

DIALECTIC AND INTERSECTION OF SUFISM AND KALAM IN THE FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES OF HIJRI

Yogi Prana Izza

Institute of Islamic Studies Sunan Giri Bojonegoro, Indonesia
E-mail: zherifzizi@gmail.com

Abstract: This article seeks to examine the dialectic of Sufism orientation and Kalam with a special focus on the intersection between these two realms during the First and Second Hijri centuries. Consequently, three aspects, which are the background and chronology of the intersection, the issues that arose in it, as well as the associated characteristics, were emphasized. The study revealed that the political, sociological, intellectual, and academic factors became the background of the intersection between Sufism and Kalam in the First and Second Hijri centuries. Also, the main issues developed were faith or *imān*, infidelity, or *kufr*, and the problems of human deeds, known as *af'āl al-'ibād*. Other issues were the relationship of the essence or *dhāt*, as well as the divine attributes or *ṣifāt* of Allah. Meanwhile, the three characteristics of the intersection that were mapped were, first, the interrelation of doctrine and political attitudes. This interrelation means that a strong correlation, or even integration, exists between the doctrine of a sect, known as *firqah*, and political attitudes. Second, a thematic theological interconnection signified that there were common issues discussed in matters of theology. Third, a rational debate based on rational approaches indicated that the conflict of thoughts that occurred was essentially a dialogue as it was not on a different study line but in the same area.

Keywords: Dialectics, intersection, Sufism, Kalam.

Introduction

A number of researchers have identified the origin of Sufism as an independent discipline that comes from Sufism in the first and second Hijri century.¹ Likewise, the idea of kalam discipline starts

¹ Ibrāhīm Basyūnī, *Nash'at al-Taṣawwuf al-Islāmī* (Mesir: Dār al-Ma'ārif, n.d.), 88-99; Abū al-A'lā al-'Aḥfīfī, *al-Taṣawwuf: al-Thawrah al-Ruhīyah fī al-Islām* (Cairo: 'Aqlān

from the debate of *kalām* with its various beliefs.² The emergence of the sufistic orientation and *kalām*, which happened almost at the same time has presented a dialectic—a dialogue with the mind. This dialectic has not been fully explored and discussed by many researchers. In general, the attention of research and discussion is focused more on the intersection of Sufism and Kalam in the third Hijri century, and it still opens up opportunities for deepening studies.

The research of Abdul Kadir Riyadi, for example, explains globally the paradigmatic intersection of various disciplines which happened in the third century of Hijriah with the emergence of Sufism in the hands of al-Ḥārīs b. Asad al-Muḥāsibī (165-243 H).³ On the other hand, Abū al-A‘lā al-‘Afīfī only mentions little about the discipline of *Kalām*⁴ as one of the factors in the emergence of Sufism, which is mostly forgotten by the researchers. Meanwhile, Andi Eka Putra’s research focuses more on the historical correlation between Sufism and Kalam in the 3rd Hijri century.⁵

The spiritual life of the ascetics early generations from the companions of the Prophet and Ṭābi‘īn (*al-ṣubḥād al-awāil*) was the source which formed the Sufism. They were known by the names *al-Qurra* (readers and reviewers of the al-Qur’ān), Ahl al-Ṣuffah, and *al-Tawwābūn* (experts of repentance). According to Amin Syukur, these terms had only just emerged among the Companions of the Prophet.⁶ However, by the end of the first century and the beginning of the second century of Hijriah, the Sufī term was allegedly well-known. Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj al-Ṭūsī in *al-Luma* (the earliest Sufism reference

‘Arabīyah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī’, 2017), 85-89; ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Badawī, *Tarikh al-Taṣawwuf al-Islāmī min al-Bidāyah ḥattā Nihāyat al-Qarn al-Thānī* (Kuwait: Wakālat al-Matbū‘āt, 1975), 126, 133-144; and ‘Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār, *Nash’at al-Fikr al-Falsafī fī al-Islām*, Vol. 3 (Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, n.d.), 63.

² Abdul Rozak and Rosihan Anwar, *Ilmu Kalam* (Bandung: Pustaka Setia, 2016), 34-35; Suryan A. Jamrah, *Studi Ilmu Kalam* (Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group, 2015), 103.

³ Abdul Kadir Riyadi, *Arkeologi Tasawuf* (Bandung: Mizan, 2016), 18-29; Abdul Kadir Riyadi, “Dinamika Kemunculan dan Persinggungan Paradigmatik Tasawuf al-Ḥārīs al-Muḥāsibī,” *Islamica: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (2014), 447-448.

⁴ Al-‘Afīfī, *al-Taṣawwuf*, 77-76.

⁵ See, Andi Eka Putra, “Tasawuf, Ilmu Kalam, dan Filsafat Islam: Suatu Tinjauan Sejarah tentang Hubungan Ketiganya,” *al-Adyan: Jurnal Studi Lintas Agama*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (2012), 91-102.

⁶ M. Amin Syukur and Masyharuddin, *Intelektualisme Tasawuf: Studi Intelektualisme Tasawuf al-Ghazālī* (Semarang: LEMBKOTA, 2014), 17-18.

book) stated that in the period of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (21-110 H) the Sufi term was already known. His opinion was based on the statement made by Ḥasan al-Baṣrī who had seen a sufi when he had been doing a tawaf, and the history of Sufyān al-Thawrī (97-161 H) who was the acquaintance of a *ṣūfī* expert named Abū Hāshim al-Ṣūfī.⁷

During the era of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, discussions and debates of divinity (*kalām*) were very lively. There were two most mainstream ideologies; Qadariyya and Jabariyya. Some of the famous figures were Ma'bad al-Juhanī (died in 80/90 H), Gailān al-Dimasqī (died in 106 H), Ja'ad b. Dirham (died at around 106-109 AH), Jahm b. Ṣafwān (died in 128 H), and others. They were representations of the early generations of kalam expertise (*mutakallimūn*). On the other hand, there were also some opponents who were against their ideas, namely Maṭraf b. al-Syakhīr (d. 88 H), Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (21-110 H), Mālik b. Dīnār (died in 127 H), 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz (61-101 H) and others. They, according to al-Kalābadhī (died in 380 H)⁸ and al-Munāwī⁹, were categorized as Sufi figures (*rijāl al-ṣūfīyya*) after the Companions of the Prophet. The debate between them was actually an extension of the conflict after the murdered of 'Uthmān b. 'Affān in 35 AH.

To sum up, the dialectic of sufism and kalam orientation had been starting in the first and second century of hijriah, yet in a "simple" format. This paper was made in order to trace and map the intersection of these two ideologies in the first and second centuries of the Hijriah using historical methods. Heuristically, the data related to the figures of the sufism and kalam ideologies of the first and second centuries of the Hijriah have been verified and mapped. The goals are to examine the background and the chronology of the intersection of both ideologies and map the issues developed in these intersections. Furthermore, through deeper analysis of the background, the chronology, and the issues, it is hoped that this paper will be able to explain the characteristics of the intersection that became the source of the debate between sufism and kalam ideologies in the first and second centuries of Hijriah.

⁷ Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj al-Ṭūsī, *al-Luma'* (Mesir: Dār al-Kutub al-Ḥadīthah, 1960), 42.

⁸ Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Kalābadhī, *al-Ta'arruf li Madhhab Abl al-Taṣanunuf* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, 1993), 21-22.

⁹ 'Abd al-Ra'ūf al-Munawī, *al-Kawākib al-Durrīyah fi Tarājum al-Sādab al-Ṣūfīyah*, Vol. 1 (Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Azharīyah li al-Turāth, n.d.), 256.

The Intersection between Sufism and Kalam Orientation in the First and Second Centuries of Hijri

1. The Background and the Chronology of the Intersection between Sufism and Kalam Orientation

The Companions of the Prophet Muhammad were divided into four groups when ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān was killed in 35 H.¹⁰ The first group was those who demanded ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 40 H) to be the new caliph to punish those who had murdered ‘Uthmān immediately. They were Ṭalhah b. Ubaydillah (d. 36 H) and Zubayr b. Awwām (d. 36 H). The second group were ‘Alī’s prosecutors, who urged that *qiyās* was supposed to be immediately sentenced against ‘Uthmān’s murderer as well as a condition for taking ‘Alī’s inclusion. They were residents of Syam with Mu‘āwiyah b. Abī Ṣufyān as their leader (d. 60 H), ‘Amr b. Āṣ (d. 43 H). The third group was those who agreed with the importance of punishing ‘Uthmān’s murderers but believed it was more appropriate to postpone the execution of the sentence until the situation was conducive enough. Some of the representatives of this group were included the caliph ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, Ibn ‘Abbās (d. 68 H) and Ammār b. Yāsir (d. 37 H). The fourth group were those who chose to withdraw themselves from defamation issues. When the Siffin war broke out in 37 H between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah, they also neither pick a side on Mu‘āwiyah nor ‘Alī as caliph. Even they tried to reconcile these two and asked people not to believe any defamations easily.¹¹ They were the majority of the Companions of the Prophet Muhammad.¹² Some of whom were Jarīr b. ‘Abdullah (d. 51 H),¹³

¹⁰ See and compare the division of four categories after the death of ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān according to Abudin Nata in Miftahur Ridho, “Peristiwa *Tabkīm*: Polemik Perselisihan Politik dan Implikasinya”, *Humanistika*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (2019), 57–71.

¹¹ Khālid Kabīr ‘Ilāl, *al-Ṣaḥābah al-Mu‘taẓilūn li al-Fitnah al-Kubrā* (Aljazair: Dār al-Balāgh, 2003), 6-7.

¹² al-Khallāl (d. 311 H) and Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241 H) wrote the history from Muhammad Ibn Sīrīn mentioning that when the Siffin defamation happened, the number of the Companions of Prophet was 10.000 people. However, those who involved was less than 30 people. See Abū Bakr Aḥmad al-Khallāl, *al-Sunnah*, Vol. 2 (Riyad: Dār al-Rāyah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘, 1989), 466; Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal, *al-‘Ilal wa Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl*, Vol. 3 (Riyad: Dār al-Khanī, 2001), 182.

¹³ ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib assigned Ibn ‘Abbās and Ash‘as went to see Jarīr praise him for being *mufāraqah* with Mu‘āwiyah and hoping him to be able to join ‘Alī. However, he emphasized that it would not be possible to fight people who recited: *lā ilah illā Allāh* because the purpose of the Prophet in sending him to Yemen was to convince people to convert to Islam. If someone has converted to Islam, his property and

Sa'ad b. Abī Waqqās (d. 55 H),¹⁴ Muḥammad b. Maslamah (d. 46 H),¹⁵ Abū Hurayrah (d. 59 H),¹⁶ Abdullah b. 'Umar (d. 73 H),¹⁷ and many others.¹⁸

There were two reasons for the Companions above chose to avoid defamations. *First*, the order of the Prophet Muhammad. Some of them heard directly from the Messenger of Allah like Abū Hurayrah and even received a message from the Messenger of Allah saying that if one day there would be any defamations, it was better to lock himself up at home, like Muḥammad b. Maslamah. *Second*, both parties conflicting in this war were all Muslims who were equally reciting the *Shahādah*. Thus, it is impossible to place one party as an infidel. As stated by Jarīr b. 'Abdullah and Sa'ad b. Abī Waqqās.

soul will be *ḥarām*. See Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Dhahabī, *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'*, Vol. 14 (Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Tawfiqiyah, n.d.), 132-133.

¹⁴ Sa'ad b. Abī Waqqās argumentatively stated that he did not want to be involved in the war because his sword could not differentiate which person was a believer and which was an infidel. See Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal*, Vol. 3 (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 2001), 112; Ma'mar b. Rāshid al-Azdī, *al-Jāmi'* (Pakistan: al-Majlis al-'Ilmī, 1983), 11, 357. As a comparison, the book *al-Jāmi'* by Ma'mar b. Rāshid al-Azdī which was verified and used as research by Mūsā Ibrāhīm Khayālayah does not contain all the *al-fitan* chapters including the statement of Sa'ad b. Abī Waqqās, however other sources supported the reference from Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. See, Mūsā Aḥmad Ibrāhīm Khayālayah, *Jāmi' Ma'mar b. Rāshid: Dirāsah wa Taḥqīq* (Jāmi'ah al-Quds, 2018); Sayyid Muḥammad Sādt al-Shanqīṭī, *Ḥamalāt al-Qur'ān min al-Ṣaḥābah* (Cairo: Dār al-Ḥaḍārah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī', 2007), 148.

¹⁵ Rasūlullah said to Muḥammad b. Maslamah that there would be fragmentation, disagreements and defamation. When it happened, he was asked to hit his sword on a large rock (put down the sword) and stayed at home. See, al-Qāsim Sulaymān b. Aḥmad al-Ṭabrānī, *al-Muḥjam al-Kabīr*, Vol. 19 (Cairo: Maktabah Ibn Taymīyah, n.d.), 233.

¹⁶ Abū Hurayrah heard that the Prophet had stated that there would be various defamations (chaos and enmity). At that time, the person sitting was better than the one standing. People standing were better than those walking. People walking were better than those running. Whoever plunged himself into it, surely he would be swallowed up, and whoever found refuge, let him took the refuge with it. See, Muḥammad b. Ismā'il al-Bukhārī, *al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, Vol. 9 (Jeddah: Dār Ṭuk al-Najāh, n.d.), 51.

¹⁷ Muṣṭafā al-'Adawī, *al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Musnad min Aḥādīth al-Fitan wa al-Malahim wa al-Fitan* (Riyad: Dār al-Hijrah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī', 1991), 141-143.

¹⁸ See 'Ilāl, *al-Ṣaḥābah*, 6-25.

Political-Sociological Background

The views of Jarīr b. Abdullah and Sa‘ad b. Abī Waqqās were followed by senior Tābi‘īn (*ḵibār al-tābi‘īn*) such as Abū al-Āliyah al-Rayyāhī (d. 93 H) whom al-Nasyār referred as one of the links in the concept of *ḍa’n Allah* (God’s lamb) or *saibat Allah* (Allah’s camel) in Sufism.¹⁹ He described the conditions during Siffin’s defamations and his attitude as follows:

It is really when Ali and Mu‘āwiyah got conflicted, I was still young. I would rather go to war than eat delicious food. I, then, prepared myself well until it reached them (who were in conflict). There were two lines that have no visible ends if they (in one line) recite *takbīr*, then those (in the other line respond) the same chant, if one group perished, then the other group would also experience the same thing. Then, I decided to withdraw myself and said, “Which of the two groups will I sit as an infidel? And who forced me to do this? It wasn’t until the evening until I left them.”²⁰

Abū al-Āliyah’s argumentative and sceptical views on who were the believers and who were the infidel have been part of the embryonic discussion of divinity (*kalām*) which also strengthened the asceticism of the early generations (*al-ṣubḥād al-awāil*) of the Companions and the seniors of Tābi‘īn (*ḵibār al-tābi‘īn*) in avoiding defamations. Presumably, this is the beginning of the intersection of the Sufi and Kalam ideologies which were manifested in the individual political-sociological thoughts and attitudes of the early generations of asceticism.²¹

The intersection of the Sufistic and Kalam ideologies has become increasingly apparent along with the emergence of various sects after the incident of *taḥkīm* (arbitration) in 38 H which brought respective religious doctrines up, such as Khawārij, Shī‘ah, and Murjī‘ah. Various theological debates which were initially politically motivated became more vibrant and systematic by the end of the first

¹⁹ The term *ḍa’n Allah* or *saibat Allah* are correlated to a total sincerity to Allah like the prophet of Ismāil as who was ready to be sacrificed by his dad, the prophet of Ibrāhīm. See al-Nashshār, *Nash’at al-Fikr al-Falsafī*, Vol. 3, 31, 78.

²⁰ Abū Qāsīm ‘Alī b. ‘Asākir, *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimasq*, Vol. 18 (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995), 181-182; Abū Nu‘aym al-Asfahānī, *Ḥīyat al-Anlīyā’ wa Ṭabaqāt al-Aṣfiyā’*, Vol. 2 (Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Sa‘ādah, 1979), 219.

²¹ See, Fāliḥ ‘Alī ‘Alī, “Ilm al-Kalām wa Atharuhu ‘alā al-Taṣawwuf fī al-Islām,” *Majallab Kulliyat al-Adab*, 95 (2011), 464-480.

Hijriah and the beginning of the second Hijriah (during the Umayyad era under the leadership of Mu‘āwiyah b. Abī Ṣufyān in 41-61 H until ‘Umar b. Abd al-‘Azīz in 99-101 H).²²

In Medina, Basrah, and Sham, there were important figures, namely Maṭraf b. Abdullah al-Syakhīr (d. 88 H), Imam Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (21-110 H), Ma‘bad al-Juhanī (d. 90 / 80 H), Gailān al-Dimasqī (d. 106 H), ‘Umar b. Abd al-‘Azīz (61-101 H), Ja‘ad b. Dirham (Died between 106-109 H), Jahm b. Ṣafwān (d. 128H) and Wāṣil b. Aṭā’ (80-131 H). They presented the intersection of the Sufism and Kalam orientation more clearly at the end of the first and second centuries of Hijriah. This period is a phase of the Islamic philosophical thought journey when people think logically and naturally compared with various opinions.²³

Maṭraf b. Abdullah b. al-Syakhīr (d. 88 H) was one of the tābī‘īn figures who known as *zūhd* and worship experts. He studied from his own father, Abdullah b. al-Syakhīr²⁴, to become a *qurrā’*.²⁵ Maṭraf was a leader and figure in his circle, *zūhd* was chosen as his way of life and a movement. He wore woolen clothes and mingled with poor people.²⁶ He avoided the issues of the murder of ‘Uthmān and the conflict between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah and invited others to stay away from defamations. From his point of view, defamation did not lead to the truth; instead, it came to uproot a *mu’min*’s religion.²⁷

The attitude of Maṭraf in avoiding and convincing the other to stay away from defamations was followed by applying a self-introspection. Often, he said that he preferred doing nothing rather than doing something, then evaluating what he had done.²⁸ However, he still actively responded to the Kalam discourse that was developing at that time by rebutting and criticizing at Qadariyya. He mentioned, “This is the group of people who say that if they want, they can go to heaven, and if they want, they can go to hell.”²⁹

²² Jamrah, *Studi Ilmu Kalam*, 18.

²³ Majīd Makhlīf Tarrād, “Dawr al-Fikr al-Falsafī fī al-Ḥaḍārah al-Arabīyah al-Islāmīyah,” *Majallat al-Turāth al-‘Ilmī al-‘Arabī*, 36 (2018), 46.

²⁴ Jamāl al-Dīn Abī al-Farj b. al-Jawzī, *Ṣifāt al-Ṣafwān*, Vol. 2 (Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 2000), 133.

²⁵ al-Asfahānī, *Ḥīyat al-Anlīyā*, Vol. 2, 203.

²⁶ Ibid., 200.

²⁷ Ibid., Vol. 3, 204.

²⁸ Ibid., Vol. 2, 200.

²⁹ Ibid., Vol. 2, 201.

At this time, the Qadariyya was voiced by Ma'bad al-Juhanī (d. 90/80 H) in Medina and Basrah, while in Damascus, there was Gailan al-Dimasqi (d. 106 H). Ma'bad al-Juhanī allegedly became a student of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (21-110H/642-728M). One of the references stated that Ma'bad and 'Aṭā' b. Yasar met Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and said, "O Abū Sa'īd, those kings (Bani Umayyah) shed blood and seized the wealth of the Muslims, they say that all these actions occur because of the decree of Allah (*qadar* Allah)". Ḥasan al-Baṣrī replied, "Those enemies of Allah have lied".³⁰ If Ma'bad was not a student of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, at least both of them had met and had a dialogue.

Ma'bad spent his life more in Medina, then moved to Basrah at the end of his life. Books on ideologies in Islam say that Ma'bad was the first Muslim to talk about destiny.³¹ In addition, he was also referred as the first to bring up the concept of *al-'adl al-ilāhī* (God's justice) and *amr ma'rūf naby munkar* which was later adopted by Mu'tazilah.³² Ma'bad mother went to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī after the murder of her son and said that she testified that her son had told the people about God's justice.³³

The concept of God's justice departs from the understanding that if good and bad destinies come from God, then man loses his freedom; he is like a feather blown by the wind. Consequently, humans will be free from the responsibility of their actions, and this is against the nature of God's concept of justice. The concept that Ma'bad rolled out as part of his resistance to various injustices made by the authorities.³⁴

At that time, the main principles of the Jabariyya sect were well received and even given the flexibility and protected by the Umayyads. The Caliph believed that the idea of Jabariyya was worth spreading throughout the Islamic world as a single interpretation of

³⁰ Aḥmad Mustafā, *Miftāḥ al-Sa'ādah wa Miṣbāḥ al-Siyādah*, Vol. 2 (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah, 1985), 144.

³¹ al-Qāhīr b. Ṭāhīr b. Muḥammad al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Madanī, n.d.), 18, Abū Muzaḥfar al-Isfarāyīnī, *al-Tabshīr fī al-Dīn wa Tamayyūz al-Firqah al-Najāyah 'an al-Firaq al-Hālikah* (Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Azharīyah li al-Turāth, n.d.), 57; Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Shahrastānī, *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*, Vol. 1 (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah, n.d.), 41.

³² al-Nashshār, *Nash'at al-Fikr al-Falsafī*, Vol. 1, 318.

³³ al-Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Faḍl al-I'tizāl wa Ṭabaqāt al-Mu'tazilah wa Mubāyinatuhum Lisāir al-Mukhālifīn* (Tunis: Dār al-Tūnisīyah li al-Nashr, n.d.), 334.

³⁴ al-Nashshār, *Nash'at al-Fikr al-Falsafī*, Vol. 1, 318.

the texts of the Qurʾān, since Jabariyya's concept was politically beneficial to the Umayyads in maintaining the continuity of control. However, as thoughts cannot be forced, the Qadariyya developed widely as a reaction and anti-thesis of Jabariyya.³⁵

Even though there were differences occurred in the leadership of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz, Umar was a caliph who was famous for his zuhudism. One of the most prominent spiritual aspects of him was his fear of Allah (*al-khawf*) and his fear of a very detailed calculation of deeds in the hereafter. He also paid special attention to the heart (*qalb*)—which later became the focus of the Sufis—as an instrument in weighing good and bad deeds. According to him, the heart cannot provide any benefits, unless what comes out of the heart,³⁶ which is the sincere acts both from heart and mind (external and internal goodness).³⁷

ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz's spiritual thinking seems inseparable from his close relationship with Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. As a caliph, Umar often asked Ḥasan al-Baṣrī for advice. Among the advice, there were some which correlated to awareness of the world with all of its mortal and lulling nature, heavy responsibility in the hereafter, and the traits of an equitable leader.³⁸

When ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz led, the idea of God's justice (*al-ʿadl al-ilāhī*) Maʿbad al-Juhanī was continued by Gailān al-Dimasqī (d. 106 H). He was often involved in discussions and debates with ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz, both directly and through correspondence.³⁹ Gailān invited Umar to follow his *madhhab*, but this invitation did not proceed with any results, in fact, ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz was able to make an agreement which had to be obeyed. Therefore Gailan al-Dimasqī would not indulge and spread his thoughts.⁴⁰ Unfortunately, after the death of the caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz, Gailān once again voiced his thoughts even louder as a form of resistance to the Umayyad rule, which he considered committing various injustices in

³⁵ Ibid., 314-315.

³⁶ al-Asfahānī, *Ḥīyat al-Anliyā*, Vol. 5, 266.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Jamāl al-Dīn Abī al-Farj b. al-Jawzī, *Adāb al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī wa Zubduhu wa Mawāʿiqbu* (Lebanon: Dār al-Nawādir, 2008), 109-114.

³⁹ See, al-Jabbār, *Faḍl al-Iʿtizāl*, 230, 231.

⁴⁰ al-Nashshār, *Nashʿat al-Fikr al-Falsafī*, Vol. 1, 323.

the name of *al-Ḥaqq al-Ilābī* or *al-Jabr*. Gailān was martyred at the hands of caliph Hishām b. Abd al-Mālik.⁴¹

Intellectual Background

The background of the intersection of the Sufistic and Kalam ideologies, indeed, cannot be separated from political-sociological factors. However, this intersection is also caused by intellectual factors. The *zūhd* experts are not only experts in worshipping, they are also intellectuals who have “madrasas religious-based school”. Even though the Qadariyya brought by Ma‘bad al-Juhanī has political nuances, but Maṭraf’s refutation and criticism of Qadariyya was purely a dialectic of thought.

The dialectic of thought that comes from intellectuality can be clearly seen in the “madrasah” Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. In addition to generating Sufi figures,⁴² from this madrasa, there were figures like Ma‘bad al-Juhanī whose opinions were followed by Gailan al-Dimasqi. Gailan’s opinion about destiny was followed by some of the students of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, namely Wāṣil b. Aṭā’ (80-131 H),⁴³ the first Mu‘tazilah figure along with Amru b. Ubaid (d. 144 H).

Before coming to Basra, and becoming a student of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (21-110H / 642-728M), Wāṣil had studied with Abū Hāshim Abdullah b. al-Ḥanafīyya (d. 98 H) in Medina and took the *i’tiẓāl madhhab* from his teacher.⁴⁴ According to Tasy Kubrā Zādah, the creator of the *i’tiẓāl* belief was Abū Hāshim and his brother who was Murji‘ah,⁴⁵ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya (d. 81 H). However, Mu‘tazilah appeared and was popular in the hands of Wāṣil b. Aṭā’.⁴⁶

Apart from the disagreement regarding the beginning of the emergence of the term Mu‘tazilah, Wāṣil b. Aṭā’ as a Mu‘tazilah figure had studied from Ḥasan al-Baṣrī in the mosque. Nevertheless, he separated from his teacher and formed his own group because of his

⁴¹ ‘Izz al-Dīn Abī al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*, Vol. 4 (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1987), 466; al-Nashshār, *Nash’at al-Fikr al-Falsafī*, Vol. 1, 323.

⁴² See, Majīd Makhlaf Tarrād, “al-Judhūr al-Fikriyah li al-Taṣawwuf al-Islāmī,” *Majallat al-Turāth al-‘Ilmī al-‘Arabī*, 3 (2015), 27.

⁴³ al-Nashshār, *Nash’at al-Fikr al-Falsafī*, Vol. 1, 360.

⁴⁴ Muṣṭafā, *Miftāḥ al-Sa‘ādah*, Vol. 2, 145.

⁴⁵ Murji‘ah is an early Islamic sect that held opinion postponement the judgment on the grave sinner (*murtakib al-kabīrah*) and only God alone has a right to judge.

⁴⁶ Muṣṭafā, *Miftāḥ al-Sa‘ādah*, Vol. 2, 145.

opinion regarding grave sinner (*murtakib al-kabirah*).⁴⁷ According to him, a person who has big sins is neither a Mukmin nor an infidel, but a *fāsiq*-immoral- person whose position is in the middle between the two (*al-manzilah bayn al-manzilatayn*).⁴⁸

Some researchers believe that there was a possibility of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī embracing Qadariyya thoughts in one phase of his life because the treatise he wrote to Abdullah b. Marwan contained *qada'* and *qadar* was applied to all things except immorality (disobedience).⁴⁹ Al-Shahrasatānī admitted that he had seen the treatise attributed to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, but according to him, the writing probably belonged to Wāsil b. Aṭā', for Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was never different from the Salaf who believed that Allah's *qadar* covers the good and the bad.⁵⁰

Ḥasan al-Baṣrī had two religious assemblies, mosque, and home. The recitation pattern in these two places was different. The mosque assembly was open in nature with various fields of study such as Hadith, Fiqh, Science of the Qur'ān, and others. People from various regions could come and ask questions about religious issues, for instance, questions related to *murtakib al-kabirah*, which suddenly had answered by his student, Wāsil b. Aṭā', before Ḥasan al-Baṣrī answered it. While at home, the recitation is closed. Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, together with *zuhd* and *wara'* expertise, talked about things which could touch and soften the heart; they reminded each other.⁵¹

Ḥasan al-Baṣrī's assembly in the mosque became a place for discussion of various thoughts. Meanwhile, the assembly at home was a place to seek knowledge as well as a spiritual movement. These assemblies could be madrassas that had a major influence in lighting up the various thoughts that developed at that time. In Islam's spiritual field, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was said to be the first to bring up the terms *zuhd* and *zāhid* with the meaning of worship.⁵²

⁴⁷ Some of the researcher said that the problem of the grave sinner (*murtakib al-kabirah*) has appeared during the era of Imam 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, exactly after arbitration (*taḥkim*) as well as Khawārij emersion. See, Ḥusayn Jābir Bani Khālid, "Murtakib al-Kabirah min Manzūr Islāmī bayn al-Ya's wa al-Rajā'," *al-Majallah al-Urdūnyah fī al-Dīrāsāt al-Islāmyah*, 3 (2011), 131-132.

⁴⁸ al-Shahrasatānī, *al-Milal wa al-Nihāl*, Vol. 1, 42.

⁴⁹ al-Nashshār, *Nash'at al-Fiker al-Falsafī*, Vol. 1, 317.

⁵⁰ al-Shahrasatānī, *al-Milal wa al-Nihāl*, Vol. 1, 42.

⁵¹ al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar A'lam al-Nubalā'*, Vol. 5, 457.

⁵² al-Nashshār, *Nash'at al-Fiker al-Falsafī*, Vol. 3, 133.

In his time, the terminology of Sufism had not yet been found specifically. However, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was an important part of the chain of Sufism.⁵³ According to Iḥsān Abbās, there were at least three branches of the Sufism tree. The *first* branch was formed from Rasulullah, Ḥuzayfah b. Yaman, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Ḥāris al-Muḥāsibī. *Second*, Rasulullah Saw, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī- Ḥabīb al-‘Ajāmī, Dāwud al-Ṭā’i, and Ma‘rūf al-Kurkhī. *Third*, Rasulullah Saw, Anas b. Mālik, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Farqad al-Sabakhī- Ma‘rūf al-Kurkhī, al-Sirrī al-Saqatī, Junayd al-Baghdādī, and Ja‘far al-Khuldī. Of these three, the first branch is more accurate than the others.⁵⁴

Thus, it is increasingly clear that the intersection of the Sufistic and Kalam beliefs in the Ḥasan al-Baṣrī’s madrasah has an intellectual background. This means that dialectics occurs because of scientific factors that come from “madrasah” or learning places. As for the contact with a political-sociological background, it was a trigger factor at the beginning of the first century, which later developed into a discourse in the second century.

2. Issues in the Intersection of Sufism and Kalam Orientation

The main issues that moved dynamically in the intersection of the sufism and kalam orientation in the first and second Hijri century were related to theological problems as follows:

a. Faith (*īmān*) and Unbelief (*kufī*)

The issue of faith and unbelief or who was a believer and disbeliever was the first issue that appeared after the killing of the caliph ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān, which continued in the dispute between Ali and Mu‘āwiyah until the incident of *taḥkīm* (arbitration) occurred. This issue became the topic of serious discussion which marked the beginning of “*al-kalām*” (divine talk) in Islam. The Khawārij, those belonging to the group which rejected *taḥkīm* (arbitration) and left ‘Alī’s ranks⁵⁵, declared that ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah were kafir, infidel. Meanwhile, ‘Alī’s loyal supporters who were later referred to as Shi’ah, stigmatized these Mu‘āwiyah as an infidel, including Āsiyah Ra, Ṭalḥah, Zubayr and all those involved in fighting ‘Alī.

⁵³ Barakāt Muḥammad Murād, *al-Musykilāt al-Falsafiyah ‘ind Ibn Ḥazm, al-Baṣri, wa Ibn Rusbd* (Riyad: al-Majalah al-Arabīyah, 2012), 71.

⁵⁴ Iḥsān ‘Abbās, *al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī: Stratuhu, Syabsiyatuhu, Ta‘ālimuhu wa Arāuhū* (Mesir: Dār al-Fikr al-Arabī, n.d.), 33.

⁵⁵ Rozak and Anwar, *Ilmu Kalam*, 34-35.

Another group claimed that it was impossible to put one of the warring parties as an infidel because, in reality, both were Muslim. In addition, it also couldn't be assured and clarified which party was either right or wrong. As a result, this group chose to be neutral and avoided any defamation issues. They were representatives of the early generation of ascetics (*al-ṣubḥād al-awāil*), namely those who fought lust (*al-mujābidūn lianfusihim*), people who like to cry (*al-bukēkūn*), and those who always repent (*al-tammābūn*). These ascetics were the forerunners of the term *ṣubḥ* which developed into Sufistic and Sufism. This group was called by Muhammad Abid al-Jabiri as sceptics (doubters) because they hesitated to determine who was a believer and who was an infidel. According to him, they were intellectuals (*al-muthaqqafūn*).⁵⁶

The issue of disagreement about the boundaries of faith and kufr or believers (Mukmin) and infidels, then developed in the legal issue of *murtakib al-kabirah law* (perpetrators of major sins). This problem actually stood for the Khawārij movement—before it was split into many sects⁵⁷—which states that “wrongdoers” were kafirs—infidel—and must be fought, regardless of whether the leader whom he considered to be wrong was ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib or Mu‘āwiyah b. Abī Sufyān.⁵⁸ However, the legal problem for the perpetrators of major sins arose from the academic atmosphere at the Ḥasan al-Baṣrī madrasah. It was Wāṣil b. Aṭā’, a student of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, who took the middle path by arguing that the perpetrator of a grave sin was neither a Mukmin, as Murji‘ah argued, nor an infidel, as Khawārij argued. Instead, they were placed in between these two positions (*al-manẓilab bayn manẓilatayn*).⁵⁹ Meanwhile, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī argued that the perpetrators of major sins were hypocrites (*munāfikūn*). The hypocritical term used by Ḥasan al-Baṣrī included *ṣālim*, fasiq, and all descriptions that were contrary to faith.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ Muḥammad ‘Ābid al-Jābirī, *al-Muthaqqafūn fī al-Ḥadarab al-‘Arabīyah: Miḥnah Ibn Ḥanbal wa Nakbah Ibn Ruṣhd* (Beirut: Markaz Dirāsāt al-Waḥdah al-‘Arabīyah, 2000), 39-40.

⁵⁷ See, Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Fayyūmī, *al-Khawārij wa al-Murji‘ah* (Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-Arabī, 2003), 106.

⁵⁸ Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd, *al-Ittijāh al-‘Aqlī fī al-Tafsīr: Dirāsah fī Qaḍīyat al-Majāz fī al-Qur‘ān ‘ind al-Mu‘taẓilab* (Beirut: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-‘Arabī, 2003), 33.

⁵⁹ al-Shahrastānī, *al-Milal wa al-Nihāl*, Vol. 1, 42.

⁶⁰ ‘Abbās, *al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī*, 140.

The term and the hypocritical meaning brought by Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was later used by his students, one of them was Mālik b. Dīnār.⁶¹ Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī in *Qūt al-Qulūb* argued that Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was the first to use the method of hypocrisy (the knowledge of *Al-nifāq*). He often said it, revealed its meaning, as well as demonstrated its benefits. People have never heard of it before. He obtained this knowledge from Ḥudhayfah b. al-Yaman, and Ḥudhaifah who had gotten it from the Prophet Muhammad.⁶² This reaffirmed Iḥsān Abbās opinion that the strongest link in the chain of Sufism was Rasulullah Saw-Ḥudhaifah b. al-Yaman-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī - al-Ḥāris b. Asad al-Muḥāsibī.

b. Af'al al-'Ibād (Human Actions)

The Bani Umayyah phase (41-132 H) was the beginning of Kalam's emergence with the main theme of the debate about *af'al al-'ibād* (human actions) between *al-jabr* and *al-ikhtiyār*. The majority of the Muslims were divided into two big categories, namely Jabariyya and Qadariyya. Apart from these two groups, there were minor sects such as al-Musyabbihah or al-Mujassimah, but these beliefs have received fierce rejections and opposition from all groups, especially from Jabariyya and Qadariyya.⁶³

However, *zūhd* experts such as Maṭraf al-Syakhīr and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz did not fully hold the point of view brought by either Jabariyya or Qadariyya. Maṭraf responded to Qadariyya, who said that going to heaven or hell was depended on their own efforts. He vowed that forever a servant would not go to heaven unless the servant who was appointed by Allah with His will to enter heaven.⁶⁴

Observing the statement above, Maṭraf seemed to follow Jabariyya's understanding. He also once said that the position of man was like a stone, the goodness existing in humans was by the will of Allah. The foundation of thought was al-Qur'an: "And whoever is not given the light (guidance) by Allah does not have the slightest light." (QS: 24:40). The principle of Maṭraf was connected to the principle of *tawakkal* in the term Tasawuf. Man, in the hand of Allah,

⁶¹ al-Asfahānī, *Ḥīyat al-Anlīyā'*, Vol. 1, 178.

⁶² Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī, *Qūt al-Qulūb fī Mu'āmalat al-Maḥbūb wa Wasf Ṭarīq ilā Maqām al-Tawḥīd*, Vol. 1 (Cairo: Maktabat al-Turāth, 2001), 417.

⁶³ Muḥammad 'Alī Rayyān, *Tārīkh al-Fīkr al-Falsafī fī al-Islām* (Alexandria: Dār al-Ma'rīfah al-Jāmiyah, n.d.), 229.

⁶⁴ al-Asfahānī, *Ḥīyat al-Anlīyā'*, Vol. 2, 201.

did not have any power. Therefore it was better to leave himself in God's hands like a mother who did not let her children walk alone whenever they are unable to walk.⁶⁵ Al-Kalābadhī in *al-Ta'aruf li Madhhab Ahl al-Taṣawwuf*, said that Allah created all human deeds since actions were part of something (*al-shay*) and Allah had confirmed that everything was created by Him.⁶⁶

However, it did not mean that Maṭraf left his mind as an instrument in seeking knowledge and truth. He believed in the mind power by saying, "Allah has given all His worshipers a more important after faith, which is mind."⁶⁷ Through simple logic, he refuted Jabariyya and, at the same time, criticized Qadariyya by saying, "No one should go up to the well and then fall into it and say," this is my destiny. "But he will be alert, try-hard, and be careful (so as not to fall). If there is a tragedy that befell him, he knows that no tragedy has befallen him but has been assigned by Allah to him."⁶⁸

In general, the *zuhd* movement figure's theological thoughts were closer to Jabariyya and opposed to Qadariyya. However, even though they were close, they also refused to understand Jabariyya. The *zuhd* figures viewed that humans had the power to choose (*ikhtiyār*) good or bad and bear the consequences of their choices. This was what 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz (61-101 H) emphasized to Gailān al-Dimasqī. At that time, Gailān said to Umar that the people of Syam thought that the caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz opined that immoral acts were the decrees of Allah." Umar then said, "Woe to you, O Gailān, don't you see me that I still call the injustices of Bani Marwan by the name of injustice?"⁶⁹

'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz was an inclusive caliph who listened to any input from the ulamas, scholars, and offered any dialogue and discussions with those who opposed his thoughts. Umar wrote a long letter (treatise) as a response, comments, and objections to religious beliefs in general, and Qadariyya in particular. In this case, the method used by Umar was to mention the opinion of his opponent, then refute it with the *naqli* argument (*dalīl naqli*) which was presented logically as the argument of '*aqli* (*dalīl 'aqli*).

⁶⁵ See, 'Alī, "Ilm al-Kalām wa Atharuhu", 468-469.

⁶⁶ al-Kalābadhī, *al-Ta'aruf*, 48.

⁶⁷ al-Asfahānī, *Ḥīyat al-Amliya'*, Vol. 2, 203.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 202.

⁶⁹ al-Jabbār, *Faql al-I'tizāl*, 339.

The main theme in the treatise included an overview of the relationship between Allah's knowledge and the will of both Allah and man, as well as the destiny written by Allah. In general, the rebuttal written by 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz was focused on three statements. First, that Allah had not known what his servant did before it was done. Second, a servant was responsible for his own actions. He could obey Allah, even though Allah's will made it clear that he would not obey Him. Third, humans could determine their own guidance (*hidāyah*) without the involvement of Allah. A servant could determine his own knowledge without depending on Allah.

The three statements above were considered as lies and exceeded the limits of religious teachings (*ghuluv*) by Umar. The first statement was refuted by saying that Allah's knowledge included the knowledge before and after the actions had been taken place. Allah said: "Verily (if) We will get rid of the torment a little bit, actually you will come back." (Q.S al-Dukhān: 15). The meaning of "come back" in verse was to return to *kufr*. So that Allah already knew what humans would do before it happened. In another verse, Allah also told Noah that there were other groups who were given pleasure in the world, but then Allah would punish those (Q.S. Hūd: 123). It meant that Allah had told them that they must have done their actions before they did and would definitely receive punishment from Allah before they were created.⁷⁰

The second statement based on the argument *faman shā' falyu'minfaman shā'afalyakfur* (Q.S. al-Kahf: 39) which was considered by Umar to be ignorant because Allah said: *wa mā tashāun illā an yashā'a rabb al-'ālamīn* (And you cannot will (to take that path) unless God will. (Q.S. al-Takwīr: 29). Obedience to both words and deeds to the will of Allah, if Allah does not wish it will not happen. The Apostles had tried hard to provide guidance to all humans, but those who got guidance were only those who were desired by Allah. Likewise, the devil who tried to mislead all humans, but those who were lost were those who were in the knowledge of Allah.⁷¹

Therefore, the statement that a servant could determine his own actions and knowledge, like the third statement, was also rejected. 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz explained further that everything was in the knowledge and destiny of Allah. All happened with the

⁷⁰ al-Asfahānī, *Ḥīyat al-Awliyā'*, Vol. 5, 346-347.

⁷¹ Ibid.

permission of Allah. If this was not the case, Allah had an ally in His kingdom because someone could carry out his own will without Allah's permission. In the Qur'ān it was stated that "Allah made you love faith, and made faith beautiful in your heart" (Q.S al-Ḥujurāt: 7), whereas previously they hated, and Allah "made you hate disbelief and infidels, wickedness, and iniquity" (Q.S. al-Ḥujurāt: 7) whereas previously they loved him. This showed that humans did not have any power.⁷²

Allah Almighty already knew his knowledge before man was created, whether he was a believer or disbeliever, good or evil. According to Allah, it was impossible for a servant to be a Mukmin, but then turned into an infidel, or an infidel then transformed into a believer. Without Allah's permission, humans would not be able to get out of their error, and vice versa. Like the devil, who was not blessed by Allah, previously devil has been an angel who always prayed and worshiped. When they were tested, they disobeyed. Meanwhile, Adam As previously sinned, but then Allah forgave him. Humans do not have the ability (*al-iṣṭitā'ah*) except by the will and permission of Allah.⁷³

The rebuttal in the treatise written by 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz was also directed specifically at Gailān al-Dimasqī. This Qadariyya figure was often involved in discussions and debates with Umar, either directly or through correspondence. He voiced the concept of God's justice openly and louder than his predecessor, Ma'bad al-Juhanī. Among the letters that Gailān sent to Umar were as follows:

...فهل وجدت يا عمر حكيمًا يعيب ما يصنع أو يصنع ما يعيب أو يعذب على ما يقضي أو يقضي ما يعذب عليه أم هل وجدت رشيدًا يدعو إلى الهدى ثم يضل عنه، أم هل وجدت رحيمًا يكلف العباد فوق الطاقة، أو يعذب فوق الطاقة، أم هل وجدت عدلًا يحمل الناس على الظلم والتظالم، هل وجدت صادقًا يحمل الناس على الكذب والتكاذب بينهم، كفى ببيان هذا بيانًا، وبالعمى عنه عمى

"Do you find, O Umar, the all-wise substance denouncing what He did, or doing what He reproached himself, or giving torment for something that He has or will determine what He will torture, or do you find a pointer to the truth that invites the truth but then He misleads him, or do you find a compassionate person who burdens his servants beyond their means, or punishes beyond their means, or do you get a just substance that leads people to do injustice and

⁷² al-Asfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā'*, Vol. 5, 348-350.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 5, 350-351.

oppress each other? Do you get a substance that honestly invites people to lie and lie between them? Suffice this as an explanation, and for those who do not understand about it, then he is blind".⁷⁴

Gailān built his argument with simple logic. According to him, Allah's actions couldn't contradict His own substance and decree. Through this letter, Gailān al-Dīmasqī emphasized his thoughts on *al-'adl al-ilāhī* and the destiny of Allah and invited the caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz to follow his *madhhab*, but he wasn't succeeded.

From the debate of Umar and Gailān above, it can be clearly seen that the intersection of the Sufistic and Kalam is clear. In Sufism, the concept of *tawakkal* starts from submission to Allah until the free will of man (*al-irādah al-insāniyya*) becomes in perfect harmony with God's will (*al-irādah al-ilāhīyya*) and ends at God's will alone.⁷⁵ Abd al-Rahmān Badawī said that the principle of Sufi's *tawakkal*, the concept of reliance, was to believe that there was no actor (*fā'il*) but Allah, to believe in the perfection of Allah's knowledge and power (*qudrāh*), and to believe in the perfection of Allah's compassion, help and mercy to His servants. If one of these matters is not believed, then the concept of *tawakkal*, reliance, is not yet complete.⁷⁶

c. God's Attributes

In the previous explanation, it is known that one of the themes of the treatise written by 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz was in response to the doctrine of religious belief is based on the knowledge of Allah (*'ilm Allah*) or the attribute of *al-ālīm*. Umar's response was a rebuttal to the Qadariyya sect, which argued that humans could determine their actions based on their knowledge.

Apart from being related to *af'āl al-'ibād*, the most serious problem of Allah's attributes is the problem of *tanzīh* (Allah's purification of the qualities that are not worthy of Him) and *tashbīh* (resembling Allah's to His creatures). Jahm b. Ṣafwān (d. 128 H), although he was called a figure of the Jabariyya sect, agreed with Qadariyya regarding Allah's attributes. Based on him, it was forbidden to similarize Allah's attribute to His creatures' characteristics because it had an impact on resemblance. Therefore, he negated the nature of life (*ḥayy*), knows (*ālīmun*), and wishes (*murīdun*) for Allah. Yet, he

⁷⁴ al-Jabbār, *Faḍl al-I'tizāl*, 230, 231.

⁷⁵ Khadrāt Inayat Khan, *Ta'ālīm al-Mutaṣawwifin* (Damaskus: Dār al-Farqad, 2008), 156.

⁷⁶ Badawī, *Tārīkh al-Taṣawwuf*, 262-263.

determined that Allah was powerful (*qādiran*), The Actor (*ʿāmilan*), The Creator (*khāliqan*), The Giver of life (*muḥyi*), and The Bringer of Death (*mumīt*), as these qualities, in his opinion, were merely specified for Allah.⁷⁷

In this case, Jahm denies and negates the eternal (*aẓālī*) attributes for Allah, whose meaning contains equality elements with His creatures. According to Ibn Taymiyya, Jahm's thought was adopted from Ja'ad b. Dirham (d. 120 H), he was the first to roll out the *nafy al-sifāt* belief (negating the attributes of Allah), and lifted the idea of *khālq al-Qur'ān*.⁷⁸ Ja'ad brought up the statement that the Qur'ān was *makhlūq* (created) to the public for the first time in Damascus.⁷⁹ Because of this statement, Ja'ad was forced to flee to Kufa in order to escape the chase from the Bani Umayyah. It was the place where he met Jahm b. Ṣafwān who then followed his views.⁸⁰

The issue of *khālq al-Qur'ān* is related to the nature of the Kalam for Allah.⁸¹ The debate about *khālq al-Qur'ān* peaked in the third century Hijriah, at the time of the caliph al-Makmūn. One of the Sufi figures involved in scientific debates on this issue was al-Ḥārīṣ b. Asad al-Muḥāsibī. The opinion of al-Muḥāsibī which affirmed that the Qur'ān is the Kalam Allah *ghayr makhlūq* was based on the doctrine of determining the attributes of Allah.⁸²

3. Characteristics of the Intersection of Sufism and Kalam

Through the analysis of the chronology, the factors behind the intersection of Sufism and Kalam orientation, as well as the issues that develop therein, can be mapped the characteristics of the

⁷⁷ See, al-Shahrastānī, *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*, Vol. 1, 73; al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*, Vol. 1, 212-213.

⁷⁸ Taqiy al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Taymīyah, *al-Fatwā al-Hamwiyyah al-Kubrā* (al-Riyād: Dār al-Ṣama'ī, 1998), 243.

⁷⁹ See, Jamaluddin, "Perkembangan dan Pengaruh Pemikiran Teologi Mu'tazilah Tentang Kemakhlukan al-Qur'ān," *Thaqāfiyyat*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (2015), 81.

⁸⁰ Muḥammad b. Mukrīm b. al-Manzūr, *Mukhtaṣar Tarikh Dimasq li Ibn 'Asākir*, Vol. 6 (Damaskus: Dār al-Fikr, 1983), 50; Abū al-Fidā 'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'il b. Kathīr, *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, Vol. 9 (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1990), 350.

⁸¹ Zubaydah al-Ṭayyib, "Isyakāliyah Tarsīm al-'Aqā'id fi al-Fikr al-Islāmī: Mas'alah Khalq al-Qur'ān Anmūdhan," *Majallat al-Dirāsāt al-'Aqdiyyah wa Muqāmat al-Adyan* Vol. 7, No. 1 (2017), 255.

⁸² Ibrāhīm M. Khālid Barqān, "Ibn al-Kullāb wa Mawqifuhu min Mas'alat al-Ṣifāt al-Ilāhiyyah," *Majallat Dirāsāt Ulūm Syarīah wa al-Qānūn*, 1 (2010), 313.

intersection of the Sufistic and kalam schools in the first and second centuries of Hijri as follows:

a. The Interrelation of Doctrine and Political Attitudes

Since avoiding defamations was a response to political strife, the doctrines of various groups (such as Khawārij, Shī'ah, Murji'ah, Qadariyya, Jabariyya, and *al-Zubhād al-Awāil*) which mutually negated and strengthened each other were due to political factors, even the “neutral” attitude of *zuhd* experts in the early first century of Hijri. However, a doctrine (belief and teaching) cannot be separated from the basis of thought or subjective awareness in the process of reading reality.⁸³

Quoting from Ibn 'Asakir's statement, al-Jābirī said that the group's attitude did not want to be involved in the conflict after the murder of Uthmān b. Affān came from the thought that conflict was based not only on ethnicity but also on religious nuances. Siding with one of the conflict meant to consider the other party to be an infidel. Because if they were not considered as an infidel, then they could not be fought. In fact, they were considering 'Alī or Mu'āwiyah as infidel was not an easy matter. Therefore, they were doubtful and chose to be silent.⁸⁴

Apart from that, individual political attitudes were influenced by doctrines coming from the knowledge and subjectivity of religious understanding, or perhaps spiritual experiences. According to Abdul Muhaya, psychological and social conditions contributed to an effect on text understanding.⁸⁵ Ascetics generally saw the conflict as defamation, which must be avoided as instructed by the Prophet Muhammad. Meanwhile, the groups involved in the conflict were also departed from the words of the Prophet Muhammad, which stated: “As a matter of fact, after I leave, you will see selfishness and many things that you will definitely deny.” The companions asked, “What will you order us, O Messenger of Allah?” He replied, “Fulfill their rights properly and ask Allah for your rights.”⁸⁶

Therefore, it can be explained that the interrelation of doctrine and political attitudes in the intersection between the sufism orientation and kalam, especially in the first half of the first century of

⁸³ Wardani, *Epistemologi Kalam Abad Pertengahan* (Yogyakarta: LKiS, 2003), 65.

⁸⁴ al-Jābirī, *al-Muthabaqqafin*, 39-40.

⁸⁵ Abdul Muhaya, “Revitalisasi Ilmu Keushuluddinian dalam Rangka Menghadapi Perubahan Zaman”, *Al-Taqqadum*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (2016), 94.

⁸⁶ 'Alī, “Ilm al-Kalām wa Atharuhu”, 468.

Hijriah, was interactional. This means that externally, political events affect thoughts and beliefs, and internally, the subjectivity of religious understanding and spiritual experiences impacts the attitudes or actions. Meanwhile, at the end of the first century and entering the beginning of the second century of Hijriah, the interrelation of doctrine between Sufism Orientation and Kalam was indeed more academic, although it is not completely separated from political elements.

The concept of God's justice (*al-'adl al-ilāhī*) promoted by Ma'bad al-Juhānī and Gailān al-Dimasqī is linked to the attitude of the rulers who adopted the Jabariyya sect to commit injustice. Meanwhile, the concept of *ijā'* (returning the law to Allah) was chosen by Ḥasan al-Baṣrī when asked by the representative of Sham, Ḥajjāj al-Thaqaḥfī, about Uthmān b. Affān and 'Alī b. Abī Tālib. *Zuhd* was the advice he often gave to Umar b. Abd al-Azīz and was also used as a criticism of rulers who lived in luxury like Ḥajjāj al-Thaqaḥfī.⁸⁷

b. Theological Thematic Interconnections

The purpose of theological thematic interconnection is that the themes carried and discussed between Sufism and Kalam are interconnected. The discussion topics are mostly theological issues such as the problem of boundaries of faith and kufr, Mukmin and infidel, the law of the perpetrators of major sins (*murtakib al-kabīrah*), God's justice (*al-'adl al-ilāhī*), the attributes of God, and human actions between *al-jabr* and *al-ikhtiyār* (*af'āl al-'ibād*).

The problems mentioned above do not stop or disappear, even when Sufism became an independent discipline. In *al-Ta'arruf li Madhhab Abl al-Taṣawwuf*, al-Kalābadhī describes the views of the Sufis in many things. Among them are those that are integrated to problems in the discipline of Kalam such as Tauhid, the attributes of Allah; including the issues with the nature of Kalam Allah (*al-Qur'ān*), *af'āl al-'ibād*, *ru'yat Allah* (seeing Allah), *al-shafā'ah*, the nature of faith, and others.⁸⁸

The views of the sufis documented and studied by al-Kalābadhī were, indeed, done mostly by the third century Hijriah Sufi figures such as Ḥāris al-Muḥāsibī (165-243 H), Junayd al-Baghdādī (d. 298 H), Sahl al-Tustarī (200-283 H). However, this shows the connectivity and even the integration of the problems between Sufism and Kalam

⁸⁷ Badawī, *Tārikh al-Taṣawwuf*, 177-182.

⁸⁸ al-Kalābadhī, *al-Ta'arruf*, 35-36.

in the third century of Hijriah, which are the link in the chain of problems in the previous century. The difference is that the themes discussed in the Sufism and kalam in the first and second centuries of Hijriah have not been as well documented as they were in the third century Hijriah.⁸⁹

Apart from that, the discussion of the divine theme between the sufistic and kalam ideologies in the first and second centuries of Hijriah has not yet focused on any ontological issues, such as the existence of God and arguments against it, as well as problems of God's transcendence and immanence. In the third century of Hijriah, various arguments about the form of God were put forward by theologians (*mutakallimūn*), especially Mu'tazilah, and some sufis as al-Muḥāsibī.⁹⁰

However, when Jahm b. Ṣafwān (d. 128 H) agreed with the Qadariyya beliefs about *nafy al-ṣifāt* (negation of the attributes of Allah) as a form of purification (*tanẓīh*) of the substance (essence) of Allah from any similarities to His creatures (*tashbīh*), this point of view contradicts 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī's belief whom actually had been talked about the transcendence and immanence of God in the form of an epistemological perspective, which was related to the possibility of humans to know Him.⁹¹

c. Rational Dialogue

Dialectics in the intersection of sufism orientation and kalam in the first and second centuries of Hijriah was merely in the form of dialogical, not a conflict, and did not constitute two independent domains. That means the sufistic and kalam cannot be separated from one another. In general, especially in the first century, there was no dichotomous demarcation line between the figures who were later identified as sufis and kalam expertise (*mutakallim*). Therefore, Sufism and Kalam's terms had not yet appeared, except for the sufi title in the second Hijri century.

Some terms used in the second century Hijriah was started to look paradigmatic, such as the meaning of *ḡubd* as expressed by Ḥasan

⁸⁹ Aḥmad Maḥmūd Muḥammad 'Ābid, "al-'Aql bayn al-Fīraq al-Islāmīyah Qadīman wa Ḥadīthan" (Cairo--al-Jāmi'ah al-Islāmīyah-Gaza, 2010), 208.

⁹⁰ See, al-Ḥārith b. Asad al-Muḥāsibī, *Fahm al-Qur'an wa Ma'anīhi* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1971), 264-265.

⁹¹ Mulyadhi Kartanegara, *Lentera Kehidupan* (Bandung: Mizan, 2017), 48.

al-Başrī,⁹² or the term God's justice by Ma'bad al-Juhanī, at this time also according to Sayyed Hossein Nasr, was an embryo from the development of Kalam discipline.⁹³ However, both (Sufism and Kalam) are brought together epistemologically. The measure of truth in answering the theological issues that arise is the verses of the al-Qur'ān and the Hadith of the Prophet. While the approach used is rational through arguments or some kind of rational method.

Suryan A. Jamrah explained that the systematic discussion which took place at the end of the first or early second century of Hijriah with several themes such as issues of faith and kufr, perpetrators of major sins (*murtakib al-kabirah*), and problems of *qada'* and *qadar* were still followed by the final generation of the Companions with a rational method. Rational thinking and analysis were the stages of accepting faith through the heart or doctrines at the time when the Prophet Muhammad was still alive. However, after the Prophet Muhammad passed away, it was a common thing to question and analyze a problem, including the problem of faith with rational and philosophical beliefs,⁹⁴ or it can be called "rational reasoning" (*al-naẓar wa al-istidlāl*).⁹⁵

Concluding Remarks

Sufism and Kalam's dialectic in the First and Second Centuries of Hijri occurred through the intersection between political-social and intellectual backgrounds. The conflict among the Muslims after the caliph 'Uthmān b. 'Affān was killed in 35 Hijriah has become increasingly sharp with the *taḥkīm* (arbitration) incident between the caliph 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalib and Mu'āwiyah b. Abī Ṣufyān in 38 H. The groups involved in the conflict raised theological statements and attitudes, claiming their faith and accusing other groups as infidels.

⁹² al-Nashshār, *Nash'at al-Fikr al-Falsafī*, Vol. 3, 133. According to A. Khudori Soleh, *ẓuhd* is an *irfān* act. The figure of *irfān* act in the second hijri century was Ḥasan al-Başrī. See, A. Khudori Soleh, "Mencermati Epistemologi Tasawuf," *Ulumuna*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (2010), 231.

⁹³ Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *Ideals and Realities of Islam* (Chicago: ABC International Group, 1994), 145.

⁹⁴ Jamrah, *Studi Ilmu Kalam*, 17-18.

⁹⁵ Miftahul Huda, "Epistemologi Tasawuf dalam Pemikiran Fiqh al-Sya'rānī," *Ulumuna*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (2010), 254.

Meanwhile, the majority of the Companions of the Prophet, who did not want to get involved in the conflict and chose to avoid defamations, argued that they could not confirm who was right and wrong and followed the guidance of the Prophet's instructions to stay away from defamations. The majority of them were known as the experts in fighting lust (*al-mujāhidūn lianfusihim*), weeping experts (*al-bukka'in*), and repentance experts (*al-tammabūn*) who were classified as the early generations of ascetics (*al-ṣubḥād al-awā'il*). Their attitudes and arguments were then followed by the *kibar al-tābi'īn* (the senior of tābi'īn) such as Abū al-Āliyah al-Rayyahī (d. 93 H), Maṭraf b. Abdullah al-Syakhīr (d. 88 H), Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (21-110 H), 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz (61-101 H), and others who became Sufism chain.

They, at this time (at the end of the first century and entering the second century of Hijriah), were often involved in discussions and conflicts of thought with Qadariyya figures such as Ma'bad al-Juhanī (d. 90/80 H) and Gailān al-Dimasqī (d. 106 H) as well as Jabariyya figures such as Jahm b. Ṣafwān (d. 128H), even the problem of perpetrators of great sins (*murtakib al-kabīrah*) appeared in majlis Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, with the well-known figure, namely Wāṣil b. Aṭā (80-131 H). Therefore, the intersection between sufism and kalam ideologies was due to political factors and academic intellectual backgrounds.

Sociological factors could be identified from contentious issues such as God's justice (*al-'adl al-ilāhī*) which was promoted by Ma'bad al-Juhanī. The issue of God's justice was actually a response to the authorities' attitude who were considered wrongdoers to society. It meant that it also had a political attitude and purpose. Mu'tazilah later adopted this concept with the addition of *amr bi al-ma'rūf wa nahy an al-munkar*.

Even though the issues or themes in the intersection of Sufism and Kalam were related to theological issues, they also departed from political-sociological factors. Among the themes which became the focus of discussion, there was the problem of human actions (*af'āl al-'ibād*); namely, whether humans had the power to choose independently (*al-ikhtiyār*) or forced (*al-jabr*), whether the perpetrator of a major sin (*murtakib al-kabīrah*) was in heaven or hell. It was also related to the relationship between the nature and the substance of God between purification (*tanzīh*) and similarities (*tashbīh*). These issues were developed from the first issue regarding faith and kufr or

Mukmin and infidels in the first century of Hijriah, as a result of the political conflicts that are commonly known as its characteristic.

At least, there are three characteristics of the intersection of sufism orientation and kalam in the first and second centuries of Hijriah, which can be mapped. The first is the interrelation of doctrine and political attitudes. This means that there is a strong correlation, even integration, between the doctrine of a sect (*firqah*) and political attitudes. The second is thematic-theological interconnection. This means that there are common issues that are discussed in matters of theology. And the third is dialogical-rational. This means that the conflict of thoughts occurred is essentially a dialogue because it is not on a different study line, but in the same area using a rational approach.

References

- ‘Abbās, Iḥsān. *al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī: Sīratuhu, Syabsiyatuhu, Ta‘ālimuhu wa Arābhu*. Mesir: Dār al-Fikr al-Arabī, n.d.
- ‘Ābid, Aḥmad Maḥmūd Muḥammad. “al-‘Aql bayn al-Fīraq al-Islāmīyah Qadīman wa Ḥadīthan”. Cairo--al-Jāmi‘ah al-Islāmīyah-Gaza, 2010.
- ‘Adawī (al), Muṣṭafā. *al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Musnad min Aḥādīth al-Fitan wa al-Malāhim wa al-Fitan*. Riyad: Dār al-Hijrah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘, 1991.
- ‘Aḥfīf (al), Abū al-A‘lā. *al-Taṣawwuf: al-Thawrab al-Rūḥīyah fī al-Islām*. Cairo: ‘Aqlān ‘Arabīyah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘, 2017.
- ‘Alī, Fāliḥ ‘Alī. “Ilm al-Kalām wa Atharuhu ‘alā al-Taṣawwuf fī al-Islām,” *Majallah Kulliyat al-Adab*, 95, 2011.
- ‘Asākir, Abū Qāsim ‘Alī b. *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimasq*, Vol. 18. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995.
- Asfahānī (al), Abū Nu‘aym. *Hilyat al-Anḥiyā’ wa Ṭabaqāt al-Aṣfiyā’*, Vol. 2. Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Sa‘ādah, 1979.
- Athīr (al), ‘Izz al-Dīn Abī al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*, Vol. 4. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1987.
- Azdī (al), Ma‘mar b. Rāshid. *al-Jāmi‘*. Pakistan: al-Majlis al-‘Ilmī, 1983.
- Badawī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. *Tārīkh al-Taṣawwuf al-Islāmī min al-Bidāyah ḥattā Nibāyat al-Qarn al-Thānī*. Kuwait: Wakālat al-Matbū‘āt, 1975.
- Baghdādī (al), al-Qāhir b. Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad. *al-Farq bayn al-Fīraq*. Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Madanī, n.d.

- Barqān, Ibrāhīm M. Khālid. "Ibn al-Kullāb wa Mawqifuhu min Mas'alat al-Ṣifāt al-Ilāhīyah," *Majallah Dirāsāt Ulūm Syarīah wa al-Qānūn*, 1, 2010.
- Basyūnī, Ibrāhīm. *Nash'at al-Taṣawwuf al-Islāmī*. Mesir: Dār al-Ma'ārif, n.d.
- Bukhārī (al), Muḥammad b. Ismāil. *al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, Vol. 9. Jeddah: Dār Ṭuk al-Najāh, n.d.
- Dhahabī (al), Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Siyar A'lam al-Nubalā'*, Vol. 14. Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Tawfiqīyah, n.d.
- Fayyūmī (al), Muḥammad Ibrāhīm. *al-Khawārij wa al-Murji'ah*. Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-Arabī, 2003.
- Ḥanbal, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. *al-'Ilal wa Ma'rifat al-Rijāl*, Vol. 3. Riyad: Dār al-Khanī, 2001.
- *Musnad Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal*, Vol. 3. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 2001.
- Huda, Miftahul. "Epistemologi Tasawuf dalam Pemikiran Fiqh al-Sya'rānī," *Ulumuna*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 2010.
- 'Ilāl, Khālid Kabīr. *al-Ṣaḥābah al-Mu'tazilūn li al-Fitnah al-Kubrā*. Aljazair: Dār al-Balāgh, 2003.
- Isfarāyīnī (al), Abū Muẓaffar. *al-Tabshīr fī al-Dīn wa Tamyiz al-Firqah al-Nājiyah 'an al-Firaq al-Hālikah*. Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Azharīyah li al-Turāth, n.d.
- Jabbār (al), al-Qāḍī 'Abd. Faḍl *al-I'tizāl wa Ṭabaqāt al-Mu'tazilah wa Mubāyinatuhum Lisāir al-Mukhbālifīn*. Tunis: Dār al-Tūnisīyah li al-Nashr, n.d.
- Jābirī (al), Muḥammad 'Ābid. *al-Muthaqqafūn fī al-Ḥadārah al-'Arabīyah: Miḥnah Ibn Ḥanbal wa Nakabah Ibn Rusbd*. Beirut: Markaz Dirāsāt al-Waḥdah al-'Arabīyah, 2000.
- Jamaluddin. "Perkembangan dan Pengaruh Pemikiran Teologi Mu'tazilah tentang Kemakhlukan al-Qur'ān," *Thaqafīyyat*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 2015.
- Jamrah, Suryan A. *Studi Ilmu Kalam*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group, 2015.
- Jawzī (al), Jamāl al-Dīn Abī al-Farj b. *Adāb al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī wa Zubduhu wa Manā'idhu*. Lebanon: Dār al-Nawādir, 2008.
- *Ṣifāt al-Ṣaḥābah*, Vol. 2. Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 2000.
- Kalābadhī (al), Abū Bakr Muḥammad. *al-Ta'arruf li Madhhab Ahl al-Taṣawwuf*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmīyah, 1993.

- Kartanegara, Mulyadhi. *Lentera Kehidupan*. Bandung: Mizan, 2017.
- Kathīr, Abū al-Fidā ‘Imād al-Dīn Ismāīl b. *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, Vol. 9. Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 1990.
- Khālīd, Husayn Jābir Bani. “Murtakib al-Kabīrah min Manzūr Islāmī bayn al-Ya’s wa al-Rajā’,” *al-Majallah al-Urdūniyah fi al-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyah*, 3, 2011.
- Khallāl (al), Abū Bakr Aḥmad. *al-Sunnah*, Vol. 2. Riyad: Dār al-Rāyah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘, 1989.
- Khan, Khadrat Inayat. *Ta‘ālim al-Mutaṣawwifin*. Damaskus: Dār al-Farqad, 2008.
- Khayalayah, Mūsā Aḥmad Ibrāhīm. *Jāmi‘ Ma‘mar b. Rāshid: Dirāsah wa Taḥqīq*. Jāmi‘ah al-Quds, 2018.
- Makkī (al), Abū Ṭālib. *Qūt al-Qulūb fi Mu‘āmalat al-Maḥbūb wa Waṣf Ṭariq ilā Maqām al-Tawḥīd*, Vol. 1. Cairo: Maktabat al-Turāth, 2001.
- Manzūr (al), Muḥammad b. Mukrim b. *Mukhtaṣar Tārikh Dimasq li Ibn ‘Asakir*, Vol. 6. Damaskus: Dār al-Fikr, 1983.
- Muḥāsibī (al), al-Ḥārith b. Asad. *Fahm al-Qur‘ān wa Ma‘ānibī*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1971.
- Muhaya, Abdul. “Revitalisasi Ilmu Keushuluddinan dalam Rangka Menghadapi Perubahan Zaman”, *At-Taqaddum*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2016.
- Munawī (al), ‘Abd al-Ra’ūf. *al-Kawākib al-Durrīyah fi Tarājum al-Sādah al-Ṣufīyah*, Vol. 1. Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Azharīyah li al-Turāth, n.d.
- Murād, Barakāt Muḥammad. *al-Musykilāt al-Falsafīyah ‘ind Ibn Ḥazm, al-Baṣrī, wa Ibn Rusbd*. Riyad: al-Majalah al-Arabīyah, 2012.
- Mustafā, Aḥmad. *Miftāḥ al-Sa‘ādah wa Miṣbāḥ al-Siyādah*, Vol. 2. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, 1985.
- Nashshār (al), ‘Alī Sāmī. *Nash‘at al-Fikr al-Falsafī fi al-Islām*, Vol. 3. Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, n.d.
- Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *Ideals and Realities of Islam*. Chicago: ABC International Group, 1994.
- Putra, Andi Eka. “Tasawuf, Ilmu Kalam, dan Filsafat Islam: Suatu Tinjauan Sejarah tentang Hubungan Ketiganya,” *al-Adyan: Jurnal Studi Lintas Agama*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 2012.
- Rayyān, Muḥammad ‘Alī. *Tārikh al-Fikr al-Falsafī fi al-Islām*. Alexandria: Dār al-Ma‘ārif al-Jāmīyah, n.d.

- Ridho, Miftahur. “Peristiwa Tahkim: Polemik Perselisihan Politik dan Implikasinya”, *Humanistika*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2019.
- Riyadi, Abdul Kadir. “Dinamika Kemunculan dan Persinggungan Paradigmatik Tasawuf al-Hāris al-Muḥāsibī,” *Islamica: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2014.
- . *Arkeologi Tasawuf*. Bandung: Mizan, 2016.
- Rozak, Abdul and Anwar, Rosihan. *Ilmu Kalam*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia, 2016.
- Shahrasatānī (al), Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm. *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*, Vol. 1. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah, n.d.
- Shanqīfī (al), Sayyid Muḥammad Sādtī. *Ḥamalat al-Qur’ān min al-Ṣaḥābah*. Cairo: Dār al-Ḥaḍārah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘, 2007.
- Soleh, A. Khudori. “Mencermati Epistemologi Tasawuf,” *Ulumuna*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 2010.
- Syukur, M. Amin and Masyharuddin. *Intelektualisme Tasawuf: Studi Intelektualisme Tasawuf al-Ghazali*. Semarang: LEMBKOTA, 2014.
- Ṭūsī (al), Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj. *al-Luma’*. Mesir: Dār al-Kutub al-Ḥadīthah, 1960.
- Ṭabrānī, al-Qāsim Sulaymān b. Aḥmad. *al-Muḥjam al-Kabir*, Vol. 19. Cairo: Maktabah Ibn Taymīyah, n.d.
- Ṭayyib (al), Zubaydah. “Ityakāliyah Tarsīm al-‘Aqāid fī al-Fikr al-Islāmī: Mas’alah Khalq al-Qur’ān Anmūdhan,” *Majallat al-Dirāsāt al-‘Aqdīyah wa Muqārnāt al-Adyān*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2017.
- Tarrād, Majīd Makhlaf. “al-Judhūr al-Fikriyah li al-Taṣawwuf al-Islāmī,” *Majallat al-Turāth al-‘Ilmī al-‘Arabī*, 3, 2015.
- . “Dawr al-Fikr al-Falsafī fī al-Ḥaḍārah al-Arabīyah al-Islāmīyah,” *Majallat al-Turāth al-‘Ilmī al-‘Arabī*, 36, 2018.
- Taymīyah, Taqiy al-Dīn Aḥmad b. *al-Fatwā al-Hamwiyah al-Kubrā*. al-Riyāḍ: Dār al-Ṣama’ī, 1998.
- Wardani, *Epistemologi Kalam Abad Pertengahan*. Yogyakarta: LKiS, 2003.
- Zayd, Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū. *al-Ittijāh al-‘Aqlī fī al-Tafsīr: Dirāsah fī Qaḍiyat al-Majāz fī al-Qur’ān ‘ind al-Mu’taẓilab*. Beirut: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-‘Arabī, 2003.