and his work.

## Life, Education and Career of Ibn al-Khallāl al-Baṣrī

Abū ʿUmar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥafṣ al-Khallāl al-Baṣrī was born in Basra. The principal, indeed the only, source for his biography is *Kitāb al-Fihrist* by Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 380/990). The information that Ibn al-Nadīm provides is scanty: The author's *nisba* is Ibn al-Khallāl, which indicates that either his father or his grandfather was a seller of vinegar (*khall*). He studied with two notable Muʿtazilite theologians: with Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Ṣaymarī (d. 315/927) in Basra[4] and with Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Ibn al-Ikhshīd (d. 326/938) in Bagh-dad.[5] This suggests that Ibn al-Khallāl started his education in Basra, and later moved to Baghdad. It is also possible that he studied with both teachers in Bagh-dad, as al-Ṣaymarī moved there towards the end of his life and became a compan-ion of Ibn al-Ikhshīd.[6]

---

*Arabica* 35 (1988), pp. 143-72 [repr. in *The Qurʾan. Formative Interpretation*, ed. Andrew Rip-pin, Aldershot 1999, pp. 283-312]; and idem, "Ambiguous," in *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, vol. 1, pp. 70b-77a.

[4]  Al-Ṣaymarī was a student of Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī and replaced him in the leadership of the Muʿtazilite movement in Basra: see Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, ed. Riḍā Tajaddud, Te-hran 1973, p. 219; and al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, ed. Shuʿayb Arnāʾūṭ [et al.], Bei-rut 1990, vol. 14, p. 480.

[5]  On Ibn al-Ikhshīd, see Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, pp. 220-21; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, ed. Muṣṭafā ʿA.-Q. ʿAṭā, Beirut 1997, vol. 5, p. 67; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 15, pp. 217-18; and J.C. Vadet, "Ibn al-Ikhshīd," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New Edition, vol. 3, p. 807a.

[6]  See al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī, *Sharḥ ʿUyūn al-masāʾil* , MS Ṣanʿāʾ, al-Jāmiʿ al-Kabīr, al-Maktaba al-Gharbiyya, ʿilm al-kalām no. 99, vol. 1, f. 68a; and Ibn al-Murtaḍā, *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-muʿ-tazila [Die Klassen der Muʿtazila von Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn al-Murtaḍā]*, ed. Susanna Diwald-Wilzer, Wiesbaden / Beirut 1380/1961, p. 96.

The fact that Ibn al-Khallāl is not mentioned at all in the extant Muʿtazilite prosopographies suggests, first, that he was a minor Muʿtazilite figure, and, second, that he was possibly ignored because of his educational background as a student of al-Ṣaymarī and Ibn al-Ikhshīd. In the few surviving Muʿtazilite prosopographies, all of which belong to the school of al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār (d. 415/1024), al-Ṣaymarī is criticized for disagreeing with his Muʿtazilite peer Abū Hāshim al-Jubbāʾī (d. 321/933). According to ʿAbd al-Jabbār, al-Ṣaymarī was pious and virtuous, except for his constantly differing with and criticizing Abū Hāshim (*wa-kāna wariʿan ḥasan al-ṭarīqa illā mā kāna minhu min muʿānadat Abī Hāshim wa-l-ghulūw fīhi*).[7] He also engaged in refutations of some views propagated by Abu l-Qāsim al-Kaʿbī al-Balkhī (d. 319/931).[8] As for Ibn al-Ikhshīd, he does not enjoy a very positive reputation either. His clashes with other notable Muʿtazilite theologians of his day often draw adverse comment. This is precisely the case in *Sharḥ ʿUyūn al-masāʾil* by the Muʿtazilite theologian al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī (d. 494/1101), who quotes ʿAbd al-Jabbār as having said: "He (Ibn al-Ikhshīd) often disagreed [with his peers] and upheld the least endorsed views."[9] Among those with whom Ibn al-Ikhshīd was in disagreement on some theological issues were Abu l-Qāsim al-Kaʿbī al-Balkhī and Abū Hāshim al-Jubbāʾī.[10]

It is important to keep in mind here that such criticism came from theologians of the Bahshamiyya school (named after Abū Hāshim al-Jubbāʾī) who disagreed with al-Ṣaymarī and Ibn al-Ikhshīd: ʿAbd al-Jabbār was a follower of Abū Hāshim al-Jubbāʾī, and al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī belonged to the school of ʿAbd al-Jabbār.[11] The omission of Ibn al-Khallāl from these particular prosopographies might therefore well have been intentional, reflecting an attempt to sideline some competing trends within the Muʿtazilite movement. This particular point remains speculative, however, and requires further examination.

In matters of jurisprudence, Ibn al-Ikhshīd followed the Shāfiʿite school, which suggests that in addition to Muʿtazilite theology, Ibn al-Khallāl also studied Shāfiʿite jurisprudence and legal theory with Ibn al-Ikshīd. Actually, Ibn al-Ikhshīd had a positive posthumous reputation among some Sunnite *ḥadīth* scholars.[12] For

---

7    ʿAbd al-Jabbār, "Faḍl al-iʿtizāl wa-ṭabaqāt al-muʿtazila," in *Faḍl al-iʿtizāl wa-ṭabaqāt al-muʿtazila*, ed. Fuʾād Sayyid, Tunis [1974], p. 309. See also al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī, *Sharḥ*, vol. 1, ff. 67b-68a; Ibn al-Murtaḍā, *Ṭabaqāt*, p. 96.

8    ʿAbd al-Jabbār, "Faḍl al-iʿtizāl," p. 309.

9    Al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī, *Sharḥ*, vol. 1, f. 70a. Ibn al-Murtaḍā (d. 840/1437), the medieval Zaydite theologian from Yemen, depends for his *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-muʿtazila* entirely on the *Sharḥ* of al-Ḥākim Jishumī; see the entry for Ibn al-Ikhshīd in Ibn al-Murtaḍā's *Ṭabaqāt al-muʿtazila*, p. 100. There is no entry for Ibn al-Ikhshīd in ʿAbd al-Jabbār's *Faḍl al-iʿtizāl*.

10   See Vadet, "Ibn al-Ikhshīd," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New Edition, vol. 3, p. 807a.

11   On the conflict between the Bahshamiyya and Ikhshīdiyya, see Margaretha T. Heemskerk, *Suffering in the Muʿtazilite Theology. ʿAbd al-Jabbār's Teaching on Pain and Divine Justice*, Leiden 2000, pp. 21-28.

12   Interestingly, however, Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 771/1370) does not include in his prosopographical dictionary an entry for either Ibn al-Ikhshīd or Ibn al-Khallāl; see *Ṭabaqāt al-*

instance, in *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348) praises the scholar-
ship of Ibn al-Ikhshīd, saying that "despite his innovation" he "made valuable
contributions" (*lahu maḥāsinun ʿalā bidʿatihī*).[13] By "innovation," al-Dhahabī ob-
viously meant Ibn al-Ikhshīd's upholding Muʿtazilite doctrine.

What we may perhaps conclude from this is that Ibn al-Khallāl followed his
teacher's specialization not only in Muʿtazilite theology but also in Shāfiʿite law;
this can also be inferred from the fact that he later served as a judge. According
to *al-Fihrist*, Ibn al-Khallāl occupied the position of chief-judge in the town of al-
Ḥadītha, possibly the one near Takrīt.[14] Before that, he was the chief-judge of
Takrīt but was dismissed; he was later reappointed to the post after serving his
term in al-Ḥadītha, as the comment by Ibn al-Nadīm indicates (*rudda ilayhi qaḍāʾ
Takrīt*). Ibn al-Nadīm adds that Ibn al-Khallāl was still occupying the post of
chief-judge of Takrīt at the time of the composition of *Kitāb al-Fihrist*,[15] which
was completed in 377/988.[16]

Ibn al-Nadīm attributes two works to Ibn al-Khallāl. The first is *Kitāb al-Uṣūl*,
which seems to be lost now and which very likely addressed the principles of
Muʿtazilite theology – Ibn al-Ikhshīd is said to have authored a book entitled *al-
Maʿūna fī l-uṣūl*, which, as can be inferred from al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī, was on the
principles of Muʿtazilite theology.[17] The second work Ibn al-Nadīm attributes to
Ibn al-Khallāl is *Kitāb al-Mutashābih* (On the Ambiguous Verses of the Qurʾān),
the work under examination in this paper.

We do not know the birth or death dates of Ibn al-Khallāl. But we can infer
from the death dates of his two principle teachers, al-Ṣaymarī and Ibn al-Ikhshīd,
that he was born before 300/913. And he was still active around the time that

---

    *shāfiʿiyya al-kubrā*, ed. Muṣṭafā ʿA.-Q. ʿAṭā, Beirut 1999. After all, by the time of al-Subkī,
    Shāfiʿite scholars had excised out of the Shāfiʿite tradition those Muʿtazilite theologians
    who, in terms of legal theory and jurisprudence, followed the Shāfiʿite school.

[13]  Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 15, pp. 217-18.

[14]  According to Yāqūt (d. 626/1229), there were two *Ḥadītha*s in Iraq, one near Mawṣil (Mo-
    sul), known as *Ḥadīthat al-Mawṣil*, and another one near Takrīt known as *Ḥadīthat al-Furāt*;
    see *Muʿjam al-buldān*, Beirut 1986, vol. 2, pp. 230-31.

[15]  Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, pp. 221-22.

[16]  Ibn al-Nadīm probably added a few more notes to his work in the couple of months fol-
    lowing its completion in 377/988. But he is not to be accredited with the expanded recen-
    sion of the *Fihrist*, which was authored by vizier Abu l-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī al-
    Maghribī (370/981-418/1027). For the date of the *Fihrist* see Rudolf Sellheim and Mohsen
    Zakeri, "Al-Fehrest," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. 9, p. 476a. See also J.W. Fück, "Ibn al-
    Nadīm," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New Edition, vol. 3, pp. 895a-96b; and F.W.
    Zimmermann, "On the supposed shorter version of Ibn an Nadīm's *Fihrist* and its date,"
    *Der Islam* 53 (1976), pp. 267-69. On Abu l-Qāsim al-Maghribī, see P. Smoor, "Al-Maghribī,
    Banū," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New Edition, vol. 5, pp. 1210a-12b. See also Devin
    Stewart, "Emendations of the Legal Section in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm," in *ʿAbbasid
    Studies. Occasional Papers of the School of ʿAbbāsid Studies, Leuven June-July 2004*, ed. John
    Nawas (forthcoming).

[17]  Al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī, *Sharḥ*, vol. 1, f. 70a; see also al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 15, p. 218.

Ibn al-Nadīm finished compiling *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, so it is likely that he died shortly after 377/988.

## *Ibn al-Khallāl's* Kitāb al-Radd

The only manuscript of *Kitāb al-Radd* known to be preserved is in the possession of La Fondazione Caetani (Ms. # 332) at the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei in Rome, Italy. The title in this manuscript reads *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā l-jabriyya al-qadariyya fīmā taʿallaqū bih min mutashābih āy al-qurʾān al-karīm*. As mentioned earlier, Ibn al-Nadīm gives the work the title of *Kitāb Mutashābih al-qurʾān*. The question that arises therefore is whether we are dealing here with two separate compilations by Ibn al-Khallāl. The answer requires some investigation, especially given that the Twelver Shīʿite scholar Ibn Ṭāwūs (d. 664/1266) refers in his *Kitāb Saʿd al-suʿūd* to what seem to be two titles that he attributes to Ibn al-Khallāl. The first time he quotes from a *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā al-jabriyya wa-l-qadariyya fīmā taʿallaqū bih min mutashābih al-qurʾān*, and the second time from a *Kitāb Mutashābih al-qurʾān*.[18] This fact led Etan Kohlberg to argue, although cautiously, that Ibn Ṭāwūs could have had two separate works by Ibn al-Khallāl.[19] Was this really the case? Or is it possible that we are dealing with two copies of the same book, under different titles? The evidence indeed suggests that Ibn Ṭāwūs had two copies of the same work – most likely each copy was incomplete – but under different titles and with insignificant variations of the author's name, mostly the result of scribal errors. This might have led Ibn Ṭāwūs to believe that the two manuscripts referred to separate works.

The quote in *Kitāb Saʿd al-suʿūd*, which Ibn Ṭāwūs paraphrases from *Kitāb Mutashābih al-qurʾān*, is found in the Caetani manuscript of *Kitāb al-Radd*. It relates to Qurʾān 2:26:

> By it, God leads astray many and guides many. But He only leads astray by it the evil-doers (*yuḍillu bihi kathīran wa-yahdī bihi kathīran wa-mā yuḍillu bihi illā al-fāsiqīn*).

Ibn Ṭāwūs summarizes a section in which Ibn al-Khallāl disputes his opponents' view that God uses the Qurʾān to save some and doom others. It reads:

فقال الخلال ما معناه أنَّ هذه الآية تدلّ على بطلان قولهم لأنّه لو كان القرآن إضلالاً ما كان قد سمّاه هدىً ورحمةً وبياناً في مواضع كثيرة.[20]

---

18  Ibn Ṭāwūs, *Kitāb Saʿd al-suʿūd*, Najaf 1950, pp. 21, 241 and 246. See also Etan Kohlberg, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work. Ibn Ṭāwūs and His Library*, Leiden 1992, pp. 292-93 and 312; and Gregor Schwarb, Sabine Schmidtke, and David Sklare (eds.), *Handbook of Muʿtazilite Works and Manuscripts* (*Handbuch der Orientalistik series*), Leiden (forthcoming), (section on Ibn al-Khallāl).

19  See Kohlberg, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar*, p. 293.

20  Ibn Ṭāwūs, *Saʿd al-suʿūd*, p. 246.

[Ibn] al-Khallāl said what can be paraphrased in the following manner that this verse proves the futility of their argument because if the Qurʾān leads astray, He (God) would not have called it in many instances a guide, a mercy, and a proof.

The corresponding section in Ibn al-Khallāl's *Kitāb al-Radd* reads:

يقَال لهم: إنّ في هذه الآية التي تظنّون أنّها حجّة لكم على صحّة مذهبكم أكبر الحجج وأظهر البراهين على بطلان قولكم

وصحّة قول مخالفيكم وذلك أنَّ الله سبحانه وتعَلى أراد بقوله: ﴿يضلّ به كثيراً ويهدي به كثيراً ﴾ ، يضلّ بتكذيب من

كذّب به ويهدي بإيمان من آمن به، وذلك أنَّ القرآن لو كان سبباً للضلال والحيرة لما وصفه الله تعَلى بأنّه هدىً وبياناً . 21

They are to be answered that this verse, which you think is evidence of the veracity of your belief, is the most explicit evidence and most manifest proof of the futility of your argument and the veracity of the argument of your adversaries. For God, be glorified and almighty, meant by His saying, *by it, He leads astray many, and by it He guides many*, that He leads astray as a result of the rejection of those who reject it, and He guides as a result of the belief of those who believe in it, because if the Qurʾān was a cause of straying and confusion, God almighty would not have described it as a guide and a proof.

What Ibn al-Khallāl tries to establish here is that the Qurʾān is a guide for those who have already opened their hearts to its message. As for those doomed, they have already made up their minds not to accept it, in which case the Qurʾān is well provided with verses to assure that they remain in falsehood. At any rate, the quotes confirm that both *Kitāb Mutashābih al-qurʾān* and *Kitāb al-Radd* are the same.

The other quote that Ibn Ṭāwūs paraphrases from *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā al-jabriyya wa-l-qadariyya*[22] relates to a disputation by Ibn al-Khallāl regarding the patriarch Abraham in Qurʾān 2:128 (*rabbanā wa-jʿalnā muslimīn laka wa-min dhurriyyatinā ummatan muslimatan laka …*), which we find in the Caetani manuscript of *Kitāb al-Radd*.[23] Here it is obvious that the work is the same. The only minor variation is in the title.[24] Ibn Ṭāwūs adds the particle of conjunction *wa* between *al-Jabriyya* (Compulsionists) and *al-Qadariyya* (Predestinarians). Although there is no significant difference here, the particle *wa* could have resulted from a scribal error, if it was assumed that these were two groups, not the same one. In works on similar topics, some of which are by authors contemporary to Ibn al-Khallāl, the predestinarians are often called *al-Jabriyya al-qadariyya* or *al-Mujbira al-qadariyya* (predestinarian Compulsionists), or *al-Qadariyya al-mujbira* (compulsionist Predestinarians).[25] It is, therefore, in line with the customary practice among anti-

---

21  Ibn al-Khallāl, *Radd*, ff. 14b-15a.
22  Ibn Ṭāwūs, *Saʿd al-suʿūd*, pp. 241-42.
23  See Ibn al-Khallāl, *Radd*, ff. 19b-22b.
24  Actually, there is a minor variation in Ibn al-Khallāl's grandfather's name as well. It is given as *Jaʿfar* (جعفر) not *Hafṣ* (حفص), which must be a scribal or editor's error, resulting from misreading (حفص) as (جعفر).
25  See, for example, [pseudo?] al-Qāsim al-Rassī, "Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā l-mujbira," in *Rasāʾil al-ʿadl wa-l-tawḥīd* 1-2, ed. Muḥammad ʿImāra, Cairo 1988, vol. 1, p. 172; al-Ṣāḥib Ibn

predestinarian theologians – Muʿtazilites, Twelver Shīʿites, and Zaydites – to use both terms to refer to one group. On the basis of this, one can conclude that the particle *wa* in the title as given by Ibn Ṭāwūs was indeed most likely the result of a scribal error.

Ibn al-Khallāl authored the work prior to 377/988, since it is listed in *Kitāb al-Fihrist*. Moreover, there is an indication in *Kitāb al-Radd* that he dictated it to one of his students. The first refutation by Ibn al-Khallāl is preceded by the following phrase: "*Qāla Abū ʿUmar: ….*"[26] However, we can dismiss entirely the possibility that the small entry on Ibn al-Khallāl could have been added to *Kitāb al-Fihrist* by the vizier Abu l-Qāsim al-Maghribī (d. 418/1027), who authored the long recension of Ibn al-Nadīm's *Kitāb al-Fihrist*,[27] for this theory would imply that Ibn al-Khallāl lived, and remained active as a judge, past the age of a hundred. Indeed, the short recension of *Kitāb al-Fihrist* (MS Şehid Ali Paşa 1934, f. 2b) contains the entry on Ibn al-Khallāl.[28]

## The Manuscript: Its Condition and Provenance:

The manuscript (Ms. # 332) at La Fondazione Caetani belongs to a collection of Arabic manuscripts from Yemen (55 in total) donated by Prof. E. Rossi to the Fondazione in 1938.[29] On the title page, following the title and author's name, it is stated that it was copied by the orders of vizier ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr b. ʿAlī b. Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥaydānī Abī ʿAmr al-Tamīmī (flourished before the eighth/fourteenth century).[30]

Usually, the scribe's name and the date of copying would appear at the end of the manuscript. But in the case of the Caetani manuscript, the text ends at the bottom of folio 173b: the discussion of Qurʾān 72:16-17 is not complete and has a continuation that is lacking from the Caetani text. Two possibilities can be advanced here. Either we are dealing with the loss of a number of folios (proba-

---

ʿAbbād, "al-Ibāna ʿan madhhab ahl al-ʿadl," in *Nafāʾis al-makhṭūṭāt*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥ. Āl Yāsīn, Najaf 1952, vol. 1, pp. 21-22; ʿAbd al-Jabbār al-Hamadhānī, *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-ʿadl*, ed. Muṣṭafā Ḥilmī [et al.], Cairo 1961-65, vol. 8, pp. 326-27; al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, "Inqādh al-bashar min al-jabr wa-l-qadar," in *Rasāʾil al-ʿadl wa-l-tawḥīd*, vol. 1, p. 296; and al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī, *Sharḥ*, vol. 1, f. 23b.

[26] Ibn al-Khallāl, *Radd*, f. 3a. Abū ʿUmar being the *kunya* (agnomen) of Ibn al-Khallāl.

[27] On the two recensions of Ibn al-Nadīm's *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, see n. 16 above.

[28] I thank Devin Stewart for checking the manuscript and providing me with this information. On the short and long recensions of Ibn al-Nadīm's *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, see Stewart, "Emendations of the Legal Section in the *Fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm."

[29] See Renato Traini, *I manoscritti arabi di recente accessione della Fondazione Caetani*, Rome 1967, pp. 40-41.

[30] The *nisba* al-Ḥaydānī refers to the town of Ḥaydān, 70 kilometers southwest of the city of Ṣaʿda, in Yemen; see Ibrāhīm al-Maqḥafī, *Muʿjam al-buldān wa-l-qabāʾil al-yamaniyya*, Ṣanʿāʾ 1988, p. 201. Traini identifies al-Ḥaydānī as the scribe who copied the manuscript, which is a mistake; see Traini, *I manoscritti arabi*, p. 41.

bly less than ten, given that Ibn al-Khallāl, as seen in Appendix A, is not systematic in addressing all the Qurʾānic *sūra*s),[31] or the scribe stopped at the end of folio 173b and planned to continue copying the manuscript at a later time, but never did. The only thing we can tell about this copy is that the scribe was commissioned to copy Ibn al-Khallāl's *Kitāb al-Radd* by the vizier al-Ḥaydānī.

Besides the fact that Rossi brought it from Yemen, the manuscript carries a number of ownership notes that also point to a provenance from Yemen, probably from as early as the sixth/twelfth century.[32] On the margins of the title page we find the names of at least six individuals who owned the manuscript at one point or another,[33] some of whom were notable Zaydite imāms, such as al-Mahdī li-dīn Allāh ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī (b. 705/1306, d. 773/1371),[34] and al-Mutawakkil ʿalā Allāh.[35]

The manuscript comprises 173 folios, with 18 lines per page. But the number of lines increases to 19/20 in folios 135b-144a. Then from folio 144b until the end of the manuscript – folio 173b – another scribe takes over, and the handwriting changes. Thus two scribes worked on copying the text, neither of whom went over the copy a second time to insert the diacritical marks; this seems to have been a practice in Yemen as many manuscripts copied by Zaydites at that time lack most diacritical marks. The handwriting is legible, yet the absence of most diacritical marks – the situation gets worse with the second scribe – makes the reading in some cases hard to decipher.

## Style

The style of Ibn al-Khallāl shares certain features with other works on the same topic by Muʿtazilite and Shīʿite theologians, especially *Kitāb Mutashābih al-qurʾān* by ʿAbd al-Jabbār (composed between 360/970 and 380/990).[36] Ibn al-Khallāl divides his book into sections that follow the order of the qurʾānic *sūra*s, starting from *Sūrat al-Fātiḥa*,[37] which we also see in ʿAbd al-Jabbār's work.[38] He first lists

---

[31] For the *sūra*s and verses discussed in *Kitāb al-Radd*, see the Appendix.

[32] On the date of the manuscript, see also Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums*, Leiden 1967-82, vol. 1, p. 624.

[33] There are a few other names that are illegible, possibly as a result of intentional effacing.

[34] See Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Zabāra, *Tārīkh al-aʾimma al-zaydiyya fī l-Yaman ḥattā l-ʿaṣr al-ḥadīth*, Cairo 1998, p. 104.

[35] The name of al-Mutawakkil ʿalā Allāh was effaced; the barely legible part reads: *min kutub mawlānā al-Mutawakkil ʿalā Allāh …* ("Of the books of our master al-Mutawakkil ʿalā Allāh …"). He must be one of several Zaydite imams from Yemen who assumed that title starting in the 9th/15th century; see Zabāra, *Tārīkh al-aʾimma al-zaydiyya*.

[36] On the date of ʿAbd al-Jabbār's *Kitāb Mutashābih al-qurʾān*, see W. Madelung, "ʿAbd al-Jabbār," in *Encyclopedia Iranica*, vol. 1, p. 117b.

[37] The only minor exceptions relate to four cases where he lists a verse after having discussed one that follows it in a given *sūra*, viz. *sūra* 5 (v. 13 after v. 14), *sūra* 6 (v. 35 after v. 53, and v. 108 after v. 110), *sūra* 7 (v. 155 after v. 179); see the Appendix.

the qurʾānic verse that his "opponents" use as the basis for their argument, along with their argument, then he follows it with his criticism, which in some cases comprises more than one opinion (*wajh*). Moreover, he often quotes other qurʾānic verses to confirm the accuracy of his peculiar interpretation of the verse under examination. A good example is Ibn al-Khallāl's treatment of Qurʾān 7:179 (*We have created for Hell many of the Jinns and humans …*):

ومّا تعلّقوا به أيضاً قوله سبحانه: ﴿ولقد ذرأنا لجهنّم كثيراً من الجنّ والإنس لهم قلوب لا يفقهون بها﴾ (7: 179) . قالوا: فأعلمنا أنّه خلق كثيراً من الجنّ والإنس للنار وليدخلهم جهنّم لأنّ الذرّ هو الخلق ومنه الذرّية، وهذا موجب لصحّة قولنا أنّ الله خلق خلقاً للنار وخلقاً للجنّة ومبطل لمذهب مخالفينا أنّه خلق الجميع للجنّة كافرهم ومؤمنهم. يقال لهم: إنّكم لو ضربتم بعض القرآن ببعض وعلمتم مرامه من التناقض والتعارض واستدللتم على متشابهه وعلى محكمه بمفسّره، لسقط تعلّقكم بهذه الآية وما أشبهها لتأييد مذهبكم وإبطال قول مخالفيكم لأنّ الله سبحانه يقول: ﴿وما خلقت الجنّ والإنس إلا ليعبدون﴾ (51: 56)، وقال في قصّة فرعون لموسى وهَرون عليهما السلام: ﴿فقولا له قولا ليّناً لعلّه يتذكّر أو يخشى﴾ (20: 44)، وقال: أوعجبتم أن جاءكم ذكر من ربّكم على رجل منكم لينذركم ولتتّقوا﴾ (7: 63)، وقال: ﴿قالوا أجئتنا لنعبد الله وحده ونذر ما كان يعبد آباؤنا﴾ (7: 70)، فأخبر سبحانه أنّه وجّه بالرسل عليهم السلم إلى الكفّار وأراد من الكفّار أن يتّقوا ويعبدوا الله ربّهم. وقال: ﴿ثمّ السبيل يسّرَه﴾ (80: 21)، فدلّ على أنّه عنى الكافر بقوله: ﴿كلّا لمّا يقض ما أمره﴾ (80: 23)، فأعلمك أنّه خلق الكافر لمثل ما خلق له المؤمن من التعرض للجنّة ونيل الثواب. وفي قوله: ﴿ولقد ذرأنا لجهنّم كثيراً من الجنّ والإنس﴾، وجهان من التأويل أحدهما قد تقدّم ذكره في باب تأويل قوله ﴿إنّما نملي لهم ليزدادوا إثماً﴾ (3: 178) وهو أنّه الإخبار عن عاقبة أمرهم وأنّهم إلى النار يصيرون وبما يوجب دخولها يعملون، والعرب تعبّر بهذه العبارة تريدها الإخبار عن العاقبة لا أنّها تخبر عن الإرادة لكون ما أخبرت عن وقوعه، كقول الله تعالى: ﴿فالتقطه آل فرعون ليكون لهم عدوّاً وحزناً﴾ (28: 8)، وقد نقضنا ما في هذا آنفاً وذكرنا ما في القرآن واللغة من الدلالة على ما ذهبنا إليه فيه. ولو حملنا هذه الآية على إرادته لخلق الكافر لإدخاله النار لتناقضت الآيات وتكاذبت الحجج والبيّنات وخرجت بذلك على أن يكون فيها حجّة أو بيّنة، ولو كان الله سبحانه أراد بخلق الكفّار أن يكفروا أو يضلوا أو يدخلوا النار لكان إنّما بعث إليهم الرسل لهلاكهم دون نجاتهم ولفسادهم دون صلاحهم وأن يضلّوا لا لأن يهتدوا وكان قد أتاهم بالضلال والحيرة ولم يقل: ﴿إنّي جئتهم بالبيّنات﴾ (5: 110)، ولم يقل: ﴿ولقد جاءهم من ربّهم الهدى﴾ (53: 23)، ﴿وما منع الناس أن يؤمنوا إذ جاءهم الهدى﴾ (17: 94)، وهذا بيّن لا إشكال فيه على أحد . والوجه الثاني أنّه أتى بهذا الخبر بصيغة الماضي وأراد المستقبل كقوله: ﴿ونادى أصحاب الجنّة أصحاب النار﴾ (7: 44)، أراد أنّهم سينادون، وقوله: ﴿إذ قال الله يا عيسى بن مريم أأنت قلت للناس اتّخذوني وأمّي إلهين من دون الله﴾ (5: 116)، فلمّا كان الله سبحانه قد أتى بلفظ الماضي في آي كثيرة وأراد المستقبل لم ينكر أن يكون قوله ﴿ولقد ذرأنا لجهنّم﴾ أيّ نذراً أقواماً لجهنّم لأنّ الله تَعَلى إذا

---

بعثهم من قبورهم فإنّما يبعثهم ليجازيهم على أعمالهم ويصير كلّ عامل منهم إلى جزاء إن عمله خيراً فخير وإن شرّاً
فشرّ، إذ كان لا تكليف في الآخرة ولا تعرّض لفعل طاعة ولا ترك معصية وإنّما يخلقهم ليوصلهم إلى استحقاقاتهم من
إثابة أو معاقبة. فالوجهان اللذان أرينا جوازهما في هذه الآية واطراد معناهما يسقطان ما ذهب إليه المخالف في
تصحيح مذهبه. ³⁹

In his argument against the Compulsionists' interpretation, Ibn al-Khallāl pro-
vides two rebuttals, which can be summarized as follows: Firstly, God is telling
about the end (*al-ʿāqiba*) of these jinns and humans, an end they will attain as
the result of their own deeds, "for if the verse in question demonstrates God's
will to create the unbeliever in order to make him enter Hell, then all the verses
of the Qurʾān would contradict themselves and God's signs and proofs would be
false." Secondly, God is using the past tense (*dharaʾnā*) but actually means the fu-
ture (*sa-nadhruʾu*), as in *wa-nādā aṣḥāb al-janna aṣḥāb al-nār* (Qurʾān 7:44: the
people of Heaven call the people of Hell). For in Qurʾān 7:44, the verb *nādā* is
in the past tense, but, since this can only take place in the future, one must read
it as *sa-yunādī* (will call): those whose end is in Heaven will call those whose end
is in Hell.[40]

Ibn al-Khallāl often quotes poetry (although he does not always name the po-
ets), and in some cases he refers to Arabic semantics by using statements like
"according to the speech of the Arabs" (*wa-fī kalām al-ʿarab*), and "the Arabs
mean by this expression" (*wa-l-ʿarab tuʿabbiru bi-hādhihi l-ʿibāra*).[41] This system is
similarly followed by Muʿtazilite, Twelver-Shīʿite, or Zaydite authors, such as in
*Kitāb al-Najāt* by al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā (d. 325/937), ʿAbd al-
Jabbār's *Mutashābih al-qurʾān*, al-Ṣāḥib Ibn ʿAbbād's (d. 385/955) treatise *al-Ibāna
ʿan madhhab ahl al-ʿadl*, and al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā's (d. 436/1044) *Amālī*.

Ibn al-Khallāl's method also involves *tafsīr al-qurʾān bi-l-qurʾān* (interpreting
some verses by referring to other verses). As the example discussed above shows,
he uses Qurʾānic verses to help him make the case for a particular interpretation
of another verse. This method suggests that the Muʿtazilite approach to *tafsīr*
treated the Qurʾān as comprised of themes and units, and when discussing a par-
ticular verse, other verses that share the same theme or unit were quoted to make
the case.[42]

---

39   Ibn al-Khallāl, *Radd*, ff. 87a-88b.
40   What Ibn al-Khallāl assumes here is that humans will be ushered into Heaven or Hell only
     after the Day of Judgment.
41   Ibn al-Khallāl, *Radd*, ff. 36b and 87b respectively.
42   See also the examples from ʿAbd al-Jabbār's *Mutashābih al-qurʾān* cited below.

## *Sources cited in* Kitāb al-Radd

Ibn al-Khallāl acknowledges that he used two books as his sources, one by the Muʿtazilite and Zaydite theologian from Baghdad Abu l-Faḍl Jaʿfar b. Ḥarb (d. 236/850), and the other by Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī (d. 303/916), the leader of the Muʿtazilite school of Basra. He introduces them towards the end of his introduction in the following way:

ووجدت ما أُورد في هذا الباب، أعني الكلام في الآي التي يتعلّق بها الجبريّة، كتابين جيّدين أحدهما لأبي الفضل جعفر بن
حرب رحمه الله، والآخر لأبي علي محمّد بن عبد الوهّاب الجبّائي رحمهما الله. فأمّا أبو الفضل فإنّ كتابه يقدّم شُبُهاً
أخذ بها الناس بعده واشعاباً تحتاج إلى كشف وإيضاح، وأمّا أبو علي فإنّه أخلا كتابه من إشباع الكلام من جهة اللغة
والإعراب وما لا غنى بالإنسان عنه ليزداد قوّة على الخصم. ⁴³

> On this topic, that is, the examination of the verses to which the Compulsionists adhere [to support their views], I came across two good books: one of them is by Abu l-Faḍl Jaʿfar b. Ḥarb, may God have mercy on his soul, and the other one is by Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Jubbāʾī, may God have mercy on both their souls.⁴⁴ As for Abu l-Faḍl, his book discusses wrong views, which were adopted by a large number of scholars [especially] after his time, and issues that require investigation and explanation. As for Abū ʿAlī, he devoted his book to a comprehensive examination from the perspective of language, grammar, and what the person needs so that he has command over the opponent.

Both Jaʿfar b. Ḥarb and Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī were known to have authored works on *mutashābih al-qurʾān*. For instance, Ibn al-Nadīm lists a *Kitāb Mutashābih al-qurʾān* among the books Jaʿfar b. Ḥarb authored,⁴⁵ and attributes to Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī a book on the topic of *mutashābih al-qurʾān*.⁴⁶ But neither work is extant.

These two works on *mutashābih al-Qurʾān* by Jaʿfar b. Ḥarb and al-Jubbāʾī are the two sources that Ibn al-Khallāl seems to have used, or at least they are the only sources that he acknowledges having employed in the writing of his own book on the topic.

---

⁴³ Ibn al-Khallāl, *Radd*, ff. 2a-b.
⁴⁴ He possibly means here Abū ʿAlī and his father.
⁴⁵ Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 213; see also p. 39. Al-Ṣāḥib Ibn ʿAbbād also names Jaʿfar b. Ḥarb among those Muʿtazilites who authored on the *mutashābih al-qurʾān*; see his *Risāla fī l-hidāya wa-l-ḍalāla*, ed. Ḥusayn ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ, Tehran 1955, p. 48. See also van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft*, vol. 6, p. 289.
⁴⁶ See Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 39; al-Ṣāḥib Ibn ʿAbbād, *Risāla fī l-hidāya wa-l-ḍalāla*, p. 48; al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī, *Sharḥ ʿUyūn al-Masāʾil*, vol. 1, f. 52a; and Schwarb, Schmidtke, and Sklare (eds.), *Handbook of Muʿtazilite Works and Manuscripts*, (section on Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī, # 25).

*Impact of* Kitāb al-Radd:

The real impact of Ibn al-Khallāl's *Kitāb al-Radd* cannot be seriously assessed until the text has been edited. But this does not necessarily mean that one cannot provide initial comments on the role it played and its potential impact on later religious scholars and movements. We have already come across the Twelver Shīʿite theologian and bibliophile Ibn Ṭāwūs, who acknowledged that he consulted two works by Ibn al-Khallāl (though as argued above it was the same work with two different titles), and incorporated arguments from them into at least one of his books. It is clear, then, that *Kitāb al-Radd* helped Ibn Ṭāwūs shape and defend his theological positions, especially the free will doctrine, which he was defending in his own *Kitāb Saʿd al-suʿūd*. One can also deduce from the personal names of Zaydite imams and scholars from Yemen who owned the current extant manuscript at different times (written around the margins of the title page in the Caetani manuscript) that they too considered it a valuable source that defends the doctrine of free will against the predestination creed. To what extent they used it, however, is impossible to establish at the moment.

*Distinctiveness of Ibn al-Khallāl's* Kitāb al-Radd

It remains to be determined how *Kitāb al-Radd* compares to ʿAbd al-Jabbār's *Kitāb Mutashābih al-qurʾān*, which draws on earlier Muʿtazilite sources, among them Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī's *Mutashābih al-qurʾān*.[47] In light of the fact that Ibn al-Khallāl was a disciple of Ibn al-Ikhshīd and al-Ṣaymarī, whereas ʿAbd al-Jabbār mainly followed the teachings of Abū Hāshim al-Jubbāʾī, it would be important to establish the degree of variance or congruence between both works, especially given the split between the students of Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī: Ibn al-Ikhshīd and his followers versus Abū Hāshim and his followers.

The section below gives ʿAbd al-Jabbār's answer to the same question of the problematic Qurʾān 7:179 quoted already above by Ibn al-Khallāl:

مسألة: قالوا ثمّ ذكر تعالى بعده ما يدلّ على أنّه خلق الكفّار لجهنّم وللكفر وأنّه أراد بهم ذلك ومنهم فقال: ﴿ ولقد ذرأنا لجهنّم كثيراً من الجنّ والإنس ﴾ (7: 179)، ثمّ حقّق ذلك بقوله: ﴿ لهم قلوب لا يفقهون بها ﴾ (7: 179)، فبيّن أنّه جعلهم بحيث لا يفقهون ولا يبصرون ولا يسمعون. والجواب عن ذلك أنّ ظاهره يقتضي أنّه خلقهم وأراد بهم جهنّم لأنّه المراد المذكور في الكلام وقد علمنا أنّ ذلك لا يدلّ على أنّه أراد الكفر وسائر ما يُستوجب به جهنّم، فظاهره لا يدلّ

---

على ما قالوه. فإنّ قال: إذا أراد بهم جهنّم فلا بدّ أن يريد ما يؤدّي إليها، فذلك غلط لأنّه تعالى يريد العقاب عندنا وإن لم يرد ما يستحقّ به كما قد يريد من الغير التوبة وإن لم يرد ما لأجله تجب التوبة من المعاصي. وقد يريد الإمام إقامة الحجّة على السارق والزاني وإن لم يرد السرقة والزنا فلا يمتنع من أن يريد تعالى بهم العقوبة بشرطية أن يكفروا بعد إقامة الحجّة وإزاحة العلّة. ويخالف ذلك ما قلناه من أنّ قوله تعالى: ﴿وما خلقت الجنّ والإنس إلّا ليعبدون﴾ (51: 56) يدلّ على إرادته العبادة من جميعهم لأنّ هناك دخلت اللام على نفس ما ادّعيناه مراداً له، وفي هذه الآية دخلت على أمر سوى ما زعم المخالف أنّه أراده. وبيين ما نقوله في ذلك أنّ قوله تعالى: ﴿وما خلقت الجنّ والإنس إلّا ليعبدون﴾، لا بدّ معه أن يقدر فيه حذف ليستقيم الكلام وهو: ﴿وما خلقت الجنّ والإنس وما أمرتهم بالطاعة وكلّفتهم إلّا ليعبدون﴾، لأنّ بنفس الخلق لا يصحّ تكليف العبادة ومتى قرّر ذلك حسن أن يعلّق به ليعبدون، فإذا قرّر مثله فيما ذكروه لم يصحّ لأنّه لو قال تعالى: ﴿ولقد ذرأنا﴾ الخلق وأمرناهم بمجانبة الكفر وزجرناهم عنه ﴿لجهنّم﴾، لتناقض القول لأنّ ما تقدّم يقتضي أنّه خلقهم لا لجهنّم والثاني يقتضي أنّه خلقهم لها، وهذا في التناقض كما ترى. فيجب أن يُحمَل الكلام على أنّ المراد به العاقبة، فكأنّه قال: ولقد ذرأناهم والمعلوم أنّ مصيرهم وعاقبة حالهم دخول جهنّم لسوء اختيارهم، وهذا كقوله تعالى: ﴿فالتقطه آل فرعون ليكون لهم عدوّاً وحزناً﴾ (28: 8)، من حيث كان ذلك هو العاقبة، وإن كانوا إنّما التقطوه ليفرحوا به ويسرّوا، وهذا ظاهر في اللغة والشعر.[48]

Clearly, both discussions are very similar. The only difference is that ʿAbd al-Jabbār brings up the issue of *ḥadhf*, which means words that are left out but without which the meaning is incomplete. ʿAbd al-Jabbār also takes the opportunity to refute the view that if God approves of the end of some people in Hell, then He must also approve of what leads to Hell (i.e., sins and transgressions). ʿAbd al-Jabbār argues that, according to the view of his school, God approves of the punishment only, not what leads to receiving the punishment, similar to the judge who imposes a penalty on the thief and the adulterer even though he disapproves of theft and adultery. As for Ibn al-Khallāl, he introduces the grammatical point regarding verb *nādā*, which, even though it is in the past tense, must refer to the future. He also brings up the issue of God having created the unbelievers, like the believers, to be admitted to Heaven and receive the rewards provided they do the work that leads to that (*khalaqa l-kāfir li-mithl mā khalaqa lahu l-muʾmin min al-taʿrīḍ li-l-janna wa-nayl al-thawāb*).

A second comparison between Ibn al-Khallāl's *Kitāb al-Radd* and ʿAbd al-Jabbār's *Mutashābih al-qurʾān* relates to Qurʾān 6:123. Ibn al-Khallāl presents the following discussion:

وممّا تعلّقوا به قوله سبحانه: ﴿وكذلك جعلنا في كلّ قرية أكابر مجرميها ليمكروا فيها وما يمكرون إلّا بأنفسهم وما يشعرون﴾ (6: 123)، فأخبر الله تعالى كما يرى أنّه جعل الأكابر في القرية ليمكروا والمكر معصية، فقد شاع استدعاء الله تعالى إلى المعصية والاستدراج إليها والخلق لها وهذا أحد قولكم وخلاف مذهبكم. يقال لهم: قد تقدّم القول منّا في

---

48  ʿAbd al-Jabbār, *Mutashābih al-qurʾān*, pp. 305-06.

هذا التأويل على نظائر هذه الآية ممّا لا يدفعه خصم ولا يقصر عنه فهم، لأنّ الله تعَالى إذا أراد الإخبار عن عاقبة قوم والدلالة على ما إليه يؤل أمرهم ويحتم عليه أحوالهم ذكر مثل هذا . وكذلك وجد مثل هذا في اللغة وليس هو على معنى أنّ الله تعَالى أراد مكرهم أو دعا إليه أو أغرى به لأنّه يقول: ﴿ وما خلقت الجنّ والإنس إلّا ليعبدون ﴾ (51: 56)، ويقول: ﴿ فقولا له قولاً ليّناً لعلّه يتذكّر أو يخشى ﴾ (20: 44)، ويقول تعَالى: ﴿ وما نرسل بالآيات إلّا تخويفاً ﴾ (17: 59)، فأعلمنا أنّه سبحانه لا يفعل إلّا ما يزجر به عن معصيته دون ما يدعو إليها ويوقع فيها ويجزي عليها، ولا يليق بحكمته وفضله ورحمته إلّا هذا . وفي القرآن لهذا الكلام من النظائر ما لا يمكن إلّا بيان عليه، منه قوله: ﴿ فالتقطه آل فرعون ليكون لهم عدوّاً وحزناً ﴾ (28: 8)، وقوله: ﴿ وجعلوا لله أنداداً ليضلّوا عن سبيله ﴾ (14: 30)، وهم في الحقيقة يريدون الاهتداء بها لقول الله حاكياً عنهم: ﴿ ما نعبدهم إلّا ليقرّبونا إلى الله زلفا ﴾ (39: 3)، فعلمنا أنّ الله إنّما أراد الإخبار عمّا يؤل إليه عاقبة هؤلاء الأكابر من المكر بالناس والخديعة لهم، وعلى هذا يقول القائل:

وأمّ سمّاك فلا تجزعي          فللموت ما غذت الوالدة،

وقال آخر:

فللموت تغذوا الوالدات سخالها          كما لخراب الدهر تبنى المساكن،

ويقول القائل: إنّما يجمع فلان لورثته. فالمعنى في هذا كلّه مفهوم أنّه ليس قصد الجامع للمال للورثة، والأولاد للموت، والمساكن للخراب، وإنّما أحملنا تكرير هذه الآيات ونقضنا الكلام في بعضها لنعي بالتقصّي هناك عن سايرها وكي لا يظنّ ظانّ من المخالفين أنّا لم نوردها أنّا أغفلنا شيئاً ممّا يتعلّقون به علينا أو يجدون فيه فرجاً في خلافنا . [49]

ʿAbd al-Jabbār has the following to say:

مسألة: ثمّ ذكر تعالى بعده ما يدلّ على أنّه تعالى يريد المكر ممّن يقدّر عليه، فقال تعالى: ﴿ وكذلك جعلنا في كلّ قرية أكابر مجرميها ليمكروا فيها ﴾ (6: 123) . والجواب عن ذلك أنّه تعالى أراد به أن عاقبة أمرهم أنْ يمكروا في القرى التي سكنهم الله تعالى فيها كقوله تعالى: ﴿ فالتقطه آل فرعون ليكون لهم عدوّاً وحزناً ﴾ (28: 8)، وكقول الشاعر:

وأمّ سمّاك فلا تجزعي          فللموت ما تلد الوالدة .

ولا يجوز أن يكون تعالى يجعلهم أكابر ليمكروا وبعصوا وقد قال تعالى: ﴿ وما خلقت الجنّ والإنس إلّا ليعبدون ﴾ (51: 56)، يبيّن أنّ ذلك متى أبرز المحذوف من الكلام وكشف لم يستقم على ظاهره، فلو قال تعالى: ﴿ وكذلك جعلنا في كلّ قرية أكابر مجرميها ﴾ وأمرناهم ألّا يمكروا فيها ليمكروا، لكان ذلك يتناقض وهذا ممّا لا بدّ من تقديره لأنّه لا يجوز أن يكون غرضه تعالى أن لا يمكروا بأن يجعلهم في القرى أكابر لأنّه لو لم يكلّفهم لم يصحّ ذلك. فأمّا ما ذكرناه فلو أبرز فيه

49   Ibn al-Khallāl, *Radd*, ff. 73a-b.

المحذوف لاستقام بأن يقول: ﴿ وما خلقت الجنّ والإنس ﴾ وأكملت عقولهم وأمرتهم بالعبادة ﴿ إلّا ليعبدون ﴾، لاستقام الكلام وانتظم. فعلى هذه الطريقة يجب أن يحمل ما يراد به العاقبة ومفارقته لما يراد به الإقدام على ذلك الفعل، وهذا واضح. [50]

Here too, both discussions are very similar, though Ibn al-Khallāl's is a little longer. One notices the citation of poetry and Qurʾānic verses by both authors – actually the same line is quoted by both of them, as well as the two Qurʾānic verses 28:8 and 51:56. The only difference is that ʿAbd al-Jabbār brings up, again, the issue of *al-maḥdhūf min al-kalām* (words that are left out).

These two comparisons between the works of Ibn al-Khallāl and ʿAbd al-Jabbār demonstrate the distinctiveness of each author, despite the similarities in presentation and style. This suggests that even though they derived some of their views from earlier Muʿtazilite sources – at least one of these sources was common to both of them, namely the *Mutashābih al-qurʾān* of Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī – each author was original in the sense that he rephrased the arguments and presented them in his own language. Yet, these two cases only touch the tip of the iceberg. Needless to say, a more thorough comparison of both texts would be valuable if it enabled us to identify specific variations within Muʿtazilite theology over certain issues, especially regarding some of the views over which Ibn al-Ikhshīd and his school differed from Abū Hāshim and the Bahshamiya school. After all, the works of al-Ṣaymarī and Ibn al-Ikhshīd have been lost, and our knowledge of their teachings is too general to allow a serious exposition of their thought and contribution to the Muʿtazilite movement. One expects, however, that some of their views would have been preserved by their disciple Ibn al-Khallāl in his *Kitāb al-Radd*. Furthermore, given the fact that Ibn al-Khallāl draws on two sources that are now lost, his work is also of paramount significance as a window into the teachings of Jaʿfar b. Ḥarb and Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī regarding the *mutashābih al-qurʾān*.

## *Appendix*

Table of Contents of Ibn al-Khallāl's *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā al-jabriyya al-qadariyya*

(*Sūra*s and verses are listed in the order they appear in the Caetani manuscript)

Introduction: ff. 1b-2b.
Sūrat al-Ḥamd (1: Sūrat al-Fātiḥa), verses 6-7: ff. 2b-5b.
Sūrat al-Baqara (2), verses 1-2, 7, 26, 49, 103, 128, 213, 253, 272, 286: ff. 5b-30a.
Sūrat Āl ʿImrān (3), verses 8, 54, 152, 154, 166, 178: ff. 30a-38a.

---

50   ʿAbd al-Jabbār, *Mutashābih al-qurʾān*, pp. 261-62.

Sūrat al-Nisāʾ (4), verses 78, 88, 129: ff. 38a-43b.

Sūrat al-Māʾida (5), verses 3, 14, 13, 29, 41, 64: ff. 43b-54a.

Sūrat al-Anʿām (6), verses 9, 25, 39, 44, 53, 35, 91, 105, 110, 108, 111, 112, 113, 123, 125, 129, 149: ff. 54a-81a.

Sūrat al-Aʿrāf (7), verses 16, 30, 89, 146, 179, 155, 182, 188: ff. 81a-92a.

Sūrat al-Anfāl (8), verses 24, 25, 44: ff. 92a-97b.

Sūrat al-Tawba (9), verses 46, 55, 76, 87, 124-125, 127: ff. 97b-103b.

Sūrat Yūnus (10), verses 88 (first part), 88 (second part), 100: ff. 103b-11b.

Sūrat Hūd (11), verses 34, 118-119: ff. 112a-120a.

Sūrat Yūsuf (12), verse 76: ff. 120a-121a.

Sūrat al-Raʿd (13), verse 16: ff. 121a-124a.

Sūrat Ibrāhīm (14), verses 37 and 40: ff. 124a-126a.

Sūrat al-Ḥijr (15), verse 11: ff. 126a-127a.

Sūrat al-Naḥl (16), verses 17, 25: ff. 127a-130b.

Sūrat Banī Isrāʾīl (17), verses 5, 7, 16, 45-46: ff. 130b-138b.

Sūrat al-Kahf (18), verses 23, 28: ff. 138b-140a.

Sūrat Maryam (19), verses 75, 83: ff. 140a-141b.

Sūrat Ṭāhā (20): Not included.

Sūrat al-Anbiyāʾ (21), verses 37, 90, 111: ff. 141b-146a.

Sūrat al-Ḥajj (22), verses 52-53: ff. 146a-148a.

Sūrat al-Muʾminūn (23), verses 55-56, 106-107: ff. 148a-150b.

Sūrat al-Nūr (24), verse 63: ff. 150b-152a.

Sūrat al-Furqān (25), verse 2: ff. 152a-155a.

Sūrat al-Shuʿarāʾ (26): not included.

Sūrat al-Naml (27), verse 50: ff. 155a-156a.

Sūrat al-Qaṣaṣ (28), verse 27: ff. 156a-158a.

Sūrat al-ʿAnkabūt (29), verse 13: ff. 158a-159a.

Sūrat al-Rūm (30), verses 22, 30: ff. 159a-161a.

Sūrat Luqmān (31): not included.

Sūrat al-Sajda (32), verse 13: ff. 161a-162b.

Sūrat al-Aḥzāb (33): not included.

Sūrat Sabaʾ (34): not included.

Sūrat al-Malāʾika (35: Sūrat Fāṭir), verse 3: ff. 162b-163a.

Sūrat Yāsīn (36), verse 8: folios 163a-165b.

Sūrat al-Ṣāffāt (37), verses 95-96, 102: ff. 165b-167b.

Sūrat Ṣad (38): not included.

Sūrat al-Zumar (39): not included.

Sūrat Ghāfir (40): not included.

Sūrat Fuṣṣilat (41), verse 25: ff. 167b-169a. (this sūra is wrongly identified as Sūrat al-Sajda)

Sūrat al-Shūrā (42): not included.

Sūrat al-Zakhruf (43): not included.
Sūrat al-Dukhān (44): not included.
Sūrat al-Jāthiya (45): not included.
Sūrat al-Aḥqāf (46): not included.
Sūrat Muḥammad (47): not included.
Sūrat al-Fatḥ (48): not included.
Sūrat al-Ḥujurāt (49): not included.
Sūrat Qāf (50): not included.
Sūrat al-Dhāriyāt (51): not included.
Sūrat al-Ṭūr (52): not included.
Sūrat al-Najm (53), verses 43-44: ff. 169a-170a.
Sūrat al-Qamar (54): not included.
Sūrat al-Raḥmān (55): not included.
Sūrat al-Wāqiʿa (56): not included.
Sūrat al-Ḥadīd (57): not included.
Sūrat al-Mujādala (58): not included.
Sūrat al-Ḥashr (59): not included.
Sūrat al-Mumtaḥana (60): not included.
Sūrat al-Ṣaff (61), verse 5: ff. 170a-171a.
Sūrat al-Jumuʿa (62): not included.
Sūrat al-Munāfiqūn (63): not included.
Sūrat al-Taghābun (64): not included.
Sūrat al-Ṭalāq (65), verses 10-11: ff. 171a-172a.
Sūrat al-Taḥrīm (66): not included.
Sūrat al-Mulk (67), verses 13-14: ff. 172a-173a.
Sūrat al-Qalam (68): not included.
Sūrat al-Ḥaqqa (69): not included.
Sūrat al-Maʿārij (70): not included.
Sūrat Nūḥ (71): not included.
Sūrat al-Jinn (72), verses 16-17: ff. 173a-173b. (Here the Caetani text ends)

## References

ʿAbd al-Jabbār al-Hamadhānī, "Faḍl al-iʿtizāl wa-ṭabaqāt al-muʿtazila," in *Faḍl al-iʿtizāl wa-ṭabaqāt al-muʿtazila,* ed. Fuʾād Sayyid, Tunis [1974], pp. 137-350.

—, *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-ʿadl* 4-9, 11-17, 20, ed. Muṣṭafā Ḥilmī [et al.], Cairo 1961-65.

—, *Mutashābih al-qurʾān*, ed. ʿAdnān Muḥammad Zarzūr, Cairo 1969.

-Dhahabī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, ed. Shuʿayb Arnāʾūṭ [et al.], Beirut 1990.

*Encyclopædia Iranica* 1-, London [etc.] 1985-.

*The Encyclopeadia of Islam*. New Edition 1-11, Leiden 1960-2004.

*Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān* 1-6, ed. Jane Dammen McAuliffe, Leiden 2001-06.

*The Encyclopedia of Religion* 1-15, ed. Mircea Eliade [et al.], New York 1987.

van Ess, Josef, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra. Eine Ge-schichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam* 1-6, Berlin 1991-97.

-Ḥākim al-Jishumī, al-Muḥassin b. Muḥammad al-Bayhaqī, *Sharḥ ʿUyūn al-ma-sāʾil*, MS Ṣanʿāʾ, al-Maktaba al-Gharbiyya, ʿilm al-kalām no. 99.

Heemskerk, Margaretha T., *Suffering in the Muʿtazilite Theology. ʿAbd al-Jabbārʾs Teaching on Pain and Divine Justice*, Leiden 2000.

Ibn al-Khallāl al-Baṣrī, Abū ʿUmar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥafṣ, *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā l-jabriyya al-qadariyya fīmā taʿallaqū bih min mutashābih āy al-qurʾān al-karīm*. MS Rome, La Fondazione Caetani, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei no. 332.

Ibn al-Murtaḍā, Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā, *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-muʿtazila [Die Klassen der Muʿtazila von Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn al-Murtaḍā]*, ed. Susanna Diwald-Wilzer, Wiesbaden / Beirut 1380/1961.

Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad b. Isḥāq, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, ed. Riḍā Tajaddud, Tehran 1973.

Ibn Ṭāwūs, ʿAlī b. Mūsā, *Kitāb Saʿd al-suʿūd*, Najaf 1950.

-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, ed. Muṣṭafā ʿA.-Q. ʿAṭā, Beirut 1997.

Kinberg, Leah, "*Muḥkamāt* and *Mutashābihāt* (Koran 3/7). Implication of a Kor-anic Pair of Terms in Medieval Exegesis," *Arabica* 35 (1988), pp. 143-72 [repr. in *The Qurʾan. Formative Interpretation*, ed. Andrew Rippin, Aldershot 1999, pp. 283-312].

Kohlberg, Etan, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work. Ibn Ṭāwūs and His Library*, Leiden 1992.

-Maqḥafi, Ibrāhīm, *Muʿjam al-buldān wa-l-qabāʾil al-yamaniyya*, Ṣanʿāʾ 1988.

[pseudo] al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm al-Rassī, "Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā al-mujbira," in *Rasāʾil al-ʿadl wa-l-tawḥīd* 1-2, ed. Muḥammad ʿImāra, Cairo 1988, vol. 1, pp. 129-65.

-Ṣāḥib Ibn ʿAbbād, "al-Ibāna ʿan madhhab ahl al-ʿadl," in *Nafāʾis al-makhṭūṭāt*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥ. Āl Yāsīn. Najaf 1952, vol. 1, pp. 9-28.

—, *Risāla fī l-hidāya wa-l-ḍalāla*, ed. Ḥusayn ʿAlī Maḥfūẓ Tehran 1955.

Schwarb, Gregor, Sabine Schmidtke, and David Sklare (eds.), *Handbook of Muʿtazilite Works and Manuscripts* (*Handbuch der Orientalistik series*), Leiden: Brill (forthcoming).

Schwarz, Michael, "'Acquisition' (*Kasb*) in early *Kalām*," in *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition. Essays presented by his friends and pupils to Richard Walzer on his seventieth birthday*, Columbia 1973, pp. 355-87.

Sezgin, Fuat, *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums* 1-12, Leiden 1967-2000.

-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn, "Inqādh al-bashar min al-jabr wa-l-qadar," in *Rasāʾil al-ʿadl wa-l-tawḥīd* 1-2, ed. Muḥammad ʿImāra, Cairo 1988, vol. 1, pp. 283-342.

Stewart, Devin, "Emendations of the Legal Section in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm," in *ʿAbbasid Studies. Occasional Papers of the School of ʿAbbāsid Studies, Leuven June-July 2004*, ed. John Nawas (forthcoming).

Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfiʿiyya al-kubrā*, ed. Muṣṭafā ʿA.-Q. ʿAṭā, Beirut 1999.

Traini, Renato, *I manoscritti arabi di recente accessione della Fondazione Caetani*, Rome 1967.

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-buldān*, Beirut 1986.

Zabāra, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, *Tārīkh al-aʾimma al-zaydiyya fī l-Yaman ḥattā l-ʿaṣr al-ḥadīth*, Cairo 1998.

Zimmermann, F.W., "On the supposed shorter version of Ibn an Nadīm's *Fihrist* and its date," *Der Islam* 53 (1976), pp. 267-73.

*Author's note:*

After this article was completed, Gregor Schwarb drew my attention to the fact that there exists an additional manuscript of Ibn Khallāl's *Kitāb al-Radd* which is preserved in Ṣanʿāʾ, al-Jāmiʿ al-kabīr, al-Maktaba al-Gharbiyya, *majmūʿa* no. 15, ff. 178-249. (See Aḥmad Muḥammad ʿĪsawī [et al.], *Fihrist al-makhṭūṭāt al-yamaniyya li-Dār al-Makhṭūṭāt wa-l-Maktaba al-Gharbiyya bi-l-Jāmiʿ al-kabīr, Ṣanʿāʾ* 1-2, Qum 2005, pp. 165, 723.)
I thank Gregor Schwarb for this information.