

## Sünnî ve Şii Makâlât Geleneğinde Zeydiyye'nin Tanıtımı: Ebu'l Hasan el-Eř'ari ve Sa'd b. Abdullah el-Kummi'nin Makâlât'ın Karşılařtırılmalı Bir Yaklaşım

The Presentation of Zaydiyya in Sunnî and Shi'ite Maqâlât Tradition: A Comparative Approach to the Maqâlât of Abū l-Ĥasan al-Ash'arî and Sa'd b. Abdullah al-Qummî

Aydın BAYRAM\*

### Öz

Şia'nın ortaya çıkışından günümüze kadar ulaşan ana kollarından biri olan Zeydilik, itikadi ve siyasi görüşleriyle Şilik içerisinde Ehl-i Sünnet'e en yakın zümre olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Hz. Ali'nin beşinci kuşaktan torunu olan Zeyd b. Ali (ö. 122/740), Emeviler'e karşı başlatmış olduğu isyan hareketinde imametle ilgili görüşlerinden dolayı pek çok Şii tarafından yalnız bırakılmıştır. Zeyd b. Ali'nin görüşlerini benimseyen ve onu takip edenler zamanla birtakım görüş ayrılıkları yaşamışlardır. Bu çalışmada, ilk dönem kelim ve mezhepler tarihi yazım türlerinden olan makalat geleneği içerisinde önemli bir yeri olan Ebu'l Hasan el-Eř'ari'nin (ö.324/935-6) *Maqâlâtü'l İslâmiyyîn ve'ĥtilâfû'l-muřallîn* adlı eseri ile Sa'd b. Abdillâh el-Kummi'nin (ö.307/913-4) *Kitâbu'l-maqâlât ve'l-fıraĥ* adlı eserinde karşılařtırılmalı olarak Zeydiyye mezhebinin (alt kolları ve itikâdi görüşleri) nasıl incelendięi ele

### Abstract

Zaydiyya, which is one of the main branches of Shi'a that has survived until today, is considered to be the closest group to Sunnism with its theological and political views. Zayd b. 'Alî (d. 122/740), the grandson of 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib in the fifth generation, was left alone by the majority of the Shi'ites due to his views on the imamate in the rebellion he started against the Umayyads. Those who adopted Zayd b. 'Alî's views and followed him experienced some differences on their opinions over time. From a comparative perspective, this study deals with how Zaydiyya and its subsects being examined in some early samples of maqâlât tradition (one of the heresiography types) namely, *Maqâlât al-islâmiyyîn wa-iĥtilâf al-muřallîn* written by Abū l-Ĥasan 'Alî ibn İsmâ'îl ibn İřĥâq al-Ash'arî (d. 324/935-6) and *Kitâb al-maqâlât wa'l-fıraĥ* written by Sa'd b. Abdillâh al-Qummî (d. 307/913-4). The main purpose of this

\* Dr., Artvin Çoruh University, Faculty of Theology, Department of Main Islamic Sciences, The History of Islamic Sects, Artvin, Turkey/ e-mail: aydinbayram@artvin.edu.tr/ ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1620-9859

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi, Temel İslam Bilimleri, İslam Mezhepleri Tarihi, Artvin, Türkiye/ e-mail: aydinbayram@artvin.edu.tr/ ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1620-9859

Başvuru   Submission	Kabul   Accept	Yayın   Publish
31.05.2022	21.06.2022	30.06.2022
DOI	10.18403/emakalat.1124305	

alınacaktır. Şia içerisinde neş'et etmiş bir mezhebin hem Ehl-i Sünnet'in hem de Şiâ'nın otorite kabul ettiği kelimeler veya mezhepler tarihçileri tarafından nasıl tasvir edildiğini ortaya koyarak karşılaştırmalı bir analizini yapmak bu çalışmanın temel gayesidir. Bu yazı, araştırma ve yayın etik kurallarına uyulmak suretiyle hazırlanmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** İslam Mezhepleri Tarihi, Zeydiyye, Makâlât, Eş'ari, Kummi

study is to make a comparative analysis by revealing how a branch of Shī'a is described by two authoritative figures accepted in both Sunnī and Shī'a as far as the history of Islamic sects concerned. This article has been prepared in accordance with research and publication ethical rules.

**Keywords:** The History of Islamic Sects, Zaydiyya, Maqālāt, al-Ash'arī, al-Qummī

### Introduction

In the history of Islamic sects, the works with the type of *maqālāt* (literally articles) has a significant importance in giving details about schools of thought and sects. Even, in early days of Islamic history, this branch of Islamic sciences used to be called as "*maqālāt, 'ilm al-maqālāt, 'ilm al-maqālāt wa'l-firāq*".<sup>1</sup> From the first century of Islam to the tenth, that kind of works intensely were written in order to explain and advocate a certain group or sect's belief and practices. Therefore, some writers were called "*ashābu'l-maqālāt*" because they tried to explain various incidents happened after the Prophet Muhammad and advocate their own sect. From the murder of the third caliph (Uthmān b. 'Affān) to the civil wars (Camel and Şiffin), and the status of caliphate/imāmate etc. those writes dealt with these issues in terms of faith and law as well as socio-political point of view.<sup>2</sup> Later on these works were generally accumulated, classified and analysed by successor writers in the history of Islamic sects that since then these works has shed light on the field.

This paper investigates two samples of that kind of literature in the field. One belongs to Sa'd b. 'Abd Allah al-Qummī (d. 307/913-4), who is famous heresiography writer within Shī'a sect. The other one

---

<sup>1</sup> Ebū Mansur Abdülkahir b Tahir b Muhammed Temimi Abdülkahir Bağdadi, *Mezhepler arasındaki farklar: el-Fark beyne'l-firak*, çev. Ethem Ruhi Fırlalı (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1991), 13.

<sup>2</sup> Mustafa Akman, "İtikadi Mezhepler Tarihinin Kaynakları: İçerik ve özellikleri", *Kırklareli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 3/2 (02 Temmuz 2019), 172.

was written by Abū l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī (d. 324/935-6), who is a pioneer in Sunnīsm. Both writers were contemporary and their works illustrated the views of different sects and groups of that time. It is useful here to introduce briefly these works in terms of content and method.

Chronologically, to begin with the work of al-Qummī that his *kitāb al-maqālāt wa'l-firāq* is one of the ancient samples in the history of Islamic sects. It has been mentioned in the sources with different names, such as *maqālātu'l-imāmīyya*, *maqālātu'l-imāmīyya wa'l-firāq wa asmāuhā wa sunūfuhā*. The work is also very similar in terms of content with Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī's (d.300/912) work called *firāqu's-Shī'a* that makes confusion in academic milieu. Until recently, within Shī'a tradition it was assumed that the work of al-Qummī as *firāqu's-Shī'a*,<sup>3</sup> nor was its existence known. However, in 1963 Muhammad Javad Mashkur published al-Qummī's *maqālāt wa'l-firāq* based on a copy existed in the library of Sultānī Sheik al-Islami, ex-president of Iran National Assembly.<sup>4</sup> It is obvious that there are very similarities between *firāqu's-Shī'a* and *maqālāt wa'l-firāq*, when we consider the latter was written later, it can be said the former's influence on it. Both belong to Shī'a theologians and heresiography writers that are important reflecting their own views and methodology in evaluating Shī'a sects. In Turkey, these two works were translated as a single book titled "*Şī' Fırkalar*" (Shī'a Sects) because of content similarity.<sup>5</sup> When al-Nawbakhtī and

<sup>3</sup> The prominent figures within Shī'a tradition, for example Abbas Iqbal Ash-tiyani, believed in *firāqu's-Shī'a* published by Helmut Ritter in Istanbul belonged to Sa'd b. `Abd Allah al-Qummī. But later on, some others such as Mirza Fadhlullah Dhiyaī admitted *firāqu's-Shī'a* belonged to Hasan b. Musa Nevbahti. See. Muhammed Cevād Meşkūr, "Sa'd b. Abdillāh Eş'arī Kummi'nin 'Kitābu'l-Makālāt'ı ve Nevbahti'nin 'Fıraku's-Şia' Eseri ile Mukayesesi", çev. Şahin Ahmetoğlu, *Iğdır Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 1 (01 Mayıs 2013), 228.

<sup>4</sup> Mustafa Öz, "el-Makālāt ve'l-Fırak", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2003), 27/405.

<sup>5</sup> Ebu Halef el-Kummi, *Şī' fırkalar: Kitābu'l-makālāt ve'l-fırak/Fıraku's-Şia*, çev. Hasan Onat, Sabri Hizmetli, Sönmez Kutlu, Ramazan Şimşek (Ankara: Ankara Okulu, 2004).

al-Qummî 's afore mentioned books are compared, it has been concluded that the work of the latter is more comprehensive than the former. Extra information in some places and thirty more pages throughout the manuscript in al-Qummî 's work are significant in proving that claim.<sup>6</sup>

The book of *kitâb al-maqâlât wa'l-firâq* deals mainly with the four sects, namely the Shî'a, Murji'a, Mu'tazila and Khawârij,<sup>7</sup> by giving details in their subsects and views on politics and theology. The book focuses on the imâmate or leadership issue after the Prophet Muhammad, and classifies the sects, accordingly.<sup>8</sup> After a general introduction about other sects, it generally examines Shî'a sub-sects emerged after the death of each imam beginning from 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib. Especially, different views emerged after the death of eleventh imam, Hasan al- 'Askarî, were classified as fifteen sects.<sup>9</sup>

The second book subjected in this study is *Maqâlât al-islâmîyîn wa-ihtilâf al-musallîn* written by Abû l-Hasan al-Ash'arî (d. 936). He gained early Islamic education under the tutorship of his step-father, Abu 'Alî al-Jubbai (d. 916) who was one of the leading Mu'tazilî theologians in Basra at that time. By the age of forty, al-Ash'arî advocated the Mu'tazilî methodology and some occasions he represented that school of thought in discussion platforms and study circles. From time to time, he discussed some theological issues in theory with Abû 'Alî al-Jubbâî (d.303/916) that resulted in his leaving from Mu'tazilî thought.<sup>10</sup> In 912 or so, he finally announced not to be a Mu'tazilî anymore and moved to Baghdad where he lived until his death. He

---

<sup>6</sup> Muhammed Cevâd Meşkûr, "Sa'd b. Abdillâh Eş'arî Kummi'nin 'Kitabu'l-Makâlât'ı ve Nevbahtî'nin 'Fıraku's-Şia' Eseri ile Mukayesesi", 228-229.

<sup>7</sup> Öz, "el-Makâlât ve'l-Fırak", 27/405.

<sup>8</sup> Akman, "İtikadi Mezhepler Tarihinin Kaynakları", 174.

<sup>9</sup> Öz, "el-Makâlât ve'l-Fırak", 27/405.

<sup>10</sup> Walter C. Klein, *Abu'l-Hasan 'Ali ibn Ismail al-As'ari's al-Ibanah 'an Usul ad-Diyânah (The Elucidation of Islâm's Foundation): A Translation with Introduction and Notes* (New York: American Oriental Society), 27-28.

declared he was following the way and methodology of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d.241/ 855), who was an eminent figure in Salaf aqidah.<sup>11</sup> Al-Ash'arī wrote many treaties and books in Islamic theology and law that the number of these works vary from fifty-five<sup>12</sup> to a hundred and even three-hundreds.<sup>13</sup> With his enthusiasm and ability, he became one of the leading figures of ahl al-Sunnah theology in the tenth century that after his death his pupils succeed in his theory and views leading to form a school of thought, Ash'ariyya.

The book of *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn* consists of two main parts: In the first, it initially begins with the discussions and disputes on the issue of caliphate emerged just after the death of the Prophet Muhammad. Then the sects of Muslims are classified as Shī'a, Khawārij, Murji'a, Mu'tazila, Jahmiyya, Ḍirāriyya, Ḥusayniyya, Bakriyya, Aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth and al-Kullābiyya counting to ten. Therefore, it gives more details on each of those sects and their sub-sects. For instance, al-Ash'arī divides the Shī'a in three main groups, namely Ghāliya, Rāfiḍīs (Kaysāniyya and Imāmiyya) and Zaydiyya. In total, he reaches the number of forty-five in classifying the Shī'a with sub-sects and divisions. The second part of the book focuses on detailed theological issues such as existence, the attributes of Allah, the will of human, angels, jinn, satan and other subjects relevant with hereafter and resurrection.<sup>14</sup>

The reasons why these two books have been chosen for this study are firstly both are the most ancient samples that reached us as far as Islamic heresiography concerned. Bearing the formation of Zaydiyya in mind in the first half of the eighth century, the time of both works are the closest amongst existing literature on that field. Secondly, both are accepted in the field as canonical either by Sunnī

<sup>11</sup> İrfan Abdülhamid Fettah, "Ebū'l-Hasen el-Eṣ'arī", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995), 11/444.

<sup>12</sup> Klein, *Abu'l-Hasan 'Ali ibn Isma'il al-As'ari's al-Ibanah 'an Usul ad-Diyānah (The Elucidation of Islām's Foundation): A Translation with Introduction and Notes*, 28.

<sup>13</sup> Fettah, "Ebū'l-Hasen el-Eṣ'arī", 11/447.

<sup>14</sup> Hasan Onat, "Maqālātü'l-İslāmiyyīn ve'htilāfü'l-muṣallīn", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2003), 27/406.

or Shī'a community. The objectivity of these works is well known<sup>15</sup> in the field that most researchers refer to these works when studying early Islamic sects. Hence, studying a Shī'a sub-sect from the narration of Sunnī and Shī'a authors would contribute to the field from a comparative perspective. Methodologically, it will be illustrated the definition and attributes of Zaydiyya according to both narrators. In doing so, the text is going to be translated from Arabic. Both authors' name end with the affiliation to tribe of al-Ash'arī, which originally came from Yemen and settled in Iraq lands. To differ one from the other, I refer to Abū l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī with his renowned short name as al-Ash'arī; whereas for Sa'd b. Abdillāh al-Qummī I prefer his famous name as al-Qummī. Henceforth, for their works I will use a short name *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn* to point out al-Ash'arī's book; *Kitāb al-maqālāt* for al-Qummī's book.

In what follows, I will initially reflect the narrations of both authors about Zaydiyya and its sub-sects, respectively. Then, I will sort theological and political views of Zaydiyya according to these two books. While doing so, I will compare them by analysing the content about Zaydiyya and its distinctive feature differing them from the mainstream of Shī'a.

### 1. Zaydiyya and its sub-sects according to al-Ash'arī

According to the narration of al-Ash'arī, the third of Shī'a's main sects is Zaydiyya. It is based on theological and political views of Zayd b. 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Abī Tālib, who died in a battle against Umayyads in 121/739. As a descendant of ahl al-bayt, Zayd was the inherent of the leadership in the family that he was given oath in Kufa during the time of Hishām b 'Abd al-Malik (d.125/743), the Umayyad

---

<sup>15</sup> el-Kummi, *Şū firkaalar: Kitābu'l-makālāt ve'l-frak/Fıraku's-Şia*, 46; Onat, "Maqālātü'l-İslāmīyīn ve'htilāfü'l-muşallīn", 27/406-407; Akman, "İtikadi Mezhepler Tarihinin Kaynakları", 178; Klein, *Abu'l-Hasan 'Ali ibn Ismail al-As'ari's al-Ibanah 'an Usul ad-Diyānah (The Elucidation of Islām's Foundation): A Translation with Introduction and Notes*, 30; Bağdadi, *Mezhepler arasındaki farklar*, 19; Ebū'l-Hasan İbn Ebu Bişr Ali b İsmail b İshak Eş'ari, *İlk dönem İslam mezhepleri*, çev. Mehmet Dalkılıç; Ömer Aydın (İstanbul: Kabcacı Yayinevi, 2005), 23.

Caliph. Al-Ash'arī says that Zayd was thinking 'Alī, son-in-law of the Prophet Muhammad, was the most respected one amongst the companions of the Prophet; was seeing Abū Bakr (d.13/634) and 'Umar (d.23/644)-the first and second caliph in Islamic history- as friend; and according to him it was permissible to rebel against any tyrant leader. In the time of rebellion against Kufa's governor, Yusuf b. 'Umar (d.126/744), Zayd witnessed that some of his fans were cursing Abū Bakr and 'Umar. Thus, he banned such attitudes against the first and second caliph of Islam. As a reaction to this banning, the majority of his fans left him. Thereby, Zayd said to them "ra-fadthumūnī" literally means "you left me". In that point, al-Ash'arī adds some information about the source of naming al-Rāfiḍa coming from that incident. A minority within Shī'a stayed with Zayd and challenged against the army of Yusuf b. 'Umar, and finally he and his followers were killed.<sup>16</sup>

### 1.1. al-Jārūdiyya

Those who follow the sayings of Abū'l Jārūd (d.150/767) that he claimed the Prophet appointed 'Alī b. Abī Tālib as a caliph not by name but by attribute. According to this sect, after the Prophet Muhammad, the political and religious leader of the Muslim community must be 'Alī. However, in fact the Muslim community by abandoning to follow 'Alī as imam, they went astray and became infidels. For their belief, after 'Alī the imam would be Ḥasan and after him, it would be Ḥusayn.

Al-Jārūdiyya further subdivided into two sections: the first argues that 'Alī appointed Ḥasan by divine order (based on Qur'an and Sunnah) and Ḥasan maintained that tradition by appointing Ḥusayn after himself. But there is a consultation (shūra) among the offspring after Ḥasan and Ḥusayn. If one of the children of those two (with his supreme knowledge and morality) emerge by inviting to the way of his lordship, he will be imam of the Muslim community. The other sect

<sup>16</sup> Abū al-Hasan 'Alī ibn İsmā'īl ibn İshāq al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1963), 129-130.

believes that the Prophet Muhammad appointed subsequently Ali, Hasan and Husayn based on revelation.

Al-Jārūdiyya has three subjects in terms of immortality of certain people. The first argued that Muhammad b. Abdillāh b. al-Ḥasan did not die and would re-emerge and be victorious. The second believed that Muhammad b. al-Qasim, the lord of Ta'likan, where a name of a town near Balkh or a city around Qazvin, was alive and would be triumph against others. And the third one said similar things for the governor of Kufa, Yaḥyā b. 'Umar.<sup>17</sup>

### 1.2. al-Sulaymāniyya

The second sect within Zaydiyya is al-Sulaymāniyya that consists of friends of Sulaymān b. Jarīr al-Zaydī (d.187/803 or so). They argue the leadership of the community (imāmate) would be defined by consultation (*shūra*), be settled with a contract by two respected members of the community; and the leadership of less virtuous (*al-maḥdūl*) would be valid while more virtuous one (*al-aḥḍal*) existed within the community. Thereby, they admit the caliphate of Abū Bakr and 'Umar.

Al-Ash'arī quotes a narration via Zurqān who transmitted from Sulayman b. Jarīr by saying that the Muslim community (*al-umma*) gave allegiance to Abū Bakr and 'Umar mistakenly. Thus, it was not convenient to call these two as sinner in terms of commentary. He was claiming that the Muslim community missed the best (*al-aṣḥ*) by giving allegiance to Abu Bakr and Omar. However, Sulaymān admitted that 'Alī b. Abī Tālib had priority over 'Uthmān b. 'Affān who was an infidel and deserved to be killed. Sulaymān argued more saying that he had a proof on 'Alī who was not in heresy, there was no fair evidence pointing the opposite, and it was nonsense for ordinary people to deal with such topics. Because such a topic in higher level was essentially incumbent upon whom reached that topic via authentic narrations.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 133-134.

<sup>18</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 135-136.



### 1.3. al-Butriyya (Batriyya)

The third sect within Zaydiyya is al-Butriyya included the friends of Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ b. Ḥayy (d.168-9/784-5) and Abū Isma'īl Kathir an-Navva al-Abtar (d. 169/785-6). The word al-Butriyya comes from the latter's nickname al-Abtar, literally cut off posterity. They believe in that 'Alī b. Abī Tālib is the best man after the Prophet and the most meritorious person for the leadership (imāmate) of the Muslim community. However, it was not a mistake to give allegiance to Abū Bakr and 'Umar since 'Alī gave his right to them. The members of al-Butriyya did not say anything about 'Uthmān and his killers, nor did they blame for his infidelity. They did not accept the return of deceased people to the world (*al-rajā*). They started the imāmate of 'Alī when it was given pledge to him (not from the death of the Prophet Muhammad). It is narrated that Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ stayed away from 'Uthmān in the time revenged from himself.<sup>19</sup>

### 1.4. al-Nu'aymiyya

The fourth sect within Zaydiyya is al-Nu'aymiyya. Those are friends and followers of Nu'aym b. al-Yamān. They argue that 'Alī has the right for the imāmate and he is also the most excellent among people after the Prophet. The Muslim community did not make false implementation by bringing Abū Bakr and 'Umar to the leadership. Whereas, they did make mistake by leaving the most virtuous one. They keep away from those who fight against 'Uthmān and 'Alī, and say that 'Uthmān became infidel.<sup>20</sup>

### 1.5. The Fifth Firqā

Al-Ash'arī does not give any name to define this group but says the fifth firqāh. Those who stay away from Abū Bakr and 'Umar and do not admit the return of deceased people to the world (*al-rajā*).<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 136-137.

<sup>20</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 137.

<sup>21</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 137.

### **1.6. al-Ya'qūbiyya**

The sixth sect within Zaydiyya that accepts Abū Bakr and 'Umar; and turns away from those who turn away from Abū Bakr and 'Umar (*tawallā*). They do not admit the return of deceased people to the world (*al-raj'a*) and they are against those accept that. They are al-Ya'qūbiyya that friends of a man called Ya'qūb.<sup>22</sup>

Al-Ash'arī finishes here his classification of Zaydi sects reflecting their views on the problem of imāmate after the Prophet Muhammad. From that stage onwards, Ash'arī deals with main theological issues put forward by Zaydi sects. But, as it can be seen in the following lines, he does not give a certain group name introduced above. Rather, he aligns some theological topics and describes the view of Zaydi sects by saying Zaydiyya divided in such topic, for instance Allah and his attributions. Thus, it can be said that al-Ash'arī examined Zaydiyya in two sections: political and theological topics. For the first, it revolves around the imāmate issue in which sub-divisions reflected above. He described sub-sects of Zaydiyya according to their approach to the imāmate issue. For theological topics, it is difficult to say that. Because, there is an ambiguity who differs from the others. Al-Ash'arī merely says that Zaydiyya differed in the creation of actions, for example. He reflects Zaydi sects in ordinal numbers, the first, second, and so on. In some topics, he just gives the name of Sulaymān b. Jarīr since he might be an important theologian within Zaydiyya. It is useful here to align these topics in terms of revealing Zaydī theology.

### **1.7. Zaydiyya's theological views according to the narration of al-Ash'arī**

Zaydiyya differed in the possibility of saying *shay'* (literally, a thing) for the Holy and Noble Bestover (*al-Bāri'*) as two: the first one from them, the majority of Zaydiyya, argues that the Holy and Noble Bestover is a thing but not like the objects, nor are they similar to

---

<sup>22</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 137.

Him. The second sect from them do not say the Holy and Noble Bestover as thing. If it is asked to them do you say He is not the thing, they say we do not say He is not the thing.<sup>23</sup>

Zaydiyya disputed in the names and attributions of Allah. They are two sects: the first from them is the friends of Sulaymān b. Jarīr al-Zaydī They argue that the Bestover is all-knower with a knowledge that neither him nor himself apart. His knowledge is a thing, an omnipotent with a power that neither is this power him, nor himself apart. His omnipotence is a thing, and their view is in similar vein in other personal attributes (of Allah), such as the life, the hear, the sight, and others. They do not say the attributes are things, but say the face of Allah (*wajhullah*) is Allah. They claim that Allah- Glorified- is not all-willing in eternity, not seeing the sins ugly in eternity, but in the time of committed. To will something is opposite of seeing ugly. In similar vein, He is not consent in eternity, not angry in eternity; his angry over the infidels is his consent by punishing them; and his consent by punishing them is his angry over them. His consent from the believers is his unwillingness to punish them; his unwillingness to punish them is his consent to forgive them. They said we do not say his angry with the infidels is his consent from the believers. The second sect from them claims that the Holy and Noble Bestower is the All-knower, Omnipotent, all-hearing, all-seeing without a knowledge, life, power, hear, and seeing. They have the same view in other personal attributes. They prohibit to say the Bestower is eternally all-willing, intolerant, consented, and angry.<sup>24</sup>

Zaydiyya divided into two sects in qualifying the power of The Noble and Holy Bestower to persecute or to lie. The first one is the friends of Sulayman b. Jarir az-Zaydī. They claim that the Bestower is not qualified to persecute and oppress. It cannot be said He could not afford, because Allah's persecution and lying is out of question. They did not accept the word of someone saying Allah is omnipotent in persecuting and lying. They saw the impossibility of that question. Sulaymān b. Jarīr replied a question, is Allah omnipotent not to do

<sup>23</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 137-138.

<sup>24</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 138.

something He knew? in following way. Verily, that word has two aspects: if asking person meant something He could not do is one of the things reported, it can not be said whether Allah is omnipotent to do that or not. If it is not reported and something exists in minds, Allah cannot be qualified that. Whoever characterizes him with that is undertaking the impossible. The answer to that is the same with the answer about something, which a report existed it would not be happened. If there is not any report about that and does not exist any doubt in minds, it can be possible to say Allah can afford that. It is possible to say that just because we do not know the unseen (*ghayb*) and there is nothing in our minds to dismiss it. And we see its similar version as being created. The second sect from them argues that the Holy and Noble Bestower can be qualified with the power to persecute and lie or not to persecute and lie. He is the omnipotent to do what he knew and he informed, things not to do and things to do.<sup>25</sup>

Zaydiyya disagreed in the creation of actions. There are two sects: the first from them argues that the human actions are created by Allah. He created, formed and composed the creations when they had not existed. Since they were created later, they have a creator. The second sect within them advocates that human actions are not created by Allah. Nor are they created later on and do not have a creator. These actions are the gain of humans who created, formed, composed, and made.<sup>26</sup>

Zaydiyya subdivided into three sects in the topic of ability (*istitā'a*). The first one says that ability is at the same time with the action, the command is before the action. The thing which belief makes is equal with the thing which blasphemy makes. That is the view of some of the Zaydiyya. The second sect from them claims that the ability exists before the action, and in the time of action it involves with the action by occupying. Human can have ability once he/she acts. It is narrated by some theologians from Sulaymān b. Jarīr in that vein. I read in the book of Sulaymān b. Jarīr that the ability is some of the actor, it has surrounded, mingled with it like two oils. The third sect from

---

<sup>25</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 139.

<sup>26</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 139.

them argues that the ability exists before the action, the command exists before the action. Human cannot be qualified as the one who have ability and potency of an action in the time of being.<sup>27</sup>

Zaydiyya disputed in belief and blasphemy, and divided into two: the first one from them argues that the belief is the knowledge, announcement and refrain from committing things for which there is a punishment for. They name commitment of such things as disbelief, not polytheism or repudiation. But it is a kind of blasphemy in terms of provision. They have the same view on commentators when saying a word that is a rebellion and sin. The second sect from them claims that the belief is the whole of obedience; but disbelief is not commitment of things for which there is punishment. That is the view of their next generations. The majority and pioneers of Zaydiyya has the first view. Zaydiyya all agreed that *murtakīb al-kabīra* (grave sinner) would be punished in the hellfire and would stay in it forever, they would be never evacuated from there. They all agreed that 'Alī b. Abī Tālib was right in his fight and whoever against him in that fight was in error. Zaydiyya divided into two sects in producing personal legal opinion (*ijtihād al-ray*): the first claims that *ijtihād al-ray* is permissible in legal verdicts. Whereas the second denies that.<sup>28</sup>

Zaydiyya all agreed that 'Alī b. Abī Tālib was right in accepting the refereeing by two referees. He applied to the refereeing for fear of corruption in his army. Obviously, he already knew that the imāmate was his right. He tried to bring the Muslims together and thus he ordered to the two referees to judge according to the book of Allah, the Holy and Noble. The two referees made a mistake by not obeying him, but he was right. All Zaydiyya admits that it can be rebelled against cruel leaders by using swords in order to dismiss persecution and replace the truth. All of them see that impermissible to pray behind a sinner (*fājir*), but permissible behind a grave offender (*fāsiq*).<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 140.

<sup>28</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 140-141.

<sup>29</sup> al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 141.

Zaydiyya and al-Rawāfiḍ agreed with the superiority of ‘Alī over other companions of the messenger of Allah (peace and blessing of Allah be upon him) and after the Prophet no one was better than him.<sup>30</sup>

### 1. Zaydiyya and its sub-sects according to al-Qummī

Al-Qummī classifies Islamic sects with four main groups, namely al-Shī’a, al-Murjī’a, al-Muṭazila and al-Khawārij. According to him, the first sect emerged in Islamic history is al-Shī’a. It is the sect of ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib that in the time of Prophet its name was Shī’atu ‘Alī (Alī’s fans) and after the Prophet it was formed by those who believe in ‘Alī’s imāmate and loyal to him. He further gives details in the definition of Shī’a and early figures amongst the companions of the Prophet.<sup>31</sup> As it outlined in the previous section, while al-Ash’arī introduces al-Shī’a with three divisions and deals with Zaydiyya as the third according to his classification<sup>32</sup>, al-Qummī does not start such an introductory vein. Rather, he begins discussing al-Shī’a with the imāmate issue by classifying different views and sects (*firqā*). After reflecting a general Shī’a view about the imāmate,<sup>33</sup> he starts to give information about a *firqā* within Shī’a and ends saying that *firqā* is the pioneers of Batriyya.

#### 2.1. Batriyya

Al-Qummī defines Batriyya with their radical view against the general belief of Shī’a on the imāmate. According to him, a group of them believe in that ‘Alī is the dearest one amongst the companions after the Prophet. With his virtue, past, kinship, and knowledge, ‘Alī was the best of all humans because he was the bravest, most heroic, most generous, most fearful of Allah and the most devout. However, they

---

<sup>30</sup> al-Ash’arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 141.

<sup>31</sup> Sa’d b. Abdillāh al-Ash’arī Ebū Halef al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq* (Tahran: Muassasa-i Matbuat-i Atai, 1963), 15.

<sup>32</sup> al-Ash’arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, 129.

<sup>33</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq*, 15-17.

considered the imāmate of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar as appropriate, and they saw both of them as qualified for this place and this office. They brought the following claims as evidence in this regard: ʿAlī handed this job over to them and agreed to it. He voluntarily pledged allegiance without being pressured and left his right to them. Thereupon, we tolerate ʿAlī and what the Muslims pledge their allegiance to, just as Allah tolerates them for Muslims. Nothing else is lawful (*ḥalāl*) for us and it would not be right to accept anything other than this for anyone from us. Abu Bakr's custody was correct and accurate because of Ali's submission to this and consent. Had it not been for his consent and submission, Abu Bakr would have erred, gone astray, and perished. These are the pioneers of Batriyya.<sup>34</sup>

It can be understood from the above passage that it reflects general views of Zaydi thought in terms of the leadership of the Muslim community. al-Qummī further states a group of people differing from Batriyya and forming another sub-sect. But he does not give any name to define that group, but begins his sentence by saying that a *firqā* separated from Batriyya. The main character of this sect is relying on the consensus of the companions in bringing someone to the caliphate whether from al-Hāshimī or al-Qurayshī tribe. After such a consensus, it is essential to every member of the Muslim community to obey. Otherwise it would be infidel, or in a heretical and ruined situation.<sup>35</sup>

## 2.2. al-Jārūdiyya

The *firqā* called al-Jārūdiyya is a group of people becoming friends of al-Jārūd Ziyad b. al-Mundhir al-Ajamī (d.150/767). al-Qummī reported that they claimed that ʿAlī was the most virtuous amongst companions of the Prophet. They did not consider anyone other than him suitable for the position of caliphate. If anyone keeps ʿAlī away from that position, he/she will be an infidel. The Muslim community became infidel and went astray by abandoning to give allegiance to ʿAlī. Later on, these people believed that the imāmate was transferred

<sup>34</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa'l-firāq*, 17-18.

<sup>35</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa'l-firāq*, 18.

to Ḥasan b. ‘Alī, then to Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī and then the imam would be any children of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn by consultation. Thus if any of these children (who deserve caliphate) rebels, he will be imām of the community. al-Qummī points out that two sects, Batriyya and al-Jārūdiyya have adopted the views of Zayd b. ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn and Zayd b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. Ali. From these two sects, Zaydi sub-sects have emerged.<sup>36</sup>

These sects argued that the imāmate after the messenger of Allah belonged to ‘Alī (may Allah mercy upon him), later to al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn by the appointment of the messenger of Allah and a will from him to them, one after one. When the time of al-Ḥusayn passed, two sons amongst the children of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn became imam, namely ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn and al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan. These sects are not independent from these two imams by knowing which one at first. The imāmate after these two passed to their children. Whoever from the offspring of al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī and ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn claims the imāmate and argues the imāmate for the children of al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī separating from the son of al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan, his imāmate is invalid and he is a deviant, a deflector, and perished. A man from the offspring of al-Ḥusayn and al-Ḥasan confesses for the imāmate, it compromises the imāmate between the children of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn. If they give consent, come to an agreement for one’s imāmate, and give allegiance to him, it is permissible for him to become imam. Whoever from them denies that and appoints a son from just one of these two, that imāmate is not permissible. According to them, that candidate is an apostate from the religion. Their view is the same for whomever claims the imāmate. They argued that the imāmate happened after the appointment of the messenger of Allah, and after the time of al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī it became only settled in choosing one emerged inviting with his sword to the imāmate, with the election of those from the offspring of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn by coming together and giving consent to him. Additionally, it is possible

---

<sup>36</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq*, 18.



to exist more than one imam on condition that they must invite people to the selected imam. Merely a certain imam, who was transmitted all kind of knowledge and authority to himself, can occupy in the office of the messenger of Allah. Because his authority is universal and he is the imam selected by everyone, consented and accepted. The way of all Zaydi sects is the same with the way of Sunnis on legal provisions, religious duties, and inheritance issues.<sup>37</sup>

### 2.3. The Surhūbiyya

A *firqā* claims that the imāmate has passed from al-Ḥusayn to the children of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn. According to this sect, the imāmate only belongs to the descendants of two sons of ‘Alī, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn. The descendants of both in the imāmate issue have equal rights in terms of law. It is an obligatory for everyone to obey one of these descendants announced his imāmate. The person who proclaims his imāmate is at the rank of Ali. Allah has made an obligation to ahl al-Bayt and all humans to accept that imāmate. If his call and sermons are for a consented person within the family of Muhammad, it is the imām. Whoever denies his imāmate and does not support in his duty, he/she is an infidel and frustrated. If any descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, claims to be imam as pulling the curtains and sitting at home, he will be an infidel, polytheist and heretical. Whoever follows to such a claim and supports, they are infidels and polytheist, either. These are from sub-sects of Zaydiyya that called Surhūbiyya and al-Jārūdiyya. These are friends of Abū’l-Jārūd Ziyad b. al-Mundhir attributed al-Jārūdiyya to him, Abū Khālid Yazid ibn Hārūn al-Wāsītī, and Fudhayl b. Zubayr al-Rasāsān.<sup>38</sup>

### 2.4. al-Şabbāḥiyya

Another sect within Zaydiyya is called al-Şabbāḥiyya. These are friends of al-Şabbāḥ al-Muzanī who ordered his fans to announce that

<sup>37</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq*, 19.

<sup>38</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq*, 71.

they were far from Abū Bakr and ʿUmar and declare the belief of the return of a deceased imām (*rajaʿ*).<sup>39</sup>

### 2.5. al-Yaʿqūbiyya

A *firqā* from them called al-Yaʿqūbiyya, are friends of Yaʿqūb b. Adī. They denied *al-rajaʿ*, did not believe in it. They did not keep away from those believed in *al-rajaʿ*, nor did they from Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Muhammad b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn called Abūʿl-Jārūd as Surhūb and said that Surhūb was a blind devil lives in sea. He was blind in terms of sight and heart, may Allah damn him. These joined two sects, which claim ʿAlī was the most virtuous amongst the companions after the Prophet. They all united with Zayd b. ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn in the time of his rebellion in Kufa, and accepted his imāmate. Thus, all of them is called Zaydiyya. However, they differ in the Qurʾān, Sunnah, sharīʿa laws, religious obligations, and history. Because according to Surhūbiyya, lawful (*ḥalāl*) is something that the descendants of Muhammad made lawful; unlawful (*ḥarām*) is whatever they prohibited; and the valid verdicts are their verdicts. The religion the Prophet Muhammad brought from Allah is with them, they know the best in everything whether big or small. Their old and young are identical in terms of knowledge. It is not preferable older to the younger for that. There is no difference between an infant and older one in terms of age.

Some of them say if anyone argues that a scholar’s and an infant’s knowledge is not the same with the knowledge of the messenger of Allah, it will be an infidel and polytheist. They do not need to learn from each other, nor anyone else. The knowledge grows up in their chest as a plant grows with rain. Allah has taught that knowledge to them from his divine grace as he wishes.<sup>40</sup>

Al-Qummī further gives information about why they think in such way and comments on it. According to al-Qummī, the main reason why they have that view is to be against to reserve the imāmate to

---

<sup>39</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt waʿl-firāq*, 71.

<sup>40</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt waʿl-firāq*, 71-72.

certain people among them. If they had not said so, it would have been refuted the idea put forward earlier that everyone among them had the same right in the matter of imāmate. Nobody from them claims rights on the imāmate and obedience unless announcing himself and inviting people with the sword. In the time, they do not do that, none of them is scholar at all. In addition, they were not narrating any information from anyone apart from the narrations from Abū Jafar Muhammad b. ‘Alī and Abu Abdullah Jafar b. Muhammad, a few hadiths coming from Zayd b. ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn, and some information derived from Abdullah b. al-Ḥasan. There is no evidence on their hands to prove these liar and stupid claims put forward. Because they defined imams as knower everything useful and harmful which the Muslim community need to know, from religion to worldly matters.<sup>41</sup>

Some others among them looked the topic from a broader perspective saying that knowledge was equally and jointly distributed between imams and ordinary people. It is permissible for anyone if he takes information which he/she needs in religious and worldly matters from an imam or ordinary. There is no problem in making personal struggle or choosing and picking among the views, if anyone does not find whatever knowledge needed. That is the view of Zaydiyya sect whether they are the powerful (*al-aqwiyyā*) or the weak (*al-ḍuafā*).<sup>42</sup>

### 2.6. al-Ijliyya

*Al-ḍuafā* from them called al-Ijliyya are the friends of Hārūn b. Saīd al-Ijlī. A *firqā* from them is called Batriyya. In fact, these are friends of Kathiru’n-Nawa, al-Ḥasan b. Salih b. Hayy, Sālim b. Abī Hafsa, al-Hakam b. Utaybā, Salamā b. Kuhayl, and Abū Mikdam Ummu Sabit al-Haddād. These are callers of humanity to accept the imāmate of ‘Alī. Later on, these confused the custody of ‘Alī with Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. These are the best within Zaydi sects in the eyes of

<sup>41</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq*, 72-73.

<sup>42</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq*, 72-73.

ahl al-Sunna. Because they accept the imāmate of Abū Bakr while keeping ‘Alī superior. They find Uthmān, Talhā and Zubayr as faulty. They see permissible to support any descendant of ‘Alī when they rebel and take that to the Qur’ānic principle enjoining what is good and forbidding what is wrong. According to them, the claim of anyone from the descendant of ‘Alī for imāmate is true. The main thing in the imāmate is announcement in terms of being imām. Each of Ali’s descendants, no matter what generation, has equal rights on the imāmate. Whereas, the powerful ones from Zaydiyya are the fans of Abū’l-Jārūd , Abū Khalid al-Wasitī, Fudhayl al-Rassān and Mansur b. Abi’l-Aswād.<sup>43</sup>

### 2.7. al-Ḥusayniyya

As for the Zaydiyya known al-Ḥusayniyya, they say that it is incumbent upon for the Muslim community if one from the family of Muhammad invites to Allah and to obey. ‘Alī became imam when he invited humans and announced his imāmate. After him, Ḥusayn became imam only once he rebelled. If he did not do so, he would not be an imam even if he is against Muawiyah and Yazid b. Muawiyah until dying. Later on, Zayd b. ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn, who was killed in Kufa and whose mother was concubine; and Yahya b. Zayd b. Ali, who was killed in Khorasan and whose mother was Rayta b. Abī Hashim Abdullah b. Muhammad b. al-Hanafīyya, became imam respectively. After him, İsa b. Zayd b. Ali, the other son of Zayd became imam. And after that, Muhammad b. Abdullah b. Ḥasan whose mother Hind b. Abī Ubaydah b. Abdillāh b. Zum’ah b. al-Aswad b. al-Muttālib b. Asad b. Abdiluzza b. Kusayy. After, whoever from the family of Muhammad invites obeying Allah, he is imam.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq*, 73-74.

<sup>44</sup> al-Qummī, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq*, 74.

### 3. Differences in the presentation of Zaydiyya between al-Ash'arī and al-Qummī

The manuscript about Zaydiyya in both heresiographies gives a general idea about Zaydiyya with its divisions on certain issues. Before dealing with them, it is useful to point out the names of sub-sects within Zaydiyya. The below table illustrates the classification of sub-sects within Zaydiyya in al-Ash'arī and al-Qummī's books.

Table 1: The names of sub-sects in Zaydiyya according to al-Ash'arī and al-Qummī

<i>Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn</i>	<i>Kitāb al-Maqālāt wa'l firāq</i>
1. al-Jārūdiyya	1. Batriyya
2. al-Sulaymāniyya	2. al-Jārūdiyya
3. al-Butriyya (Batriyya)	3. The Surhūbiyya
4. al-Nu'aymiyya	4. al-Şabbāhiyya
5. The Fifth Firqā	5. al-Ya'qūbiyya
6. al-Ya'qūbiyya	6. al-Ijlīyya
	7. al-Ḥusayniyya

Some names of sub-sects are identical, such as the Jarudiyya, Batriyya and Jakobiyya and some others overlap from the content albeit in different names. While al-Ash'arī counts six different sub-sects of Zaydiyya; al-Qummī extends that number to seven. Even the latter qualifies sub-sects of Zaydiyya as the powerful (*al-aqwiya*) or the weak (*al-ḍu'afā*) in terms of advocating certain issues, for instance the imāmate. According to al-Qummī, the weak sects from Zaydiyya are al-Ijlīyya, Batriyya, and (al-Ya'qūbiyya); whereas the powerful ones are the friends of Abū l-Jārūd (al-Jārūdiyya) and Abū Khalid

al-Wasitî, Fudhayl al-Rassân (Surhûbiyya) and Mansur b. Abî 'l-Aswad.<sup>45</sup>

Al-Ash'arî begins his account on Zaydiyya giving an introductory information about it and then aligns its subsects. In doing so, he deals with all subsects subsequently in an order and as a whole. He gives the main hallmark of a sub-sect which it differs from the others, but he does not give much details in each sect's representatives. After subsects he examines some theological problems which Zaydiyya engaged. These vary from the names and attributes of Allah to belief and disbelief, as mentioned in the first section of this study. Al-Ash'arî reflects Zaydiyya in his book as a whole section starting from page 129 and finishing on 141. Whereas, al-Qummî focuses on the imâmate issue when giving information about sects. He gives a general stand of Shî'a on the imâmate and aligns different views according to sects. He begins with Batriyya by describing it as a radical view against general Shî'a tendency on the imâmate. He claimed that the other Zaydî sects emerged from Batriyya. Unlike al-Ash'arî, he does not discuss any theological topic. Rather, he mainly reflects the view of Zaydî subsects on the imâmate. He does not reflect all Zaydî subsects in certain pages, rather some on pages between 15 to 19 and some on 71 to 75 pages. Some other views are somewhere else throughout the whole book.

The content on Zaydiyya in both books is roughly the same. That proves the originality and reliability of these books in reflecting that sect. Later sources benefited from that and gave further details about the view of Zaydiyya. Batriyya with its moderate views is the closest to Sunnîsm and as a part of Kufan traditional movement, it is pointed out that it became absorbed by Sunnîsm in the 9<sup>th</sup> century, then the view of al-Jârûdiyya came to prevail among the Zaydiyya.<sup>46</sup> Like al-Baghdādî and al-Shahrastānî classified the Zaydiyya as counting down less divisions. According to al-Baghdādî, Zaydî sects are al-

---

<sup>45</sup> al-Qummî, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa'l-firāq*, 73-74.

<sup>46</sup> Wilfred Madelung, "Zaydiyya", *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. P.J. Bearman et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2002), XI/478.

Jārūdiyyya, Sulaymāniyya (Jarīriyya) and Butriyya.<sup>47</sup> For al-Shahrastānī, Zaydiyya consists of al-Jārūdiyyya, Sulaymāniyya, Salīhiyya and Butriyya.<sup>48</sup> Salīhiyya name is attributed to Ḥasan b. Salih b. Hayy al-Hamadānī. According to Ibn Ḥazm, this sect is the closest one within Shī'a to Sunnīsm.<sup>49</sup> It is likely some sects have involved in each other because of akin views. Some has not established itself well to transmit to the next generations, either. It is known that in early phases of Zaydiyya there was close relationship between Zaydī sub-sects and Sunnīsm,<sup>50</sup> later on Zaydiyya has been in contact with the Mu'tazilī thought and borrowed some theological ideas from them.<sup>51</sup>

Al-Ash'arī reflects Zaydī sub-sects in terms of their views on the imāmate issue. From the ways of an imam come to power whether by divine order or consultation to the superiority of companions and their caliphate order. 'Alī b. Abī Tālib's virtue among the companions is the main concern for all Zaydī sects. In the meantime, like Butriyya, al-Sulaymāniyya, al-Nu'aymiyya, and al-Ya'qūbiyya admit the caliphate of Abū Bakr and 'Umar. They argue that although 'Alī b. Abī Tālib had the superiority for the leadership, the Muslim community did nothing wrong in pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr and 'Umar since 'Alī gave allegiance to the both. al-Jārūdiyyya differed from them in that advocating the imāmate of 'Alī with the designation of the Prophet. In similar vein al-Qummī narrates the main difference between the powerful (*al-aqwīya*) and the weak (*al-du'afā*) as approaching the imāmate of 'Alī b. Abī Tālib. Subjectively, he categorises al-'Ijlīyya, Batriyya, and al-Ya'qūbiyya as weak because they admit the

<sup>47</sup> Bağdadi, *Mezhepler arasındaki farklar*, 26-28.

<sup>48</sup> Ebū'l-Feth Tācūddīn (Lisānūddīn) Muhammed b Abdilkerīm b Ahmed Şehristānī, *el-Mīlel ve'n-nihal*. (Beirut/ Lebanon: Resalah Publishers, 2015), 174-179.

<sup>49</sup> İbn Hazm, *el-Fasl: dīnler ve mezhepler tarihi*, çev. Halil İbrahim Bulut (İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2017), 2/88.

<sup>50</sup> Madelung, "Zaydiyya", XI/478.

<sup>51</sup> Mehmet Ümit, *Zeydiyye- Mu'tezile etkileşimi: Zeyd b. Ali'den Kasım er-Ressi'nin ölümüne kadar*. (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010), 53-54.

caliphate of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Whereas, he qualifies al-Jārūdiyya and Surhūbiyya as powerful since both reject the caliphate of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar.

The return of a deceased person or in occultation is another difference point. According to al-Ashʿarī, only al-Jārūdiyya believes in that albeit further divisions exist among them. For al-Qummī, al-Yaʿqūbiyya openly reject that belief and Sabbāhiyya declare that they have this belief. Al-Qummī does not give much details on what al-Jārūdiyya thinks about that.

The imāmate after ʿAlī b. Ḥusayn is one of the diverging points among Zaydiyya. According to al-Ashʿarī, al-Jārūdiyya believes in that the Prophet appointed ʿAlī. Later on ʿAlī appointed al-Ḥasan, and al-Ḥasan appointed al-Ḥusayn, subsequently. al-Jārūdiyya further divided into on that issue one saying after the imāmate of of Ḥusayn consultation had to become among the descendants of both al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn. The other one argues divine appointment after al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn. Sulaymāniyya advocates consultation on the imāmate issue at least two respected men’s contract. On the other hand, according to al-Qummī, al-Jārūdiyya accepts the imāmate after al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī by consultation amongst the offspring of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn. Surhūbiyya limits that to the descendants of two sons of ʿAlī, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, meaning must be a Fatimi. al-Ḥusayniyya argues that anyone among the descendants from the family of Muhammad can be imam by announcing his imāmate. al-Yaʿqūbiyya advocates that the descendants of ʿAlī have equal rights for the imāmate on condition to announce his imāmate. In the classification of al-Qummī, unnamed sect admits consensus in defining the leader of community.

As far as theological topics concerned in Zaydiyya, al-Ashʿarī numbers them on seven points as mentioned above. Whereas, al-Qummī does not give such an account, rather he focuses on the imāmate issue and topics revolved around it. mamet, otoritenin



### Conclusion

In this paper, Zaydiyya has been examined in two classical works on heresiography of Islam, by comparing content analysis. Both works were written in the tenth century and since then, they have maintained the significance in contributing to the field by revealing classical Islamic thought. al-Ash'arī and al-Qummī reflected Zaydiyya with the knowledge reached to their hands, and both tried to be loyal to the objectivity in the conditions of their age. Their definition and narrations on Zaydiyya is roughly similar. That shows the objectivity and reliability of their works in the field. Although al-Ash'arī gives further details on theological views of Zaydiyya, al-Qummī intensely focuses on the imāmate issue and deals with sub-sects from that perspective.

Zaydiyya with its sub-sects in Shī'a tradition is the closest to the Sunnī tradition with its views about early discussions in Islamic history. It is obvious that the imāmate issue has not resolved within the Muslim community for centuries. It will not be ended to the last day of the world as long as Shī'a community exists. Because the theology of Shī'a is based on the imāmate issue that they believe in that position designated by the messenger of Allah. However, their moderate views on that issue makes Zaydiyya close to the majority of Muslim community. It can be concluded from the above that all Zaydī sects were influenced by the sayings of Zayd b. 'Alī and his successors. In early ages, Butriyya was dominant and transmitted general thought of Zayd b. 'Alī to the next generations. Other subsects with some changes accepted the leadership of Abū Bakr and 'Umar albeit 'Alī had the right for the caliphate. But, later on al-Jārūdiyya became influential and confined the leadership to the family of 'Alī b. Abī Tālib, especially to the descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn. al-Qummī, qualifies al-Jārūdiyya with this feature as the powerful sub-sect of Zaydiyya. In the narration of al-Ash'arī, it is possible to see that further divisions happened within al-Jārūdiyya. Thereby, it can be said that from the early ages of Zaydiyya today there has been a bipolar tendency, to name it between Butriyya and al-Jārūdiyya.

### References

- Akman, Mustafa. "İtikadi Mezhepler Tarihinin Kaynakları: İçerik ve özellikleri". *Kırklareli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 3/2 (02 Temmuz 2019), 169-204.
- al-Ash'arî, Abû al-Hasan 'Alî ibn İsmâ'îl ibn İshâq. *Maqâlât al-islâmîyîn wa-ihtilâf al-musallîn*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1963.
- al-Qummî, Sa'd b. Abdillâh al-Ash'arî Ebû Halef. *Kitâb al-maqâlât wa'l-firâq*. Tahran: Muassasa-i Matbuat-ı Atai, 1963.
- Bağdadi, Ebû Mansur Abdülkahir b Tahir b Muhammed Temimi Abdülkahir. *Mezhepler arasındaki farklar: el-Fark beyne'l-fırak*. çev. Ethem Ruhi Fığlalı. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1991.
- Eş'ari, Ebû'l-Hasan İbn Ebu Bişr Ali b İsmail b İshak. *İlk dönem İslam mezhepleri*. çev. Mehmet Dalkılıç; Ömer Aydın. İstanbul: Kabcacı Yayınevi, 2005.
- Fettah, İrfan Abdülhamid. "Ebû'l-Hasen el-Eş'arî". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 11/444-447. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995.
- İbn Hazm, *el-Fasl: dinler ve mezhepler tarihi*. çev. Halil İbrahim Bulut. İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2017.
- Klein, Walter C. *Abu'l-Hasan 'Ali ibn Ismail al-As'ari's al-Ibanah 'an Usul ad-Diyânah (The Elucidation of Islâm's Foundation): A Translation with Introduction and Notes*. New York: American Oriental Society.
- Kummi, Ebu Halef el-. *Şîi fırkalar: Kitâbu'l-makâlât ve'l-fırak/Fıraku's-Şia*. çev. Hasan Onat, Sabri Hizmetli, Sönmez Kutlu, Ramazan Şimşek. Ankara: Ankara Okulu, 2004.
- Madelung, Wilfred. "Zaydiyya". *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. ed. P.J. Bearman et al. XI/477-481. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Muhammed Cevâd Meşkûr. "Sa'd b. Abdillâh Eş'arî Kummi'nin 'Kitabu'l-Makâlât'ı ve Nevbahtî'nin 'Fıraku's-Şia' Eseri ile Mukayesesi". çev. Şahin Ahmetoğlu. *İğdır Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 1 (01 Mayıs 2013), 223-230.

- Onat, Hasan. "Maqālātü'l-İslâmiyyîn ve'htilâfû'l-muşallîn". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 27/406-407. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2003.
- Öz, Mustafa. "el-Makâlât ve'l-Fırak". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 27/405. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2003.
- Şehristani, Ebü'l-Feth Tâcüddîn (Lisânüddîn) Muhammed b Abdilkerîm b Ahmed. *el-Milel ve'n-nihal*. Beirut/ Lebanon: Resalah Publishers, 2015.
- Ümit, Mehmet. *Zeydiyye- Mu'tezile etkileşimi: Zeyd b. Ali'den Kasım er-Ressi'nin ölümüne kadar*. İstanbul : Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010.

### Extended Summary

In Islamic history, Zaydiyya emerged as a result of a rebellion against the Umayyad rule in Kufa in 739. The views and impact of Zayd b. 'Alî (d. 122/740), the grandson of 'Alî b. Abî Tâlib in the fifth generation, has a crucial importance on the formation of that sect. It is one of the three main branches of Shî'a that from the eight century to our age has survived. When Zayd b. 'Alî commenced his revolt to Kufa's governor, Yusuf b. 'Umar (d.744), many Shi'ites abandoned Zayd since his moderate views on the imâmate issue. Basically, he admitted the caliphate of Abû Bakr (d.13/634) and 'Umar (d.23/644). That is a contradiction to Shî'a *raison d'etre* doctrine, the imâmate. From that aspect, Zaydiyya is considered to be the closest sect within Shî'a to Sunnîsm. However, over the time, the followers of Zaydiyya differed in their political and theological views and divided into a few sub-sects.

From a comparative perspective, this study deals with how Zaydiyya and its subsects being examined in some early samples of maqālât tradition, one of the heresiography types in Islamic literature. In the history of Islamic sects, the works with the type of *maqālât* (literally articles) has a significant importance in giving details about schools of thought and sects. From the first century of Islam to the tenth, that kind of works intensely were written in order to explain and advocate a certain group or sect's belief and practices.

Therefore, some writers were called “*ashābu’l-maqālāt*” since they tried to explain various incidents happened after the Prophet Muhammad and advocate their own view. From the murder of the third caliph (Uthmān b. ‘Affān) to the civil wars (Camel and Şiffin), and the status of caliphate/imāmate etc. those writes dealt with these issues in terms of faith and law as well as socio-political point of view. Later on these works were generally accumulated, classified and analysed by successor writers in the history of Islamic sects that since then these works has shed light on the field.

This paper investigates two samples of that kind of literature in the field: one titled *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa’l-firāq* belongs to Sa’d b. ‘Abd Allah al-Qummī (d. 307/913-4), who is famous heresiography writer within Shī’a sect. The other one titled *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn* belongs to Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn İsmā‘īl ibn İshāq al-Ash‘arī (d. 324/935-6), who is a prominent figure in Sunnī theology. The reasons why these two books have been chosen for this study are firstly both are the most ancient samples that reached us as far as Islamic heresiography concerned. Bearing the formation of Zaydiyya in mind in the first half of the eighth century, the time of both works are the closest amongst existing literature on that field. Secondly, both are accepted in the field as canonical either by Sunnī or Shī’a community. The objectivity of these works is well known in the field that most researchers refer to these works when studying early Islamic sects. Hence, studying a Shī’a sub-sect from the narration of Sunnī and Shī’a authors would contribute to the field from a comparative perspective. The main purpose of this study is to find out how a sub-sect of Shī’a is described and transmitted by two authoritative figures accepted in both Sunnī and Shī’a as far as the history of Islamic sects concerned.

Abū l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī introduces Zaydiyya in his book *Maqālāt al-islāmīyīn wa-ihtilāf al-musallīn*, as one of the main branches of Shī’a. He classifies Zaydiyya according to their views on the imāmate into six different subsects, namely, al-Jārūdiyya, al-Sulaymāniyya, al-Butriyya (Batriyya), al-Nu‘aymiyya, The Fifth Firqā, and al-Ya‘qūbiyya. He gives information about charismatic leader of that

groups or view peculiar to them. Then, he deals with theological topics such as the names and attributes of Allah, the creation of actions, and so on. In doing so, he generally reports that Zaydiyya differed in that view barely giving subsect's name. But, he objectively transmits their views and approaches in political and theological issues. As far as the history of Islamic sects concerned, al-Ash'arī's work fits best to descriptive method of today's research. The other work, *Kitāb al-maqālāt wa'l-firāq* written by Sa'd b. 'Abd Allah al-Qummī, focuses the main doctrine of Shī'a, imāmate. Unlike al-Ash'arī, al-Qummī does not reflect Zaydiyya as a whole in a particular place, rather he gives general thought of Shī'a and divergences on the issue of imāmate. He reflects a particular view of a Zaydi sect in one place and gives information in the same topic in another place in his book. He dispersed Zaydi sects and their views throughout his book. According to al-Qummī's classification Zaydiyya consists of seven subsects: Batriyya, al-Jārūdiyya, al-Surhūbiyya, al-Ṣabbāḥiyya, al-Ya'qūbiyya, al-Ījlīyya, and al-Ḥusayniyya. He does not touch upon theological views of Zaydiyya, intensely. According to al-Qummī, all discussions and disputes revolve mainly around the imāmate issue that clustering Zaydi subsects around either al-Jārūdiyya or Batriyya.

This study proves that both al-Ash'arī and al-Qummī transmit the knowledge reached to their time in an objective way. That explains why their works are still amongst the most reliable resources as far as the history of Islamic sects concerned. Although some subsect's names differ from one to another in their narration, that names roughly match with the clue of views and approaches. These two works are important in terms of giving information on the early history of Zaydiyya and its formation period.