

Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi - Cumhuriyet Theology Journal

ISSN: 2528-9861 e-ISSN: 2528-987X

Aralık / December 2018, 22 (2): 1401-1423

Some Ĥadiths Subjected to Discussion by Supporters of Bishr al-Marīsī

Due to Having an Anthropomorphist and Corporeal Content*

Tecsim ve Teşbih İçerdiği İddiasıyla Bishr el-Merīsī Taraftarlarının Tartışma

Konusu Yaptığı Bazı Hadisler

Ali Kaya

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi, Hadis Anabilim Dalı

Assistant Professor, Kocaeli Univ., Faculty of Theology, Department of Hadith

Kocaeli, Turkey

ali.kaya@kocaeli.edu.tr

orcid.org/0000-0002-7058-1088

Translator / Çeviren

Ahmet Çekiç

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Bölümü

Assistant Professor Dr., Sivas Cumhuriyet Univ., Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Languages

Sivas, Turkey

acekic@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

orcid.org/0000-0002-7292-3301

Makale Bilgisi / Article Information

Article Types / Makale Türü: Translated Article / Çeviri

* This article has been published previously in Turkish: Kaya, Ali . “Tecsim ve Teşbih İçerdiği İddiasıyla Bishr el-Merīsī Taraftarlarının Tartışma Konusu Yaptığı Bazı Hadisler”. *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi* 22 / 1 (Haziran 2018): 163-188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18505/cuid.384790>.

Received / Geliş Tarihi: 23 November / Kasım 2018

Accepted / Kabul Tarihi: 22 December / Aralık 2018

Published / Yayın Tarihi: 15 Aralık / December 2018

Volume / Cilt: 22 **Issue / Sayı:** 2 **Pages / Sayfa:** 1401-1423

Cite as / Atıf: Kaya, Ali. “Some Ĥadiths Subjected to Discussion by Supporters of Bishr al-Marīsī Due to Having an Anthropomorphist and Corporeal Content”. Trans. Ahmet Çekiç. *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi-Cumhuriyet Theology Journal* 22/2 (December 2018): 1401–1423. <https://doi.org/10.18505/cuid.481543>

**Some Ḥadiths Subjected to Discussion by Supporters of Bishr al-Marīsī
Due to Having an Anthropomorphist and Corporeal Content**

Abstract: Ḥadiths that have been discussed in this paper consist of narrations regarding divine attributes and having some problematic meanings between supporters of Bishr al-Marīsī and ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī. These narrations were mostly accepted denounced (*munkar*) by Bishr al-Marīsī and his supporters due to having an anthropomorphist and corporeal content about God. They rejected divine attributes according to their understanding of God based on incompatibility (*tanzih*) which provided by Mu‘tazilite approach towards divine attributes even though they conveyed some features of Ahl al-Ra’y. They found contradicted of attributing human features to God based on their *tanzih* understanding, therefore, they interpreted such this kind of narrations in terms of their approach or rejected at all. At the other hand, a hard Ḥadith scholar ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī believed that one should accept divine attributes as they are in the Qur’ān and Sunna. According to his belief, he considered the explicit meanings of the narrations without interpretation of divine attributes, and based on his perspective he denied Bishr al-Marīsī (d. 218 /833) and his supporters’ interpretations claiming they would cause divesting God of all attributes (*ta‘tīl*). He argues that these narrations should be taken into considerations based on their explicit meanings. The discussions on these ḥadiths are important due to showing different approaches of scholars from the schools of Ahl al-Ra’y and the ones from Ahl al-Ḥadith towards the ḥadith during the period when the main Ḥadith works were collected. Discussions on the narrations studied in this paper reveal two schools’ understandings of divine issues, their approaches to divine attributes, as well inform us their perspectives of ḥadith in general.

Keywords: Ḥadith, ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, Bishr al-Marīsī, Divine attributes, Anthropomorphism/(*Tashbīh*), Corporealism/(*Tajsim*), Interpretation/(*Ta’wīl*)

**Tecsim ve Teşbih İçerdiği İddiasıyla Bışr el-Merīsī Taraftarlarının
Tartışma Konusu Yaptığı Bazı Hadisler**

Öz: Bışr el-Merīsī taraftarları ile Osman ed-Dārimī arasında burada tartışma konusu yapılan hadisler haberî sıfatları konu alan ve müşkil nitelikte olan rivayetlerden oluşmaktadır. Bu rivayetleri genelde Bışr el-Merīsī ve taraftarlarının tecsim ve teşbih içerdiği iddiasıyla münker kabul ettikleri görülmektedir. Ehl-i re’y özellikleri taşımakla birlikte ilahî sıfatlar konusunda Mu‘tezilî bir anlayışa sahip olduklarından tenzih anlayışları gereği sıfatları reddetmektedirler. Yaratılmışlara ait niteliklerin yaratıcıya nisbet edilmesini tenzih anlayışlarına aykırı gördüklerinden bu tür müşkil rivayetleri ya kendi anlayışları doğrultusunda te’vīl ya da reddettikleri gözlenmektedir. Sert bir ehl-i hadīs âlimi olan Osman ed-Dārimī ise, ayet ve hadislerde bildirilen ilahî sıfatlara iman edilmesi gerektiğini kabul etmektedir. Bu anlayışı sebebiyle bu rivayetlerde bildirilen haberî sıfatlara da te’vīl etmeksizin lafzî anlamıyla yaklaşmakta; kendi görüşü doğrultusunda Bışr el-Merīsī ve taraftarlarının yaptığı te’vīlleri reddetmekte, bu te’vīllerin ta’tile yol açacağını ileri sürmektedir. Bu rivayetlerin lafzî (literal) anlamları doğrultusunda anlaşılması gerektiğini savunmaktadır. Bu hadisler üzerinde yapılan tartışmalar, temel hadis eserlerinin yazıldığı dönemde Ehl-i re’y ve Ehl-i hadīs ekollerine mensup âlimlerin hadislere yaklaşımlarını göstermesi bakımından önem arz etmektedir. Burada vermiş olduğumuz hadisler üzerindeki tartışmalar bu iki

ekolün uluhiyet anlayışını, haberî sıfatlara yaklaşımlarını ortaya koyduđu gibi bunların genel anlamda hadis perspektifi hakkında bizlere bilgi vermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hadis, Osman ed-Dārimī, Bişr el-Meriṣi, Haberî sıfatlar, Teş̣ḅih, Tec̣ṣm, Te'vīl

INTRODUCTION

This study examines the debates between ʿUthmān al-Dārimī (d. 280/894) and the supporters of Bişr al-Mariṣi (d. 218/833) on some ḥadīths which are found ambiguous and involve anthropomorphic description of God, in the third century of Islamic calendar, the period when the main ḥadīth books were composed. We could say that the debates between the scholars of Ahl al-Ḥadīth and Ahl al-Ra'y on the ḥadīths which we have examined here as the subject of study, concern understanding the text of the ḥadīth in one respect. Understanding the text of the ḥadīth in a broad sense is described as the science field that studies the understanding of the ḥadīths, while in a narrow sense it studies ascertainment of decretals from them.¹ We could also say that the debates about these ḥadīths are focused on how these ḥadīths should be understood; whether paying attention to the literal meaning of the wordings in the narrations, or paying attention to the possible figurative meanings which are aimed to go beyond those wordings.

From the first period, not only the understanding that rejects the proving of the anthropomorphic description of God and the interpretation of related narrations, but also those who uphold the interpretation of these narrations based on the understanding of incomparability composed many in line with their understandings. With the statement of ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, in the emergence of the literature of criticism and rejection of Ahl al-Ḥadīth, having been raised the topic of createdness of the Qur'ān by Jahmiyyah and Mu'tazilah after rejecting divine attributes was effective² and many authors, including ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, composed regarding this subject.³ It can be said that the writing works related to the subject are continued by contemporary writers. There are also some studies that made divine attributes their subject of examination at the academic level.⁴

It should be noted that there are old and new works related to ḥadīths or similar narratives discussed here. Ibn Furak (d. 406/1015), who wrote a book named *Mushkil al-ḥadīth wa bayānuh* in order to defend the ḥadīths against Jahmiyyah and Mu'tazilah, who rejected some narrations conveyed on the creed issues, hereby interpreted the divine attributes. Although it is not written in order to examine the narrations containing corporealism and interpretation, it is understood that they were examined in the article in question since this kind of narratives are

¹ Mehmet Görmez, "Fikhü'l-Hadis", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 1995), 13: 547.

² Abū Sa'īd ʿUthmān b. Sa'īd al-Dārimī, *al-Rad ʿalā al-Jahmiyyah*, ed. Badr b. ʿAbdallāh al-Badr (Kuwait: Dār Ibn al-Athīr, 1995), 17-18.

³ For criticism works related to the anti-ta'wīl literature of Ahl al-Ḥadīth scholars, please see Ahmet Yücel, *Hadis Tarihi*, 8. Baskı (Istanbul: İFAV Publications, 2012), 78-81.

⁴ For more information about this subject, please see Ali Budak, "Haberî Sıfatlara Dair Rivayetlerin Te'vīl Yoluyla Çözümü Bağlamında Rāzī'nin Esāsu't-Takdīs Adlı Eseri", *Hitit Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 10/19 (2011/1): 44-45.

included in the scope of ambiguous tradition. As it can be seen in the references to the related ḥadīths, there are Ibn Furak's evaluations on all of the ḥadīths we have selected as the subject of study. In this very work; some divine attributes were examined and interpreted such as "ṣūrat, ḥad, jihat, yemīnullāh, rijl/qadam, istilqā, ḍiḥk, ṣadr, khalwat with human, farah, hijāb/hujub, ru'yat, kaff, ṣba', yad/qabza, 'ayn, dahr..."⁵ Another study on the subject is an article titled "Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī: A Ḥadīth Person Against Corporealism and Interpretation" written by Kamil Çakın, on the writing of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) titled "Ta'wīl al-aḥādīth al-mūmiha li-l-tashbīh". It is indicated in the article that among Suyūṭī's sources there is a writing named Radd al-Dārimī 'alā al-Marīsī, written by 'Uthmān al-Dārimī.⁶ However, it should be emphasized that in this work of Suyūṭī the opinions conveyed for the interpretation of narratives do not belong to 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, but belong to Bishr al-Marīsī -who was criticised and rejected by al-Dārimī- and to his supporters. Another study is an edict named "Commentary of the Wordings that include Corporealism and Interpretation for God in Holy-Religious Texts According to Arabic Language (In the Context of Ash'arist Doctrine)" presented by Mustafa Öncü who offers to gloss the statements in the Qur'ān and in narratives that include corporealism and interpretation, according to the Arabic language. The ones read in the narratives and examined have been limited to a few ambiguous words such as "rijl", "qadam", "ḍiḥk/ḍaḥik".⁷

1. THE PARTIES TO THE DISPUTE

The debates on the ḥadīths that we are going to examine were between Bishr al-Marīsī (d. 218/833) and 'Uthmān al-Dārimī (d. 280/894).⁸ One of the most important personalities of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth, 'Uthmān al-Dārimī's work, which contains these disputes related to ḥadīths, "al-Naqḍ 'alā al-Marīsī" has been an important source in that it transmitted us the ḥadīth issues and the dispute subjects of the period of classification. This work by 'Uthmān al-Dārimī was written as a refutation against Bishr al-Marīsī and his two disciples' views⁹ about God's attributes and

⁵ For more information about this ta'wīl, please see Ibn Fūrek, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Isfahānī, *Mushkil al-ḥadīth wa bayānuh*, ed. Mūsā Muḥammad 'Alī (Beirut: 'Ālem al-Kutub, 1985), 45, 50, 60, 115, 120, 125, 132, 143, 158, 170, 186, 191, 224, 232, 243, 258, 263, 275.

⁶ Please see Kamil Çakın, "Teşbīh ve Tescīm Karşısında Bir Hadisçi: Celāluddīn es-Suyūṭī", *Dinî Araştırmalar* 4/10 (2001): 11.

⁷ Please see for more information Mustafa Öncü, "Dinî Kutsal Metinlerde Allah İçin Tescīm Ve Teşbīh İfade Eden Lafızların Arap Diline Göre Yorumlanması (Eş'arilik Doktrini Bağlamında)", *Uluslararası İmam Eş'arî ve Eş'arilik Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, ed. Cemallettin Erdemci-Fadıl Aygün (İstanbul: Beyan Publications, 2015), 2: 681-692.

⁸ Among the scholars of Hadīth, there are two scholars named Dārimī. The Hadīth scholar, which is known more and who comes to mind first is known for his work al-Sunan, is Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Dārimī (ö. 255/869). The other Dārimī is Abū Sa'īd 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd al-Dārimī (ö. 280/894), who died twenty-five years after the first one. The one who was discussed here is 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd al-Dārimī who came later.

⁹ al-Dārimī, called one of these two students of Bishr al-Marīsī, Muḥammad b. Shujā' al-Thaljī (ö. 266/880) and without giving the other's name called him as "mu'ariz". For more information please see Abū Sa'īd 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd al-Dārimī, *Naqḍ al-Imām Abī Sa'īd 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd 'alā al-Marīsīyyi al-Jahmiyyi al-'anīd fīmā 'iftarā 'alallāhi min al-tawḥīd (al-Naqḍ 'alā al-Marīsī)*, ed. Badr b. 'Abdallāh al-Badr (Kuwait: Dār Ibn al-Athīr, 1995), 1: 139, 432-435, 454, 483, 493, 524, 541, 555, 578; 2: 693-695, 697, 833, 836, 913.

some ḥadith issues.¹⁰ Besides having studied under Imam Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767) for a short period¹¹, Bişr al-Marīsī was educated mainly by Abū Yūsuf.¹² Bişr al-Marīsī, who is considered to be an important theologian, and also the founder of the Marīsīyya branch of the Murjī'a sect¹³, is a scholar of Ahl al-ra'y who made theological discussion on the subject of ḥadith and kalām with Imam al-Shāfi'ī (d. 204/820)¹⁴, with 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Kinānī (d. 240/854 [?])¹⁵ and with Za'farānī (d. 260/874)¹⁶ the disciple of Imam al-Shāfi'ī and with many other scholars. Among the people Bişr al-Marīsī discussed were the scholars of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth as well as the scholars of Ahl al-ra'y and Mu'tazilah. Bişr al-Marīsī witnessed the period of Hārūn al-Rashīd (786-809) and Al-Ma'mūn (813-833) and played a significant role in the cultural life of Al-Ma'mūn's era. He was

¹⁰ 'Uthmān al-Dārimī wrote al-Naqd to refute criticisms of his earlier book al-Rad 'alā al-Jahmiyyah. One of the followers of Bişr al-Marīsī, known as mu'āriz, had criticized his book al-Rad 'alā al-Jahmiyyah. This is understood from the statements of al-Dārimī. There have been many places in the work that mu'āriz's opinions have been referred by stating his name as mu'āriz and then his work were criticized. As an example please see 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 1: 139-142, 145, 146, 149, 152, 157, 158.

¹¹ Abū-l-Ḥasenāt Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥay b. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥalīm al-Laknawī, *al-Fawā'id al-bahīyyah fī tarājīm al-Ḥanefīyyah*, ed. Sayyid Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn Abū Firās al-Nu'mānī (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-İslāmī, nd.), 54; al-Kāsānī, 'Ālā al-Dīn Abū Bakr b. Mas'ūd al-Kāsānī, *Badā'i' al-ṣanā'i' fī tartīb al-ṣarā'i'*, (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'İlmiyyah, 1986), 1: 462.

¹² al-Shīrāzī, Abū Ishāq Jamāl al-Dīn İbrāhīm b. 'Alī al-Shīrāzī, *Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahā'*, ed. İhsān 'Abbās. (Beirut: Dār a;-Rā'id al-'Arabi, 1970), 138; Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Baghdādī, *Tārikhu Baghdād*, ed. Muştafa 'Abd al-lkādīr 'Atā (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'İlmiyyah, 1417), 7: 61; Abū Sa'd 'Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad al-Sam'ānī, *al-Ansāb*, ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yaḥyā al-Mu'allimī al-Yamanī et al. (Hyderabad: Majlisu Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-Othmaniyya, 1382/1962), 12: 210.

¹³ Abū Manşūr 'Abd al-Qāhir b. Ṭāhir al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayna al-firāq wa bayān al-firāq al-nājiyyah minhum* (Beirut: Dār al-Āfāk al-Jadīde, 1977), 19, 192; Abū-l-Muzaffer 'Imād al-Dīn Shahfūr (Shāhfūr) b. Ṭāhir al-İsfarāyīnī, *al-Tabşīr fī-l-dīn wa tamyiz al-firāq al-nājiyyah 'an al-firāq al-hālikin*, ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt (Beirut: 'Ālem al-Kutub, 1983), 24.

¹⁴ İbn Abī Ḥātim, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Rāzī, *Ādāb al-Shfi'ī wa manāqibuh*, ed. 'Abd al-Ghanī 'Abd al-Khālīq (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'İlmiyyah, 2003), 132-133; al-İsfarāyīnī, *al-Tabşīr*, 99; al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. 'Uthmān b. Qāymāz b. 'Abdallāh al-Turkumānī al-Fāriqī al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi'ī, *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'*, ed. Shu'ayb al-Arnaūt (Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1405/1985), 10: 30.

¹⁵ İbn Abī Ṭāhir, Abū-l-Faql Aḥmad b. Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr al-Marwazī, *Tārikhu (Kitābu) Baghdād*, editted by Sayed 'Izzet al-Attār al-Ḥusaynī (Cairo: Maktaba al-Khanci, 2002), 47; Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Baghdādī, *Tārikhu Baghdād*, ed. Muştafa 'Abd al-lkādīr 'Atā (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'İlmiyyah, 1417), 10: 448; al-Shīrāzī, *Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahā'*, 103; al-Sam'ānī, *al-Ansāb*, 10: 95.

¹⁶ Yāqūt al-Hamawī, Abū 'Abdallāh Shihāb al-Dīn b. 'Abdallāh al-Hamawī, *Mu'jam al-udabā'* (*Ṭabaqāt al-udabā'*), ed. İhsān 'Abbās (Beirut: Dār al-Gharbī al-İslāmī, 1993), 6: 2405.

in the Caliph Al-Ma'mūn's consultation assembly¹⁷ and had a massive contribution in the adoption and implementation¹⁸ of the idea of createdness of the Qur'ān by the caliph.¹⁹

‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, on the other hand, who was originally from Sijistān, was a scholar of Ahl al-Ḥadīth, who learned the ḥadīth science from the crucial scholars of his period such as Yaḥyā Ibn Ma‘īn (d. 233/848), Ishāq Ibn Rāhawayh (d. 238/853) and Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855)²⁰, learned the Arabic language from Ibn al-‘Arabī (d. 231/846), and was educated on Islamic law (fiqh) by Buwayṭī (d. 231/846), disciple of Imam al-Shāfi‘ī.²¹ He visited all the major cities of the Islamic world for ḥadīth collection, learned the ḥadīths from the ḥadīth scholars in this region and conveyed them.²²

2. CONTROVERSIAL ḤADĪTHS

The ḥadīths and narratives which are to be examined here are the ḥadīths that are interpreted by Bishr al-Marīsī and his two students by reason of having contained corporealism and interpretation. ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, on the other hand, as a rigid scholar of Ahl al-Ḥadīth who advocates adherence to the wording of the verses, objects these interpretations and exegesis, asserting that the verbal meanings in these ḥadīths should be accepted. In this review, the approaches of the parties to the ḥadīths discussed and how they understand the ḥadīths will be revealed and an evaluation of them will be made.

2.1. ḤADĪTH OF HEARING AND SEEING

¹⁷ Ibn Abī Ṭāhir, *Kitābu Baghdad*, 36, Josef Van Ess, "Mu'tezile: İslām'ın Akılcı Yorumu-1", translator Veysel Kanar, *Harran Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 20 (2008): 296.

¹⁸ Ibn Kathīr, 'Imād al-Dīn Abū-l-Fedā' Ismā'īl b. 'Umar Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nehāye*, ed. Ali Shīrī (Beirut: Dār Ihyā' al-Turath al-Arabī, 1988), 10: 301, 308; Ahmet Saim Kılavuz, "Bişr b. Gıyās el-Merīsī", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 1992), 6: 220.

¹⁹ For information about Bishr al-Marīsī please see Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārikhu Baghdad*, 7: 61-70; al-Sam'ānī, *al-Ansāb*, 12: 210-211; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10: 199-202; Al-Qurashī, Abū Muḥammad Muḥyiddīn 'Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad al-Qurashī, *al-Jawāhir al-muḥyiyah fī ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanefiyye*, (Karachi: Mīr Muḥammad Kutupkhāne, nd.), 1: 164-166; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, 10: 308.

²⁰ Al-Ḥākīm al-Naysābūrī, Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh al-Naysābūrī, *Ma'rifat 'ulūm al-(uṣūl al-) ḥadīth*, ed. al-Sayyid Mu'azzam Hosain (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1977), 80; Ibn 'Asākir, Abū-l-Kāsim 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan al-Dimashqī, *Tārikhu madīnet Dimashq*, ed. 'Amr b. Gharāme al-'Amrawī (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995), 38: 363.

²¹ Ibn al-Athīr, Abū-l-Ḥasan 'Iz al-Dīn Alī b. Muḥammad al-Jazarī, *al-Kāmil fī al-tārikh*, ed. 'Umar 'Abd al-Salām Tadmūrī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Arabī, 1997), 6: 488; Al-Subqī, Abū Naşr Tāj al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. 'Alī al-Subqī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyah al-kubrā*, ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad at-Tanāhī-'Abd al-Fattāh Muḥammad al-Ḥulv (Cairo: Dāru Hicr, 1413/1992), 2: 302; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, 11: 83.

²² For more information about 'Uthmān al-Dārimī please see Qiwām al-Sunnah, Abū-l-Kāsim Qiwām al-Sunnah Ismā'īl b. Muḥammad al-Isfahānī, *Siyar al-salaf al-ṣāliḥīn*, ed. Karam b. Ḥilmi b. Farḥāt (Riyadh: Dār al-Rāya, nd.), 1150; Ibn 'Asākir, *Tārikhu Dimashq*, 38: 362; al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. 'Uthmān b. Qāymāz b. 'Abdallāh al-Turkumānī al-Fāriqī al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi'ī, *Tārikh al-Islām wa vafayāt al-(tabakāt al-)mashāhīr wa-l-a'lām*, ed. 'Umar Abdussalām al-Tadmūrī (Beirut: Dār al-Kātib al-'Arabī, 1413/1993), 20: 396; Al-Subqī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyah*, 2: 302.

One of the ḥadiths of the subject of discussion is the following narration of Abū Hurayra: قَرَأَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: {إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ سَمِيعًا بَصِيرًا} فَوَضَعَ أُصْبُعَهُ الدَّعَاءَ عَلَى عَيْنَيْهِ وَإِبَاهِمَهُ عَلَى أُذُنَيْهِ

According to the narrated story Abū Hurayra said: "Prophet pointed his ear with his thumb and his eye with his forefinger after reading the verse: "Allah is the hearing and seeing one." (Al-Nisā 4/58)²³

The opponent transferring this ḥadith argues that God Almighty is given the impression of consisting of organs by some of the ḥadith clerks by arguing that they have proven that Allah has eye and ear that are similar to the common ground for everyone.²⁴ ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī acknowledges that this ḥadith proves sight and hearing, but rejects the claim that it refers to organs such as eyes and ears that are similar to the organs in humans because neither God Almighty is similar to others nor his attributes resemble to the attributes of others. According to him, it is slander to associate God Almighty being consisted of organs to Ahl al-Ḥadīth, and such a thought cannot be expressed by a believer because it is blasphemy. ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī says that they accept hearing and seeing attributes of the Praised One as it was stated in the Qur’ān and in Sunnah but they do not assign a quality.²⁵

The teacher of two sheikhs from whom Abū Dāwūd narrated this ḥadith: ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yezīd al-Maḥzūmī al-Muqrī, explains that God’s seeing and hearing attributes are proven with this ḥadith. Abū Dāwūd indicates that the explanation of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yezīd al-Maḥzūmī al-Muqrī is a refutation against Jahmiyah’s opinion that rejects divine attributes.²⁶ Ibn Abī Ḥātim (d. 327/938) said that, by pointing his ear and eye, the Prophet (pbuh) did not want to say that God Almighty saw and heard with an eye and with an ear which resemble to the human organs consisting of eyelash and eyelid or any kind of ear that man would have but wanted to tell that God possessed the attributes of hearing and seeing. God Almighty is glorious and excluded from showing resemblance to any kind of a living creature.²⁷ Also Khattābī’s (d. 388/998) commentary shows resemblance to the comments of Imām Abū Ḥātim, in his elucidation to Abū Dāwūd’s Sunan, regarding this ḥadith.²⁸ Ibn Furak (d. 406/1015) in contrast to the claim of the anthropomorphists, states that this ḥadith does not refer to organs.²⁹ According to Al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066), by pointing the eye and ear which are locus of sight and hearing, the Messenger of God (pbuh) meant that

²³ Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. al-Ash‘ath b. Ishāq al-Azdī al-Sijistānī. *al-Sunan*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī l-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, (Beirut: al-Maktabah al-‘Asriyyah, nd.), "Sunnah", 19; ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqḍ ‘alā al-Marīsī*, 1: 318-319; 2: 688; Ibn Khuzayma, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Khuzayma al-Sulamī al-Naysābūrī, *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, ed. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Ibrāhīm al-Shahvān (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd, 1994), 1: 97, 98; Ibn Ḥibbān, Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī, *al-Musnad al-ṣaḥīḥ ‘alā at-taqāsīm wa-l-anvā’*, ed. Ṣu‘aib al-Arnaūt (Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1988), 1: 498.

²⁴ ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqḍ ‘alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 688.

²⁵ ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqḍ ‘alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 688-689.

²⁶ Please, see Abū Dāwūd, *al-Sunan*, "Sunnah", 19; al-Ḥakamī, Ḥāfiẓ b. Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Ḥakamī, *Ma‘ārij al-qabūl*, ed. ‘Umar b. Maḥmūd Abū ‘Umar (Dār Ibn al-Kayyim, 1410/1990), 1: 136.

²⁷ Please, see Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, 1: 498-499.

²⁸ Al-Khattābī, Abū Sulaymān Ḥamd (Aḥmed) b. Muḥammad al-Khattābī, *Ma‘ālim al-Sunan* (Aleppo: al-Matba‘a al-‘Ilmiyya, 1932), 4: 330.

²⁹ Please, see Ibn Fūrek, *Mushkil al-ḥadīth*, 248-253.

God Almighty possessed this attributes not the organs of the sight and hearing.³⁰ It is seen that the commentaries and similar interpretations mentioned here are shared by other scholars.³¹

1.2. The Ḥadīth "I feel the breath of Lord from Yaman!"

The opponent also considered Abū Hurayra's narration referring to the Prophet:

الإيمانُ يَمَانٌ، وَالْحِكْمَةُ يَمَانِيَّةٌ، وَأَجْدُ نَفْسٍ رَبِّكُمْ مِنْ قِبَلِ الْيَمَنِ.

"Faith is from Yaman, wisdom is from Yaman! I feel the breath of your Lord from Yaman!"³²

The opponent denounced this ḥadīth because, according to Bishr al-Marīsī and his companions, breath can only come from those with an abdominal cavity, and Allah is free from it.³³ According to 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, the opponent misunderstood it. What is meant here is the wind that blows from Yaman and comforts people. According to 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, nobody had stated the meaning that is stated by opponent.³⁴

It is possible to say that we are facing an interesting situation when the approach of Bishr al-Marīsī and his companions and 'Uthmān al-Dārimī towards this ḥadīth are taken into consideration because Bishr al-Marīsī and his companions, who share the interpretationist features and approaches of Ahl al-Ra'y, tend to accept this ḥadīth as denounced. On the other hand, it is also seen that 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, who argues against interpretation (Ta'wīl) and shows loyalty to the wordings of the nas, interpreted the ḥadīth instead of understanding it literally. It is possible to see a similar approach in some other scholars of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth school. In the context of this ḥadīth, Bishr al-Marīsī and his companions subscribed to wording while 'Uthmān al-Dārimī and Ahl al-Ḥadīth subscribed to the interpretation (Ta'wīl).

The statement "breath of your Lord" that involves this ḥadīth was interpreted by a great number of scholars from both Ahl al-Ḥadīth and Ahl al-Ra'y. They argued that the meanings of help, support, relief, disembarassment and fatah were meant. Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276/889), as one of the most important representatives of Ahl al-Ḥadīth, said that the expression in the ḥadīth was allegorical. He stated that what is meant by "the breath of Allah" is that Prophet's salvation and relief from oppression and distress caused by the people of Mecca would come with the

³⁰ al-Bayhaqī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī, *al-Asmā' wa al-ṣifāt*, ed. 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad al-Ḥāshidī (Jeddah: Maktabah al-Savādī, 1993), 1: 462-463.

³¹ Please see for these comments Ibn al-Kharrāt, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥaq b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ishbīlī, *al-Aḥkām al-kubrā fī-l-ḥadīth*, ed. Abū 'Abdallāh Ḥusayn b. Ukkāsha (Riyadh: Maktaba al-Rushd, 2001), 1: 273.

³² 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 686. Please see as well Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal Abū 'Abdallāh al-Shaybānī al-Marwazī, *al-Musnad*, ed. 'Abdullāh b. 'Abdulmuḥsin al-Turkī (Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla), 16: 576-577; Ibn Qutayba, Abū Muḥammad 'Abdullāh b. Muslim al-Dīnawarī, *Ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth* (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1999), 307; Ibn Abī 'Āṣim, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Amr al-Shaibānī, *al-Āḥād ve'l-mathānī*, ed. Bāsim Fayṣal Aḥmad al-Jawābira (Riyadh: Dār al-Rāya, 1991), 4: 263.

³³ 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 686.

³⁴ 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 686-687.

support that would come from Yaman.³⁵ Ibn Furak (d. 406/1015) also made close comments.³⁶ Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) stated that the Prophet told this ḥadīth after receiving the Surat al-Naṣr and that the ḥadīth foretold the conquest of Mecca.³⁷ The fact that Yamani people converted to Islam consecutively, or the salvation of the Prophet from his distress by favour of Yamani people, was accepted amongst the possible commentaries of this ḥadīth by many glossators that conveyed this ḥadīth in exegesis of Surat en-Naṣr.³⁸ It can be seen that similar comments about this ḥadīth have been made by other scholars as well.³⁹

It can also be seen that the scholars from the Ḥanbali and Salafi movements, who argue strictly against interpretation (Taʾwīl) and advocate adhering to the explicit meaning of the narration, interpreted this ḥadīth. Al-Qāḍī Abū Yaʿlā (d. 458/1066), who composed detachedly in order to reject interpretation (Taʾwīl), needed to interpret this ḥadīth in his work titled "Ibtāl al-taʾwīlāt".⁴⁰ Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728/1328), one of the prominent representatives of the Salafi movement, quoted the exact interpretation of Al-Qāḍī Abū Yaʿlā in his book regarding this ḥadīth.⁴¹ One of the Ḥanbali scholars, Ibn al-ʿAdil (d. 775/1373) argued that this ḥadīth aimed to reflect Yamani people's collective and consecutive conversion to Islam, or that the Messenger of God's salvation from the troubles by means of the Yamani. Again, Marʿī Ibn-Yūsuf (d. 1033/1624), a scholar of Ḥanbali also, implies that he agrees with Ibn ʿArabī (d. 543/1148) by citing his interpretation (Taʾwīl): "This ḥadīth reflects the Prophet's salvation from his troubles with the aid of Yamani supporters."⁴² The comments of Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn (1928-2001), one of the contemporary representatives of Salafi and Ḥanbali understanding, resemble to these interpretations.⁴³

1.3. The Ḥadīth about the Outflow of Qurʾān from Allah

Another ḥadīth that is argued is this mursal ḥadīth (incompletely transmitted ḥadīth) from Jubayr ibn Nufayr:

عَنْ جُبَيْرِ بْنِ نُفَيْرٍ قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: إِنَّكُمْ لَنْ تَقْرَبُوا إِلَيَّ اللَّهُ يَشْفِيءُ أَفْضَلَ مِمَّا حَرَجَ مِنْهُ

³⁵ Ibn Qūṭayba, *Taʾwīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*, 307-308.

³⁶ Please, see Ibn Fūrek, *Mushkil al-ḥadīth*, 195-198.

³⁷ Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Abū ʿAbdallāh Fakhr al-dīn Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Rāzī, *Mafātīhu-l-ghayb* (Beirut: Dār Ihyāʾ al-Turas al-Arabī, 1420), 32: 340.

³⁸ Please, see Al-Māwardī, Abū-l-Ḥāsen ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Māwardī, *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān*, ed. Sayyid b. ʿAbd al-Maqsūd b. ʿAbd al-Rahīm (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, nd.), 6: 360; al-Qurtubī, Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr, *al-Jāmiʿ li-aḥkām al-Qurʾān*, ed. ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Misriyyah, 1964), 20: 231.

³⁹ For comments on the ḥadīths please see Ibn Qūṭayba, *Taʾwīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*, 307-308; Ibn Fūrek, *Mushkil al-ḥadīth*, 195-198.

⁴⁰ For the comment on the ḥadīth please see Abū Yaʿlā Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Farrāʿ, *Ibtāl al-taʾwīlāt li-akḥbār al-ṣifāt*, ed. Muḥammad b. Ḥamd al-Najdī (Kuwait: Dār Ilāf al-Dawla, nd.), 1: 252.

⁴¹ Ibn Taymiyyah, Abū-l-ʿAbbās Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm al-Ḥarrānī, *Bayānu talbīs al-Jahmiyya*, ed. scholars delegation (Madina: Majmaʿ al-Malik Fahd, 1426), 6: 166.

⁴² Marʿī b. Yūsuf, Zayn al-Dīn b. Marʿī b. Yūsuf al-Karmī, *Akāwīl al-thikāt fī taʾwīl al-asmāʾ wa-l-ṣifāt wa-l-āyāt al-muḥkamāt wa-l-mutashābihāt*, ed. Şuʿaib al-Arnaūt (Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1985), 187-188.

⁴³ Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn, Muḥammad b. Şālīḥ b. Muḥammad al-ʿUthaymīn, *al-Kawāʿid al-muthlā fī ṣifātillāh wa asmāʾih al-ḥusnā* (Madina: al-Jāmiʿah al-Islāmiyyah, 2001), 51.

According to the narration from Jubayr ibn Nufayr Messenger of God (pbuh) stated: "You cannot approach Allah with something more virtuous than what comes out of it (the Qur'ān)."⁴⁴

Except this incompletely transmitted ḥadith that comes from Jubayr Ibn Nufayr there is also a report attributed to the Prophet, conveyed from Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī and Abū 'Umāmah.⁴⁵ Al-Bukhārī stated that, the incompletely transmitted ḥadith was not valid on account of the break in the chain, while Al-Tirmidhī did not evaluate but indicated that this report attributed to the Prophet was a ḥadith narrated just by a single person at one point in the chain of transmitters. Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014) who conveyed this ḥadith as a connected (mawsūl) ḥadith from Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī stated that it was authentic chain of narration, and also Al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348) shared this opinion. Al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066) also stated that this was authentic chain of narration.⁴⁶

Ibn al-Thaljī (d. 266/880) reports that Mushabbīha understands this ḥadith as one with an abdominal cavity and from whom speech comes out. This understanding is invalid since God is "ṣamad" in the sense that He has no void. With this ḥadith, it is possibly meant that the Qur'ān comes out of God's presence rather than God. In this ḥadith, the expression that "coming from him" has a similar meaning as the expression "Someone has donated us that much money". In this case, the money does not come within the body of that person rather it is taken out of money he has.⁴⁷

According to 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, the real aim of the opponent who conveyed this comment from Ibn al-Thaljī is to deny God's attribute of speech. This is the reason behind the chanting of "jawf", which everyone would reject. There is no doubt that the Qur'ān comes from Him, and only those who do not accept it are those who deny the attribute of speech, because if there is a word then there is someone who utters it. The claim that the Ahl al-Ḥadīth accepted the

⁴⁴ Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal Abū 'Abdallāh al-Shaybānī al-Marwazī, *Kitāb al-Zuhd*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Salām Shāhin (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1999), 32; Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Mughīra b. Bardizba al-Ju'fī al-Bukhārī, *Khalk af'āl al-'ibād*, ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Umayra (Riyadh: Dār al-Ma'ārif, nd.), 103-104; Al-Tirmidhī, Abū 'Isā Muḥammad b. 'Isā al-Tirmidhī, *Sunan al-Tirmidhī (al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ, al-Jāmi' al-kabīr)*, ed. Bashār 'Awwād Ma'rūf (Beirut: Dār al-Gharbī al-Islāmī, 1998), "Tafsīr", 17; 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 690-691; Al-Ṭabarānī, Abū l-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī Sulaymān b. Aḥmad al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Mu'jam al-kabīr*, ed. Ḥamdī 'Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī (Cairo: Maktaba Ibn Taymiyyah, 1994), 9: 151.

⁴⁵ For "marfū'" narrations from Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī please see Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak 'alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, ed. Muṣṭafa 'Abd al-lkādīr 'Atā (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1990), 1: 741; al-Bayhaqī, *al-Asmā' wa al-ṣifāt*, 1: 576.

For "marfū'" narrations from Abū Umāmah please see Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, 36: 644; al-Tirmidhī, "Tafsīr", 17; 'Abdallāh b. Aḥmad, Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Abdallāh b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal al-Shaybānī al-Marwazī, *al-Sunna*, Ed. Muḥammad b. Sa'īd b. Sālīm al-Qaḥṭānī (Dammām: Dār Ibn al-Qayyim, 1406/1986), 1: 136; al-Marwazī, Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Naṣr al-Marwazī, *Ta'zīmu qadr al-ṣalāt*, ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Firyuvā'ī (Madina: Maktabah al-Dār, 1406/1986), 1: 208; al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Mu'jam al-kabīr*, 8: 151

⁴⁶ For assessments about the accuracy of the narration, please see al-Bukhārī, *Khalk af'āl al-'ibād*, 104; al-Tirmidhī, "Tafsīr", 17; Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak*, 1: 741; al-Bayhaqī, *al-Asmā' wa al-ṣifāt*, 1: 576.

⁴⁷ 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 691-692.

"jawf" is a slander by the opponents and God Almighty is more supreme than this. The one who says that Qurʾān did not come out of Him but came out beside him, as it might be seen happening in the case of a person helps others, accepts Qurʾān as somebody else's words but not God's. Man's words were created, so that it is not permissible to equate those with God's. If it is permitted then this could mean all the words that man speak of should be accepted as the words of God which is impossible, and also to claim that is heresy. If it is accepted that the Qurʾān is the word of God, there is no doubt that it came from him. If it did not come out of Him then it is not His word. Everyone knows that words come out of a speaker, yet donation does not come out of the one who helps but from what s/he has. Comparing the words that come out of man and cannot be thought of as separate from him, with the goods that are not integral parts and can be possibly separated from him, is not only contradictory regarding the rules of comparison but also false analogy.⁴⁸

Ibn Furak, who connected to Al-Tirmidhī by conveying the report attributed to the Prophet, also made comments that are similar to the comments of Ibn al-Thaljī regarding this narrative. According to him, there are two meanings for something to come out of something. The first one is the fact that a substance comes out of a substance, leaves a place and moves to another. The second one is the use in the phrase "from your word emerged many benevolences and obvious benefits for us", which is said in order to indicate the emerging of many benefits. Since God Almighty is neither a substance nor an object the first meaning is false. The second meaning, on the other hand is authentic. What is meant is that the Qurʾān, which God delivered to his Messenger and informed His subjects with. It was also interpreted as follows: the pronoun "hu" in the word "minhu" which is mentioned in the report attributed to Prophet (وَمَا تَقْرَبُ الْعِبَادُ) (إِلَى اللَّهِ بِمَثَلِ مَا خَرَجَ مِنْهُ) belongs to the word "ibād" (subjects/servants/men), and "emerging from subject" means that it should be chanted, memorised and written. Therefore, subject cannot approach God with a deed that is more virtuous than the Qurʾān, which came out of Him, and chanting it.⁴⁹

1.4. The Ḥadith Hajar al-aswad and يَمِينُ اللَّهِ

Another narrative that is argued is as follows:

عَنْ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ الرَّكْنُ يَمِينُ اللَّهِ فِي الْأَرْضِ يُصَافِحُ بِهِ خَلْقَهُ

Ibn al-ʿAbbās once stated: "Rukn (Hajar al-aswad) is God's right-hand on earth; with it He shakes hand with people."⁵⁰

This ḥadith conveyed as a report attributed to the Prophet by Anas ibn Mālik, Jābir ibn ʿAbdallāh and ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀs. The narrative by ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀs is as follows: The Messenger of God (pbuh) stated: "In the day of judgement Rukn (Hajar al-aswad) is going to come as bigger than the Abū Kubais (a sacred hill), (the very day) it is going to have a

⁴⁸ ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqḍ ʿalā al-Marisī*, 2: 692-694.

⁴⁹ For Ibn Fūrek's reviews please see Ibn Fūrek, *Mushkil al-ḥadīth*, 286-287.

⁵⁰ ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī, ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām b. Nāfiʿ al-Ṣanʿānī, Abū Bakr al-Yamanī al-Ḥimyarī, *al-Tafsīr*, ed. Maḥmūd Moḥamed ʿAbduh (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1419), 5: 39; Ibn Quṭayba, *Taʾwīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*, 313; ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqḍ ʿalā al-Marisī*, 2: 694; Abū Yaʿlā al-Farrāʾ, *Ibtāl al-taʾwīlāt*, 183.

tongue and two lips, it is going to speak of the ones who had saluted it. That Rukn is the right-hand of God by which He shakes hand with His creatures."⁵¹

According to Ibn al-Thaljī, the meaning of "yamīn Allah" (the right hand of Allah) in the narration is not the right hand that we know, but it is blessing and grace of Allah.⁵²

According to ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, who acknowledges that Black Stone is not meant to be a hand, the purpose of Ibn al-Thaljī is to deny the two hands mentioned in the verses and ḥadīths about Allah with invalid interpretations. His right hand is with the God in the highest heaven, not separated from him. The meaning of the ḥadīth is that the ones who shake hands with Hajar al-aswad and salute it, are the ones to shake hands with God, as it was stated in the verse; "The ones who swore an oath of allegiance to you are the ones who swore an oath of allegiance to God. The hand of God is over theirs!" (Al-Fatah 48/10) This verse proves that God has a hand also the meaning in the following ḥadīth "The alms arrive at the hand of The Compassionate (raḥmān) before they are put in the hands of the beggar!"⁵³ is such: even if the alms are not put in the hand of God, the expression "hand" hereby stands for the hand of God. This expression was used to indicate the virtue of alms. This expression was not only used in order to indicate the value of Hajar al-aswad and to accredit it with honour and supremacy but also it proves the existence of a hand which belongs to God Himself. The meaning of right hand is not as Ibn al-Thaljī claimed as His blessing.⁵⁴

‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī (d. 211/826-27) narrated this ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Abbās and also chanted his father’s reply (when he said this to his father) right after the ḥadīth. "I heard Wahb Ibn-Munabbih saying ‘That (Rukn (Hajar al-aswad) stands for the hand of Baytullah. Do you not see that when one encounters a brother (coreligionist), he shakes hands with the right hand?"⁵⁵ While Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276/889) says that the expression in the ḥadīth is an analogy and rendition⁵⁶, Ibn Baṭṭāl (d. 449/1057) as one of the commentators of Al-Bukhārī, states that this ḥadīth does not mean an organ attributed to God Almighty in a manner evocative of anthropomorphism and corporealism with this ḥadīth.⁵⁷ Ibn Furak (d. 406/1015) interpreted the word "yamīn Allah" similarly to Ibn al-Thaljī and pointed out the meaning blessing (nimāt)⁵⁸, and he also thought that it seemed possible to mean the honour and glory for Hajar al-aswad with this

⁵¹ For the narrations from Anas b. Mālik, Jābir b. ‘Abdallāh and ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Amr b. ‘Ās, please see Ibn Khuzayma, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Khuzayma al-Sulamī al-Naysābūrī, *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafa al-A‘zamī (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 2003), 4: 221; Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak*, 1: 627.

⁵² ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd ‘alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 695.

⁵³ ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd ‘alā al-Marīsī*, 1: 288; 2: 696. Additionally please see Ibn al-Mubārak, Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Abdallāh b. Mubārak al-Marwazī, *Kitāb al-Zuhd wa-l-raqā‘iq*, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-A‘zamī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, nd.), 1: 227-228; ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī, *al-Tafsīr*, 2: 165.

⁵⁴ ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd ‘alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 695-697. Additionally please see Ibn Taymiyyah, *Bayānu talbīs*, 6: 140-141.

⁵⁵ ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām b. Nāfi‘ al-Ṣan‘ānī, Abū Bakr al-Yamanī al-Ḥimyarī, *al-Muṣanneffī-l-ḥadīth*, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-A‘zamī, (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1403), 5: 39.

⁵⁶ Ibn Qutayba, *Ta’wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*, 313. s

⁵⁷ Ibn Baṭṭāl, Abū-l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Khalaf al-Qurtubī, *Sharḥ al-Jamī‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Abū Tamīm Yāser b. Ibrāhīm (Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd, 2003), 4: 278-279.

⁵⁸ Ibn Fūrek, *Mushkil al-ḥadīth*, 117.

phrase.⁵⁹ Also Imâm Al-Ghazâlî (d. 505/1111) accuses those who understand the word "yamîn" as the organ which consists of five fingers and used for right hand of ignorance⁶⁰, and states that a metaphoric expression is used here, indicating that it is intended to attribute honour and glory to Hajar al-aswad with the word "yamîn Allah".⁶¹ Abû Bakr ibn al-‘Arabî (d. 543/1148), who stated that the word "yamîn" had eight meanings in Arabic, said that one of the meanings was "proof" and for this reason gave the meaning of "proof" to this expression in the ḥadith.⁶² Ibn Athîr (d. 606/1210), who understands the expression in this ḥadith as a rendition and envisaging, states that Hajar al-aswad is being saluted in just the same way as the right hand of the sultan is being kissed in order to show respect.⁶³

The comments of Al-Dhahabî(d. 748/1348), who points out that the noun-phrase "yamîn Allah" means possession and that there is an analogy and a metaphoric use here in just the same way as in the words "Baitullah" (house of God) and "Nâqatallâh" (she-camel of God), support the commentary of both Ibn Baṭṭâl and Imâm Al-Ghazâlî.⁶⁴ It is seen that also Ibn Hajar al-Haytamî (d. 974/1567), interpreted the word "yamîn Allah" as fortune and blessing, in a similar way to the commentary of Ibn al-Thaljî.⁶⁵ It is also understood that similar comments to the comments which we have partially conveyed here were also made by many other scholars.⁶⁶

Scholars such as Imâm Al-Ghazâlî, Abû Bakr ibn al-‘Arabî and Fakhr al-Dîn al-Râzî state that this ḥadith was one of the three ḥadiths which were interpreted (ta’wîl) by Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal.⁶⁷ But Ibn Taymiyyah says that this information conveyed by Imâm al-Ghazâlî, who claimed that Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal interpreted (ta’wîl) these three ḥadiths, was not true, and also claims that nobody ever narrated this by attributing it to Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal.⁶⁸ In addition to this, it is also remarkable that Al-Qâḍî Abû Ya’lâ (d. 458/1066), who is known for his antagonism against Interpretation (ta’wîl) and his closeness to the Salafî movement, said that this relativity meant

⁵⁹ Ibn Fûrek, *Mushkil al-ḥadîth*, 119.

⁶⁰ Al-Ghazâlî, *Hujjat al-Islâm* Abû Ḥâmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Al-Ghazâlî, *al-Iqtisâd fi-l-‘itikâd*, ed. ‘Abdallâh Muḥammad al-Khalîlî (Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 2004), 39-40.

⁶¹ Al-Ghazâlî, *Hujjat al-Islâm* Abû Ḥâmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Al-Ghazâlî, *Qavâ'id al-‘akâ'id*, ed. Mūsâ Muḥammad ‘Alî (Beirut: ‘Âlem al-Kutub, 1985), 168.

⁶² Ibn al-‘Arabî, Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. Abdallâh al-Ma‘âfirî, *Kitâb al-Masâlik fi sharḥi Muvatta’ Mâlik*, ed. Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn al-Sulaymânî et al. (Beirut: Dâr al-Garb al-Islâmî, 2007), 4: 402.

⁶³ Ibn al-Athîr, Abû-l-Sa‘âdât Majd al-Dîn al-Mubâarak b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Jazarî, *al-Nihâyah fi gharîb al-ḥadîth wa-l-athar*, ed. Tâhir Aḥmad al-Zâwî-Maḥmud Muḥammad al-Tanâhî (Beirut: al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1979), 5: 300.

⁶⁴ al-Dhahabî, *Târikh al-Islâm*, 36: 68.

⁶⁵ Ibn Hajar al-Haytamî, Abû-l-‘Abbâs Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmed b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Haytamî, *al-Zawâcîr ‘an iqtirâf al-kabâ’ir* (Beirut: Dâr al-Fîkr, 1987), 1: 340.

⁶⁶ For these comments please see Mar‘î b. Yûsuf, *Akâwîl al-thikâh*, 133-134.

⁶⁷ For information please see Al-Ghazâlî, *Hujjat al-Islâm* Abû Ḥâmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Al-Ghazâlî, *Ihyâ’u ‘ulûm al-dîn*, (Beirut: Dâr al-Ma‘rifa, nd.), 1: 103-104; Ibn al-‘Arabî, *al-Masâlik*, 3: 465; Fakhr al-Dîn al-Râzî, *Mafâtiḥ-l-ghayb*, 22: 9.

⁶⁸ For information please see Ibn Taymiyyah, Abû-l-‘Abbâs Taqî al-Dîn Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ḥalîm al-Ḥarrânî, *Mejmû‘ al-fatâwâ*, ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmân b. Muḥammad b. Qâsîm (Madina: Majma‘ al-Malik Fahd, 1995), 5: 398; The same person *Bayânu talbîs*, 6: 105-109.

honour, in a way that approved the Interpretation (ta'wil) of this ḥadīth.⁶⁹ Muḥammad ibn al-ʿUthaymeen, who is known for his proximity to Salafī movement, exhibits similar attitude as ʿUthmān al-Dārimī by opposing to Interpretation (Ta'wil). After indicating that this narrative is not a report attributed to the Prophet, he states that this can be understood genuinely without being interpreted (ta'wil), because the expression does not absolute point out to "the right hand of God" but "the right hand of God on earth", so it is understood that it does not mean His hand.⁷⁰

1.5. The Ḥadīth: "I came into the presence of my Lord."

According to a narrative conveyed from ʿAbdallāh Ibn ʿAbbās by the opponent who is one of the supporters of Bishr al-Marīsī, Messenger of God (pbuh) once said:

دَخَلْتُ عَلَى رَبِّي فِي جَنَّةٍ عِنْدَ شَابٍ جَعَدَ فِي ثَوْبَيْنِ أَخْضَرَيْنِ

"I came into the presence of my Lord in the highest heaven; He was young and had curly hair, He possessed two green robes."⁷¹

ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, who criticises the opponent not only for adding this narrative to his work but also for evaluating it, states that the scholars must not expand these kind of narratives. He criticises that the narrative is interpreted as denounced (munkar), and says that the interpretation made is even more denounced (munkar) than the narrative itself. According to ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, the narrative is truly denounced (munkar) since it contradicts the ḥadīth narrated by Abū Dhar because according to that narrative, the Prophet, facing the question: "Oh Messenger of God, have you seen the Lord?", answered: "He is light, how can I ever see Him!"⁷² This narrative told by the opponent also contradicts the ḥadīth conveyed by ʿĀisha: "The one whoever claims that Muḥammad has seen the Lord (on earth), is guilty of a great slander against God." and "The Prophet (pbuh) cited the verse: 'Your eyes cannot see into Him but He sees into your eyes.'" (Sūrat al-Anʿām 6/103)⁷³

ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, who carries out the evaluation, rejects all comments made by opponents, addressing them one by one, regarding this narrative. According to the opponents, the

⁶⁹ Abū Yaʿlā al-Farrāʾ, *Ibtāl al-taʿwīlāt*, 185.

⁷⁰ Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn, Muḥammad b. Šālīḥ b. Muḥammad al-ʿUthaymīn, *Asmāʿullāh ve şifātuh ve mawqif Ahl al-sunnah minhā*, (s.l.: Dār al-Sharīʿa, 2003), 48-49.

⁷¹ ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd ʿalā al-Marīsī*, 2: 725, 727, 730. Al-Dārimī says that muʿariz narrated this ḥadīth in his own work and criticizes that is munkar. For more information, please see Ibn Fūrek, *Mushkil al-ḥadīth*, 336-337; Abū Yaʿlā al-Farrāʾ, *Ibtāl al-taʿwīlāt*, 1: 473-474.

⁷² Al-Ṭayālīsī, Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī, *al-Musnad*, ed. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī (Cairo: Dāru Hicr, 1419/1999), 1: 381; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, 36: 311, 420; Muslim, Abū-l-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Hajjāj al-Kushayrī, *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Muḥammad Fuʿād ʿAbd al-Bāqī (Beirut: Dār Ihyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1955-1956), "Imān", 292; al-Tirmidhī, *al-Sunan*, "Tafsīr", 53; ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Rad ʿalā al-Jahmiyyah*, 123-124; The same person *al-Naqd ʿalā al-Marīsī*, 1: 363; 2: 726, 815; Al-Bazzār, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ʿAmr al-Bazzār, *al-Musnad (al-Baḥr al-zahḥār)*, ed. Maḥfūz al-Raḥmān Zeynullāh et al. (Madena: Maktabah al-ʿUlūm wa-l-Ḥikam, 1988-2009), 9: 346, 347, 362.

⁷³ Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, 40: 275; Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Mughīra b. Bardizba al-Juʿfī al-Bukhārī. *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Muḥammad Zuhayr b. Nāṣer (Beirut: Dār Tavk al-Najāṭ, 1422), "Tawḥīd", 4; Muslim, *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, "Imān", 287; Al-Tirmidhī, *al-Sunan*, "Tafsīr", 7; ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd ʿalā al-Marīsī*, 2: 726, 738, 761, 815; The same person *al-Rad ʿalā al-Jahmiyyah*, 71, 124; Ibn Khuzayma, *al-Tawḥīd*, 2: 248-250, 551, 552.

phrase "I came into the presence of my Lord" is a similar expression to this phrase used by pilgrims "Oh Lord, we have come to you from all around the world, so that you forgive our sins." And it means "I came into the presence of my Lord in the highest heaven." According to ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, the expression in the narrative "He was young and had curly hair, He possessed two green robes." invalides this interpretation of the opponents. Thus, these kinds of ambiguous traditions should merely be conveyed but must not be interpreted by Ahl al-Raʿy. The ḥadīths, which are similar to this, were narrated but never interpreted by the scholars because those who interpret these ḥadīths from their points of view open themselves to criticism. The statement of Abū ʿUbaidah ibn al-Jarrāh (d. 197/812), as a response when he was asked a question related to a similar ḥadīth: "This is a famous ḥadīth, we narrate it in accordance with the previous narratives."⁷⁴ is shown as an exemplary attitude in relation to these kinds of ḥadīths by ʿUthmān al-Dārimī. According to him, there is no need to make an explanation to those who ask questions about similar ḥadīths; those who deny or dispute will be criticised owing to their wrong attitudes but those who act like Abū ʿUbaidah ibn al-Jarrāh will reach safety. ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, who criticises strictly the claim of the opponents who claimed that this narrative was made up and put into the books of ḥadīth narrators by infidels, rejects this claim of the opponents, reminding the difficulty of access to those books even for reliable men, and states that it would be impossible for infidels to have access to the books and put made up narratives into those.⁷⁵

It is remarkable that Ibn Furak making similar comments to the opponent or quoting the comments made by him⁷⁶ was criticised by one of the Hanbalī scholars Al-Qāḍī Abū Yaʿlā in a similar manner with ʿUthmān al-Dārimī's criticism.⁷⁷ Another conspicuous aspect regarding the argument on this narrative is the fact that narratives were generally conveyed by ʿUthmān al-Dārimī and were made the matters of debate by Bîşr al-Marîsî and his companions. However, this time companions of Bîşr al-Marîsî did not only narrate but also tried to interpret the narration, which was criticized by ʿUthmān al-Dārimī.

Here, it would be appropriate to point out an important issue in terms of ḥadīth history. The fact that scholars in the period of classification strictly rejected the assertion that made up ḥadīths were put into the works of the narrators of Muḥammad's all sayings (muhaddīths), points out a crucial situation. This assertion that claims some infidels had access to those works and had been able to put made up narratives into those works was strictly rejected. However, as stated ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, even reliable men could not have access to those works. This statement can be regarded as a sign of the fact that the muhaddīths preserved their work from the interventions of the factors beyond their knowledge.

1.6. The Ḥadīth Kaf and Anamil (Palm and Fingertips)

Same as the previous one, this narrative is also conveyed and made a matter of debate by the opponents. According to the narrative by Sawbān, Messenger of God (pbuh) stated:

⁷⁴ ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd ʿalā al-Marîsî*, 2: 728-729.

⁷⁵ ʿUthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd ʿalā al-Marîsî*, 2: 726-731. For all of ʿUthmān al-Dārimī's criticisms on this narration, please see *al-Naqd ʿalā al-Marîsî*, 2: 726-733.

⁷⁶ For Ibn Fūrek's comments please see Ibn Fūrek, *Mushkil al-ḥadīth*, 336-337.

⁷⁷ Please, see Abū Yaʿlā al-Farrāʿ, *Ibtāl al-taʿwīlāt*, 1: 473-474.

أَتَانِي رَبِّي فِي أَحْسَنِ صُورَةٍ فَقَالَ يَا مُحَمَّدُ فِيمَ بَخْتَصِمُ الْمَلَأَ الْأَعْلَى؟ فَقُلْتُ: لَا عِلْمَ لِي يَا رَبِّ فَوَضَعَ كَفَّهُ بَيْنَ كَتِفَيْ حَتَّى وَجَدْتُ بَرْدَ أَنَامِلِهِ فِي صَدْرِي، فَتَجَلَّى لِي مَا بَيْنَ السَّمَاءِ وَالْأَرْضِ.

"My Lord came to me with the finest semblance (in my dream at night) and asked 'What does Mele-i a'lā discusses, Muḥammad?' I answered 'Oh Lord I do not have any information!'" Then He put His palm between my two shoulder blades, I felt the chillness of His fingers on my chest and in the sequel, all those in between the heavens and earth came into my view."⁷⁸

This ḥadith was also narrated from Abū Hurayra, Anas ibn Mālik, Abū al-Rāfi', Abū 'Ubaydah ibn al-Jarrāh, Abū Umāmah al-Bāhili', 'Abdallāh Ibn 'Umar, Mu'ādh ibn Jabal, Ibn Khaldūn and 'Abdallāh Ibn 'Abbās.⁷⁹ However, ḥadith critics argue that Ibn Khaldūn neither understood the Messenger of God nor had a relationship with Him.⁸⁰

According to the opponents, the Prophet probably wanted to say that Lord came to him in the shape of a creature that He had created and the comer actually was not God Almighty but was directed by God. The Prophet wanted to say that creature came and put its palm between His shoulder blades so that He felt the chillness of that creature's fingers on His chest. Palm and appearance were attributed to God as they belonged to a creature which God had created, besides being directed by God Himself. After all, God is the creator of all the creatures and everything belongs to Him.⁸¹

'Uthmān al-Dārimī, who states that the comments of the opponents meant to say that the Prophet (pbuh) called "Oh Lord" addressing another creature and also said "Lord came to me" addressing that very creature, rejects this commentary of the opponents and indicates that such a claim about the Messenger of God is blasphemy.⁸² This commentary also contradicts the ḥadiths conveyed from both Abū Dhar⁸³ and 'Āisha⁸⁴ regarding the fact that the Prophet did not see the Lord. Furthermore, Muslims had arrived at a consensus regarding the fact that God Almighty can not be seen in this world.⁸⁵ After rejecting mentally the commentary of the opponents, 'Uthmān

⁷⁸ 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 733; Al-Bazzār, *al-Musnad*, 10: 110; Al-Rūyānī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Hārūn al-Rūyānī, *al-Musnad*, ed. Ayman 'Ali Abū Yamānī (Cairo: Muasasah Qurṭuba, 1416), 1: 429; Ibn Khuzayma, *al-Tawḥīd*, 2: 543-544; al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Mu'jam al-kabīr*, 8: 290; 20: 109, 141; al-Dāraquṭnī, Abū Ḥasan 'Alī b. 'Umar b. Aḥmad b. Maḥdī al-Dāraquṭnī, *Ru'yatullāh* (Zerkā: Maktabah al-Manār, 1411), 337-338, 340, 341.

⁷⁹ For related narrations please see Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, 5: 437-438; 32: 171; 36: 422-423; al-Dārimī, Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dārimī, *al-Sunan*, ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad al-Dārānī (S.l.: Dār al-Mughnī, 2000), "Ru'yā", 12; al-Tirmidhī, *al-Sunan*, "Tafsīr", 39; Ibn Abī 'Āṣim, *al-Āḥād ve'l-mathānī*, 5: 48-49, 50; 'Abdallāh b. Aḥmad, *al-Sunna*, 2: 489-490; Al-Bazzār, *al-Musnad*, 8: 110; 10: 110; 11: 42; 12: 18; Al-Rūyānī, *al-Musnad*, 2: 299; Ibn Khuzayma, *al-Tawḥīd*, 2: 533-534, 538, 540; 1549; al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Mu'jam al-kabīr*, 1: 317; 8: 290; 20: 109, 141.

⁸⁰ Al-Tirmidhī, Abū 'Īsā Muḥammad b. 'Īsā al-Tirmidhī, *al-Ilal al-kabīr*, ed. Subḥi Sāmerrā'ī et al. (Beirut: 'Ālem al-Kutub, 1409), 356; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Rāzī, *al-Marāsīl*, ed. Shukrallāh Ni'matallāh Kūjānī (Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1397), 124.

⁸¹ 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 735.

⁸² 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 736.

⁸³ For the text and references of this ḥadith please see footnote 72.

⁸⁴ For the text and references of this ḥadith please see footnote 73.

⁸⁵ 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, *al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī*, 2: 737-738.

al-Dārimî states that this must not be trusted by virtue of the authentic ḥadiths he cited and the proof of consensus.

Ibn Furak accredited this narrative, which was accredited to the opponents by ʿUthmān al-Dārimî, to Ibn al-Thaljî. After stating that Abū Yahyā once said the narrative was a defected narration, he indicated that Ibn al-Thaljî made the possible comments adding the note "only if it is authentic". According to him, as it is in the verse from the Qurʾān (هَلْ يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ يَأْتِيَهُمُ اللَّهُ فِي ظُلَلٍ (من الغمام) asking to be punished quickly (في ظلال=يظلل), the (prepositional) letter "fi" in this narrative can also be used in the meaning of the letter "bi" in Arabic in terms of the literal wording. The Lord sent Him an angel in the finest semblance. Also the fact that the Lord came to the Prophet, stands for the deed and work of God that came to Him. The expressions "kaf and anamil" which are read in this narrative might mean "divine power or blessing (nimāt), gratitude and benediction.⁸⁶ Also Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī interpreted the word "yad" in this narrative to have two meanings. The first interpretation purports the excessive elaboration and showing great care to the situation, while the second one stands for blessing (nimāt).⁸⁷

EVALUATION and CONCLUSION

Talking and making evaluations about divine attributes have been seen amongst the most difficult and sinister subjects. Therefore, Salafî scholars preferred to remain silent on this subject. However, it can be seen that next generations acted differently regarding this subject due to various factors and objectives. It is possible to divide the fundamental approaches on comprehending divine attributes into three main topics such as: delegation (tafwîḍ), corporealism (tashbîh) and interpretation (taʾwîl). Tafwîḍ is the path that Salafî scholars adopted and followed, and it also means referring the information related to the personality and the attributes of God to apologetic works. Tashbîh means anthropomorphising God, or likening living creatures to God. It can be stated that this understanding became apparent in the Islamic world due to the concepts derived from Judaism, Christianity and Zoroastrianism. Besides, the reactions shown against Jahmiyah and Muʿtazila, which went too far on incomparability (tanzîh), might have been influential. Interpretation (taʾwîl) can be defined as explicating the explicit provisions (nas), which give the impression of anthropomorphism, in the light of linguistic rules and rational knowledge. In spite of the fact that Jahmiyah, Muʿtazila, Shiʿah, Ashʿarism, Maturidiyya and Falasifa adopted the Interpretation (taʾwîl), each maintained different attitudes regarding their approaches on divine attributes. Those who rejected some attributes by going too far on incomparability (tanzîh) were entitled as Muʿaṭṭila, while Salafî movement, Ashʿarism and Maturidiyya were entitled as "ṣiyah" by reason of proving the attributes.⁸⁸ According to Ahl al-Raʾy, the attributes which are accredited to God in the explicit provisions and give the impression of corporealism and anthropomorphism in the lexical meaning must be interpreted in accordance with the incomparability

⁸⁶ For more information please see Ibn Fūrek, *Mushkil al-ḥadith*, 77-83.

⁸⁷ Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Abū ʿAbdallāh Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Rāzī, *Asās al-taqdīs*, ed. Aḥmad Hijāzī al-Sakkā (Maktaba al-Kulliyāt al-Azhariyya, 1406/1986), 119-120.

⁸⁸ For information of techniques for understanding the adjectives, please see İlyas Çelebi, "Sifat", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 2009), 39: 102-103.

(tanzih). Regarding divine attributes Mu‘tazila and Jahmiyyah drove Tanzih forward and in the sequel Ash‘arism and Māturīdiyya adopted the interpretation (ta’wīl) that is in accordance with the Tanzih. Also Mushabbiha (Anthropopathism) and al-Wahhābiya-Salafī understandings accepted the wordings in divine attributes with their virtual meanings.

This discussion on some ḥadiths among the scholars of two different approaches who lived in the late second and the third century of the Islamic calendar, a period when the most important fundamental works in the ḥadith science were composed, has importance due to the fact that it belongs to the first period. In addition, this debate involves important information in terms of demonstrating two fundamental approaches regarding the explicit provisions that consist of ḥadiths and verses of the Qur’ān. The first of these two approaches represents the Ahl al-Ra’y school and the Interpretationist (ta’wīl) understanding, on account of the fact that it endeavours to understand the intentions and the meanings in explicit provisions and interprets the wordings not by their lexical meanings but by their figurative meanings, when in need. On the other hand, the second approach reflects the Ahl al-Ḥadīth understanding which argues strictly against Interpretation (Ta’wīl) of the explicit provisions and advocates taking those provisions into consideration by their literal meanings. Bishr al-Marīsī and his companions represent Ahl al-Ra’y understanding, while ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī represents Ahl al-Ḥadīth understanding.

In spite of the fact that the parties generally approach to the issues according to the characteristics of the schools they represent, they might occasionally view some of the issues according to the characteristics of the party they are opposing. ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī generally advocates the explicit provision itself and adherence to the wording of the narrative, while Bishr al-Marīsī and his companions criticize the narrative on the grounds that it is denounced or interpret the narrative in line with their own understanding. In rare cases, it can be observed that the parties of the debate have taken a stance against the understanding they have adopted in order to leave their opponents in a difficult situation or to free themselves from arduous situations. In other words, it can also be seen that ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī has taken the position of interpreting (ta’wīl) or rejecting the narrative, while Bishr al-Marīsī and his companions have taken the position of advocating the narrative or evaluating it by its literal meaning. In that case, Bishr al-Marīsī and his companions, who are known to be Interpretationists, might show a literalist approach, while ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, who is known for his literalist approaches and strict arguments against Interpretation, might show an Interpretationist approach.

‘Uthmān al-Dārimī thinks that some weak and denounced ḥadiths were propounded deliberately by Bishr al-Marīsī and his companions in order to provide a basis for the Ahl al-Ḥadīth criticism. It is noteworthy that ‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, who opposes Interpretation and always seeks for a basis formed by predecessors when it comes to the comments made by Bishr al-Marīsī, sometimes makes anomalous comments against the predecessors’ understanding by contravening the rule which he set up. It is understood that the interpretations made by Bishr al-Marīsī on Mutashābih scriptures influenced the succeeding scholars. Bishr al-Marīsī’s influence over succeeding scholars regarding interpretation is cited by many scholars; Bishr al-Marīsī was described as the Imām of the Interpretationists. In addition to the Mu‘tazilī scholars such as, Jubbā’ī (d. 303/916), ‘Abd al-Jabbār Ibn Aḥmad (d. 415/1025), Abū Hussain al-Baṣrī (d. 436/1044); some

Sunnî scholars such as, Ibn Furak (d. 406/1015), Al-Ghazālî (d. 505/1111), Ibn ‘Aqîl (d. 513/1119) and Fakhr al-Dîn al-Râzî (d. 606/1210) also quoted him.⁸⁹

It should be kept in mind that in order to reveal the fact in ḥadîth science which is based on narrations, one should not only select one of the "narrative" and "ra'y" options but also use both of them correctly and in a balanced way. In the discovery of the truth, narrative is in need of ra'y as well as ra'y is in need of narrative. The narrative and ra'y should be seen as complementary elements, not rivals of each other. The statement of İbrâhîm al-Nakha‘î (d. 96/714): "Neither ra'y without narrative nor narrative without ra'y is accurate!"⁹⁰ Reveals the fact that giving preference to one of the "Ahl al-Ḥadîth or Ahl al-Ra'y" approaches over the other is not accurate. This statement also reflects the conception that they complement each other; in fact they are in need of each other. Not only had the companions of Bişr al-Marisî but also ‘Uthmân al-Dârimî tried to silence the opposite party by using the literary characteristics of Arabic language. The supporters of Bişr al-Marisî generally used the literary characteristics of the language to reveal the possible metaphorical meanings of the narratives by prioritising the Tanzîh. ‘Uthmân al-Dârimî, on the other hand, prefers using the literary characteristics of the language to protect the virtual meaning of the narrative by prioritising the proof. Actually this situation is nothing more than the fact that the parties reflect the characteristics of Ahl al-Ḥadîth and Ahl al-Ra'y parties on the debate. From time to time, both sides used the textual criticism method by resorting to the Qur’ân, the authentic narrations and their mind. It can be said that the supporters of the Bişr al-Marisî resorted to textual criticism in order to reasonably interpret the narration. On the other hand, using the textual criticism as an objection to a certain narrative, ‘Uthmân al-Dârimî might have aimed to reject the interpretation of the narrative at the same time.

There is one more point to discuss with regard to the debates of the parties on ḥadîths. In a broad sense, the approach of Bişr al-Marisî towards understanding and interpreting the meaning and the intention of discontinued/halted ḥadîths (athar) can be evaluated as "understanding the text of the ḥadîth". How much he influenced the "understanding the text of the ḥadîth" understanding, and how much he contributed to it can only be revealed with a separate examination. Likewise, it is seen that ‘Uthmân al-Dârimî’s literalist approach has an effect on next generations and especially on the scholars who are close to Hanbalî and Salafî schools. His influence is most evident on Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728/1328) and his disciple Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350). The fact that in almost all of his works, Ibn Taymiyyah extensively quoted from ‘Uthmân al-Dârimî, urged his students to read ‘Uthmân al-Dârimî’s works. The same recommendations were also made by Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, which shows that ‘Uthmân al-Dârimî influenced these two composers. However, the degree of this influence and the extent to which the thoughts of ‘Uthmân al-Dârimî reflected or were adopted by the generations representing Salafî movement can only be revealed with another study.

⁸⁹ For information please see Ibn Taymiyyah, *Mejmû‘ al-fatâwâ* , 5: 23; Jamâl al-Dîn al-Qâsimî, *Târîkh al-Jahmiyya wa al-Mu‘tazila* (Beirut: Muassasa al-Risâla, 1979), 61.

⁹⁰ Abû Nu‘aym Aḥmad b. ‘Abdallâh b. Aḥmad b. Ishâq al-Işfahânî (or al-Işbahânî), *Ḥilyat al-awliyâ’*, (Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1409), 4: 225; Ibn Kathîr, *al-Bidâya*, 12: 554.

REFERENCES

- ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī, Abū Manṣūr ‘Abd al-Qāhir b. Tāhir. *al-Farq bayna al-firaq wa bayān al-firqah al-nājiyah minhum*. Beirut: Dār al-Āfāk al-Jadīde, 1977.
- ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī, ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām b. Nāfi‘ al-Ṣan‘ānī, Abū Bakr al-Yamanī al-Ḥimyarī. *al-Tafsīr*. Ed. Maḥmūd Moḥamed ‘Abduh. 3 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1419.
- ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī. *al-Muṣannaf fi al-ḥadīth*. Ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-A‘zamī. 11 vol. Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1403.
- ‘Abdallāh b. Aḥmad, Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Abdallāh b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal al-Shaybānī al-Marwazī. *al-Sunna*. Ed. Muḥammad b. Sa‘īd b. Sālīm al-Qaḥṭānī. 2 vol. Dammām: Dār Ibn al-Qayyim, 1406/1986.
- Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Shaybānī al-Marwazī, *al-Musnad*. Ed. ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Abdulmuḥsin al-Turkī. 45 vol. Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 2001.
- Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Kitāb al-Zuhd*. Ed. Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Salām Shāhīn. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1999.
- Al-Bayhaqī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī. *al-Asmā’ wa al-ṣifāt*. Ed. ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad al-Ḥāshidī. 2 vol. Jeddah: Maktabah al-Savādī, 1993.
- Al-Bazzār, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ‘Amr al-Bazzār. *al-Musnad (al-Baḥr al-zahḥār)*. Ed. Maḥfūz al-Raḥmān Zeynullāh et al. 18 vol. Madena: Maktabah al-‘Ulūm wa-l-Ḥikam, 1988-2009.
- Budak, Ali. "Haberī Sıfatlara Dair Rivayetlerin Te’vīl Yoluyla Çözümü Bağlamında Râzî’nin Esâsu’t-Takdīs Adlı Eseri". *Hitit Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 10/19 (2011): 37-77
- al-Bukhārī, Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl b. İbrāhīm b. al-Mughīra b. Bardizba al-Ju‘fī al-Bukhārī. *al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣaḥīḥ*. Ed. Muḥammad Zuhayr b. Nāşer. 9 vol. Beirut: Dār Tavk al-Najāt, 1422.
- al-Bukhārī. *Khalk af‘āl al-‘ibād*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Umayra. Riyadh: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, nd.
- Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qāsimī. *Tārīkh al-Jahmiyya wa al-Mu‘tazila*. Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1979.
- Çakın, Kamil. "Teşbīh ve Tecsim Karşısında Bir Hadisçi: Celāluddīn es-Suyûtī". *Dinî Araştırmalar* 4/10 (2001): 7-16.
- Çelebi, İlyas. "Sıfat". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi*. 39: 100-106. Ankara: TDV Publications, 2009.
- al-Dāraquṭnī, Abū Ḥasan ‘Alī b. ‘Umar b. Aḥmad b. Maḥdī al-Dāraquṭnī. *Ru‘yatullāh*. Zerkā: Maktabah al-Manār, 1411.
- al-Dārimī, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dārimī. *al-Sunan*. Ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad al-Dārānī. 4 vol. S.l.: Dār al-Mughni, 2000.
- Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. al-Ash‘ath b. İshāq al-Azdī al-Sijistānī. *al-Sunan*. Ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī l-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd. 4 vol. Beirut: al-Maktabah al-‘Asriyyah, nd.
- Abū Nu‘aym Aḥmad b. ‘Abdallāh b. Aḥmad b. İshāq al-İşfahānī (or al-İşbahānī). *Ḥilyat al-awliyā’*. 10 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1409.
- Abū Ya‘lā Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Farrā‘. *Ibtāl al-ta’wīlāt li-akḥbār al-ṣifāt*. Ed. Muḥammad b. Ḥamd al-Najdī. 2 vol. Kuwait: Dār İläf al-Dawla, nd.
- Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Abū ‘Abdallāh Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Umar. *Mafātihu-l-ghayb (al-Tafsīr al-kabīr)*. 32 vol. Beirut: Dār İhyā’ al-Turas al-Arabī, 1420.
- Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī. *Asās al-taqdīs*. Ed. Aḥmad Hījāzī al-Sakkā. Cairo: Maktaba al-Kulliyāt al-Azhariyya, 1406/1986.
- Al-Ghazālī, Ḥujjat al-İslām Abū Ḥamīd Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Al-Ghazālī. *İhyā’u ‘ulūm al-dīn*. 4 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifa, nd.

- Al-Ghazâlî, Hujjat al-Islâm Abû Hâmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Al-Ghazâlî *al-Iqtisād fî-l-îtikād*. Ed. ‘Abdallâh Muḥammad al-Khalîlî. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 2004.
- Al-Ghazâlî, Hujjat al-Islâm Abû Hâmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Al-Ghazâlî. *Qavā'id al-‘akā'id*. Ed. Mūsâ Muḥammad ‘Alî. Beirut: ‘Ālem al-Kutub, 1985.
- Görmez, Mehmet. "Fikhü'l-Hadîs". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 13: 547-549. Ankara: TDV Publications, 1995.
- Al-Ḥakamî, Hâfîz b. Aḥmad b. ‘Alî al-Ḥakamî. *Ma‘ârij al-qabûl*. Ed. ‘Umar b. Maḥmûd Abû ‘Umar. Dâr Ibn al-Kayyim, 1410/1990.
- Al-Ḥâkim al-Naysâbüri, Abû ‘Abdallâh Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallâh al-Naysâbüri. *al-Mustadrak ‘alâ al-Şaḥîḥayn*. Ed. Muştafa ‘Abd al-kâdir ‘Atâ. 4 vol. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1990.
- Al-Ḥâkim al-Naysâbüri *Ma‘rifat ‘ulûm al-(uşûl al-) ḥadîth*. Ed. al-Sayyid Mu‘azzam Hosain. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1977.
- Al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî, Abû Bakr Aḥmad b. ‘Alî al-Baghdâdî. *Târikhu Baghdâd*. Ed. Muştafa ‘Abd al-İkâdir ‘Atâ. 24 vol. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1417.
- Al-Khattâbî, Abû Sulaymân Ḥamd (Aḥmed) b. Muḥammad al-Khattâbî. *Ma‘âlim al-Sunan*. 4 vol. Aleppo: al-Matba‘a al-‘Ilmiyya, 1932.
- Ibn ‘Asâkir, Abû-l-Kâsım ‘Alî b. al-Ḥasan al-Dimashqî. *Târikhu madîna Dimashq*. Ed. ‘Amr b. Gharâme al-‘Amrawî. 80 vol. Beirut: Dâr al-Fîkr, 1995.
- Ibn Baṭṭâl, Abû-l-Ḥasan ‘Alî b. Khalaf al-Qurtubî. *Sharḥ al-Jami‘ al-Şaḥîḥ*. Ed. Abû Tamîm Yâser b. İbrâhîm. 10 vol. Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd, 2003.
- Ibn Abî ‘Âşim, Abû Bakr Aḥmad b. ‘Amr al-Shaibânî. *al-Āḥād ve’l-mathânî*. Ed. Bâsim Fayşal Aḥmad al-Jawâbira. 6 vol. Riyadh: Dâr al-Râya, 1991.
- Ibn Abî Hâtim, Abû Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmân b. Muḥammad al-Râzî. *Ādâb al-Shfi‘î wa manâqibuh*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Ghanî ‘Abd al-Khâliq. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 2003.
- Ibn Abî Hâtim, Abû Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmân b. Muḥammad al-Râzî. *al-Marâsîl*. Ed. Shukrallâh Ni‘matallâh Kûjânî. Beirut: Muassasa al-Risâla, 1397.
- Ibn Abî Tâhir, Abû-l-Faḍl Aḥmad b. Abî Tâhir Ṭayfûr al-Marwazî. *Târikhu (Kitâbu) Baghdâd*. Ed. Sayed ‘Izzet al-Attâr al-Ḥusaynî. Cairo: Maktaba al-Khanci, 2002.
- Ibn Fûrek, Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-İsfahânî. *Mushkil al-ḥadîth wa bayānuh*. Ed. Mūsâ Muḥammad ‘Alî. Beirut: ‘Ālem al-Kutub, 1985.
- Ibn Hajar al-Ḥaytamî, Abû-l-‘Abbâs Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmed b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaytamî. *al-Zawâcîr ‘an iqtirâf al-kabâ’ir*. 2 vol. Beirut: Dâr al-Fîkr, 1987.
- Ibn Hibbân, Abû Hâtim Muḥammad b. Hibbân al-Bustî. *al-Musnad al-Şaḥîḥ ‘alâ at-taqâsîm wa-l-anvâ’*. Ed. Şu‘aib al-Arnaût. 18 vol. Beirut: Muassasa al-Risâla, 1988.
- Ibn Khuzayma, Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. İshâq b. Khuzayma al-Sulamî al-Naysâbüri. *al-Şaḥîḥ*. Ed. Muḥammad Muştafa al-A‘zamî. 2 vol. Beirut: al-Maktab al-İslâmî, 2003.
- Ibn Khuzayma, Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. İshâq b. Khuzayma al-Sulamî al-Naysâbüri. *Kitâb al-Tawḥîd*. Ed. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz b. İbrâhîm al-Shahvân. 2 vol. Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd, 1994.
- Ibn Kathîr, ‘İmâd al-Dîn Abû-l-Fedâ’ İsmâ‘îl b. ‘Umar Ibn Kathîr. *al-Bidâya wa-l-nehâye*. Ed. Ali Şîrî. 14 vol. Beirut: Dâr İhyâ’ al-Turath al-Arabî, 1988.
- Ibn Quṭayba, Abû Muḥammad ‘Abdullâh b. Muslim al-Dînawarî. *Ta’wîl mukhtalif al-ḥadîth*. Beirut: al-Maktab al-İslâmî, 1999.
- Ibn Taymiyyah, Abû-l-‘Abbâs Taqî al-Dîn Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ḥalîm al-Ḥarrânî. *Bayānu talbîs al-Jahmiyya*. Ed. scholars delegation. 10 vol. Madina: Majma‘ al-Malik Fahd, 1426.

- Ibn Taymiyyah. *Mejmu' al-fatāwā*. Ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Qāsim. 35 vol. Madina: Majma' al-Malik Fahd, 1995.
- Ibn al-'Arabī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Abdallāh al-Ma'āfirī. *Kitāb al-Masālik fi sharḥi Muvaṭṭa' Mālik*. Ed. Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn al-Sulaymānī et al. 7 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Garb al-Islāmī, 2007.
- Ibn al-Athīr, Abū-l-Ḥasan 'Iz al-Dīn Ali b. Muḥammad al-Jazarī. *al-Kāmil fi al-tārīkh*. Ed. 'Umar 'Abd al-Salām Tadmurī. 10 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Arabī, 1997.
- Ibn al-Athīr, Abū-l-Sa'ādāt Majd al-Dīn al-Mubārak b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Jazarī. *al-Nihāyah fi gharīb al-ḥadīth wa-l-athar*. Ed. Ṭāhir Aḥmad al-Zāwī, Maḥmud Muḥammad al-Tanāhī. 5 vols. Beirut: al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah, 1979.
- Ibn al-Kharrāt, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥaq b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ishbīlī. *al-Aḥkām al-kubrā fi-l-ḥadīth*. Ed. Abū 'Abdallāh Ḥusayn b. Ukkāsha. 5 vol. Riyadh: Maktaba al-Rushd, 2001.
- Ibn al-Mubārak, Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Abdallāh b. Mubārak al-Marwazī. *Kitāb al-Zuhd wa-l-raqā'iq*. Ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-A'zamī. 2 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, nd.
- Ibn al-'Uthaymīn, Muḥammad b. Şālīh b. Muḥammad al-'Uthaymīn. *al-Kawā'id al-muthlā fi şifātillāh wa asmā'ih al-ḥusnā*. Madina: al-Jāmi'ah al-Islāmiyyah, 2001.
- Ibn al-'Uthaymīn. *Asmā'ullāh ve şifātuh ve mawqif Ahl al-sunnah minhā*. S.l.: Dār al-Sharī'a, 2003.
- al-Isfarāyīnī, Abū-l-Muzaffer 'Imād al-Dīn Shahfūr (Shāhfūr) b. Ṭāhir al-Isfarāyīnī. *al-Tabşir fi-l-dīn wa tamyiz al-firqah al-nājiyyah 'an al-firaq al-hālikīn*. Ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt. Beirut: 'Ālem al-Kutub, 1983.
- al-Kāsānī, 'Ālā al-Dīn Abū Bakr b. Mas'ūd al-Kāsānī. *Badā'i' al-şanā'i' fi tartīb al-şarā'i'*. 7 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1986.
- Kılavuz, Ahmet Saim. "Bişr b. Gıyās el-Merīsī". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi*. 6: 220-221. Ankara: TDV Publications, 1992.
- Qiwām al-Sunnah, Abū-l-Kāsim Qiwām al-Sunnah Ismā'īl b. Muḥammad al-Isfahānī. *Siyar al-salaf al-şālīḥīn*. Ed. Karam b. Ḥilmi b. Farḥāt. Riyadh: Dār al-Rāya, nd.
- Al-Qurashī, Abū Muḥammad Muḥyiddīn 'Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad al-Qurashī. *al-Jawāhīr al-muḍiyyah fi ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanafiyye*. 2 vol. Karachi: Mīr Muḥammad Kutupkhāne, nd.
- al-Qurtubī, Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abi Bakr. *al-Jāmi' li-aḥkām al-Qur'ān*. Ed. 'Abdallāh b. 'Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī. 20 vol. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Misriyyah, 1964.
- Al-Laknawī, Abū-l-Ḥasenāt Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥay b. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥalīm al-Laknawī. *al-Fawā'id al-bahiyyah fi tarājim al-Ḥanafiyah*. Ed. Sayyid Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn Abū Firās al-Nu'mānī. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-İslāmī, nd.
- Al-Māwardī, Abū-l-Ḥasen 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Māwardī. *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. Ed. Sayyid b. 'Abd al-Maqsūd b. 'Abd al-Rahīm. 6 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, nd.
- Mar'ī b. Yūsuf, Zayn al-Dīn b. Mar'ī b. Yūsuf al-Karmī. *Akāwīl al-thikāt fi ta'wīl al-asmā' wa-l-şifāt wa-l-āyāt al-muḥkamāt wa-l-mutashābihāt*. Ed. Şu'aib al-Arnaūt. Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1985.
- al-Marwazī, Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Naşr al-Marwazī. *Ta'zīmu qadr al-şalāt*. Ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Firyuvā'i. 2 vol. Madina: Maktabah al-Dār, 1406/1986.
- Muslim, Abū-l-Ḥusayn Muslim b. al-Hajjāj al-Kushayrī. *al-Jāmi' al-Şāḥīḥ*. Ed. Muḥammad Fu'ād 'Abd al-Bāqī. 5 vol. Beirut: Dār Ihyā' al-Turas al-Arabī, 1955-1956.
- 'Uthmān al-Dārimī, Abū Sa'īd 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd al-Dārimī. *al-Rad 'alā al-Jahmiyyah*. Ed. Badr b. 'Abdallāh al-Badr. Kuwait: Dār Ibn al-Athīr, 1995.
- 'Uthmān al-Dārimī. *Naqd al-Imām Abi Sa'īd 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd 'alā al-Marīsīyyi al-Jahmiyyi al-'anid fimā'iftarā 'alallāhi min al-tawḥīd (al-Naqd 'alā al-Marīsī)*. Ed. Raşīd b. Ḥasan al-Alma'ī. 2 vol. Riyadh: Maktaba al-Rushd, 1998.

- Öncü, Mustafa. "Dini Kutsal Metinlerde Allah İçin Tecsim Ve Teşbih İfade Eden Lafızların Arap Diline Göre Yorumlanması (Eş'arilik Doktrini Bağlamında)". *Uluslararası İmam Eş'ari ve Eş'arilik Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. Ed. Cemallettin Erdemci-Fadıl Ayğan, 2: 681-692. İstanbul: Beyan Publications, 2015.
- Al-Rüyānī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Hārūn al-Rüyānī. *al-Musnad*. Ed. Ayman 'Ali Abū Yamānī. 2 vol. Cairo: Muassasah Qurṭuba, 1416.
- Al-Sam'ānī, Abū Sa'd 'Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad al-Sam'ānī. *al-Ansāb*. Ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yaḥyā al-Mu'allimī al-Yamanī et al. Hyderabad: Majlisu Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-Othmaniyya, 1382/1962.
- Al-Subqī, Abū Naşr Tāj al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. 'Alī al-Subqī. *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah al-kubrā*. Ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad at-Tanāhī-'Abd al-Fattāh Muḥammad al-Ḥulv. 10 vol. Cairo: Dāru Hicr, 1413/1992.
- Al-Shirāzī, Abū Ishāq Jamāl al-Dīn İbrāhīm b. 'Alī al-Shirāzī. *Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahā'*. Ed. İhsān 'Abbās. Beirut: Dār a-Rā'id al-'Arabī, 1970.
- Al-Ṭabarānī, Abū l-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī Sulaymān b. Aḥmad al-Ṭabarānī. *al-Mu'jam al-kabīr*. Ed. Ḥamdī 'Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī. 25 vol. Cairo: Maktabu Ibn Taymiyyah, 1994.
- Al-Ṭayālīsī, Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī. *al-Musnad*. Ed. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī. 4 vol. Cairo: Dāru Hicr, 1419/1999.
- Al-Tirmidhī, Abū 'İsā Muḥammad b. 'İsā al-Tirmidhī. *Sunan al-Tirmidhī (al-Jāmi' al-Şaḥīḥ, al-Jāmi' al-kabīr)*. Ed. Bashār 'Awwād Ma'rūf. 5 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Gharbī al-Islāmī, 1998.
- Al-Tirmidhī. *al-'İlal al-kabīr*. Ed. Subḥi Sāmerrā'ī et al. Beirut: 'Ālem al-Kutub, 1409.
- Van Ess, Josef. "Mu'tezile: İslām'ın Akılcı Yorumu-1". Trc. Veysel Kanar *Harran Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 13, sy. 20 (2008): 291-299.
- Yāqūt al-Hamawī, Abū 'Abdallāh Shihāb al-Dīn b. 'Abdallāh al-Hamawī. *Mu'jam al-udabā' (Ṭabaqāt al-udabā')*. Ed. İhsān 'Abbās. 7 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Gharbī al-Islāmī, 1993.
- Yücel, Ahmet. *Hadis Tarihi*. 8. Baskı. İstanbul: İFAV Publications, 2012.
- al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. 'Uthmān b. Qāymāz b. 'Abdallāh al-Turkumānī al-Fāriqī al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi'ī. *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'*. Ed. Shu'aib al-Arnaūt et al. 25 vol. Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1405/1985.
- al-Dhahabī. *Tārīkh al-Islām wa vafayāt al-(tabakāt al-)mashāhīr wa-l-a'lām*. Ed. 'Umar Abdussalām al-Tadmūrī. 52 vol. Beirut: Dār al-Kātib al-'Arabī, 1413/1993.