

Murtakib al-Kabīra (Cardinal Sinner) and Takfīr (Excommunication) from the Perspective of Ibn Ḥazm: a Political and Theological Review

Fikret Soyol *

Abstract

From the beginning of the first periods of Islamic theology, the concept of *kufir* is the most important amongst other terminology related to the judgement of *murtakib al-kabīra* (cardinal sinner) in this world and Hereafter. The purpose of this article is to focus on the problems in the use of *takfīr* (excommunication), which is the final judgement of *murtakib al-kabīra* representing the very extremism itself, against other views of other theological readings within *kalām* methodology. Ibn Ḥazm is another major scholar who investigates the judgement of *murtakib al-kabīra* within the scope of faith in itself. Examining the understanding of *takfīr* in different *kalam* schools, Ibn Ḥazm also evaluates the use of this judgement in intellectual disputes. The relationship of *īmān* and *amal* (faith and deed) in the debates of *kalam* schools, some concepts such as *īmān*, *kufir*, *fiṣq*, *shirk*, *nifāq* and *al-manzila bayn al-manzilatayn*, some mentioned in the Qur’ān and some not, are in constant use. It is observed that some of these discussions were institutionalized and transformed into a school in the process. Thus, *takfīr* was not only a matter of only cardinal sins in later periods, but was also utilized for differences of opinions due to the different readings and interpretations arising from social and political factors. Thus, *takfīr* has been the issue for both religious and political purposes, which are two separate areas. Therefore, *takfīr* has been studied relying on its political disputes in a theological paradigm and its major feature, being weaponized to silence and overpower the opponent, has been emphasized in this work.

Keywords

Kalām, Theology, al-Kabīra, Cardinal sin, Takfīr, Excommunication, Ibn Ḥazm

* Assistant Professor, Istanbul University, Faculty of Theology, Department of Kalam, Istanbul, Turkey

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi, Kalam Anabilim Dalı

fikret@istanbul.edu.tr ORCID 0000-0001-5549-9791

Article Types: Research Article

Received: 28 April 2019

Accepted: 30 July 2019

Published: 31 July 2019

Cite as: Fikret Soyol, “Murtakib al-Kabīra (Cardinal Sinner) and Takfīr (Excommunication) from the Perspective of Ibn Ḥazm: a Political and Theological Review”, *ULUM* 2/1 (July 2019): 81-101, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3355738>

İbn Hazm Perspektifinden Büyük Günah ve Tekfir: Politik ve Teolojik Açıdan Bir Değerlendirme

Öz

İlk dönemlerden itibaren mürtekib-i kebîrenin dünyevî ve uhrevî hükmü ile alakalı gündeme gelen farklı kavramlar arasından en önemlisini küfür oluşturmaktadır. Bu makalenin amacı, büyük günahın hükmü olan ve haddizatında bir aşırılığı temsil eden tekfirin kelâm metodolojisi bağlamında farklı okumaya dayanan görüşlere karşı kullanılmasının mahzurları üzerinde durmaktır. İbn Hazm imânın mahiyeti bağlamında büyük günahın hükmü konusunu incelemektedir. Mürtekib-i kebîrenin hükmü olan tekfir ile ilgili kelâm ekollerinin görüşlerini ele alan İbn Hazm bu hükmün fikrî ayrılıklarda kullanılmasını da değerlendirmektedir. Kelâm ekolleri imân-amel ilişkisine dair tartışmalarda imân başta olmak üzere küfür, fişq, şirk, nifâk ve el-menzile beyne'l-menzileteyn gibi bir kısmı Kur'an'da geçen bir kısmı Kur'anî olmayan kavramlar üzerinde durmaktadır. İlgili tartışmaların, süreç içinde kurumsallaşarak birer ekole dönüştüğü görülmektedir. Adı geçen kavramlardan tekfir, sadece büyük günahın hükmü olmakla kalmayarak sosyal ve politik faktörlerden ötürü ortaya çıkan farklı okuma ve yorumlama biçiminde de karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Böylece tekfir, iki ayrı alan olan dinî ve politik maksatlarla mevzu bahis edilmektedir. Bu yönüyle, çalışmada siyasî bağlamıyla birlikte gündeme gelen tekfirin teolojik bir boyutta değerlendirilmesiyle dinî ve siyasî alanda muhalifini susturmaya ve ona üstünlük sağlamaya yarayan bir silaha dönüştürüldüğüne dikkat çekilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Kelâm, Teoloji, Büyük Günah, Tekfir, İbn Hazm

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning, it was not possible for the followers of different sects to retreat from extremism while evaluating the views of others. Although it is possible to evaluate some rigid attitudes in the course of history, the nature of the event has changed completely after it was moved to the belief channel.¹ As a matter of fact, those who have different views towards the end of the first century did not only criticize each other, but these differences were maintained within a framework of creed and reached the point of takfir, thus the situation completely differentiated. The scholars of the Ahl al-sunna criticized some of the views of their opponents, and from time to time dealt with them in the form of takfir.²

Although the principles of faith should be based on the trustable evidence,³ many concepts and issues related to religious, political and cultural problems experienced by Muslims have been brought up in kalâm since the beginning of the first periods. For example, concepts such as imân, kufr, fişq, and nifâq have been

¹ Mehmet Kalaycı, “Kutuplaşma, Konumlanma ve Ayrışma Zemini Olarak Mezheplerde Tekfir ve Tadfîl Olgusu”, *Hayatın Anlamı İmân*, ed. Murat Sülün (İstanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 2018), 184.

² İrfan Abdulhamid, *İslam'da İtikâdî Mezhepler ve Akaid Esasları*, trans. Mustafa Saim Yeprem (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2011), 140-149.

³ Nu'mân b. Şâbit Abū Ḥanîfa, *al-Ālim wa al-mutaāllim*, ed. Muḥammad Zâhid b. al-Ḥasan al-Kawtharî (Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Azhariyya li'al-Turas, 2001), 11-12.

subjected to different interpretations and evaluations by kalām schools. Since each of the mentioned concepts has its own dynamics, they form provisions of different nature.⁴ The most important of the mentioned provisions was undoubtedly takfir. In this study, it will be evaluated that takfir is not only used as a provision of major sin, but also as a reference to the different forms of reading of Kalām.

Kalām schools mentioned various judgments about the name given to someone who commits a sin while they are Muslims. According to Murji'a, a person who commits a major sin is a muslim, disbeliever according to the Khārijites; but according to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Qatāda, he is a hypocrite. While Mu'tazilite is placing him in between imān and kufr, the Ash'arites and Māturīdites define such person a perverse believer (fāsiq). Takfir,⁵ one of the previous provisions, gained different dimensions with the institutionalization of Kalām⁶ debates in the process and transformed into a school.

By the end of the first century, there was no tolerance for the owners of opposite views.

Moreover, this intolerance has gone up to takfir⁷ with the aim of providing psychological superiority against his counterparts. However, if the discussions had remained at the level of mutual criticism and rejection of opinions, the historical course and development of Islamic thought would have been different. How to explain this critical situation that transcends the rule of major sin is important. For example, the evaluation of some thinkers' opinions has different importance. One of them is Ibn Ḥazm. Ibn Ḥazm, draws attention to the danger of the mentions of takfir about the differences in views in his work, *al-Faṣl*.⁸ Ibn Hazm, who expressed such an important principle, entered into a contradictory stance by not standing in the line he spoke of.

Although being a theologian and whose approaches will be evaluated, Ibn Ḥazm, is more compatible with / leaning to the line of Salaf.⁹ Because of this identity, Ibn Hazm studied the exclusion of Murji'a, Shi'a and Mu'tazila¹⁰ independently in the sections of his book, where he evaluated the Islamic sects, but in the

⁴ Abū Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Aḥmad b. Saīd ez-Zāhir Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl fi al-milal wa al-ahwā' wa al-niḥal*, ed. Aḥmad Shams al-Din (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiya, 1996/1416), 2: 250.

⁵ Muḥammad Fuād Abd al-Bāqī, “Kfr”, *al-Mu'jam al-mufahras li-alfāz al-Qur'an al-Karīm*, 3th Edition (Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 1991/1411), 769.

⁶ The first two centuries following the death of the Messenger of Allah is an important period for the formation of theological schools. In terms of the formation of Mu'tezilite and the issues raised by it, this period has been quite active in the name of theology. Therefore, we come across many subjects, concepts and ideas put forward in the name of theology in this period. See Orhan Şener Koloğlu, “Mu'tezile'nin Temel Öğretileri”, *İslâmî İlimler Dergisi*12/2 (2017): 44.

⁷ Yusuf Şevki Yavuz, “Tekfir”, *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam* (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2011), 40: 351.

⁸ Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 2: 231.

⁹ Murat Serdar, *İbn Hazm'in Kelâmî Görüşleri* (Doctoral thesis: Erciyes University, 2005), 57-58, 105.

¹⁰ Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 3: 111-168.

section where he criticized some Ash‘ari theologians, he used a more harsh style against the Ash‘ari theologians.¹¹

Ibn Hāẓm, who did not mention the kufr about the major sin, was in a position to oppose the idea of takfir in disagreements. Although the continuity of his tolerant attitude was expected, the result did not manifest in this way.

On the other hand, if it is used based on unfounded, arbitrary and arbitrariness, it becomes a 'charging of apostasy'¹² rather than a takfir. Because the use of something in a different sense is completely separate from being oneself and by becoming different with being included in the scope of bigotry. Besides, takfir is not an issue that is left to human decision. The main importance of the issue was not only discussed in terms of its relations / dimensions with the Hereafter but also noted the existence of the worldly dimension. As a matter of fact, the killing of the person who is charged with takfir is deemed necessary for the salvation of religion.¹³

Before entering the subject of takfir as a judgment in relation to murtakib al-kabira, it is useful to give some information about the major and minor sins.

1. SEPARATION OF MAJOR AND MINOR SIN

Since takfir is related to the major sin rather than to the minor sin, it is important to determine the limit between the major sin and the minor sin. In terms of the concept of sin which is introduced with the following terms such as; zānib, fiṣq, ism (sin), ‘isyan / rebellion in the Qur’ān is made the distinction between major or minor sins.¹⁴ However, it is not clear which sins are the major and which are the minor. The fact that sins are major or minor by mentioning themselves is more of the information we obtain from hadiths.

In the discussions of kalām schools, it is possible to see that there is no significant disagreement about the provision of minor sin. The main argument about the provision of major sin is the various provisions of the kalām schools which are brought on the agenda within the limits of imān – kufr.

Although we cannot abstract what is major and minor sin from the Qur’ān, it can easily be said that there is a separation between sins, since Allah has informed us that a man who fears major sins, Allah will

¹¹ Çağfer Karadaş, “İbn Hazm ve Eşarilik Eleştirisi”, *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18/1 (2009): 89-102; Murat Serdar, “İbn Hazm’ın Eş‘arî Kelâmına Yönelik Eleştirileri” *Uluslararası İmam Eş‘arî ve Eş‘arilik Sempozyumu Bildirileri 21-23 Eylül 2014*. 2: 89-120 (İstanbul: Beyan Yayınları, 2015) 2: 89-90.

¹² Mehmet Ali Büyükkara, “Hâricîliğin Modern Bir Görüntüsü Olarak Tekfirçilik”, *İç Tehdit ve Riskler Işığında İslâm Dünyasının Geleceği* (İstanbul: İnsamer, 2016), 13.

¹³ Abū Ḥamīd Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Ġazzālī, *İslam’da Müsamaha (Fayşal al-tafriqa)*, trans. Süleyman Uludağ (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2013), 51.

¹⁴ al-Nisā 4/31; al-Shūrā 42/36-37; al-Qāf 18/49.

forgive¹⁵ his minor sins. The words “kabāir al-iṣm” and “zunūb” refer to the major sin, and the words “sayia” and “lamam” refer to the minor sins.¹⁶

Mu'tezilite accepts the separation of minor and major sins. However, there are several opinions about the definition of these two types of sins. These definitions include the concept of “every sin that has threat (waīd), every sin that has no threat (waīd),” and “because every sin that has been committed intentionally is major, there are also those who call the person who has committed this sin as “murtakib al-kabīra.”¹⁷ Minor sins are also described as those that do not have a clear punishment and do not have a threat to the fire of Hell.¹⁸

Another characteristic of minor sin is that it is said that repentance is required for the remission of major sin, whereas such a condition is not required for the removal of the responsibility of minor sin, and some other reasons are sufficient for the remission of such sins.

In the Murji'a, there are those who say that all kinds of sins that involve rebellion against Allah are major, and that the existence of those who acknowledge that there are two types of sins, such as major and minor.¹⁹

One of those who accept that the disobediences (ma'siya) are divided into two groups as minor and major is Abū al-Huzayl al-'Allāf (d. 235/849-50 [?])²⁰ According to Qadī 'Abd al Jabbār (d. 415/1025), Khāricīta ruled that, by denying minor sins, all sins were great.²¹

Another aspect of the distinction between major and minor sin is whether or not it depends on reason ('aql) or Sharia. According to al-Jabbār, Abu 'Ali and Abū Hashim have disagreed about it. According to Abū 'Ali, the knowledge of the major sins is only possible by the notification of the Sharia.²²

Māturīdītes theologian Sābūnī (d.) 580/1184) states that there is a conflict between the people on the subject of minor and major sin. According to him, every sin in which repentance and istighfar (chastisement)

¹⁵ al-Nisā 4: 31.

¹⁶ Mustafa Türkgülü, “Günah Kavramı ve İman Problemi Haline Getirilen Büyük Günah/Kebire Hakkındaki Kelâmî Tartışmalar”, *Diyanet İlmî Dergisi*, 36/ 4. (2000): 65.

¹⁷ Abū al-Ḥasan Ibn Abū Bishr Alī b. İsmāil b. İshāq Ash'ārī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyyīn wa-iḥtilāf al-muṣallīn*, ed. Hellmut Ritter. 2th Edition. (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1963), 270-271.

¹⁸ Türkgülü, “Günah Kavramı ve İmân Problemi”, 67.

¹⁹ Ash'ārī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyyīn*, 150.

²⁰ Abd al-Rahman Badawī, *Mazahib al-islamiyyīn*. 2th Edition. (Beirut: Dār al-İlm li al-Malayīn, 1979), 1: 174.

²¹ Qādī 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-khamsa*, 632.

²² Qādī 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, 633.

are concerned is a minor sin.²³ According to this, major sin can be defined as any attitude and behavior²⁴ that God has forbidden for sure and which requires a worldly or the other-worldly punishment in return.

According to the information given above, the point about major-minor sin and generally the punishments of sin is the obligation of this belief. In other words, the question of whether a religious flaw and misdemeanor will hold him in the state of *imān*; in other words, what is the judgment of such a person in the sense of belief is the most sensitive point of the matter. Therefore, although there are different evaluations about the minor and major separation of sin, it is clear that the main argument is to determine what will be the verdict of the major sin.

2. THE PROVISION OF MURTAKIB AL-KABĪRA

The religious status and position of murtakib al-kabira has been the subject of intense discussions between Kalām schools.

The judgment of the major sin rather than the minor sin is emphasized by the opinion of the advocates of takfir for the major sin. Since it is discussed as a major sin, the name (*Asmā*) and the judgment (*Ahkām*) that will be given to him in the worldly sense constitute the main issue in the life of the Hereafter. Since this is a bilateral situation, it is recorded in the sources of Kalām as *asmā* and *ahkām*. There are some conflicts between kalām schools about the preferred names depending on the belief of murtakib al-kabira. In this regard, various names such as *Mu'min*, *Kāfir*, *Munāfiq*, *Fāsiq*, *al-Manzila Bayn al-Manzilatayn*²⁵ were preferred.

Although different views have been expressed on the use of mentioned names, it is possible to talk about an agreement²⁶ on the *fāsiq*.

Ibn Hāzım indicates that in the event of major sin, there are other preferences, along with basic concepts such as *imān* and *kufir*, in the event of major sin.²⁷ Among the rulings to be given to the person who commits the major sin is that there are some concepts which are not Qur'ānic and are similar to those of earthly and other-worldly values. It should be noted that those other than *Manzila Bayn al-Manzilatayn* are also Qur'ānic concepts.

²³ Nur al-Dīn al-Sābūnī, *al-Kifāya fi al-hidāya*, ed. Muḥammad Aruçi (Beirut: Dār Ibn Hāzım; Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2014/1435), 339-340.

²⁴ We encounter different definitions and evaluations of what is the major sin. According to this, (1) Those for whom Allah has appointed a punishment and has openly threatened with his punishment; (2) Everything in which there is a rebellion against Allah; (3) Everything Allah threatens with hell; (4) It is possible to make a classification as: “every sin which the servant insists upon”. For further information, see Cihat Tunç, “Kelām İlminde Büyük Günah Meselesi”, *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23 1978: 326.

²⁵ Ibn Hāzım, *al-Faşl*, 2: 341.

²⁶ Ibn Hāzım, *al-Faşl*, 2: 251; Abū al-Muīn Meymūn b. Muḥammad al-Nasafī, *Tabşirat al-adilla fi usūl al-dīn*, ed. Hüseyin Atay - Şaban Ali Düzgün (Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2003), 2: 371.

²⁷ Ibn Hāzım, *al-Faşl*, 2: 341.

Other concepts, even if they are Qur'ānic ones, are used in a sense other than the context from time to time. One of the rulings given about murtakib al-kabīra is a separate argument for the concept of Fisq. Relating the concept of the fisq to the infidels or believers is a controversial issue in our sources. Ibn Hazm, who argues that the fisq should be used in the sense of the believer, would surely say that it would be a disbeliever if it meant something other than imān.²⁸

In the first years of Islamic history, the relationship between faith and deeds and the kufr and takfīr, which came upon the agenda in relation to the major sin, are among the first conflicts experienced by Muslims.²⁹ Among the various provisions preferred by Kalām schools, especially kufr was used persistently and radically by Khārijīte. The general view of Khārijīte is that a person who commits a major sin will be infidel, and if he dies without repentance, he will remain in hell forever.³⁰ In addition to this general attitude, some more specific views of Khāricī groups are known. According to Azārika, one who commits any major or minor sin is a disbeliever.³¹ According to Sufriya, murtakib al-kabīra is a mushrik, while the Section of Najadāt defends³² that those who insist on sin are mushriks.³³ Ibāziyya claims that the major sinner is not infidel in the belief that he is only in the *kufr al-ni'ma*.³⁴ Ibāziyya is known to be the most tolerant of Khārijīte parties because of its many views, especially the Kufrān al-ni'mat approach.

In response to the Kufr leaning views of Khārijīte, Murji'a uses³⁵ the name of mu'min for murtakib al-kabīra while Ḥasan al-Baṣrī prefers munafiq³⁶ for such person. However, the opinion of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī with

²⁸ Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl*, 2: 261.

²⁹ Abū al-Fath Tāj al-Dīn (Lisān al-Dīn) Muḥammad b. Abd al-Karīm b. Aḥmad Shahristānī, *al-Milal wa al-niḥal*, ed. 'Abd al 'Azīz Muḥammad Wakil (Cairo: Muassasa al-Ḥalabī, 1968), 1: 25-26.

³⁰ Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn* 86; Abū Mansūr Abd al-Qāhir b. Tāhir b. Muḥammad Tamimī Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayna al-firaq wa bayān al-firقات al-nāciya minhum*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyi al-Dīn Abd al-Hamīd (Cairo: Dār al-Turas, nd.), 73; Shahristānī, *Milal*, 1: 114.

³¹ Baghdādī, *Farq*, 83-87; Shahristānī, *Milal*, 1: 122.

³² Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn*, 89-92; Shahristānī, *Milal*, 1: 124; Baghdādī, *Farq*, 86-90.

³³ Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn* 118; Baghdādī, *Farq*, 90-91; Shahristānī, *Milal*, 1: 137.

³⁴ Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn al-*, 110; Baghdādī, *Farq*, 103-104; Shahristānī, *Milal*, 1: 135; Muḥammad b. Omar b. al-Ḥusayn Fakhr al-Din al-Rādī, *Nihāyat al-ūqūl fī dirayat al-uṣūl*, ed. Saīd Abd al-Latīf Fūde (Beirut: Dār al-Zahāir, 2015/1436), 4: 305.

³⁵ Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, 137.

³⁶ Rādī, *Nihāyat al-ūqūl fī dirayāt al-uṣūl*, 4: 306; Sābūnī, *al-Kifāya fī al-hidāya*, 326; According to Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār, who analysed Ḥasan al-Baṣrī 's recognition of murtakib-i kabīra as "munafiq"; fasiq, like a munafiq, is deserved to be disparaged and cursed, and it is appropriate to give him that name. See Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, 715; According to Nasafī, another name evaluating Ḥasan al-Baṣrī's recognition of murtakib al-kabīra as "munafiq," his aim is that a person who professes that he is a believer in his language is munafiq because he opposes what he says with his actions. See Nasafī, *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, 2: 370.

the provision of "hypocrisy" indicates that such a person is not mature enough, and his view in this regard is open to interpretation.³⁷ On the other hand, there are rumors that Ḥasan al-Baṣrī gave up this view later.³⁸

Zaydiyya has joined with other Khārijite groups saying³⁹ that they will not exit from the hell because a major sinful individual will deserve eternal punishment.

Ḥasan al-Baṣrī's student and founder of Mu'tazilezite Waṣil bin 'Atā' claims that al-manzila bayn al-manzilatayn provision is for murtakib al-kabira, because whoever commits a major sin is neither a believer nor a disbeliever.⁴⁰ Ġaylān Damashqī believes that it is permissible (jāiz) for God to forgive the major sinner. Again for him, it is not permissible for God to punish those who commit a similar sin when such a person is forgiven by Allah.⁴¹

Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār (d. 415/1024) does not object to a person who commits a major sin, to be called "limited believer", while he opposes the name of the "full believer".

He argues that even though he (murtakib al-kabira) deserves to be reproached and condemned, it is permissible to call him a believer even though he says⁴² that he cannot be deprived of praise, ta'zim and muwālāt because of his belief in Allah and his messenger.

According to Ibn Ḥazm, some groups believe that kufr will only be for sins that are not punishable by *hadd* punishment.⁴³ According to this, committing sins that are punishable by *hadd* is not counted as kufr.

Ibn Ḥazm says that according to Caliph Omar and Ibn Abbas the eternal punishment in hell is not about the sinner, but that it will apply to the murderer.⁴⁴ According to a group that Ibn Hazm did not name it, the minor sinner remains in hell forever.⁴⁵

Ibn Hazm also refers to the stance of Mu'tazila and the stance of Khārijite in the context of punishments about *Murtad*. According to Ibn Ḥazm, they accept that the person who committed a major sin should not be killed. According to Ibn Ḥazm, referring⁴⁶ to some of the *hadds* (punishments) prescribed by the members of the two sects or the penalties imposed for the purposes of *ta'dib* indicates that there is no such situation as disbelievers or idolaters.

³⁷ Ġazzālī, *Fayṣal al-tafriqa*, 52.

³⁸ Ahmed Saim Kılavuz, *İmân-küfür Sınırı: Tekfir Meselesi* (Istanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1984), 155.

³⁹ Ash'ārī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyyin*, 74.

⁴⁰ Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, 697.

⁴¹ Nasafī, *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, 2: 369.

⁴² Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, 701-702.

⁴³ Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 2: 276.

⁴⁴ Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 2: 340.

⁴⁵ Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 2: 340-341.

⁴⁶ Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 2: 261.

Indeed, in Khārijīte, a marginal small group argues that those who commit major sins should be killed if they do not repent. Mu'tezilite, one of the systematic kalām schools, Ash'arī and Māturīdites wanted to acquire a position in the context of the relationship between mān – 'amal (deeds). The perception of the Ahl al-sunna is based on the belief that Abū Ḥanīfa defends that 'amal (deed) is not part of īmān. Mu'tezilite discussed whether it was possible to call the fāsiq a believer or not, and gave different opinions on this subject: Some Mu'tezilite, such as 'Abbād, defends that even if it can be said for a fāsiq person who is transgressed by sin "he believed," he can not be called "mu'min." Some of them have the belief that "they neither believed nor believers". Jubbāi says: "In terms of the attributes of Lugāt / Lexicon he is called "believed," but, "in terms of the names of lugāt, he is called "believer."⁴⁷

So far, the first Kalām schools had their opinions on the provision of major sin. As we can see, among the mentioned provisions, the most rigid one is the takfīr. In fact, takfīr is a problem for Muslims in all periods of history. In history, takfīr, which describes the basic characteristics of the Khārijīte and reflects their concept of faith (īmān), is currently maintained by various groups called "contemporary Khārijīte". Moreover, jihad, which includes conquest (fath), has been misinterpreted as an act of deception against Muslims and not against those who set up traps, but against Muslims.⁴⁸

Besides Khāricīta, which has been prominent in history as an understanding that flags takfīr, it is obligatory to conduct various analyses by investigating the reasons why contemporary salafism addicted to takfirism. In this sense, different preferences such as "minor Kufr" were made instead of "kufr," which is the main concept in order to prevent takfīrism perceptions. The concepts that Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) and Ibn al-Qayyim Al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350) adopted and used were evaluated to express that murtakib al-kabīra was in kufr, but not apostate / murtad.⁴⁹

Contrary to the harsh attitudes of the historical Khārijīte, Mu'tazila has at least shown a more moderate attitude towards the person who commits major sins in terms of worldly judgment. The principle of al-manzila bayn al-manzilatayn, adopted by Mu'tazila for the first time, is not a concept in the Qur'ān. While Khārijīte uses the concept of kufr, Mu'tazila's preference of the more moderate way in this regard is based on the provision between īmān and kufr.

The fact that the Ahl al-sunna and Salafiyya adopt that a committer of major sin would be fāsiq is the reason that anyone who commits a sin should still be considered a believer. The Mu'tazila, who discriminated between the kafir who deserved the major torment (punishment), and murtakib al-kabīra who commit the major sin (The Mu'tazila) wanted to prove that murtakib al-kabīra is not a genuine disbeliever (*kafir*) by using the concepts of *Fāsiq* and *Fājir*.⁵⁰ Accordingly, it is possible to read the "al-manzila bayn al-manzilatayn" provision initiated by Wāsil b. 'Atā' and then adopted by Mu'tazila theologians and made a systematic system, as an attempt to find an intermediate formula. Because this effort seems to

⁴⁷ Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-islāmīyyīn*, 274.

⁴⁸ Bekir Topaloğlu, "Cihad" *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam* (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1993), 7: 531-534.

⁴⁹ Büyükkara, *Hāricīlīğin Modern Bir Görüntüsü*, 18.

⁵⁰ Koloğlu, "Mu'tezile'nin Temel Öğretileri", 73. Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār's understanding of the "limited believer" mentioned earlier must be the same as what he meant. See, Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Sharh al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, 701-702.

reconcile the two in exchange for the conflict between the Khārijīte and the Murji'a. Because, by not counting murtakib al-kabira" as completely *kāfir*, Mu'tazila separate themselves from Khārijīte; and by not counting him as *mu'min*, they separate themselves from Murjia.⁵¹

The great sin - takfir relationship is brought up not only in the context of the sin committed, but also in different matters of Kalām. Then, to talk about the takfir, some matters must be crystal clear. These are; considered to be knowingly accepting a situation that is contrary to Allah and his messenger's commands, to adopt the prohibitions as lawful and to ridicule Islam.

The way in which such an important issue is dealt with in the hadiths is remarkable.

The fact that the messenger of Allah (pbuh) informs⁵² us that someone who is Muslim by accepting the tawhid and praying is under the guarantee of Allah and himself is telling us that we should have a sensitivity to takfir.

The second point that is as sensitive and important as the first one regarding takfir, which is brought up as a provision of major sin, is to mention takfir about different views. According to this, takfir is used for someone who interprets a text / nass. In the next section, this aspect of the takfir will be evaluated.

3. TAKFİR IN THEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL ASPECTS

As a concept, takfir does not pass explicitly in the Qur'an. However, there are various uses derived from kfr-root.⁵³ In particular, kufr is used for stubborn people who do not accept Islam. (al-Tavba 9/74). Kufr used for those who abandoned religion after becoming Muslim: (al-Baqara 2/217; Āl 'Imrān 3/106); in this case, it is used for those who insist on it and who have lost hope of them in this sense (Āl 'Imrān 3/90).

Besides that, kufr is used to deny the existence of Allah, His prophets, His books, some provisions of the Qur'an, the resurrection after death, and the life of the hereafter, and committing shirk, and for those who make lawful the prohibitions, and for those who make mock of Islam and for hypocrites.⁵⁴

When it comes to religious and i'tiqādī (theological) use, it is obligatory to distinguish between those who say that they are Muslims, and more importantly, those who turn to Qibla and those who perform prayer (salah)⁵⁵ having disagreements in some theological matters and deliberately denying them. For this

⁵¹ The article of Akoğlu, which provides detailed information about the historical and cultural background in the formation of Mu'tazila's attitude on the subject, and provides satisfactory information as it is a study that examines the interaction and the separation of Kharijism - Mu'tazilite can be examined. See, Muharrem Akoğlu, "Kebîre ve İman Bağlamında Hāricilik-Mu'tezile İlişkisi", *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 2/23 (2007): 331.

⁵² Bukhārī, "imān", 17.

⁵³ Abd al-Bākī, "Kfr", *al-Mu'jam al-mufahras*, 769.

⁵⁴ Abd al-Bākī, *al-Mu'jam al-mufahras*, "Kfr", 769; "Cdl", 210; "Hz'e", 905-905; "Hrm", 251.

⁵⁵ There have been various discussions among the theologians regarding the relationship between imān and kufr. When believers have faith, emphasis is placed on the concepts of prayer (salāt) and qibla in the context of the discourses of defending their disbelief. Accordingly, the ahl al-qibla ve ahl al-salā, were used as a concept that refers to all Muslims connected to different sects who believe that it is obligatory (fard) to perform salāt in the direction

reason, those who defend the denial of the adjectives for example, claiming that Allah has no knowledge, those who commit some concepts to Allah, and those who say that there is no pre-destination (meaning that Allah is eternal) are unbelievers. However, takfir can not be applied for those who derive some rulings on the basis of the commentary of the nass / text.⁵⁶ Accordingly, when evaluating different views, it is understood that the owners of these views should be in a tolerant manner without taking any takfir.

Ash'ari and Maturidi, who made up the Kalām of the Ahl al-sunna, wanted to avoid any doubt about the worldly and other-worldly rulings by specifying the limit of imān-kufr. The determination of precise boundaries between the two things will allow a person to be alert and protected against the mixing of these two with each other, the emergence of a dark and blurry situation. If takfir is something that can be used at random, it will reveal social and political chaos and disturbance as seen in the early periods of Islamic history.

Ibn Ḥazm argues that it is possible for someone who says that he belongs to Islam to be removed from it only with a naṣṣ and ijmā'.⁵⁷ Since leaving Islam is revealed by abandoning faith, Ibn Ḥazm wants to express that it is not possible to know that someone who is clearly Muslim has come out of this circle. However, it is observed that he took a very hard and rigid attitude where he evaluated the kalām schools. He has taken a radical attitude about the kalām schools in general in the section he talks about Islamic sects. Although there are some statements in hadiths about separation⁵⁸ from different parties, not blaming his brother with kufr⁵⁹, Ibn Ḥazm has openly stated that some of the kalām sects and kalām sects are related to this subject (takfir).⁶⁰

Two views are related to Aḥmat bin Ḥanbal on the subject of takfir: The first is that someone who is protected (abstained) from the shirk and prays towards qibla cannot be charged with takfir. The second; Unlike Ahl al-hadith, in some of the issues of belief, such as Sifat Allah (The Attributes), he charged kalām schools that they adopt various theological interpretations with kufr / takfir.⁶¹ It is necessary to think about

of the Ka'ba. See, Muhiddin Bağçeci, "Ehl-i salât", *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam* (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1994), 10: 524-525.

⁵⁶ Beyazizâda Ahmet Efendi, *Ishârât al-marâm min 'ibârât al-Imâm*, ed. Yusûf 'Abd al-Razzâq (Istanbul: Dâr al-Kitab al-Islâmî, 1949/1368), 105-106. By taking advantage of the Risâlât of Abû Ḥanîfa, Beyazizade Aḥmad Efendi, without referring to the whole Mu'tazila as a sect, "some of the Mutezilîler" records, the defense of the Hudûs of the Knowledge of Allah as kufr, should not be read in the form that the understanding of Attributes of Mu'tazila is required by the kufr. Beyazizâda Ahmet Efendi, *Ishârât al-marâm min 'ibârât al-Imâm*, 149, 278, 307.

⁵⁷ See Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Faṣl*, 2: 268.

⁵⁸ Tirmizî, "Imân", 18.

⁵⁹ Bukhârî, "Edeb", 73.

⁶⁰ Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 3: 144, 145, 159. Also see Hüseyin Güneş, *İslam'da Zahiri-Sünni Düşüncenin Çekişmesi: İbn Ḥazm ve Eş'arilik Örneği* (Konya: Kitap Dünyası, 2007), 56-57.

⁶¹ Abû al-Ḥusayn Ibn al-Farrâ Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn Baghdâdî Ibn Abû Ya'lâ, *Ṭabaqât al-Ḥanâbila* (Beirut: Dâr al-Ma'rifa, 1952/1371), 1: 26-27; Abû Saïd Utman b. Saïd al-Dârimî, *al-Radd alâ al-Jahmiyya*, ed. Gosta Vitastam (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1960), 101-103.

the correctness of the second opinion narrated from Aḥmat bin Ḥanbal. On the other hand, it can be seen as a contradiction that a Aḥmat bin Ḥanbal, who avoids takfir for a sinful person, considers the abandonment of the prayer to be the cause of Kufr.⁶²

Although differences in the Kalāmist interpretation should never be discussed in takfir, the historical process did not conform to this ideal.⁶³ The contradictory situation that emerged in Ibn Hazm's approach was not only unique to him but also exhibited by the followers of other sects. In this sense, the takfir used by Ahl al-sunna for Mu‘tazilite was sometimes used in the opposite direction.⁶⁴ Therefore, a situation, as contrary to the principle⁶⁵ that the Ahl al-sunna defined that Ahl al-qibla cannot be charged with takfir,⁶⁶ has emerged. Differences in sectual interpretation have been made by members of the sect to evaluate the opinions of the other sect, and takfir has been shown for reasons.⁶⁷ As an example, ‘Abdulqāhir al-Baghdādī can be cited to refer to Jaḥiḥ as a kafir / takfir⁶⁸ for some of his views. Likewise, reaction of Abū Faḍl Ja‘far

⁶² Yaşar Kandemir, “Aḥmed b. Ḥanbel”, *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam* (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1989), 2: 75-80.

⁶³ Muammer Esen, “Tekfir Söyleminin Dinî ve İdeolojik Boyutları”, *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 52/2 (2011): 100.

⁶⁴ Esen, “Tekfir Söyleminin Dinî ve İdeolojik Boyutları”, 101.

⁶⁵ Abu Hanifa started the issue of the fact that the Ahl al-Qibla could not be blamed with takfir, and then as a principle it was among the general principles of the Ahl al-Sunna. See Metin Yurdağür, “Ehl-i kible”, *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam* (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1994), 10: 515-516.

⁶⁶ Ğazzālī, *al-İqtisād fī al-İ‘tiqād*, ed. İbrāhīm Agah Çubukçu - Hüseyin Atay (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi, 1962), 250-251; Rāzī, *Nihāyātu al-‘uqūl fī dirāyāt al-uşūl*, 4: 305-306; Abū Ya‘la, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila*, 1: 26; It was accepted in Kalam sources as a principle that the people who prayed in many places by turning to the Qibla termed as “Ahl al-Qibla” and “Ahl al-Sala”, could not be charged with kufr. (Baghdādī, Farq, 231). Especially Curcānī’ in Sharḥu al-Mavāqif, makes extensive evaluations on the subject under the title “Whether the opponents of truth (Haqq) from Ahl al-Sunna charged with kufr or not”. See Abū al-Ḥasan Alī b. Muḥammad b. Alī Sayyid Sharīf Ḥanafī al-Jurcānī, *Şerḥu al-mavāqif*, ed. Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Umayra (Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1997/1417) 3: 560-574; Also see Yūsuf Qaradāwī, *Zāhirat al-guluw fī al-takfir*, 2th Edition (Cairo: Maktaba Wahba, 1985/1406), 60-63.

⁶⁷ Ğazzālī talks about four degrees of denouncing different Kalam sects. In the first degree; he states that there are Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians (Majusi), pagans, and their kufr is fixed by the Qur'an. After the second degree, which constitutes the refutation of the Brahmins and the Dehri (materialists), the third degree expresses the views of the philosophers of whom he claims kufr. Those in this group actually believe in Allah and His messenger, but some of their views contradict the Shari'a (legal codes). The fourth and extremely relevant topic is some of the parties / sects, such as Mu‘tazilite and Mushabbihā (anthropomorphists). According to Gazzālī, who states that the main issue of these people is related to ta‘wil / interpretation, their situation is similar to falling into error in ijtiḥād. What needs to be done about these things is to avoid takfir of them. Ğazzālī, *al-İqtisād fī al-İ‘tiqād*, 248-251.

⁶⁸ According to Abdulkāhir al-Baghdādī, among the Mu‘tazili scholars, takfir has been mentioned about Abū Ḥāshim. See Abd al-Qāhir Baghdādī, *Farq*, 175-176.

bin Ḥarb al-Hamādānī (d. 236/850), a kalām scholar who was attached to the Mu‘tezilite of Baghdād to Nazzām who was also belonged to Mu‘tezilite can be an example of this situation.⁶⁹

Various qualifications are encountered in order to make sense of the position of Kalām schools, themselves and their offenders. For example, it is necessary to read how the Ahl al-sunna, especially Salafiyya, describe Mu‘tezilite as “Mu’attila” and “Majūsi”;⁷⁰ how they call shiā as “Rāfiḍita”. On the one hand, Ahl al-sunna theologians describe themselves as “Ahl al-qibla”, “Ahl al-sunna”.⁷¹

Māturīdī refers Mu‘tazila as “Ahl-al-tawhīd” when he talk about “Ahl-al-tawhīd”, however, mentioning Mu‘tezilite’s similar views with other parties, and his charging them⁷² with kufr from time to time, can be considered in this context.

The subject of the Isbāt or cancellation of Divine Attributes to Takfīr is also addressed by theologians.⁷³ Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār narrates in his book, *al-Mughnī, al-Aswārī*’s views on the creation, power and knowledge of Allah.⁷⁴ It is assumed that Aswārī’s was charged with takfīr, because he has limited Allah's will and power and has put forth the power of man (kudra).⁷⁵

Another example of the emergence of takfīr in the ideological differences between the thinkers of the same sect was between Mu‘tazilite theologian Jubbāī and Abū Huzayl al-‘Allāf.⁷⁶ Jubbāī, who followed the views of al-‘Allāf, showed his opposition to him. According to Mālātī, who stated that Jubbāī opposes him on nineteen issues, the mutual takfīr was raised due to disagreements between the Kalāmists of Baghdad and Baṣra Mu‘tazilite.⁷⁷

⁶⁹ Cihat Tunç, “Ca’far b. Ḥarb”, *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam* (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1992) 6: 549-551.

⁷⁰ Those who prove the Attributes, accuse those who refute them as the ones who worship to a being without Attribute. Those who ignore (nafy) the Attributes; (Ibn Hazm refers Mu‘tazila) accuse those who prove them as who worship other than Allah, and also accuse them of worshipping some eternal beings. See Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 2: 266.

⁷¹ Muammer Esen, “Tekfīr Söyleminin Dinî ve İdeolojik Boyutları”, *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 52/2 (2011): 100.

⁷² Abū Mansūr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd al-Māturīdī (Māturīdī) al-Samarqandī, *Kitāb al-tawhīd* (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2003), 500-501.

⁷³ Dawwānī (d. 908/1502) who evaluates the debates about whether or not the Attributes added up (zāid) on the Essence (dhāt) in the relationship between Zāt and Sifat, states that such discussions are not the basic subjects of the belief. See Abū Abdallah Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Asad b. Muḥammad Dawwānī, *Sharḥ al-‘aqaid al-‘adūdiyya* (Istanbul: al-Ḥāc Ḥuseyin Efendi Matbaası, 1305), 4-5, 28-30, 53, 63-64.

⁷⁴ Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawhīd wa al-‘adl*, ed. Abd al-Hālim Maḥmūd, Sulayman Dunya (Cairo: al-Dār al-Misriyya, 1963), 311.

⁷⁵ Mustafa Öz, “Ali el-Esvārī”, *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam* (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1989), 2: 391-392.

⁷⁶ According to Abdulkāhīr al-Baghdādī, among the Mu‘tazili scholars, takfir has been mentioned about Abū Ḥāshim. See Abd al-Qāhīr al-Baghdādī, *Farq*, 186.

⁷⁷ Abū al-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abd al-Raḥmān Malatī, *al-Tanbih wa al-radd ‘alā ahl al-ahwā’ wa al-bid‘a* (Beirut: Maktaba al-Maārif, 1968), 40.

According to Abū Huzayl al-‘Allāf, major sins are divided into two, leading to blasphemy (kufr), and the one not leading to it. al-‘Allāf by pointing out that the takfir, which starts with a great sin, and comes upon other issues, can see the takfir possible for those who liken Allah to various beings, who describes judgments of Allah as cruelty, denies divine news, rejects the points that Muslims have agreed on (Ijma^c).⁷⁸

In his work *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa*, al-Ġazzālī, referring to matters that require the disbelief of philosophers, al-Ġazzālī sees it possible to direct various criticism because different terminologies related to the Attributes of Allah is on the agenda. According to him, those who approach to denial (ta’tīl) or who emphasize the tanzih (incompatibility) in order to preserve Tawhīd in this regard have not been put into direct denial of the Essence and Attribute.⁷⁹

al-Ġazzālī says that there are three different situations for takfir in order to be certain, to know the assumption with the most probability and to require hesitation. He recommends that he shows tawakkuf instead of takfir in “hesitant cases”, which he considers as the third kind.⁸⁰ In this regard, al-Ġazzālī wants to say that it is an ignorant attitude to embrace the takfir discourse immediately.

Is it possible to mention the possibility of takfir for those who performs ta’wīl on mutawātir nass. According to al-Ġazzālī, it should be evaluated whether or not to charge someone who performs ta’wīl on a mutawātir nass / script, with takfir.⁸¹ If there is no logic in terms of language rules, this type of ta’wīl means refutation (disbelief / kufr). On the other hand, the fact that al-Ġazzālī had philosophers in takfir on the basis of some reasons, left a turning point in the history of Islamic thought. He decided that some of the philosopher’s ta’wīl were directly subject to denial.⁸² However, the claim that the takfir mentioned by al-Ġazzālī is not related to philosophers, it (takfir) has been raised for those who say that the knowledge of Allah does not encompass everything.⁸³

al-Ġazzālī states in his book “Faḍāih al-Bātiniyya”,⁸⁴ where he gives extensive explanations about the Bātiniīs in the context of criticism (tankid)-takfir, it is necessary to distinguish between the situation that requires takfir because of an error or different thinking based on the ta’wīl.⁸⁵ According to al-Ġazzālī, the basic problem of Mu’tazila, Mushabbiha and other parties other than the philosophers are just some of the

⁷⁸ Abd al-Rahmān Badawī, *Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyīn*, 1: 174.

⁷⁹ Abū Ḥamid Ḥujja al-Islām Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Ġazzālī, *Tahāfut al-falāsifa*, ed. Sulayman Dunya (Cairo: Dār al-Maārif, nd.), 79-80.

⁸⁰ Ġazzālī, *Fayṣal al-tafriqa*, 51.

⁸¹ Ġazzālī, *al-Iqtisād fī al-i’tiqād*, 250-251.

⁸² Ġazzālī, *Tahāfut al-falāsifa*, 84-90, 282-292.

⁸³ Dawwanī, *Sharḥ al-‘aqaid al-‘adudiyya*, 29-31.

⁸⁴ The eighth part (p. 146-169) of al-Ġazzālī’s work “Faḍāih al-bātiniyya”, which consists of ten parts, is completely devoted to this subject. In the relevant section, he points out that some of their views require criticism and others require takfir. (Abū Ḥamid al-Ġazzālī, *Faḍāih al-bātiniyya*, ed. Abd al-Rahmān Badawī (Cairo: al-Dār al-Qawmiyya, 1964) 146.)

⁸⁵ Ġazzālī, *Faḍāih al-bātiniyya* 148.

mistakes that occurred when they were engaged ta'wil in an open matter which subject to ijtihad.⁸⁶ al-Ġazzālī aims to reveal what is blasphemy with its conditions. According to him, those who openly deny the idea of a single God, prophesy and the hereafter, hashr, apocalypse, who do not accept heaven-hell will be disbelievers.⁸⁷

al-Ġazzālī, who evaluates in his book *al-Iqtisād fi al-i'tiqād*, the intellectual disagreements caused by the different thinking and inference based on the interpretation of the works, al-Ġazzālī states that this cannot be the subject of kufr. The divisions between kalām schools or in the individual sense do not reflect the general opinion, even⁸⁸ though they are occasionally subject to takfir.⁸⁹

Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rādī (d. 606/1210) covered takfir in his book *Asās al-taqdīth* in the third (last) section of his fourth chapter. al-Rādī, who argues that the kufr of groups attributing to Allah is necessary, states that Mu'tazila acted with the idea of tanzih in the question of Attributes of God, they are separated from Mujassima and Mushabbiha. Rādī states that the takfir is not possible because of the Mu'tazila, who opposes them in the relation of Zāt - Sifāt.⁹⁰

Ibn Ḥazm makes an inference in bringing to the agenda the verses related to the naming of beings and events:

They are not but [mere] names you have named them - you and your forefathers - for which Allah has sent down no authority. They follow not except assumption and what [their] souls desire, and there has already come to them from their Lord guidance. (al-Najm 53/23)

And He taught Adam the names - all of them. Then He showed them to the angels and said, "Inform Me of the names of these, if you are truthful." (al-Baqara 2/31)

According to Ibn Hazm, angels or people do not have the authority to nominate a noun in the context of these two verses. Ibn Ḥazm, who argues that this principle should be followed, states that seeking a name other than this means lying against Allah and slander the Qur'ān.⁹¹ According to this, it is necessary to accept a person who Allah calls the believer in that way; since the place of imān is the heart, there is no right to remove it from it.

⁸⁶ Ġazzālī, *al-Iqtisād fi al-i'tiqād*, 250; Yūsuf Karadāvī, *Zahira-al-guluw fi al-takfir*, 2th Edition (Cairo: Maktaba Wahba 1985/1406), 60-63.

⁸⁷ Ġazzālī, *Faḍāih al-bāṭniyya*, 151.

⁸⁸ Abū Ya'lā's (d. 458/1066) mentioning of the takfir of the groups of faith except the Ahl-al-Sunna (Ibnu al-Farra Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn Abū Ya'la al-Farra, *al-Mu'tamad fi usūli al-dīn*, critical ed. Vedī` Zaydān Ḥaddād (Beirut: Dāru'l-Meşrik (Dar el-Machreq, 1974), 267-278) constitutes a contradiction with the tahammul (acceptance) and tolerance mentioned above.

⁸⁹ Ġazzālī, *al-Iqtisād fi al-i'tiqād*, 246.

⁹⁰ Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rādī Muḥammad b. Omar b. al-Ḥusayn, *Asās al-taqdīs fi ilm al-kalām*, ed. Aḥmad Ḥijāzī al-Sakkā (Cairo: Maktaba al-Kulliya al-Azhariyya, 1406/1986), 257-258.

⁹¹ Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 2: 211.

According to Ibn Hāẓm, the existence of *īmān* draws attention to the fact that there is no *kufr*, and that the existence of *kufr* is proof⁹² that there is no *īmān* he points out that where something exists, it is also where it will disappear. Ibn Hāẓm stated that there is no doubt about a person who denies Allah and his messenger is and there is a consensus of the scholars of the Muslims (*ijmaʿ*) mentioning that there is no doubt that he is an unbeliever / *kāfir*.⁹³ In spite of this, Ibn Hāẓm has not always remained in such a reasonable line. In spite of the measures he has determined to be consistent with *taqfir* (*takfir*), he blamed the scholars of Ashʿarī, such as Bāqillānī, Ibn Fūrak, Sulaymān bin Ḥalaf al-Bājī with *kufr* because of some of their commentaries.⁹⁴

In *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, where he summed up⁹⁵ different opinions on the subject, Ashʿarī argues that because they are *Ahl-al qibla*, they will not be considered disbelievers considering them like the people of the sinners, who are considered as adulterers and thieves.⁹⁶ Ashʿarī, who expresses that the *Ahl al-qibla* cannot be blamed with *takfir*, shows us what is the provision of both *takfir* and the great sin, saying that whoever accepts sin as lawful and does not believe that it is unlawful will be disbelieving.⁹⁷ As Ashʿarī, states, particularly, ʿĪjī (d. 756/1355), the author of Ashʿarī's basic sources and 756/1355) and Jurjānī (d. 816/1413), and the majority of the theologians act with this principle.⁹⁸ Qutbuddīnzāda (d. 885/1480) has written an independent work in this regard.⁹⁹

The difference between Muʿtezilite and *Ahl al-sunna*, who call the sinner “*fāsiq*”, is that Muʿtezilite used the term “*fāsiq*” in the meaning of *al-manzila bayn al-manzilatayn* to refer to it as a new name except *īmān* and *kufr*.¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, the meaning that the *Ahl al-sunna*, who gives the sinner the name of

⁹² Ibn Hāẓm, *Faṣl*, 2: 254.

⁹³ Ibn Hāẓm, *Faṣl*, 2: 248.

⁹⁴ Ibn Hāẓm, *Faṣl*, 3: 144,145, 159.

⁹⁵ Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt alʾ-islāmiyyīn* 290.

⁹⁶ Ashʿarī, *Maqālātʾl-islāmiyyīn*, 293; Also see Ğazzālī, *al-Iqtisād fiʾ al-ʿitiqād*, 250-251.

⁹⁷ Abū al-Ḥasan Ibn Abū Bishr Alī b. Ismāil b. Iṣḥāq (Ashʿarī), *al-İbāne an usūl al-diyāna*, ed. Fawqīyya Ḥusayn Maḥmūd, 2th Edition (Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb, 1987), 26.

⁹⁸ See Ğazzālī, *al-Iqtisād fiʾ al-ʿitiqād*, 250-251; Ibn Abū Yaʿla, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila*, 1: 26; Saʿd al-Dīn Masūd b. Omer b. Abd al-Allah Taftāzānī, *Sharḥ al-maqāṣid*, ed. 3: 461-462, 560; İlyas Çelebi, *Dinî Düşüncede İtidal ve Hoşgörü* (Istanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları, 2009), 139.

⁹⁹ Muḥyī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Qutb al-Dīn al-Iznikī, *Risāla fi ʿadami jawāzi takfiri ahl al-qibla*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Bağdatlı Vehbi Efendi, nr. 2041.

¹⁰⁰ “Uṣūl al-thalasa” composition is the most succinct expression of the belief principles that form the systematic structure of the *Ahl-al Sunna*'s *kalam* / theological books. Muʿtazila, on the other hand, by expressing the basic belief principles with the composition of “Uṣūl al-khamsa” studied the subjects of the Here-after by describing the rewards and penalties for the person who is responsible (*mukallaf*) with the divinity (*ulūhiyya*) in the principle of *tawḥīd*; prophethood in the principle of justice; *al-Waʿd- waʿl-Wāʿid* and *al-Manzila bayn al-Manzilatayn*. See Orhan Şener Koloğlu, “Muʿtezile'nin Temel Öğretileri”, 45.

fāsiq, imposes on this name is that he is a believer because of the fact that he has īmān in himself and he is a fāsiq because of the sin and fisq he committed.

According to Ibn Ḥazm, Mu'tezilite, who perceives īmān as righteous deeds, says that the fisq is not īmān. Mu'tazilite, who says that the fāsiq is not a believer, takes the verse of "Thus the word of your Lord has come into effect upon those who defiantly disobeyed - that they will not believe." (Yūnus, 10/33) as evidence.¹⁰¹

Thus fisq, because it does not have an opposite, is considered as kufr, and the idea of "murtakib al-kabira cannot be charged with kufr" is accepted. In addition, because the major sin is not the action of organs, it is not necessary to cause the faith (īmān), which is the action of the heart, to be destroyed. Most importantly, it is important to stay away from takfir in this matter and in different ways of reading the Kalām, as the believer in the prayer towards Qibla is Ahl al-Ṣalāh, which is accepted as a principle.

Although it is not possible for the takfir of the Ahl al-qibla,¹⁰² the subject has been evaluated in this direction from time to time. As a result, takfir has become a weapon used against the opposition groups of the theological schools in the discussion of religious issues. Thus, the aim was to obtain a psychological superiority against the challenge.

According to all these information, the kufr and takfir problem encountered in the early periods regarding the great sin is brought to the agenda again in the context of different issues in the history of Islam. It is a fact that sometimes the criticism of the members of the sects against each other has reached an insults beyond the limit of criticism, and from time to time, takfir is a subject among the two thinkers who are members of the same sects.

CONCLUSION

One of the first problems Muslims face after the death of the Messenger of Allah is the controversy over the provision of great sin. Khārijīte was the first party to advocate takfir as a provision of great sin.

Mu'tazila found it hard to judge the great sin as kufr when they said that 'amal (deed) was a part from īmān/faith, and instead, used the principle *al-Manzila Bayn al-Manzilatayn*. In this way, Mu'tezile was more moderate in terms of worldly rule than Khārijīte. Ibn Ḥazm, who counted the murtakib al-kabira as mu'min, is one of the names that do not include murtakib al-kabira under the scope of kufr.

Takfir, not only a subject of great sin, was also used in the ideological differences between kalām schools. It is important to note that Ibn Ḥazm should be met with tolerance in different reading forms on the subjects of the Kalām, and in separations of intellectual values based on ta'wīl and the case of the ijtihād. However, it is not possible to say that he himself fully obeys the principle that he determined not to turn the intellectual disputes into i'tiqādī / theological secessionals.

This attitude of Ibn Ḥazm especially for Ash'ari and Mu'tazila, has been mentioned for the purpose of differentiating one of the kalām schools from the other. Takfir was experienced between thinkers who were members of the same denomination from time to time.

¹⁰¹ Ibn Ḥazm, *Faṣl*, 2: 254.

¹⁰² Jurcānī, *Ṣarḥ al-mavāqif*, 3: 560.

Takfir, which is located at the heart of the events that emerged in the early stages of the history of Islam, was not dependent on the subject matter, in addition, to ensure the legitimacy of takfir in the political sphere, arguments were tried to be found in the field. The idea and intellectual conflicts that we can call theological ta'wil (interpretation) are met in a strict and hard way nowadays, as in the history. Ultimately, the event can be taken as far as takfir.

In fact, anyone who says that he is a Muslim should accept it in this direction. It is primarily necessary to keep the believer away from the blame of *kufir*. In the context of scientific sensitivity, it is not possible to accept that an event which should remain at a totally methodological level should be brought to the level of takfir by the transfer of it to the theological plane. The abandonment of takfir discourse is important in terms of maintaining the balance of Islam until the day of judgment without losing the dynamism of universal Islam and ensuring the development of Islamic thought at all times.

REFERENCES

- Abd al-Babāqī, Muḥammad Fuād. “Hrm”. *al-Muʿjam al-mufahras li alfāz al-Qurʾān al-karīm*. 251-252. 3th Edition Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadith, 1991/1411.
- Abd al-Bāqī, Muḥammad Fuād. “Cdl”. *al-Muʿjam al-mufahras li alfāz al-Qurʾān al-karīm*. 210. 3th Edition Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadith, 1991/1411.
- Abd al-Bāqī, Muḥammad Fuād. “Hz'e”. *al-Muʿjam al-mufahras li alfāz al-Qurʾān al-karīm*. 905-906. 3th Edition Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadith, 1991/1411.
- Akoğlu, Muharrem. “Kebîre ve İman Bağlamında Hâricilik-Mu'tezile İlişkisi”. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 2/23 (2007): 317-339.
- Bağçeci, Muhiddin. “Ehl-i salât”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 10: 524-525. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1994.
- Baghdādī, Abū Mansūr Abd al-Qāhir b. Tāhir b. Muḥammad Tamīmī Abd al-Qāhir. *al-Farq bayn al-firaq wa bayān al-Firqaḥ al-Nāciya Minhum*. Ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn Abd al-Hamīd. Cairo: Dār al-Turas, nd.
- Badawī, Abd al-Raḥman. *Madhahib al-Islamiyyin*. 2 Vols. 2th Edition. Beirut: Dār al-ʿIlm li al-Malāyīn, 1979.
- Beyazizade Ahmet Efendi. *Ishārāt al-marām min ʿibārāt al-Imām*. Ed. Yusûf ʿAbd al-Razzāq. Istanbul: Dar al-Kitāb' al-Islāmi, 1949/1368.
- Büyükkara, Mehmet Ali. “Hâricîliğin Modern Bir Görüntüsü Olarak Tekfircilik”. *İç Tehdit ve Riskler Işığında İslâm Dünyasının Geleceği*. 13-46. Istanbul: İnsamer, 2016.
- Jurcānī, Abū al-Ḥasan Alī b. Muḥammad b. Alī al-Sayyid al-Sharīf. *Sharh al-Mavāqif*. Ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ʿUmayra. Beirut: Dār al-Jil, 1997/1417.

- Çelebi, İlyas. *Dinî Düşüncede İtidal ve Hoşgörü*. İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları, 2009.
- Dārimī, Abū Sa’īd Uthman b. Saīd. *al-Radd alā al-Jahmiyya*. Nşr. Gösta Vitestam. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1960.
- Dawwānī, Abū Abdallāh Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. As’ad b. Muḥammad. *Sharh al-Aqaid al-Adudiyya*. İstanbul: al-Ḥāc Ḥusayn Efendi Matbaası, 1305.
- Dahlawī, Abū Abd al-Azīz Qutb al-Dīn Shah Wali Allah Aḥmad b. Abd al-Raḥīm b. Wajihal-Dīn Fārūqī Shah Wali ullah, *Ḥujjat Allāhī al-bāliḡha*. Ed. Muḥammad Sharīf Sukkar. Beirut: Dār İḥya al-‘Ulūm, 1990.
- Abū Ya’la al-Farrā, Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn Ibn al-Farrā. *al-Mu’tamad fī usūl al-dīn*. Ed. Wadi` Zeydān Ḥaddād. Beirut: Dār al-Mashriq, 1974.
- Esen, Muammer. “Tekfır, Söyleminin Dinî ve İdeolojik Boyutları”. *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 52/2 (2011): 97-110.
- Ash‘arī, Abū al-Ḥasan Ibn Abū Bishr Alī b. İsmail b. İshāq. *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn wa ikhtilāf al-musallīn*. Ed. Hellmut Ritter. 2th Edition. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1963.
- Ash‘arī, Abū al-Ḥasan Ibn Abū Bishr Ali b. İsmail b. İshāq. *al-İbāna an usūl al-Diyāna*. Ed. Fawqıyya Ḥusayn Maḥmūd. 2th Edition Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb, 1987.
- Abū Ḥanīfa, Nu’mān b. Sābit. *al-Alim wa al-Mutaallim*. Ed. Muḥammad Zāhid b. al-Ḥasan al-Kawsarī. Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Azhariyya li al-Turās, 2001.
- Ġhazzālī, Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Fadāih al-Bātiniyya*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Rahman Badawī. Cairo: al-Dār al-Qavmiyya, 1964.
- Ġazzālī, Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa*. Ed. Sulayman Dunya. Cairo: Dār al-Maārif, nd.
- Ġazzālī, Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *al-Iqtisād fī al-İ’tiqād*. Ed. İbrāhim Agah Çubukçu - Ḥuseyin Atay. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi, 1962.
- Ġazzālī, Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *İslam’da Müsamaha (Fayşal al-tafriqa bayn al-İslām wa al-zandaqa)*. trans. Süleyman Uludağ. İstanbul: Dergāh Yayınları, 2013.
- Güneş, Hüseyin. *İslam’da Zahiri-Sünni Düşüncenin Çekişmesi: İbn Hazm ve Eş’arilik Örneği*. Konya: Kitap Dünyası, 2007.
- Ibn Abū Ya’la, Abū al-Ḥusayn Ibn al-Farra Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn Baghdad Ḥanbalī. *Ṭabaqāt al-Hanābila*. 3 Vols. Beirut: Dār al-Ma’rifa, 1952/1371.
- Ibn Ḥaldūn. *Muqaddima*. trans. Aḥmad Cevdet Paşa - Yavuz Yıldırım et al. İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2015.

- Ibn Hāzım, Abū Muḥammad b. Ali b. Aḥmad b. Saïd al-Zāhirī. *al-Faṣl fī al-Milal wa al-Nihāl*. Aḥmad Shams al-Dīn. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-İlmiya, 1996/1416.
- Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad. *Sharh al-Uṣūl al-khamsa*. 2th Edition. Ed. Aḥmad veb. al-Ḥusayn b. Abū Ḥashim Mankdim. Ed. Abd al-Karīm Uthman. Cairo: Maktaba Wahba, 1988/1408.
- Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad. *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa al-‘adl*. Ed. Abd al-Hālim Maḥmūd, Sulayman Dunya. 20 Vols. Cairo: al-Dār al-Mısriyya, 1963.
- Kandemir, Yaşar. “Aḥmad b. Hanbel”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 2: 75-80. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1989.
- Kılavuz, Aḥmad Saim. *İmân-Küfür Sınırı: Tekfir Meselesi*. Istanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1984.
- Iznikî, Muḥyî al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Qutb al-Dīn. *Risāla fī ‘adami jawāzi takfir ahl al-qibla*. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Bağdatlı Vehbi Efendi, no. 2041.
- Mātūrīdī, Abū Mansūr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd. *Kitāb al-tawḥīd*. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2003.
- Ḥarizmî, Rukn al-Dīn b. Malahimî. *Kitāb al-faiq fī usūl al-dīn*. Ed. Wilferd Madelung, Mardin Mc Dermont. Tahran: Muassasa Pejoūhesh Hikma wa Falsafa-yī Irān, 1386.
- Qaradāwī, Yūsuf. *Zahira al-guluw fī al-takfir*. 2th Edition. Cairo: Maktaba Wahba, 1985/1406.
- Koloğlu, Orhan Şener. “Mu‘tezile’nin Temel Öğretileri”. *İslâmî İlimler Dergisi = Islamic Theology Journal* 12/2 (2017): 43-80.
- Rādī, Muḥammad b. Umar b. al-Ḥusayn Faḥr al-Dīn. *Asās al-Taqdis fī ‘ilm al-Kalām*. Ed. Aḥmad Hicāzī es-Sekkā. Cairo: Maktaba al-Kulliyā al-Azhariyya, 1406/1986.
- Rādī, Muḥammad b. Umar b. al-Ḥusayn Fakhr al-Dīn. *Nihāya al-‘uqūl fī dirāya al-usūl*. Ed. Saïd Abd al-Lātif Fūde. Beirut: Dār al-Zehāir, 2015/1436.
- Malatī, Abū al-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abd al-Raḥmān. *al-Tanbih wa al-Radd ‘alā ahl al-Ahvā wa al-Bid’a*, Beirut: Maktaba al-Maārif, 1968.
- Nasafī, Abū-al-Muīn Maymūn b. Muḥammad. *Tabşıra al-adilla fī usūl al-Dīn*. Ed. Hüseyin Atay, Şa‘ban Ali Düzgün. Ankara: Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Presidency of Religious Affairs, 2003.
- Öz, Mustafa. “Ali el-Esvārī”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 2: 391-392. Istanbul, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1989.
- Şabūnī Nureddin. *al-Kifāya fī al-Hidāya*. Ed. Muḥammad Aruçi. Beirut: Dār Ibn Hāzım; (Ibn Hāzım) Istanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2014/1435.

- Serdar, Murat. *İbn Hazm'ın Kelâmî Görüşleri*. Doctoral thesis: Erciyes University, 2005.
- Serdar, Murat. “İbn Hazm'ın Eş'arî Kelâmına Yönelik Eleştirileri”. *Uluslararası İmam Eş'arî ve Eş'arîlik Sempozyumu Bildirileri 21-23 Eylül 2014*. 2: 89-120. İstanbul: Beyan Yayınları, 2015.
- Shahriştānī, Abū al-Fath Tāj al-Dīn (Lisān al -Dīn) Muḥammad b. Abd al-Qarīm b. Aḥmad. *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*. Ed. Abd al-Azīz Muḥammad Wakil. Cairo: Muassasa al -Ḥalabī, 1968.
- Taftāzānī, Sa'd al-Dīn Mas'ūd b.Umar. *Sharh al-Maqāşid*. Ed. Abd al-Raḥmān 'Umayra, 5 Vols. Beirut: Ālem al-Kutub, 1989.
- Topaloğlu, Bekir. “Cihad”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 7: 531-534. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1993.
- Tunç, Cihat. “Ca'fer b. Harb”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 6: 549-551, İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1992.
- Tunç, Cihat. “Kelâm ilminde Büyük Günah Meselesi”. *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 23 (1978): 325-342.
- Türkgülü, Mustafa. “Günah Kavramı ve İman Problemi Haline Getirilen Büyük Günah/Kebire Hakkındaki Kelâmî Tartışmalar”. *Diyanet İlmî Dergi* 36/4 (2000): 63-88.
- Yavuz, Yusuf Şevki. “İbn Hazm”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 20: 52-56. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1999.
- Yavuz, Yusuf Şevki. “İhbât”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 20: 529-530. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2000.
- Yavuz, Yusuf Şevki. “Haber-i Vâhid”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 14: 352-355. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1996.
- Yavuz, Yusuf Şevki. “Tekfir”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 40: 350-356. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2011.
- Yurdagür, Metin. “Ehl-i kible”. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*. 10: 515-516. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1994.