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In the Shadow of Utopia (طُوبِيَا)

The Muslim moralist Aḥmad Taqiyuddin Ibn Taymiyya (1263 - 1328) of 13th century and the English utopian Thomas More (1477 -1535) of 15th century have nothing similar except that, each one of them in their own terms, had been against the existing place of living, searching for or dreaming of a place of no-place, i.e., a place that does not exist in a real world. This is called utopia from Greek οὐ (ou)+ τόπος, which means “nowhere” or “no-place”. The word utopia has often been taken to mean “good place”, through confusion of its syllable with the Greek eu as in euphemism or eulogy. As a result of this mix-up, another word dystopia was invented, to mean “bad place”. But, strictly speaking, imaginary “good places” and imaginary “bad places” are all utopias, or nowhere [10].

Thomas More was not first who dreamt of utopia, a “good place” for living. He was preceded by Plato (428 - 347 before Milād [b.m.]) with his Republic as well as by Tommaso Campanella (1568 – 1639) with his The City of the Sun [11]. However, Thomas More was the first to make the word utopia up for his book Utopia [9]. In Utopia, Thomas More presents to his readers an idealistic portrayal of a nation employing an egalitarian government. Through his spokesperson, the sagacious and well-traveled Raphael Hythloday, Thomas More describes and evaluates utopian politics and social values, including attitudes toward money, work, land ownership, punishment of crime, and poverty. Utopia has no lawyers. Politicians are respected but not venerated, and since there is no money or property, bribery is unknown. Utopians view marriage as a sacred institution. Premarital intercourse is prohibited and severely punished. “The head of each household searches out [from central warehouses] whatever he or his household needs and carries away their requirements without any payment or recompense. After all, why should anything be denied him? There is more than enough of everything, and there is no fear that anyone will take more than they really need” [9].

The Arabs have translated the More’s Utopia as طُوبَا from the word "ُطَّيِّبَة", which means a goodness and good luck and the plural of it is طُوبَ. It is mentioned in the Holy Qur’an:

الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصِّالحَِاتِ طُوبَ لهَُمْ وَحُسْنُ مَآبٍ (٩٢ سورة الرعد الآية)

"Those who believed, and work righteousness Ṭūba (good luck) is for them and a beautiful place of (final) return”.

In The Dictionary of Fiqh Meanings, the Arabic word طُوبَا (wish, hope, yearning) from the word “ُطَّيِّبَة”, which means a goodness and good luck and plural of it is طُوبَ, which is mentioned in the Holy Qur’an:

اٰلَذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصِّالحَِاتِ طُوبَُهُمْ وَحُسْنُ مَآبٍ (٩٢ سورة الرعد الآية)

These who believed, and work righteousness Ṭūba (good luck) is for them and a beautiful place of (final) return”.

In The Dictionary of Fiqh Meanings, the Arabic word طُوبَا means “happiness”, which is the name of a tree in the Jannah (Heaven). “Whoever gets the chance to reach such a tree will walk in the shadow of it for a hundred years”. Then, neither the Muslim philosophers were without utopian ideas. The most
The greatest contribution of Imam Maturidi to the development of Islamic theology was undoubtedly the theory of knowledge proposed by him. The scholar’s unique scientific method in learning of the science of aqeedah, his ability to approach all the facts objectively and critically, ensured that he became one of the greatest thinkers of all time. In his time, Imam Maturidi made extensive use of reason as well as naqli evidence in solving problems related to Islamic theology. This led to the spread of the teachings he founded widely and became one of the doctrines of Sunni Muslims.

The article analyzes the views of representatives of the Western Utopian School on utopian theory as well as Muslim philosophers. In particular, the results of the scientific research by Abu Nasr al-Farabi and the English philosopher Thomas More on this subject have been studied comparatively. In addition, the article reveals the differences between as-Salaf as-salih who lived in the first three centuries of Islam and the destructive ideas of the group that claims to be Salaf today. Furthermore, the scientific and practical significance of the doctrine of Maturidiyya, founded by Imam Maturidi, in the struggle against various misguided sects is substantiated.

Имом Мотуридийнинг ислом илоҳиётшунослиги ривожида қўшган энг катта хиссаси – бу, шубхасиз, билиш назарини ҳисобланади. Олимнинг акидан тадқиги энди ҳисоблаган, барча далилларга холосса ва танқидий ёндаса олиши уни барча даврларнинг энг буюк мутафаккири билиш билан бир сафда бўлишини таъминлаб, у зиндаги Имом Мотуридий ислом илоҳиётшунослиги ойд мумкинларининг ичимини ҳал килишда накллар далиллар билан бир каторда ақлдан ҳам кенг кўйилган. Бу еса у томонидан асос солинган таълимотларнинг кенг тарқалган, сунни мусулмонлар акидавий таълимотларидан бирга айланнишга замин яратган.

Маколада мусулмонлар орасидан итибистик чиккан файласуфлар билан бир каторда Гарб утопик мактаби вақилларининг утопик назария борасидаги қарашлари ҳам таълил килинган. Жумладан, Абу Наср Форобий ҳамда инглиз файласуфи Томас Морнинг бу борада олиб борган илмий изланишлари натижасида мусулмонлар ва воплощением было то многими мыслителями всех времен. В свое время в решении спорных вопросов исламского богословия имам Мотуридий широко использовал рационализм, а также аргументы, основанные на религиозных текстах, в решении спорных вопросов исламского богословия. Это привело к распространению основанных им учений и стало одним из теологических учений мусульман-суннитов.

Наибольший вклад имама Матуриди в развитие исламского богословия, несомненно, составляет теория познания. Уникальный научный стиль учёного в изучении научных акиды, его способность объективно и критически подходить ко всем доводам и доказательствам, ставит его в один ряд с величайшими мыслителями всех времен. В свое время в решении спорных вопросов исламского богословия имам Матуриди широко использовал рационализм, а также аргументы, основанные на религиозных текстах, в решении спорных вопросов исламского богословия. Это привело к распространению основанных им учений и стало одним из теологических учений мусульман-суннитов.

В статье анализируются взгляды представителей западной утопической школы на свои теории, а также философов, выросших среди мусульман. В частности, проведен сравнительный анализ результатов научных исследований Абу Насра аль-Фараби и английского философа Томаса Мора на эту тему. В то же время, в статье раскрываются различия между салафитами, жившими в первые три века ислама, и деструктивными идеями группы, которая называет себя салафитами сегодня. Кроме того, борьба с ересью основывалась на научном и практических знаниях учений Матуридизма, созданных имамом Матуриди.

conspicuous among them was Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī (870 - 950) by his epochal work: Principles of the Views of the Citizens of the Best State

Al-Fārābī is interesting to us not only because he developed a utopia-ṭūbāwiyyah idea of “The Virtuous City” (یوتوپيا طَوْبَايُّيْهَ) (پژوهش ارائه‌هایی در مورد “شکوهیت” (Politics); ترجمه، "النظریات" (A Treatise as a Reminder to the Road Toward Happiness); and "كامل الاعمال" (A Triumph of Happiness).

Al-Fārābī’s utopian (ṭūbāwiyya) ideas are not a mere imitation of Plato’s Republic, as some tend to think, but his “Virtuous City” is a structure of his theological opinions as well as his intention to make a “Perfect State”, whereby a noble society may live, the society that is compatible with the demands of time in which Al-Fārābī himself had lived. Indeed, Al-Fārābī’s plan for an imaginary city-state and society is at the same time a sharp critique of or opposition to the existing Muslim state and society of his time. And that is the basic idea of any utopian concept - a critique or destruction of the existing state of affairs in order to construct or reconstruct nonexistent state. In fact, by negating the existing place one wants to find or reconstruct non-existent place, if not in reality
then at least in the head of protagonists of an ideal society, in the case of the contemporary Muslim affairs to reconstruct a society in accordance to the ideals of al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ, the reverend and glorious forerunners of the first generation of the Prophet - the ‘āshāb, then of the second generation of the Prophet and the first generation of the followers of the Prophet’s ‘āshāb - the tābi’īn and then the third generation of the Prophet, the second generation of the followers of ‘āshāb and the first generation of followers of the followers - the tābi’ū t al-tābi’īn.

In Europe or in the West generally the basic idea of Enlightenment is founded on a deconstruction of existing methods in science and technology and, consequently, on the deconstruction of the existing norms in the state and society in order to construct new social norms and establish new scientific and technical methods. Here we have a movement or stride from unwanted past and present into a wanted future, while in the Muslim contemporary or modern history this movement was going the opposite way - from one unwanted preset toward a wanted past as a tābā tree in Heaven or utopian-ṭūbāwian no-wheristan. Indeed, this utopian idea, which could not originate and prevail without some theological premises, has always appeared at critical historical situations, especially when the Muslims were losing their place which they thought has belonged to them forever.

Certainly, the fall of the Abbaside Caliphate in Baghdad by the end of 13th century, and, then, the final abolition of the institution of the Caliphate in Istanbul by the beginning of the 20th century, marked the two most crises in the history of Islam and Muslims. In the case of the former crisis it can be said that Ibn Taymiyya and his pupil Qayyim al-Jawziyya (1292-1350) were main protagonists of a utopian idea in the sense of a reconstruction of the deconstructed idea of al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ, while in the case of latter, i.e., the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate, the main protagonists of the return to the path (مهاج) to a pure spring of pure and eternal water (شرعة) was Muḥammad bin Abd al-Wahhab (1703 -1792).

In the case of the previous crisis, it can be said that Ibn Taymiyya and his disciple Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (1292-1350) were the main protagonists of utopian-ṭūbāwiyah thought in terms of reconstructing the deconstructed idea of al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ, while in the case of the latter crisis, i.e., the collapse of the Ottoman Caliphate, the main protagonist of the return to the Path (مهاج) of pure and eternal Norma (شرعة) was Imam Muḥammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab (1703 -1792).
the term “al-salafi” means everything, especially that you are the only saved group (under that name and that, therefore, you should be against all who are not Salafis in the al-Shams al-Salafi al-Afghani way. It does not matter whether you are al-salih or not. What matters is that you are Salafi in accordance to the al-Shams al-Salafi al-Afghani’s mind. He wrote his master’s thesis at the Islamic University of Medina in 1989 under the working title: "الفرقة الناجية (‘Enemity of the Al-Māturīdiyya towards the Salafi aqīda - their history and madhhab on Divine attributes) [8]. One would have hoped to learnt about the great representatives of the Ahl-i Sunni-Jama’ah, the Imam al-Māturīdī, who for some reason was neglected in the ‘aqā’īd dispute, where the Ash’arite ‘aqā’īd school predominated, but al-Shams al-Salafi experiences a kind of Copernican turn, so that correct becomes incorrect in his mind, and what was considered good becomes bad. Then, al-Shams al-Salafi changed the working title of his master’s thesis to the official title: "علم الماتريدية للصفات الإلهية - ونomenclature and definitions in the sciences of the Divine"

The logic is clear: if you don’t have an enemy, invent it. That is how al-Shams al-Salafi does it. In three large volumes, each of 600 or more pages, al-Shams al-Salafi exposes the mockery of Imam al-Māturīdī, his disciples and followers, of whom Muhammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī (1879–1952) is his favorite target because, as al-Shams al-Salafi says, al-Kawtharī was the restorer (mujaddid) of the Imam al-Māturīdī school [8: 20].

Al-Shams al-Salafi is not only biasedly incorrect against Imam al-Māturīdī, but he is much more aggressively biased in praising himself because all failed in defending the Salafi ‘aqīda except him, who was chosen and called to defend the Ummah from the dangers of those who are called to defend Muhammad’s (a.s.) Shari`ah (Path, but they are not doing so. They are, Al-Shams al-Salafi claims, more dangerous than all, even more than Jews and Christians, who are not concerned with ‘aqīda among Muslims. The fight against the ‘aqīda bid’at, as seen by al-Shams al-Salafi, is more important and valuable than jiḥād itself and that is why he left the jiḥād in Afghanistan and came to Medina to write his master’s thesis against the al-Māturīdī aqīda, as the highest act of īmān/faith for the specter of a guilty ‘aqīda haunting over Muslim heads. This latest crisis among Muslims bears a resemblance to the crises of Ibn Taymiyyah and Abdul-l-Wahhābi, but it is special in that it is self-extorted or self-promoted as an internal crisis of mind and motive of individual or group interests in the distribution of inherited spiritual treasures or paths to springs or springs of the pure and eternal word of God, paths that interest groups block from each other so that all remain both without an open path and without a clear goal to the promised salvation. It was, indeed, a noble idea in the 1960s from noble royal and ulamā’ minds to raise three reference Islamic universities to train young people based on authentic Islamic Sunni science from the Qur’an and Sunnah in Saudi Arabia, Medina; Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur; and Nigeria, Abuja.

Two projects have become successful: in Kuala Lumpur and in Medina. Many of our Bosnian students also studied at the Islamic University in Malaysia and Medina. Many of them today occupy important positions in our state and society. The Islamic theological school could not, and never will be reduced to only one Path to the source or fountain of the pure and eternal word of God, but the idea of Tawḥīd, defined for each of you the Norma (سِيُّهْنَة) and the Way (نهج), to remain forever the same, as Medina will remain forever and for all Muslims and for all followers of Imam al-Māturīdī:

Иам المهدی ، علم المهدی ، وإمام المتكلمين ، ومصحيح عقائد المسلمين ، ورئيس أهل السنة

May Allah’s mercy be upon him, his disciples, his followers and all who read his noble ideas of Tawḥīd.

II

In the Search of al-Salaf al-Ṣāliḥ Instead of the Quasi-Salafi Ideology

The idea of salaf is a noble one. For, without a salaf, i.e. the autochthon ancestors, the khalaf, i.e. the autochthon descendants would not know their proper identity because the identity is a continuity of memory, and the memory, especially religious and spiritual one is preserved by al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ, the good and caring ancestors. Thus, the salaf, i.e. the ancestors as a paradigm of the khalaf, i.e. the descendants are indispensable in defining and keeping the khalaf’s internal and external identity. Hence, no one has monopoly on the salaf as it is a Muslim shared property of individual as well as of collective identity as a continuity of memory of the tenets of faith, of the knowledge of history, of the sense of destiny, of the purpose of life and of the right to a success here in this world and to a salvation in the hereafter. Therefore, no one should be alienated from the right to identify himself/herself from belonging
to the salaf as his/her rightful predecessors. Based on this premise, we all as Muslims have the right to claim that we belong to the good heritage of the good al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ, but we do not have the right to monopolise this noble title by excommunicating those who are not in the line of our point of view about certain issues, including those opinions pertaining to the understanding of the very meaning of al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ. There is no genuine Muslim ʿālum, scholar, who alienated himself from al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ. On the contrary, every ʿālum, scholar was proud to claim that he followed the path of al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ and believed that he was part of al-firqah a-nājiyah, the saved group. However, the Muslim scholar are confronted today with a quasi-slafi ideology which tends to poison the the spirit and body of the originality of the idea of al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ, the good and positive memory of the salad as the core of our Muslim identity. This is why we need today, as our remote ancestor, Imām Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī’s spirit and mind as well as the the spirit of the al-Māturīdī’s of teachings, i.e. the Māturīdiyyah of the past for the solution of the present spiritual, intellectual and political crisis of the Ummah. And the is what we are trying to do in this paper - to show the al-Māturīdi’s genuine methodological working out of a synthetic Sunni theology as well as an original epistemological framework for a synthesis of the Naql (tradition) and ʿAql (Reason). Here some are extracts from my doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago 1986 titled “A Study of the Theology of Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī”. The result of this dissertation was not only a discovery of an orthodox Sunni theological doctrine, which comes along with al-Asḥāʾī’s as well as al-Ṭahāwī’s Sunni theology, but also it is a guideline for a genuine al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ theology against the quasi-slafi ideology. If this guideline was workable in the past, it means that it can be workable at the present. I understand that this conference is organized to promote exactly this the Sunni theology of al-salaf al-ṣāliḥ against quasi-slafi ideology.

III

In the Light of Imām al-Māturīdī’s Synthesis of Naql-ʿAql Tensions

(a) Faithful Obedience (Ṭāʿah)

Although the idea of Ṭāʿah (obedience) assumes the traditional or irrational approach to problems, in this case to religious or theological problems, it is not completely devoid of Reason. For one must also have a justification for adopting this traditional approach of Ṭāʿah. In the case of the early stage of Islam, this Ṭāʿah was adopted, first, second, because the community was not yet exposed either to internal conflict or external influences.

This first aspect may be further elaborated by the fact that the early Muslim generations saw in Islam both the resumption of primordial monotheism and, more importantly, the removal of old social injustice. They thus lived in the hope that Islam would provide a better life both here and in the hereafter. To attain either of these two goals, one had obediently to accept the new perspective because it comes not from immediate experience but was supposed to create one. Thus, on the one hand, the very idea that Islam came from authentic divine source, and, on the other, that it was different from the existing ethical, social and political system, had enough force to gain the total acceptance of the early Muslim community.

When we speak of the early stage of Islamic theology as Ṭāʿah, we mean the total commitment of Muslims to the theoretical premises of Islam, without consciously questioning their implications or their possible logical conflicts. This, however, does not mean complete irrationality, but rather an acceptance of the idea that Reason is short of explaining everything. On the basis of this assertion we may explain Imam Malik’s doctrine of bilā kayf (a non-committal or non-questioning) attitude to which the Sunni theologians often had recourse when they saw that there was no rational explanation for a certain theological proposition.

(b) Elucidation (Bayān)

As long as there was no noticeable internal conflict within the Muslim community, this Ṭāʿah attitude was both justifiable and strong. But, when a series of conflicts erupted within the community, this collective Ṭāʿah lost its previous rationale and strength. It was, for example, hard for all Muslims to accept unquestioningly the assassination of the caliph ‘Uthman, to witness indifferently the battles of the Camel and Şīfīn, and to acquiesce obediently to the unfortunate events at Karbalā’. Nevertheless, the community had to continue its life, and, therefore, there had to be a Bayān (elucidation or justification) of these unpleasant events. That is to say, the Muslim community had by now created its own tradition, and some events were not compatible with the fundamental principles of Islam on which this tradition was based. Furthermore, the rapidity of these events left no time for calm reasoning or reflection, but required an immediate response to the difficult question as to who was wrong and who right in these bloody struggles or, what was the relationship between Islamic theory and practice. The first reaction to this dilemma came...
from the Kharijites, who, revolted by the injustice of Mu‘āwiya and upset by the indecisiveness of ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, proclaimed both parties wrong and, consequently, came up with the extreme theological judgement that a Muslim who committed mortal sin can no longer be regarded as a legitimate member of the Muslim community. This, in turn, opened a series of other extreme theological views. In counter-reaction to this Kharijite view came the stance of the Murji‘ī‘es, who, seeing the moral utopianism of the Kharijites, connected their theology with political conformism to the Umayyad regime. Worse than tis Abdullah b. Saba’ went so far as to proclaim ‘Ali b. Ṭālib as incarnation of God.

A is well known; all these extremist groups disappeared in the course of Islamic history and have only served orthodox theology as bad examples. Two different groups within the realm of Islamic, however, have survived throughout the whole history of Islam and still hold fast to their early difference, namely, the Sunnites and the Shi‘ītes. The former has always represented the main stream of the Muslim community while the latter has always tried to be duly recognized and sometimes even to dominate. Just as the Shi‘īites developed their own political philosophy, they evolved their own theological one as well. Here, however, our focus is on the theological development of the Sunnites, the majority part of the Muslim world, rather than the Shi‘ītes.

At first, the idea of the Sunnism implied political positivism rather than theological synthesis or Islamic orthodoxy. In fact, this early political Sunnism was developed to repel the opposition of the political theocrats of the Shi‘ītes. Thus, in this political sense of Sunnis, all groups that objected to the idea of the Shi‘ī theocracy, such as the Murji‘ī‘es, Qadarites, Jabrites, and so on, were considered to be the Sunnites. It was only later, when Sunnism came to represent ideological or theological synthetism, that the term was reserved for Islamic orthodoxy as opposed to all extremist theological groups regardless of their political attitudes. At this point of the stage of Bayān in Islamic theology, the most visible figure of Islamic theological moderation of orthodoxy was Abu Ḥanīfah, the founder of one of the four main Islamic legal schools. He is not only important for us here because he probably was the only person at this stage who dealt seriously with theological problems. In fact, Abu Ḥanīfah left behind more books or tracts on Islamic theology than any of his contemporaries. Five of these tracts have been preserved, namely:

1. al-Fiqh al-Akbar
2. al-Fiqh al-Absaṭ
3. Kitab al-‘Ālim wa al-Muta‘allīm
4. Risālah īlā ‘Uthmān al-Batti
5. al-Waṣiyyah

There are some questions as to the origin of these tracts which are ascribed to Abu Ḥanīfah. Wensinck thinks “...that it (al-Fiqh al-Akbar) represents the view of orthodoxy in the middle of the eighth century A.D. on the then prominent dogmatic questions; and that it reflects the discussions of the Kharijites, Shi‘ītes and Qadarites, not those of the Murtji‘ī‘es, nor those of the Mu‘tazilites.” Our aim here is not to discuss Abu Ḥanīfah’s theology per se, and the origin of his tracts, but rather to contend that they definitely represent his theological assertions and reflect, as Wensinck has rightly out it; “…the discussion of the Kharijites, Shi‘ītes, Qadarites, not those of the Mu‘tazilites.” That is to say, Abu Ḥanīfah’s theology is aimed at finding a moderate or inclusive theological way and at repelling those extreme elements of the Kharijites, the Shi‘ītes, the Qadarates, the Jabrates and the like. It is not yet rational in the sense that it still lacks a definite system of reasoning, and it is no longer Tā’ah theology because it has in itself certain theological judgements which are based on human experience rather than merely inspired by the Scripture.

Therefore, by the stage of Bayān in Islamic theology we mean that period when the Muslim theologians were responding to the immediate challenges of their times with an intent either to condemn or to justify certain actions of the past. This “theology of elucidation” has rational elements in its procedure but is still far from the point to be called rational in the full sense of that term.

(c) Naql-ʿAql: Conflict and Synthesis

Full development of Islamic theology came with the introduction of the more refined and more systematically worked out theological method. There is a general feeling among the students of Islam that the rational way in Islamic theology, and in other fields of Islamic studies as well, came as the result of the introduction, however indirect, of Greek philosophy into the intellectual world of Islam at the end of the first century of Islam. On the whole, this assertion, of course, is true. However, I think that even if the Muslims had not known all the details of Greek philosophy, there would still have been some sort of rational impulse in their system of learning. For, Islam, i.e., the Qur‘an and the example of the Prophet, is full of rational premises and rational explanations. Of course, Islam is first and
foremost a religion, it is not unconditional dogma. But unlike many religions, it is not irrational in the sense of suppressing Reason, although it is not overly rational in the sense of espousing pure philosophy. Therefore, from the very beginning, Islam had assumed a certain amount of rationality which in the stage of Tā’ah was not really needed and in the stage of Bāyan was not well worked out.

As is often the case with any religion, so it was with Islam, too, that a conflict between Reason and Dogma has inevitably arisen. The first initiative of this conflict came on the part of Reason, and the first exponents of it were called the Muʿtazilites. Supported by the rational side of Islam and influenced by Greek philosophers, they were the first Muslim thinkers who saw in Reason all possible solutions for theological and other religious problems. This pure rationalism of the Muʿtazilites could not but provoke the other side of Islam, pure dogma. But probably, had it not been for interference by the state into the theological issues at this stage, which tipped the balance to favour Reason, this first conflict between Naql and ʿAql in Islam would not have had such a great impact on the subsequent development of Islam theology. Nevertheless, in this conflict of Naql and ʿAql there were always those Muslims who were able to recognise the original Islamic intent and to maintain a balance between Reason and Dogma and who tried to work out proper system for realising that goal. al-Māturīdī is one of the best examples in this regard. In fact, as our study sow, he was one of the most original orthodox Muslim thinkers of the early period. Indeed, without any exaggeration, al-Māturīdī may be regarded as the most genuine founder of Islamic synthetic theology. He was not only able always to keep the balance between Tradition and Reason, but was also he was able to sow the validity of Tradition and the full strength of Reason within the context of that Islamic Tradition. As we shall see, many points concerning the early and later development of Islamic theology up to his time, points which are thought to be the discovery of modern scholarship, had already been made by al-Māturīdī in the fourth/tenth century.

Undoubtedly, al-Māturīdī’s most important contribution to Islamic theological thought was his development of the Islamic theological theory of knowledge. The significance of his theological theory of knowledge, although not always fully recognized by either Muslim or non-Muslim scholars, is no less than that of al-Shafiʿi’s theoretical framework of Islamic Law. Furthermore, al-Māturīdī’s scientific way of research, his sense of thorough analysis, and his objective critical mind reserve for him a place among the most serious thinkers of all times. We will see that al-Māturīdī was not afraid of any theological question, was not reluctant to take up any difficult issue and was not disinclined to any rational possibility.
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