



Relations of Moturidi and Samarkandi

Abduhamidov Muhammadjon Abduhalim ugli

Associate professor, Doctor of philosophy in Islamic studies, Fergana State University, Uzbekistan, Fergana

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.47134/pjpi.v2i1.920>

*Correspondence: Abduhamidov

Muhammadjon Abduhalim ugli

Email: abduhamidov_m@mail.ru

Received: 25-08-2024

Accepted: 29-09-2024

Published: 22-10-2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors.

Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract: This article highlights the relationship between Moturidi and Samarkandi, with a focus on the work “Kitab as-savod al-azam” and its significant theological elements. The study explores the connection between the two scholars, investigating whether Hakim Samarkandi was a disciple of Moturidi or merely a contemporary. The article also examines the impact of “Kitab as-savod al-azam” on Moturidi theology and its relevance to traditional Hanafi doctrine. The research delves into the theological discourse between the two scholars, addressing conflicting views on various theological issues.

Keywords: Moturudi, Samarkandi, “Kitab as-savod al-azam”, Moturudi, Hanafi, Theology, Prophet.

Introduction

Hakim Samarkandi lived in the same period as Moturidi. They were born in Samarkand and did not leave this city for a long time. Thanks to this, they knew each other well, which is also proven by sources. At this point, it will be necessary to determine the question of whether these personal relationships have achieved some kind of result and have been embodied in their interaction in the theological sphere. Was Moturidius, who was slightly older than Hakim Samarkandi and gained much more fame than him, supposedly a teacher of the scientist, or was he only a native and contemporary? Is “Kitab as-savod al-azam” now subject to a new “moturidiyona” doctrine, or is the text still relevant to the old “hanafiyona” theology? If the first question is proved, then the reason for the assumption is that Moturidius soon had a significant impact on his contemporaries. If the second question is correct, then the work “Kitab as-savod al-azam” would be regarded as the work that gave the most immediate and widely accepted definition of traditional Hanafi doctrine in terms of time. In reality, it also serves as the earliest and most valuable resource. In addition, in front of the work “Kitab as-savod al-a'zam”, the originality and novelty of Moturidi's ideas are more vividly manifested. Both of these conflicting questions are incredibly interesting, but solving the issue in favor of any question is not an easy task. It is

necessary not to rush to draw the appropriate conclusions, realizing that the answer to the first question will determine the appearance of Moturidium.

Methodology

However, on the other hand, it is not necessary to make a decision without preparation in a short time. There were no less attempts in subject to accurately determine the position of "Kitab as-savod al-azam" in the spoken direction of theology. These should be considered in more detail than usual in this place. This, in turn, makes it possible to realize that this problem is important. According to the scientific hypothesis, which initially appeared and has survived to this time, Hakim Samarkandi should be considered a disciple of Moturidi, that is, to some extent, the first moturidiist. This hypothesis appeared with the knowledge of the text "Kitab as-savod al-azam" and to this day occupies a leading place in popular science literature. It was originally attributed to Goldsier, and the scholar referred to the work as "an early source on the doctrine of moturidia". Tritton, on the other hand, claimed that the relationship between the two scholars was close (Tveitereid, 2023).

He was educated by a contemporary of Hakim Samarkandi from fiqh and the word, and was an early moturidi. After this, the traditional assessment given to Hakim Samarkandi as an early moturidiist was repeated by Watt (Watt Der Islam II, 1985). In doing so, he could provide evidence of a special study conducted on his own initiative. F.O.A.Umar translated the text "Kitab as-savod al-azam" into English in his dissertation (1974), "the doctrines of the Moturidite School with Special Reference to as-Savad al-azam of al-Hakim as-Samarkandi", written in Edinburgh and did his scientific analysis. As a result, earlier hypotheses seemed to find their confirmation (Müller, 2023b). According to F.O.A.Umar, Hakim Samarkandi studied under Moturidi and had a close relationship with him, while the set of rules developed in cooperation were the creeds of the early Moturidia School (1 ба 60 ба к.б). There has also been another little-publicized approximation to the issue until recent times, only to be strongly repeated by Madelung. His reflections contain various subtle nuances that, of course, reflect the difficulties in the process of working with the text. Madelung's first meditation (Madelung, 1968) "Kitab as-savod al-azam", in general, does not belong to the pen of Hakim Samarkandi, but appeared a century after his death. Later, however, Madelung changed his mind radically (influenced by the Persian edition of the work) and characterized "Kitab as-savod al-azam" as a document of the traditional Hanafi doctrine attributed to the pen of Hakim Samarkandi. In this place, the name of Moturidi is not called by the way to maintain periodic regularity, identifying internal contacts.

These meditations and their proof are given in the article "Abulkosim Ishoq Samarkandi" (E Iran I, 1985), in which Madelung addresses the relationship of both thinkers in detail. He proves that the work "Kitab as-savod al-azam" did not advance any particular idea of moturidia. On certain issues, however, the text contradicts Moturidius' theology. Later sources claim that Hakim Samakandi was a disciple of Moturidius, which may have been the result of misjudging the work from the perspective of the later period. Thus, the work "Kitab as-savod al-azam" received its completely different assessment in science, and

this new reflection was the impetus for a conscious revision of the earlier hypothesis (Watkins, 2023).

At the time that Madelung's so-called first paper was being republished for the collection, this opinion of the scientist had been added to his draft. The only scholar to return to this controversial problem thereafter is Vann Ess, who touches on the place of his early history of Islamic theology in which Hakim Samarkandi is mentioned (Religious Schools and sects, 1985). He also strives to draw a boundary between the two theologians, and Hakim Samarkand, who was not a disciple of Moturidius, says that he should be viewed as merely a *murji'i*. The listed scientific hypotheses indicate that their views are diverse. However, such a case is common in the scientific process. The birth of conflicting opinions on each issue that causes a scientific debate can be taken as natural at first glance. However, when the argument described in this position is focused on base, it becomes clear that there is another aspect in it (Azcu, 2023). This is exactly what will have to be derived in the first goal. It will not only reveal various scientific theories, but also reveal that there are serious difficulties monetizing the search for ways of agreement on this issue. These difficulties lead to such conclusions and observations that they, perhaps, will guide the correct way for further deliberations.

The reason for the first difficulty is that Moturidius did not commit any fundamental change in Samarkand or the theology of the entire Movarounnahr. If it can be concluded that Hakim Samarkandi was not a disciple of Moturidius, nor was Moturidius influenced by his work, then there would be no major difference between the theology of hanafi and the views of Moturidius. Much of the education given before him was present in his work and beyond. However, at one point this also suggests that in the history of theological development, there are no criteria for each case that can distinguish the period before Moturidium from the period after Moturidium (Miller-McLemore, 2023). It would also be a mistake to conclude from this that Moturidium absolutely did not contribute to any changes. After all, differences between his divine views and those of other hanafis, including Hakim Samarkandi, were revealed. Only the question of how to assess these differences remains controversial. This in turn brings it closer to the second important observation, which also applies to the argument spoken at the same time (Geiser, 2023).

Until this time, it had been customary to derive from the assumption that Movarounnahr's hanafi theology, even if it had undergone only one significant change, had not been explicitly expressed under the influence of Moturidius. From this came the conclusion that there are two theological doctrines, one – earlier than Moturidius, and the other – that he was created by himself. However, such an idea is not convincing from a historical point of view, in addition to the fact that the service of the remaining authoritative scientists is not given a decent assessment. It is a very rare phenomenon that one system is fully exchanged with the other (Demjaha, 2023). Progress is more likely to progress slowly through several stages. One system changes over time as a result of the influence of each generation on it at one level or another, improving in content. Moreover, the entire scientific system does not change at once, but at each time its individual parts are revised.

The re-examination of the connection between the work "Kitab as-savod al-azam" and the doctrine of Moturidius opens up horizons that have not been encountered in dispute by this time. At the same time, it is divided into not two, but three-dimensional images. It turns out that the opinions expressed in the treatises of Hakim Samarkandi and Moturidi, ultimately, can be divided into three groups. Religious creeds, similar in both thinkers, also not found in early authors such as Abu Muqotil Samarkandi or Abu Muti' Balkhi, belong to the first group (Müller, 2023a). In such cases, Moturidi and Hakim Samarkandi repeat ideas that have long been known in the eastern Hanafi. These analyses report the succession in the Movarounnahr doctrine. But not from the specific relationship between the two thinkers. In this place, the following specific topics can be listed: such issues as the definition of faith, the abandonment of exceptions, the state of the sinful believer, the age-old qualities of God (Slee, 2023). The second group-it will be necessary to distinguish it from the first group, that is, it is not the first hanafis with moturidius, but the doctrinal issues that testify to the unity between Hakim Samarkand. In this regard, it is first of all about the consideration of God's grace and wrath, like his sitting in the throne, or whether it is true that God is given a certain place in general (Ess, 1991).

Result and Discussion

All of these meditations fall within the framework of the great problems of how to interpret in any case the description of God in the Qur'an, which has an anthropomorphic meaning. Accordingly, it can be assumed that a considerable shift had taken place by the second half of the 3rd/9th century in the dispute under hanafism throughout Movarounnahr on this particular issue. In this position, both Hakim Samarkandi and Moturidi expressed not their separate positions, but a ubiquitous position. Now Abu Hanifa and his disciples were radically different from the views of his time. There is no way to determine who made this change. However, it can be inferred for what reason it occurred in Hanafi theology. This may have been based on a disagreement between Ibn Karrom and Abu Bakr Samarqandi, whose head dates precisely to the middle of the 3rd/9th century. Abu Karrom's anthropomorphism had a very rough appearance. From this comes the conclusion that the hanafis sought to avoid it under this very substance and seek other ways.

The third group is made up of issues in which did not testify of any closeness between Hakim Samarkandi and Moturidius, but rather pointed to a sharp disagreement between them. They concern some problems with the nature of the faith, suggesting the impossibility of a master-disciple relationship between the two theological scholars. At a time when Hakim Samarqandi was close to traditional hanafi views on these items, Moturidi sought to seek new paths and improve the doctrine. In this regard, the consideration of free will should be singled out in particular the issue of the creation of faith, the question of how to treat mutashobihot in the Qur'an (Мотуридий). It should also be noted that the entire style and method of proof of "Kitab as-savod al-azam" is reminiscent of the earlier hanafi texts seen above, and does not provide a basis for comparison with the dialectics developed by Moturidius. As all this proved, Hakim Samarkand's famous contemporary could not have been a follower. He had not accepted his statements, which were described in a unique and

novel way. As the narrative style of Hakim Samarkandi's work shows, he continued to fill the succession among the Hanafi representatives, who had not yet seriously engaged in rational theology.

However, studies show that it is not enough to define Hakim Samarkandi as a completely *murji'i* or an Hanafi of an old sample. He did not simply repeat the creeds that the tradition had delivered, but looked much further, and only penetrated into the new controversies that began to be referred to from the second half of the 3rd/9th century. Thus, he stood closer to Moturidi than Abu Muqatil or Abu Muti, representatives of previous generations of scholars. This conclusion is also confirmed by some external factors that should be briefly listed in this position. First, it should be derived from the fact that Moturidi expressed his teaching not at the beginning of the 4th/10th century, but much later (Madelung).

In any case, the work "*Kitab at-tavhid*", considered the main source of Moturidi theology, could have arisen many years after the work "*Kitab as-savod al-azam*". Continuing the debate, it should be noted that the biographical literature does not record any reference to Hakim Samarkandi as a disciple of Moturidi for centuries. Nasafi wrote that both of them studied under Abu Nasr Iyadi, except (Табсира" I 357.7 ва к.с. Танҳида 5.5-7). Sam'ani did not write on the subject. Only Abulwafo ("*Жавоҳир*" I 39 ва № 305) and Lakhnawi were the first to say that Hakim Samarkandi studied under Moturidi. Another argument can be made that if Moturidi had in fact also been an outstanding teacher and theologian in Samarkand during the reign of Ismail ibn Ahmad, then the fate of the set of creeds to be written would also have been different. The structure of such an important document would have been delegated not to one of his disciples, representing the style of the master, but to him. The generalization of these observations proves the assumption that "*Kitab as-savod al-azam*" is a valuable and important source for the work.

It reflected the views of the Movarounnahr Hanafi of the contiguous period of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, and characterized theological co-ordination in the process. Moturidi had built and separated his personal meditations from this very foundation of co-existence. The statement in "*Kitab as-savod al-azam*" is not limited to some fundamental issues of theology. This also further increases its value as a source. In addition to issues where it is customary to consider the definition of faith, the state of the sinner, the world before or beyond, the calculation, Hakim Samarkandi touched on many more topics.

Conclusion

God and his qualities, as well as the image of the creator of the Quran, sources of the Quran, eschatology and piety, respect for Saints and asceticism, respect for the Companions of the Prophet, political relations in the community and even the specific problems of fiqh are repeatedly discussed. Quotes from religious opponents can also be found in it. However, in this place some specific ideas of certain philosophers are not clearly expressed. Maybe they are presented in an incredibly general look. For the author, his own personal teaching is important and expounds it in extension, with all its details. In place of the conclusion, it is worth noting that the problem in the text description of Hakim Samarkandi's work "*Kitab*

as-savod al-azam” is that, despite the large number of publications, there is still not a single reliable publication. In existing publications, there are quite differences in the order of words as well as in the numbering of paragraphs. There are 60 paragraphs in the spring and Istanbul editions, 61 in the Persian translation text, and 62 in the copy Umar translated and printed into English based on the London and Paris manuscripts. The situation was also somewhat complicated by the fact that the text of “Kitab as-savod al-azam” was preceded by a complete list of treatises on Faith created after it. It usually coincides with the main text. Only the spring and Istanbul editions contained 60 paragraphs rather than 61.

References

- Azcuy, V. R. (2023). Nicholas M. Healy’s ethnographic ecclesiology: Reflections on the use of qualitative research in ecclesiology. *Cuestiones Teologicas*, 50(114). <https://doi.org/10.18566/cueteo.v50n114.a05>
- Demjaha, D. (2023). Feuerbach and Kierkegaard on Sin as Infinite Qualitative Difference A Co-Meditation on Hegelian Entzweiung. *Neue Zeitschrift Fur Systematische Theologie Und Religionsphilosophie*, 65(3), 378–410. <https://doi.org/10.1515/nzsth-2023-0027>
- E Iran I, 1985, 358a ва 359a
- Geiser, F. (2023). How can resilience be described in a process-oriented view and does this have significance for psychotherapy? A qualitative study. *Zeitschrift Fur Psychosomatische Medizin Und Psychotherapie*, 69(4), 316–330. <https://doi.org/10.13109/zptm.2023.69.oa3>
- I, 1 ва 60 ва к.б.
- “Жавоҳир” I 39 ва № 305
- Madelung, Spread [1968], 118 ва к.б.
- Madelung. – E Iran I. 358a
- Mamatakhunov N. A. Scientific And Educational Activities Of The Iodi’s Family //Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry. – 2021. – T. 12. – №. 6.
- Miller-McLemore, B. (2023). Is Qualitative Research the Best or Only Way to Study Lived Theology? *Ecclesial Practices*, 10(2), 157–164. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22144471-bja10055>
- Мотуридӣ. Тавҳид. 67-б.о.: Omar. The doctrines. 73-б.о.
- Müller, S. (2023a). Embracing the Unseen: A Journey into Qualitative Research in Theology. Introduction to the Panel and the Contributions Presented in this Journal. *Ecclesial Practices*, 10(2), 133–136. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22144471-bja10051>
- Müller, S. (2023b). Religious experience and its transformational power: Qualitative and hermeneutic approaches to a practical theological foundational concept. *Religious Experience and Its Transformational Power: Qualitative and Hermeneutic Approaches to a Practical Theological Foundational Concept*, 1–243. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110990461>
- Slee, N. (2023). Female Faith Practices: Qualitative Research Perspectives. *Female Faith Practices: Qualitative Research Perspectives*, 1–262. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003228431>
- Spread – Religious Schools and sects [1985] №11 Addenda et Corrigenda. – S. 118.
- “Табсира” I 357.7 ва к.с. Танҳида 5.5-7.

-
- Tveitereid, K. (2023). The Story Behind The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Theology and Qualitative Research. *Ecclesial Practices*, 10(2), 137–141. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22144471-10020004>
- Vann Ess, Theologie II [1991]. – S. 565
- Watt Der Islam II (1985)? 423 ва к.б.
- Watkins, C. (2023). Qualitative Research in Theology. A Spiritual Turn? *Ecclesial Practices*, 10(2), 142–146. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22144471-10020003>