

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF *DHAMM AL-KALAM WA AHLIH* BY AL-HARAWI AS A SOURCE OF AL-SUYUTI'S *SAWN AL-MANTIQ WA 'L-KALAM 'AN FANNAY AL-MANTIQ WA 'L-KALAM*

Abstract:

Redaksi Sawn al-Mantiq yang diedit oleh al-Nashshar (1947) dan Su'ada 'Ali 'Abd al-Raziq (1970) masih bisa di-upgrade; nama-nama otoritas yang dirujuk oleh al-Suyuti bisa diperbaiki, tidak dengan membaca kembali naskah aslinya yang sudah tidak bisa diakses lagi dan tersimpan di Perpustakaan al-Azhar tetapi dengan mengkolasi (collate)' salah satu karya yang diringkas al-Suyuti dalam Sawn al-Mantiq tsb. Karya yang diringkas tersebut adalah Dhamm al-Kalam karya al-Harawi, satu karya yang ringkasannya adalah seperempat lebih batang tubuh (corpus) Sawn al-Mantiq (terdiri dari 227 halaman cetak) karya al-Suyuti.

Hasil kolasi terhadap reproduksi naskah Dhamm al-Kalam yang disimpan di Perpustakaan Nasional Suriah memperlihatkan signifikansi Dhamm al-Kalam sebagai sumber Sawn al-Mantiq dan bahan dasar untuk meng-upgrade redaksi Sawn al-Mantiq yang diedit masing-masing oleh 'Ali Sami al-Nashshar (1947) and Su'ada 'Ali 'Abd al-Raziq (1970).

Key Words: *Kolasi, Dhamm al-Kalam, Sumber utama, Sawn al-Mantiq.*

Introduction

To the best of my knowledge, Muslim literatures discussing the opposition against *kalam* can be classified into two kinds: *First*, those which discuss incidentally the opposition against *kalam*, and *Secondly*, those which discuss elaborately the same issue. Into the first category, some works, to set few examples, can be mentioned: *al-Ri'aya* by al-Harith al-Muhasibi (d. 243/858), *Kitab Halq Af'al al-'Ibad* by al-Buhari (d. 256/871), *Sarih al-Sunna* by Ibn Jarir al-Tabari (d. 310/923), *al-Shari'a* by Abu Bakr Muhammad b. al-Husayn al-'Ajurri (d. 360/972). *Al-Gunya 'an al-Kalam wa Ahlih* by Abu Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Hattabi (d. 388/999), *al-Radd 'ala Ahl al-Kalam* (forthwith called: *al-Radd*) by al-Sulami

(d.412/1022), *Dhamm al-Kalam* (forthwith called: DhK) by ‘Abd Allah al-Ansari al-Harawi (d. 481/1089), and *Tahrim al-Nazar fi Kutub Ahl al-Kalam* of Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi (d. 620/1224) are classified into the second one.

DhK deserves special attention for several obvious reasons: *First*, that which is found in al-Suyuti’s statement in his *Sawn al-Mantiq wa’l-Kalam* (forthwith called: SM) which reads: “the most significant work in that respect [to condemn *kalam* and its authors] is *Kitab Dhamm al-Kalam wa Ahlih* of *Shayh al-Islam* Abu Isma’il al-Harawi. The size of this book is a bound volume. Every information is produced with the chains of transmission...”² *Secondly*, due to the fact that DhK is, according to Beaucueuil, ‘a principal source for the history of the struggle against rational theology in Islam.’³ *Finally*, in the history of the Arabic literature against *kalam*, DhK constitutes a chain of transmission from al-Sulami’s *al-Radd ‘ala Fann al-Kalam* for the works against *kalam* of later generations. Having failed to refer to *al-Radd*, al-Suyuti when composing SM, for instance, relies on DhK extensively. Abu Muzaffar b. al-Sam’ani in his *al-Intisar li Ahl al-Hadith* refers to DhK three times as well. Likewise, some other works abridged in SM, like al-Hatib al-Bagdadi’s *Sharaf Ashab al-Hadith*, al-Lalaka’i’s *al-Shari’a*, etc share some discussion of DhK.

This paper tries to answer following questions: What is the Significance of al-Harawi’s DhK as a Source for SM? And what is the role played by DhK for the Correction of SM? As far as the organization of the discussion of this paper is concerned, the following topics will be dealt with:

1. The biography of al-Harawi and the purpose of his composition of DhK
2. The Arabic Texts of DhK and Its Edition as well as the Study of both of them by Modern Scholar(s)
3. Al-Suyuti’s Method of Dealing with DhK
4. Why does al-Suyuti leave some chapters in DhK unabridged?
5. The Significance of al-Harawi’s DhK as a Source for SM
6. The Role of DhK for the Correction of SM

1. The Biography of al-Harawi and the Purpose of his Composition of DhK

According to al-Suyuti, al-Harawi’s complete name was Abu Isma’il ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. ‘Ali al-Ansari al-Harawi. He was a Hanbalite scholar, a *Hafiz* of tradition, an expert in language, a

prominent figure in *tasawwuf*, a great savant who established the *Sunna* and rejected innovations, and the author of *Kitab Manazil al-Sa'irin*.⁴

According to Brockelmann, al-Harawi was born in Wuhendiz in 396/1005. He was appointed a professor by Nizam al-Mulk in the end of 480/1087, several years after having been given the title of *Shaykh al-Islam* awarded to him by al-Muqtadir Bi 'llah in 474/1081, because of his high position in the Hanbalite school.⁵ He died in the city of his birth in 481/1088.⁶

Considered as the most excellent work in condemning *kalam* and its authors⁷ and as "a principal source for the history of the struggle against rational theology in Islam.", DhK, according to Beaurecueil, was written in Jumada II 474/1082 when al-Harawi settled in Herat, where he discoursed against the theologians. This *opus* was the fruit of his labour against *kalam*, which then was transmitted to his disciples.⁸ As a result of his polemics against the author of *kalam*, al-Harawi was subject to murder on five occasions and was thrice exiled.⁹

2. The Arabic Texts of DhK and Its Edition as well as the Study of both of them by Modern Scholar(s)

The manuscript the present author relies on is that of Maktaba al-Asad (Syrian National Library in Damascus) registered no. 1138. The manuscript consists of 149 folios. Each folio has two pages, each of which has twenty lines. The manuscript does not seem to be an autograph. This is based on introduction of each *juʿz*, which implies that each information in the manuscript is dictated by al-Harawi to his disciples. The manuscript is produced out of a dictation during lectures (*al-majalis*). As described at the endnote of the author of the *sama'a*, this manuscript is accordingly the oldest *sama'a* written at Qasiyun, Damascus in 685/1287.¹⁰

There are three originals of DhK, which are respectively preserved in the British Museum, in Maktaba al-Asad (Syrian National Library) and in İlâhiyat Fakültesi Ankara.

A number of studies, however, in one or another way have been undertaken by modern scholars to deal with DhK. Relying on both manuscripts of DhK preserved in the British Museum and in Maktaba al-Azhariyya (the manuscript is now preserved in Maktaba al-Asad), al-Hashshash in his *Zwischen Tradition und Aufbruch* has devoted one chapter to discuss extensively this work.¹¹ He also edited and published a small part of this manuscript and put it in the appendix of his study. Likewise,

relying on the manuscript of the British Museum, Dugaym (1994) also dealt with some part of DhK. Furthermore, he edited and published it.¹²

Beaurecueil discussed DhK and its literary context briefly.¹³ Despite efforts expended in discussing the biography and the mystical thought of al-Harawi extensively, Beaurecueil's discussion of the context of this work does not exceed a half page. Accordingly, DhK was referred to by Massignon in his study of al-Hallaj the Mystic, due the fact that its author (viz. al-Harawi) is a great mystic.¹⁴

DhK records al-Harawi's discussion against *kalam*. This work is divided into seven *juʿz*s. Some *juʿz*s has several *abwabs*, while the others have even no single *bab*. The first *juʿz*, for instance, has six *abwabs*, and the seventh *juʿz* has four *abwabs*. While fifth and sixth *juʿz*s even have no single *bab*.

Al-Harawi's discussion in the first *juʿz* revolves around (a) the ancient communities' derailment with the obedience and the observation, (b) the worry of the Prophet about the dangers effecting his community, (c) the abhorrence of using the vague words and expressions, (d) censuring debate and mentioning its misfortunes, (e) the virtue of avoiding the disputation and (f) the Prophet's objection to the debate on the issues in the Koran. The second *juʿz* deals with (1) the prophet's prohibition of the dispute on the (theological) issues in the Koran, (2) the evidence against the opinion that the Koran does not need the tradition, and (3) the emphasis that the use of opinion in the tradition is prohibited. The third *juʿz* discusses (a) the abhorrence of the prophet at those who were occupied very deeply by religious disputation, (b) the abhorrence of being extravagant in matters of religion, (c) the worry of the Prophet and Pious ancestors about those who were occupied by the words of the People of the Books. The Forth chapter elaborates the issues revolving around (a) the Prophet's information of the status of the theologians, (b) mentioning issues occurred at the time of the prophet and (c) the abhorrence of making use of the innovation made by the theologians. The fifth and sixth chapters discuss the arguments against *kalam* made by leading scholars of various generations. The last chapter is concerned with (a) that the innovators and the theologians are cursed, (b) obtaining the knowledge from the theologians is prohibited, (c) effecting sin on those who follow the evil tradition, and (d) mentioning the opinions of al-Ash'ari.¹⁵

3. Al-Suyuti's Method of Dealing with DhK

That al-Suyuti has expended his efforts at rendering an abridged DhK in SM shorter is beyond question since al-Harawi's discussion in DhK of 149 folios was condensed into only 47 printed pages.¹⁶ But that al-Suyuti's dealing with DhK only makes use of the method of abridgement is open to question.

If one compares DhK with the abridged one in SM, he would be convinced that when dealing with DhK, al-Suyuti actually makes use of three methods: summarizing, paraphrasing and omitting. When summarizing, al-Suyuti abridges al-Harawi's statements by shortening them. When paraphrasing, al-Suyuti reformulates al-Harawi's ideas in his DhK without altering the basic structure and the significance of al-Harawi's discussion. Al-Suyuti also omits irrelevant and digressive part of al-Harawi's discussion and even same chapters, which do not relatively comply with general discussion.

Al-Suyuti's method of summarizing is reflected in a following case: when transmitting traditions, he almost always cuts a great number of chains of the transmission and leaves out that of the closest one to the Prophet: In DhK, for instance, it is written as follows:

"wa ahbarani isma'il ibn ibrahim huwa al-nasr abadhi nisabur haddathana isma'il ibn najid qala haddathana muhammad ibn ayyub al-razi haddathana muhammad ibn shannan haddathana ahmad ibn muhammad ibn mansur haddathana 'abd al-allah ibn 'adi al-hafiz wa haddathana 'abd al-rahman ibn muhammad ibn abi al-hayyiz haddathana muhammad ibn ahmad ibn hamdan qala' haddathana abu ya'la haddathana muhammad ibn al-sabbah al-dawlawi wa haddathana al-hayyiz ibn muhammad ibn 'ali haddathana muhammad ibn ahmad ibn al-'atr ibn al-hafiz haddathana muhammad ibn tahir ibn abi al-damik haddathana ibrahim ibn ziyad shiblan. Wa ahbarana ahmad ibn muhammad ibn muhammad ibn al-hayyiz ibn malik wa huwa mujtami' haddathana muhammad ibn ahmad ibn hams haddathana muhammad ibn 'abd al-rahman al-sami haddathana abu 'imran al-haytham ibn ayyub. Wa haddathana al-hayyiz ibn muhammad ibn 'ali haddathana 'abd -allah ibn muhammad ibn 'ali al-zinad haddathana ja'far ibn ahmad ibn nasr haddathana abu marwan al-uthmani. Wa haddathana abu ya'qub al-hafiz haddathana al-basan ibn abi al-basan al-faqih haddathana muhammad ibn idris haddathana ishaq ibn abi isra'il qalu haddathana ibrahim ibn sa'ad haddathana abi. Wa haddathana 'abd al-rahman ibn muhammad ibn abi al-husayn al-faqih haddathana muhammad ibn muhammad ibn ahmad ibn ishaq al-hafiz haddathana ahmad ibn muhammad ibn al-hayyiz haddathana abu al-azhar haddathana ya'qub ibn ibrahim ibn sa'd haddathana abi. Wa haddathana ahmad ibn muhammad ibn mansur haddathana 'abd allah ibn 'adi haddathana abu halifa haddathana muhammad ibn al-salat 'an al-darawidi wa haddathana al-basan ibn yahya haddathana 'abd al-rahman ibn ahmad haddathana sa'id ibn muhammad abi al-zubayr haddathana yusuf ibn

*muhammad haddathana 'abd al-rahman ibn migra haddathana muhammad ibn ishaq haythuma 'an 'abd al-wahid ibn abi 'awn 'an sa'd ibn ibrahim haddathana abi wahd al-fat ibn al-siyah 'an al-qasim 'an 'a'isha radiya -allah 'anha qalat qala rasul allah salla allah 'alayh wa sallama man abdatha fi amrina ma laysa minh fahuwa radd."*¹⁷

These words are summarized by al-Suyuti as follows: *'an 'a'isha radiya allah 'anha qalat qala rasul allah salla allah 'alayh wa sallama man abdatha fi amrina ma laysa minh fahuwa radd.*¹⁸

His method of paraphrasing is exemplified in a number of following cases:

- (1) Without altering the basic structure and meaning of al-Harawi's statement, when dealing with DhK, al-Suyuti paraphrases the *athar* and formulates it with his own words. This is exemplified in a following case: In DhK, it is stated: *"ma ra'aytu abadan kana ashaddu 'ala al-mutanatti'in min rasul allah wala ra'aytu ba'dahu abadan ashaddu 'alayhim hawfan min abi baker walakinni laazunnu 'umar kana ashadd abl al-ard hawfan 'alayhim."*¹⁹ This is paraphrased by al-Suyuti into the following statement: *"ma ra'aytu abadan kana ashadd 'ala al-mutanatti'in min rasul allah wala min abi baker wa 'umar."*²⁰

His method of abridgement is also represented by the following example:

*"...ma jalasna majlisan fi 'abd rasul allah salla allah 'alayh wa sallama kunna bihi ashaddu igtiyazan ...faidha rijal 'ind hujrat 'a'isha radiya allah 'anhuma yataraja'un fi al-qadar falamma ra'aynahum i'tazalnahum warasul allah salla allah 'alayh wa sallama half al-hujrat yasma'u kalamahum fabaraja 'alayna rasul allah mugdaban yu'rafu fi wajbih al-gadab hatta waqafa 'alayhim faqala salla allah 'alayhi ya qawmi bihadha dallat al-umam qablakum bi'htilafihim 'ala anbiya'ihim wadarbihim al-kitab ba'dah biba'd wa inna al-qur'an lam yunazzal litadribu ba'dah biba'd walakin nu'zila al-qur'an yusaddiq ba'duh ba'd ma 'araftum minh fa'malu' bih wa ma tashabaha bih fa-aminu' bih."*²¹ Al-Suyuti's abridgement of the tradition above is as follows: *"haraja rasul allah 'ala ashabih dhat yawm wahum yataraja'un fi al-qadar fabaraja mugdaban hatta waqafa 'alayhim faqala ya qawm bihadha dallat al-umam qablakum bi'htilafihim 'ala anbiya'ihim wadarbihim al-kitab ba'dah biba'd wa inna al-qur'an lam yunazzal linadrib ba'dah biba'd walakin nu'zila al-qur'an fasaddaqa ba'duh ba'd ma 'araftum minh fa'malu' bih wa ma tashabaha bih fa-aminu' bih."*²²

- (2) When being encountered with a number of *athars* dealing with the same issue, al-Suyuti in his abridgement sorts out some words from *athar* and adds them to another. This is exemplified by the fact that al-Suyuti abridges al-Harawi's report of some *athars* dealing with the debate on *qadr*.

When explaining that the companions disputed each other on *qadr*, al-Harawi uses three variants: (a) *wahum yabtasimun fi 'l-qadr*, (b) *yataraja'un*, and (c) *wahum yatanaja'un*.²³ Al-Suyuti, however, chooses *yataraja'un*.²⁴

- (3) Al-Suyuti does not follow al-Harawi's organization of his discussion. This happens in two cases: (1) al-Harawi's report of Ibn Yusuf's statement which reads: "*al-'ilm bi'l-busuma wa 'l-kalam jahl wa 'l-jahl bi 'l-busuma wa 'l-kalam 'ilm*" is put by al-Suyuti after al-Harawi's report of Nuh al-Jami' who said: "*qultu liabi hanifata ma taqul fima abdath al-nas min al-kalam fi al-a'rad wa 'l-aqsam...*" not before it.²⁵

This also holds true for a chapter on the worry of the Prophet about the dangers effecting his community,²⁶ in which the *athar* on the authority of 'Umar b. al-Hattab, which says "*yahdum al-islam thalath zulla 'alim wa jidal munafiq bi 'l-qur'an wa a'immah mudillun*" was reported after the tradition of the Prophet who says "*inni abafu 'alaykum thalath wahiya ka'ina zilla 'alim wa jidal munafiq bi 'l-qur'an wa dunya ta'ummu 'alaykum*." The reason could be that the *athar* of 'Umar b. Hattab is made use of to emphasize the prophetic tradition.

- (4) Al-Suyuti includes al-Harawi's discussion in several chapters into one single chapter. This can be seen in the fact that chapter *bab al-wuquf 'ind al-sunna wa dhamm al-ra'y wa 'l-bid'a wa 'l-ta'ammuq fi al-din* in SM²⁷ is extracted from three chapters in DhK: *Bab iqama al-dalil 'ala butlan qawl man za'ama anna al-qur'an yastaghni bih 'an al-sunna*,²⁸ *bab tagliz fi mu'arada al-hadith bi 'l-ra'y*,²⁹ and *bab shidda karahiyyat al-mustafa wa hiyar ummatih al-ta'ammuq fi 'l-din*.³⁰

Al-Suyuti's method of omission is represented in following two cases:

- (1) If there are a number of traditions dealing with the same issue, al-Suyuti chooses only some of them. When discussing the prophet's criticism against those who dispute on religious doctrines, he refers to traditions dealing with the same subject matter, but adduced from different chains of transmission. In DhK, al-Harawi describes the following traditions:

(a) "*anna al-nabiyya salla allah 'alayh wa sallama qara'a hadbih al-ayat fa amma al-ladhina fi qulubihim zayg qala hum al-ladhina samma allah fa 'bdharubum*," (b) "*anna al-nabiyya salla allah 'alayh wa sallama qara'a hadbih al-ayat fa amma al-ladhina fi qulubihim zayg faqala idha ra'aytum al-ladhin yujadilun fih fabum al-ladhin 'afa allah fa 'bdharubum*," (c)

“anna al-nabiyya salla allah ‘alayh wa sallama qara’a hadbih al-ayat huwa al-ladhina unzila ‘alayk al-kitab faqala idha ra’aytum al-ladhin yattabi’una ma tashabaha minh ula’ik al-ladhina samma allah fa’ihdharuhum, (d) annahu qala al-ladhina yujadiluna liayatina qala fa’ulaika al-ladhina ‘an allah fa’ihdharuhum,” (e) “fa amma al-ladhina fi qulubihim zayy qala hum ashab al-busumat wa ‘l-mara’ fi din allah.”³¹

Al-Suyuti chooses one of them, saying :

“anna al-nabiyya salla allah ‘alayh wa sallama qara’a hadbih al-ayat huwa al-ladhina unzila ‘alayk al-kitab faqala idha ra’aytum al-ladhin yattabi’una ma tashabaha minh ula’ik al-ladhina samma allah fa’ihdharuhum.”³²

Accordingly, when dealing with the topic in chapter IV, censuring debate and mentioning its misfortunes, al-Suyuti chooses four out of fifteen traditions discussing the same issue.³³

- (2) Al-Suyuti skips deliberately an irrelevant and digressive part of *athar* of al-Awza’i. This can be seen in a number of *athars*, one of which reads: “wa ‘sluk sabil salafika al-salih fa innahu yasa’uka ma yasa’uhum wa lawkana hayran ma husistum bih duna aslafikum wa innahu lam yaddahir ‘anhum hayr habi’a lakum dunahum lifadl ‘indakum wahum ashab muhammad ihtarahum allah wa ba’athah fihim.”³⁴ In DhK the *athar* reads “wa ‘sluk sabil salafika al-salih fa innahu yasa’uka ma yasa’uhum wa lawkana hayran ma husistum bih duna aslafikum wa innahu lam yaddahir ‘anhum hayr lastu amanu alla uridu ma’a allah sarra hadbih al-bid’a min an yasbiru ihwanan ba’da quwwad ila tafarruq dinihim wa tabagud habi’a lakum dunahum lifadl ‘indakum wahum ashab muhammad ihtarahum allah wa ba’athah fihim wa wasafahum bima wasafahum.”³⁵

4. Why does al-Suyuti Leave some Chapters in DhK unabridged?

It is not easy to find some information in SM about the reason why al-Suyuti leaves some chapters in DhK unabridged, since the author only indicates that DhK is the most excellent work discussing the condemnation of *kalam* and the *Mutakallimun* and information about which, al-Suyuti says, is produced with the chains of transmission.³⁶ Underlining his last statement which reads: “wa ana ulahhisu huna jami’a maqasidih talhisan hasanan” (I abridge all its purposes adequately), however, gives one an inferential understanding that the only possible reason revolves around their being incompatible with al-Suyuti’s purposes in abridging DhK, i.e. al-Harawi’s discussion in those chapters thus could be relatively repetitive and digressive.

Before delving into the discussion of these two reasons, knowing the chapters of DhK not abridged by al-Suyuti is indispensable for two obvious reasons. *First*, to understand the topic of al-Harawi's discussion not abridged by al-Suyuti. *Secondly*, to be able to understand to which extant repetitiveness and digressiveness of those chapters range so that al-Suyuti leaves them unabridged. Understanding these reasons could help us understand the general characteristic of al-Suyuti's abridgement: whether his is eclectic or that unabridged chapters themselves actually contain al-Harawi's repetitive and digressive discussions, the abridgement of which, in al-Suyuti's view, may let the readers fed up.

The chapters which are ignored by al-Suyuti revolve around the following topics (1) the virtue of avoiding argumentation, (2) the Prophet's prohibition against the debate on the Koran, (3) Being cursed of the innovators, the *Mutakallimun* and the disputants, (4) the sin of the followers of the evil tradition, and (5) Discussing al-Ash'ari's *kalam*.

It is the present author's hypothesis that those chapters are ignored by al-Suyuti because of their being repetitive and digressive. Topics number 1 and 2 are relatively repetitive, while the rest, number 3, 4, and 5 are digressive. The main topic of al-Harawi's discussion in topic number 1, is the virtue of avoiding the argumentation. In this topic, he puts forwards a tradition which reads: "*man taraka al-kidhb wa huwa batil buniya lahu fi riyad al-janna wa man taraka al-mara' wa huwa mahaqqan buniya fi wasatiba wa man hassana buluqah buniya lahu a'laha*."³⁷ The following passage in this chapter is replete with al-Harawi's report of a number of traditions with different chains of transmissions, which deal with the same issue. Not a single remark by al-Harawi in this chapter can be found. In addition, this chapter is relatively shorter than the others.

This chapter is preceded by that which deals with censuring debate and mentioning its misfortunes and followed by that which discusses the Prophet's objection to the debate on the Koran. The reason why al-Suyuti leaves the topic unabridged could be because of the fact that the core idea of al-Harawi's discussion in this chapter has been dealt with in the previous chapter and even more specifically in the following chapter. This could be based on al-Suyuti's own assumption that *al-mara'* (argumentation), the discussion of which constitutes a central in this chapter, substantially share the same significance with *al-jidal* (the debate), which constitutes a central topic in the previous chapter as well.

The Prophet's prohibition against the debate on the Koran is another chapter not abridged by al-Suyuti. This chapter is preceded by al-

Harawi's discussion on the Prophet's strong objection to those who debate on the Koran. These two chapters share the same topic asserting that the debate on the Koran is prohibited by the Prophet. All information contained in these two chapters is derived from the traditions which respectively censure the debate on the createdness of the Koran. Therefore it is plausible if al-Suyuti did not abridge this chapter.

Although no information can be found in SM concerning the fact why al-Suyuti did not abridge several chapters which discuss the topic number 3, 4, and 5, an inferential understanding of the last part of his introductory remark on his abridgement of DhK gives one a clue which enables him find al-Suyuti's rationale. The remark states that al-Suyuti is going to abridge all his (al-Harawi's) purposes adequately (*wa ana ulahhisu buna jami'a maqasidih talhisan hasanan*). This statement can lead to a logical inference that the chapters of DhK not abridged by al-Suyuti in SM are not adequate enough to serve the purposes of his author in discussing the censure against *kalam*. If being digressive, or not being digressive of a chapter is measured through being or not being adequate to serve al-Harawi's purpose in discussing against *kalam*. It is logically distinctive that al-Suyuti's rationale of not abridging these chapters originates from their being digressive from the main discussion against *kalam*. The following passages will test whether each chapter not abridged is void from any discussion against *kalam*.

The central information of the chapter on being cursed of the innovators, the authors of *kalam* and polemicists is found in a tradition which reads: "...man ahdatha hadathan fa'ala nafsih wa man ahdatha hadathan aw awi muhdathan fa'alayh la'nat allah wa 'l-mala'ika wa 'l-nas ajma'in la yaqbal allah sarfan wala 'adlan faqalu' li 'l-hasan ma al-hadath faqala ashab al-fitan wa ahl al-ahwa' kulluhum muhdithun."³⁸ Even though the title of this chapter underlines the *Mutakallimun*, if one reads the statement mentioned above, one is able to give a remarkable note that this tradition does not specifically deal with *kalam* and the *Mutakallimun*. This chapter, however, underlines the innovation and its authors as well as identifies *ashab al-fitan* and *ahl al-ahwa'* with the innovators. Accordingly not a single direct remark against *kalam* by al-Harawi can be found in this chapter.

This also holds true for a chapter, 'the sin of the observers of the bad tradition.' Being different from its previous chapter which directly censures obtaining the knowledge from the *Mutakallimun*, this chapter deals with the sin of the followers of the evil tradition, the discussion of which roots out from a tradition stating: "*innahu man aby'a sunnata min*

sunani qad umtiyat ba'di fainna lahu ajr min al-ujr mithl ajr man 'amila biha min al-nas la yantaqis dhalika min ayyam al-nas shay'an waman ibtada'a bid'at la yardaha allah wa rasuluh fa-inna 'alayh mithl ithm man 'amila biha min al-nas la yantaqisu dhalika min ayyam al-nas shay'an."³⁹ The rest of the passages of this chapter are replete with al-Harawi's report of a number of traditions with different chains of transmission dealing with the same topic. The fact that not a single passage dealing with al-Harawi's censure on *kalam* can be found in this chapter attests to this chapter's being digressive.

The last chapter not abridged by al-Suyuti is al-Harawi's discussion of al-Ash'ari's statement. As the title itself suggests, this chapter must be al-Harawi's quotation of al-Ash'ari's ideas *verbatim* for several obvious reasons. *First*, the structure of the argument is analytical in a sense that each argument is based on al-Ash'ari's analysis on a number of questions ranging from the People of Tradition and *Jama'a*, the createdness of the Koran, etc. *Secondly*, the method of the discussion is speculative, based on the abstract ideas with deductive truths. These two remarkable characteristics of the discussion rarely belong to those of the people of the tradition whose arguments are marked by their repetitive method, circular and not irrespective of chains of the transmission. Besides, if this is al-Harawi's discussion of al-Ash'ari's ideas, each information contained in it, as emphasized by al-Suyuti, must be produced with the chains of the transmission.⁴⁰ The reason why al-Suyuti does not abridge this chapter comes from the fact that this is a separate work by al-Harawi, which is later on attached to DhK by later copier. This conclusion is at least affirmed by al-Hashshash who is of opinion that *dhikr kalam al-ash'ari* is one of two works written by the Hanbalites, the other is *Matalib Ibn Abi Bizr* by al-Ahwazi, in which the authors discuss the foundation of the Ash'arite school.⁴¹

5. The Significance of al-Harawi's DhK as a Source for SM

The most important thing deserving to note here is that the abridgement of DhK constitutes the greatest part of SM. Out of 200 printed pages of SM, more than 50 pages are occupied by al-Suyuti's abridgement of DhK. The rest of the pages is occupied by al-Suyuti's introduction (32 pages) and al-Suyuti's abridgement of 12 works as well as his discussion of al-Sirafi's debate opposing Matta b. Yunus. It is plausible if al-Suyuti himself acknowledges that DhK is the most excellent work discussing the censure against *kalam*. If he then puts his abridgement of DhK the first time, that must be in accordance with his purpose of composing SM, building up well-arranged arguments against *kalam* and logic, showing off before his opponents that he is well-versed

with the method of the arguing which constitutes the core learning of logic. Besides, the authority of DhK as the most important source against *kalam* in SM is also reflected in the fact that SM refers to it more than 9 times.

Even though in the history of Muslim literatures against *kalam* and the *Mutakallimun* DhK came after *al-radd* of al-Sulami (d.412/1022), it is referred to by the authors whose works abridged by al-Suyuti in SM the most. Imam Abu al-Muzaffar b. al-Sam'ani in his *al-Intisar li Ahl al-Hadith*, for instance, refers to DhK three times, while the other works share some information produced by DhK. This special position cannot be separated from DhK's own topics of discussion and its detail information against *kalam* as well as its reports of a great number of chains of transmission against it.

Another significance we could adduce to DhK is that it constitutes the backbone of SM. This is based on the fact that DhK shares all significances born by SM: *First*, SM contains historical data with which the history of the opposition against *kalam* can be reconstructed. *Secondly*, it deals with the prosopographical discussion of the opposition against *kalam* as set forth by single individuals, scattered over different regions of the Muslim empire and a great number of historical personalities who condemn and censure *kalam*.⁴² *Finally*, it contains the information about their censure, which is produced by elaborate chains of transmission, which could represent, in the first place, the development of the opposition against *kalam*.

As can be seen in most of the traditionists' works, the information against *kalam* could take forms of the Koranic verses, the traditions of the Prophet, *athars* of the Companions and the leading scholars, the number of which, as registered by Nasir b. 'Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad al-Jadi' in *al-Radd* by al-Sulami, amount to 8 Qur'anic verses, 5 traditions and 40 *athars*.⁴³

All condemnation of *kalam* mentioned above are shared by DhK, since the data of DhK as like the data of others works of traditionists' circle, according to al-Jadi', relies much on *al-Radd*.⁴⁴

The number of this information is relatively constant and different only in the chains of the transmission. The rationale of this fact is not irrespective of the nature of the circle of the traditionists who tend to convey the information literally the same as they receive from their predecessors.

One is, therefore, encountered with two facts, one of which may exert an influence upon another. *First*, *al-Radd* is the pioneer work that

constitutes the most important source for most of the traditionists' literature of later period against *kalam*. Secondly, DhK is considered to be one of those works whose much of their historical data owe to *al-Radd*. The logical consequence must indicate that SM owes much historical data against *kalam* to DhK due to the fact al-Suyuti, when discussing the movement against *kalam* does not refer directly to *al-Radd* but relies much on DhK whose historical data is parallel to that of *al-Radd*. Hence, saying that DhK constitutes the backbone of SM is not an exaggeration.

6. The Role of DhK for the Correction of SM

First of all, it must be noted that the basis for correcting SM here is DhK which constitutes the backbone of SM. This is because of the fact that the original of SM, which is preserved in al-Maktaba al-Azhariyya (Majami' 204), is not accessible anymore.⁴⁵

The betterment of SM is focused on correcting evident and linguistic mistakes as well as copying ones. Evident mistakes can be seen in describing, for instance, an historical figure. In SM, for instance, is written 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Ansari, while in DhK is 'Isa b. Muhammad al-Ansari. Instead of listing Abu Mansur al-Albani, al-Suyuti in SM calls him Abu Mansur al-Malini.⁴⁶ Linguistic mistakes could be embodied in misuse of a word, the significance of which may mislead the interpretation. This mistake includes inappropriate diction, misuse of conjugative verbs and the use of certain *harf*. To set some examples, in SM are written *mu'tamidan* for *mu'tadilan*,⁴⁷ *intabarna* for *anharna*, *yazalu* for *tazalu*,⁴⁸ and *'alayh* for *ilayh*.⁴⁹ Copying mistakes can be evidently seen in scribal errors and misprints. This is evident, for instance, in some cases: *'ala wajh* for *'ala wajhib*,⁵⁰ *la tukayyif*, *takdhib*, *tufassir* for *la nukayyif*, *nakdhib*, *nufassir*.⁵¹

The value of DhK's manuscript for the betterment of SM edition also lies in the fact that there are great linguistic differences found between DhK and SM. The differences come into being after that the original manuscripts of DhK was compared with the abridged version in SM. Even though some of the linguistic differences are diction in a sense that they belong to the same root of the words and thus signify the same meaning, but it is not rare that the differences are so grave that produce different significances that could change general meaning of the topic discussed. The following passage discusses some typical examples.

The first case is exemplified by, for instance, al-Harawi's discussion of the ideas that being occupied with the debate on God and His attributes is prohibited and that proposing a question with

interrogative word 'how' (*kayfa*) to the question of *al-iman* is condemned by Muslim leading scholars. Thus, it is incumbent, al-Harawi maintains, for everyone to observe what he is obliged to do and to be loyal to what God has determined.

The examples of three linguistic differences found in DhK and SM, which will be discussed in the following paragraph are preceded with al-Harawi's quoting Ibn Rahawiyya's remarkable statements saying: "*la yajuz al-hawd fi amr allah kama yajuz al-hawd fi fi'l al-mabluqin... wala yajuz lihad an yatawabbham 'ala allah bisifatih wa as'alih ta'mim ma yajuz al-tafkir wa 'l-nazr fi amr al-mabluqin...*" (Being occupied in the discussion of God is not permitted while in that of the deed of the creatures is permitted. One is not allowed to have doubt on the attributes and deeds of God, he is, however, permitted to think about the creatures...). It must be noted, however, that for practical convenience, the lexicographical differences and its English significances are highlighted and each al-Harawi's discussion is presented per phrase, which is then compared with its abridged version and translated.

(1) In DhK is stated: "*wa ahraja 'an abi 'abd allah muhammad ibn ibrahim al-bushanji hina su'ila 'an al-iman faqala...*" (he transmitted on the authority of abi 'abd allah muhammad ibn ibrahim al-bushanji when he was asked about the belief, he said...).

In SM is stated: "*wa ahraja 'an abi 'abd allah muhammad ibn ibrahim al-bushanji annahu su'ila 'an al-iman faqala*" (he transmitted on the authority of abi 'abd allah muhammad ibn ibrahim al-bushanji that he was asked about the belief, he said).

This phrase is followed with al-Harawi's report of al-Bushanji's response, of which DhK and SM have no different wording. The response emphasizes the importance of the following (*al-ittiba*'), considering the principles derived from the Koran and the tradition as ultimate aims of the intellects (*gaya li 'l-'uquh*) but not *vice versa*. God, al-Bushanji continues, sometimes differentiates between two similar things (*al-mushtabihayn*) and distinguishes two united things (*al-mujtami'ayn*) in the object of the intellect for the sake of loyalty, test and examination. This phrase is then followed by the following which bears further difference.

(2) In DhK: "*wamata warada 'ala al-mar'i waridun min wujub al-'ilm la yabluguh 'aqluh aw tanfir minh nafsub wa na'a 'anhu fabmuh wa tab'udu 'anh ma'rifatah waqafa 'indah wa i'tarafa bi 'l-taqir 'an idrak 'ilmih wa bi l-busur 'an kannih ma'rifatah.*" (when an object of knowledge comes upon a man, while his intellect cannot perceive it, or his soul runs away from it and his knowledge does not reach it as well as his perception is far away from

it, then he adheres to it admitting his incapability of knowing it and his dullness due to his being hindered from knowing it)

In SM: "*wamata warada 'ala al-mar' waridun min wujub al-'ilm la yabluḡuh 'aqluh aw tanfir minh nafsuh wa yana' 'anhu fahmuh wa tab'udu 'anh ma'rifatah waqafa 'indah wa i'tarafa bi'l-taqir 'an idrak 'ilmih wa bi'l-busur 'an kannih ma'rifatah.*" (when object of knowledge came upon a man, while his intellect cannot perceive it, or his soul runs away from it and his knowledge does not reach it as well as his perception is far away from (understanding) it, then he just adheres to it admitting his incapability of knowing it and his dullness due to his being hindered from knowing it).

This phrase is followed by al-Bushanji's further remark that some *'illa* (reason) and *sabab* (cause) of God's law are perceptible and the others are imperceptible. To some perceptible *'illa* belong the grave test and examination which demands one's loyalty, belief and observation. Then comes the following phrase:

(3) which DhK records as follows: "*wa lawla ma wasafnah kana al-ladhi sabaqa ilayhi fikr al-'uqul minna anna wajiban fi kulli ma sa'ala rasul allah rabbah an yujibah wa an yunazzil 'alayh shifa'an liyazdad al-nas bih 'ilman wa limalakutih fahman.*" (If we had explained it, what has come to our mind is that in each what the Messenger asked to his God must be that God necessitates recovery (*shifa'*) with which one increases his knowledge and understanding). While SM records as follows: "*wa lawla wasafnah kana al-ladhi sabaqa ilayhi fikr al-'uqul minna anna wajiban fi kulli ma sa'ala rasul allah rabbah an yujibah wa an yunazzil 'alayh shifa'an liyazdad al-nas bih 'ilman wa limalakutih fahman.*" (if we had not explained it, what has come to our mind is that in each what the Messenger asked to his God must be that God necessitates recovery (*shifa'*) with which one increases his knowledge and understanding).⁵²

Even though the first two lexicographical differences mentioned above do not enable one find any significant difference of the meaning in DhK and SM, he must be surprised if he pays his deep attention to the third one which could lead one to the following interpretation.

What comes to our mind after thinking over the *'illa* of what God has ordained is that God's *shifa'* is always available after having been asked by the Prophet. His *shifa'*, thus, is necessary in all the laws He imposes upon His worshippers. This is the significance of al-Harawi's statement in DhK. This is deduced from the following logical reasoning: Our understanding that God's *shifa'* is available is logical consequence from our having thought over the *'illa* of what God has ordained. If that God's *shifa'* is necessary in each God's imposing the law, that could be,

thus, because of the fact that we have thought over the 'illa i.e. explaining it.

In contrast, al-Harawi's statement which is abridged by al-Suyuti could lead us to the following interpretation: Due to the absence of our thinking over the 'illa of what God has ordained, we had never come to say that God's *shifa'* in each laws He imposed is available. In sum, the conclusion of what one could deduce from DhK is that God's *shifa'* is necessary in each God's imposing the law, while in SM it is not.

Another example of this indication can be found in following discussion. In DhK it is stated: "*sahib al-bid'a 'ala wajhib gubar wa in udhina fi 'l-yawm thalathin marra*" (the author of the innovation is that on his face is always dirt even if he washes it thirty times a day). In SM it is written as follows "*sahib al-bid'a 'ala wajb gubar wa in udhina fi 'l-yawm thalathin marra*" (the author of the innovation is in front of the dirt even if he washes it thirty times a day).⁵³

Conclusion

Since the abridgement of DhK by al-Suyuti constitutes the greatest part of *Sawn al-Mantiq*, al-Harawi's *Dhamm al-Kalam* can be said to be an indispensable source that can be used to correct mistakes born in the edition of *Sawn al-Mantiq* by al-Nashshar (1947) and Su'ada 'Ali 'Abd al-Raziq (1970). As for the mistakes that need to be corrected pertain to evident and linguistic mistakes as well as copying ones.

Endnotes:

- ² Dalam kamus A.S. Hornby, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), *collate* bermakna "make a careful comparison between (copies of texts, manuscripts, books, etc) to learn the differences between them."
- ³ "*Wa ajallu kitab fi dhalika kitab dhamm al-kalam wa ahlih li shayh al-islam abi isma'il al-harawi. Wa huwa mujalladun kulluhu muhraj bi 'l-asanid...*" See, *Sawn al-Mantiq wa 'l-Kalam 'an Fannay al-Mantiq wa 'l-Kalam* (Cairo: Dar al-Nashr wa 'l-Tiba'a, 1970) ed. Su'ad 'Abd al-Raziq and 'Ali Sami al-Nashshar, p. 68.
- ⁴ Beaucrueuil, S.D., 'al-Ansari al-Harawi,' in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Leiden & London: E.J. Brill & Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb et al, vol. I., p. 515.
- ⁵ *Sawn al-Mantiq* (Cairo: Matba'a al-Sa'ada, 1970), p. 126.
- ⁶ Brockelmann, Carl, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, 2 vols. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1943-9); 3 supplements (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1937-42), G.I, p. 433, S.I, p. 773.
- ⁷ *Sawn, op. cit.*, p. 126.
- ⁸ *Sawn, op. cit.*, p. 68.
- ⁹ Beaucrueuil, S.D, *Khwadja 'Abdullah Ansari (396-481/1006-1089) Mystique Hanbalite* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique) p. 135; Massignon, Louis, *La Passion d'Al Hallaj* (Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner, 1914-1921), p. 367.

- ¹⁰ Beaucueil, EI2, p.515-6.
- ¹¹ DhK, fol. 149a.
- ¹² See, al-Hashshash, Muhammad, *Zwischen Tradition und Aufbruch Die Ablehnung und Verleumdung der spekulativen Theologie – Dhamm al-Kalam wa ahlih- in der Frühzeit des Islam Ursachen und Folgen* (Bonn: 2000) Inaugural dissertation, p. 237-365.
- ¹³ Al-Harawi, *Dhamm al-Kalam wa Ahlih* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr al-Lubnani, 1994), ed. Samih Dugaym.
- ¹⁴ Beaucueil, EI2, p. 515-6.
- ¹⁵ Massignon, ibidem.
- ¹⁶ *Dhamm Fann al-Kalam* preserved at the British Museum consists of two parts of discussions, each of which comprises 15 chapters. The first part deals with the Prophet's condemnation of *kalam* while the second one discusses the scholars' attitude against *kalam*. See, al-Hashshash, *op. cit.*, p. 298.
- ¹⁷ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 68-125.
- ¹⁸ DhK, fol. 4a-b.
- ¹⁹ *Sawn al-Mantiq* (Cairo: Matba'a al-Sa'ada, 1947), p. 34.
- ²⁰ DhK, fol. 59b.
- ²¹ SM, p. 45.
- ²² DhK, fol. 8a-b.
- ²³ SM, p. 35.
- ²⁴ DhK, fol. 8a-b.
- ²⁵ SM, p. 35.
- ²⁶ DhK, 104b-105a; SM, p. 60.
- ²⁷ DhK, 12a-15a; SM, p. 38.
- ²⁸ SM, p. 40-44.
- ²⁹ DhK, fol.28b-34a.
- ³⁰ DhK, fol. 34a-49b.
- ³¹ DhK, fol. 49b-56a.
- ³² DhK, fol. 21a-22b.
- ³³ Sawn, p. 39.
- ³⁴ DhK, fol. 17a-19b; SM, p. 39.
- ³⁵ SM, p. 58.
- ³⁶ DhK, fol. 98b.
- ³⁷ "... wa ajallu kitab ullifa fi dhalik kitab dhamm al-kalam wa ahlih lishayh al-islam abi isma'il al-harawi wa huwa mujalladu kulluh muhraj bi'l-asaniid wa ana ulahisu huna jami'a maqasidih talhisan hasanan." SM, p. 33.
- ³⁸ DhK, fol. 19b-20a.
- ³⁹ DhK, fol 133b.
- ⁴⁰ DhK, fol. 139b.
- ⁴¹ "... wa huwa mujalladun kulluh muhraj bi 'l-asaniid..." SM, p. 33.
- ⁴² Al-Hashshash, *op.cit.*, p. 297.
- ⁴³ The elaborate discussion of prosopographical approach can be read in Van Ess, Joseph, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra, Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im fruhen Islam* (Berlin: New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), vol. I, p. ix.
- ⁴⁴ Abu al-Fadl al-Muqri, *Ahadith fi Dhamm al-Kalam wa Ahlih: Intahabaha al-Imam Abu al-Fadl al-Muqri* (Riyad: Dar Itlis li 'l-Nashr wa 'l-Tawzi', 1996) p. 107-112.

⁴⁵ *Ahadith, op. cit.* p. 56.

⁴⁶ This is the information obtained by Dr. N.J.G Kaptein from a letter sent by Dr. Nursamad Kamba, The Educational Attaché of Indonesian Republic at Cairo, on 23rd of November, 2003.

⁴⁷ DhK, fol. 131 a; SM, p. 79.

⁴⁸ “*Anna bani isra’il lam yazal amruhum mu’tamidan hatta nasha’a fihim al-muwalladun abna’a sabaya’ al-umam fa ahadhum bi ‘l-ra’y fahalaku.*” SM, p. 37; DhK, fol. 11a.

⁴⁹ SM, p. 36; DhK, fol. 10a.

⁵⁰ “*waza’amah al-bahit ‘alayh...*” SM, p. 80; DhK, fol. 132b.

⁵¹ SM, p. 60; DhK, fol. 105b.

⁵² “*la tukayyif hadhih al-sifat wala takdhib biha wala tufassirha.*” SM, p. 69; DhK, fol. 121a.

⁵³ DhK, fol 121a-b; SM, p. 69-70.

⁵⁴ DhK, fol. 105b; SM, p. 60.

Bibliographies:

Manuscript:

Manuscript of Dhamm al-Kalam wa Ahlih, preserved at Maktaba al-Asad, Syrian National Library. in Damascus, 149 fols. Reg. No. 1138

A Letter sent by Dr. Nursamad Kamba, The Educational Attaché of Indonesian Republic at Cairo, on 23rd of November, 2003 to Dr. N.J.G Kaptein, the Director of Indonesian-Netherlands Cooperation for Islamic Studies, INIS.

Edited. Sources:

Beaurecueil, S.D., ‘al-Ansari al-Harawi,’ in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Leiden& London: E.J. Brill & Luzac& Co, 1960. , ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I., p. 515

-----, *Khwadja ‘Abdullah Ansari, 396-481/1006-1089. Mystique Hanbalite*, Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique. -

Brockelmann, Carl, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, 2 vols., Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1943-9. ; 3 supplements, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1937-42.

Al-Harawi, *Dhamm al-Kalam wa Ahlih*, Beirut: Dar al-Fikr al-Lubnani, 1994. , ed. Samih Dugaym

Al-Hashshash, Muhammad, *Zwischen Tradition und Aufbruch Die Ablehnung und Verleumdung der spekulativen Theologie – Dhamm al-Kalam wa ahlih- in der Frühzeit des Islam Ursachen und Folgen*, Inaugural dissertation at University of Bonn: 2000.

Hornby, A.S., *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Massignon, Louis, *La Passion d'Al Hallaj*, Paris: Libraire Paul Geuthner, 1914-1921.

Al-Muqri, Abu al-Fadl, *Abadith fi Dhamm al-Kalam wa Ahlih: Intabahaba al-Imam Abu al-Fadl al-Muqri*, Riyad: Dar Itlis li'l-Nashr wa'l-Tawzi', 1996.

Al-Suyuti, Jalal al-Din, *Sawn al-Mantiq wa'l-Kalam 'an Fannay al-Mantiq wa'l-Kalam*, Cairo: Matba'a al-Sa'ada, 1947. , ed. 'Ali Sami al-Nashshar

---, *Sawn al-Mantiq wa'l-Kalam 'an Fannay al-Mantiq wa'l-Kalam*, Cairo: Dar al-Nashr wa'l-Tiba'a, 1970. ed. Su'ad 'Abd al-Raziq and 'Ali Sami al-Nashshar

Van Ess, Joseph, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra, Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam*, Berlin: New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991. , 6 vols.

Mufti Ali, adalah dosen pada Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Adab IAIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Serang