

was perhaps projection; we do not know whether the thought pattern was also known in the Hījāz.<sup>7</sup> But in Kūfa it was certainly disseminated among his followers;<sup>8</sup> to that extent the Sunnī reports may be right, according to which Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb excused himself in this manner before his followers for the failure of his revolt.<sup>9</sup> In the mouth of a Sunnī this was naturally pure derision; here at any rate one had never kept one's criticism quiet. This gradually intensified to the point that when matters turned out differently than a person expected, according to this idea they also turned out differently than God had expected – or better yet: God had not in fact expected anything because He possessed no foreknowledge.<sup>10</sup> In their own system the Imāmites came up against the difficulty that if the whole time God could change His mind, the Imam would not be able to know the future in advance.<sup>11</sup> Nor was the idea consistent with revelation; divine knowledge, once it was “made public”, cannot be cancelled.<sup>12</sup> But this is theology in an advanced form. Now we must focus our attention more closely on this.<sup>13</sup>

### 2.1.3.3-7 *Rāfīdīte Theological Schools*

The way in which theology developed on the basis portrayed up to here is an interesting phenomenon. Its beginnings reach back to the early 2nd century. Sometime under the imamate of Ja'far al-Şādiq, presumably after the collapse of Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb's revolt and after the death of Ismā'īl, a fundamental transition came about: mythologizing gnostic models were replaced by rational

- 7 To that extent McDermott's remark seems to me premature that Ja'far “introduced” the concept into the Imāmite tradition (p. 331).
- 8 See below p. 385 f. for Zurāra b. A'yan; also Text III 6 and above p. 42 f. On this Ash'arī, *Maq.* 36, ll. 12 f. = 491, ll. 12 f.
- 9 Reported in Nawbakhtī 59, ll. 15 f. > Qummī 82, ll. 3 f. (with a better text transmission).
- 10 Cf. for instance Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār *Mughnī*, xvī, 59, 10 f., and 65, ll. 4 ff.; Ibn Mattōya, *Muḥīṭ* 1, 301, ll. 15 f., 'Azmi/311, ll. 19 f., Houben.
- 11 On this Ayoub in: JAOS 106/1986/627 and 629.
- 12 Ash'arī, *Maq.* 39, ll. 6 ff.; on this Kulīnī, *Kāfi* 1, 147, ll. 13 ff. and ll. 4 ff. from bot., where this argument is projected back onto Muḥammad al-Bāqir. Cf. also al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, *Rasā'il* 1, 116 ff. Of course, the normal cases of *badā'* do not belong in the domain of revelation; as one said, God keeps that particular knowledge to Himself (Ibn al-Şaffār, *Başā'ir al-darajāt* 109, ll. 9 ff.).
- 13 On the further development of the *badā'*-concept cf. Ayoub, op. cit., and Madelung in: *Isl. Philos. Theology* 131, fn. 25.

Joscf van Ess, *Theology and Society in the Second and Third Century of the Hījra: a History of Religious Thought in Early Islam*, c. I, terc. John O'Kane, edit. Maribel Fierro, M. Şükrü Hanioglu, Renata Holod, Florian Schwarz, Leiden: E. J Brill, 2017. İSAM DN. 253960