

One of them (sc. the Mu'tazila), al-Shaḥḥām, held: God has power over that over which He has given men power; one movement is the object of the power (*maqḍūra*) of both God and man, so that if God does it, it is compulsion, and if man does it, it is acquisition (*ḡurūra, kasb*).

In respect of the question whether God has power over that over which he has given men power (*Maq.* 549 f.), al-Ash'arī records that al-Nazzām, Abū 'l-Hudhail, and others of the Mu'tazila and Qadariya answer in the negative, and hold that it is absurd that one thing should be object of power to two "empowered beings" (*maqḍūr wāḥid liqādirain*). Only al-Shaḥḥām held the contrary view; the above statement is repeated, and then the report continues:

*W. M. Watt, "The Origin of the Islamic doctrine acquisition,"*  
*JRAS, p. 239-242, 1943 (London)*

"Both of them are described as having power to perform the one act; but the Eternal is not described as having power that the movement should be the man's act as well as His, and the man is not described as having power that the movement should be the act of the Eternal as well as his own."

Al-Shaḥḥām was one of the leaders of the Mu'tazila of Baṣra of his time, a pupil of Abū 'l-Hudhail and teacher of al-Jubbā'ī (*Munya*, 40, etc.). His statement (ib.) that Ḍirār held a certain view indicates some contact between them; and it might be supposed that he is restating Ḍirār's conception of two agents in Mu'tazilite terms, possibly in opposition to al-Nazzām and Abū 'l-Hudhail (whose view on this question seems, in any case, to be a denial of Ḍirār's). But this cannot be so, since al-Shaḥḥām must have held the freedom of the human will. The last part of the account of his view on this question is intended to rule out any Ḍirārite or orthodox interpretation of al-Shaḥḥām's formula. He was presumably thinking of some such act as the raising of an arm which may be performed either voluntarily or involuntarily; in the one case it is "by acquisition" and is the man's act, and in the other it is "by compulsion" and is God's act; but the alternatives exclude one another.

The account of al-Shaḥḥām by al-Baḡhdādi (*Faṣḡ*, 163) notices only this point, implies that his view has been confused with that of the Ṣifāṭiya (who include the orthodox), and calls attention to the difference. It is noteworthy, however, that the formula "one object of power to two empowered beings" (*maqḍūr wāḥid liqādirain*) is admitted as an account of the orthodox doctrine—which goes to confirm the primacy claimed for Ḍirār.

It seems probable that al-Shaḥḥām's use of *kasb* and *iktisāb* was the result of his connection with Mu'ammār, either because Mu'ammār himself used the terms, or because his account of human acts (on the assumption that it was accepted by al-Shaḥḥām) made some such terms desirable. That Mu'ammār had influenced him to some extent is shown by al-Khaiyāt's reference to him (*Intiṣār*, 53) as an associate of Mu'ammār. Mu'ammār regarded man as essentially an invisible, immaterial unity, which moderns might call "mind" or "consciousness". The man is thus quite distinct from his body; he directs it, and it is his tool. Moving, resting, colour, etc., are the body's doing. The only acts of the man are willing, knowing, disapproving (willing not to do a thing),

speculation, comparison; power (*quḍra*) and life are also ascribed to the man (*Maq.* 405; cf. 331 f.).

This view enables one to distinguish between a man's voluntary acts and his involuntary or automatic movements, and to give some explanation of the difference. The sheer act of will is emphasized in an almost Kantian fashion. But, since the view maintains that the outward movement is the act or "doing" of the body, it does not make clear how the will or intention comes to be realized in outward events. The movement is, in a sense, the man's act, since by it he fulfils the law; but strictly it is only the inner act which is his. For the relation between the man in his inner being and the outward act *kasb* seems an appropriate term, especially in the light of its Qur'ānic use.

The word is actually used twice by al-Ash'arī in reporting Mu'ammār's views. In a discussion of the derivation of colour from the nature of the body, there is the remark: "it is not admissible that what results from something else should be from the body's constitution, just as it is not admissible that the acquisition (*kasb*) of a thing should be the creation (*khalq*) of something else" (*Maq.* 406). That is to say, *kasb* and *khalq* exemplify things that are mutually exclusive.

On p. 417 there is a consideration of the case where a man decides to move but in fact remains still. This "remaining still", says Mu'ammār, is not an acquired act (*fi'l muktasab*) nor voluntary inactivity, but a "remaining still" by structure (*binya*; presumably = *tab'*—constitution). The details of this passage are a little obscure, but this appears to give the general sense. The term "acquired act" here stands for a voluntary act in distinction from involuntary movement or rest, as, for example, when owing to paralysis or nervous disorder the body does not obey the will.

These references are too slight for weighty conclusions to be built upon them. They may perhaps be taken at their face value, and then Mu'ammār would either have invented the term for himself (and Ḍirār might have borrowed from him), or else have adapted it from Ḍirār. But it is also possible that *kasb* and *muktasab* were first introduced by the person who reported Mu'ammār's views—presumably some follower of his such as al-Shaḥḥām or Muḥammad b. 'Isā. It does, however, seem safe to conclude that the followers of Mu'ammār were prominent in the use of the conception of *kasb*, that they used it to distinguish voluntary human acts not merely

from the "acts" of inanimate things but from involuntary human "acts", and that this was connected with Mu'ammār's theory of man.

محمد أبو بكر بن علي ، استد راقات علي تاريخ التراث العربي ، قسم  
العقيدة ، الجزء الثالث ، جدة 1422. ص. 74. ISAM 90256..

(١) كتاب الإرادة \*

SAHHAM

(٢) كتاب الاستطاعة على المجبرة \*

(٣) كتاب دلالة الأعراض \*

(٤) كتاب كان ويكون \*

لأبي يعقوب : يوسف بن عبد الله الشحام البصري المعتزلي (ت نحو ٢٨٠هـ)

ذكرها الذهبي (٤) .

(٤) سير أعلام النبلاء ١٠/٥٥٢ .

**MUSTAFA BİLGİN, TEFSİRDE MUTEZİLE EKOLÜ (Doktora tezi), ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ TEFSİR-HADİS ANABİLİM DALI), DANIŞMAN SAKİP YILDIZ, BURSA 1991, İSAM KTP. 40175, SS. 71-72.**

el-Cübbâî'nin bu değerlendirmesi, el-Esamm'ın eserinin, onun tefsir kaynakları arasında olması dışında, metot itibariyle, lügat ve fıkıh gibi konulara pek girmeyen, kelamî yaklaşımı esas almış, muhtasar bir tefsir olduğuna işaret eder mahiyettedir.

Bundan önceki mutezilî tefsirleri hakkında ancak ismen bilgi sahibi olabiliyoruz. Buna karşılık el-Esamm'ın tefsiri, müstakıl olarak günümüze intikal ettiği henüz bilinmemekle birlikte, mevcut tefsirlerde yaşayan ilk canlı tefsir olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Tefsirinde, baştan sona yaptığımız tarama sırasında, er-Râzî (v.606/1209)'nin, 140 kûsur yerde ismen zikrederek, Ebu Bekr el-Esamm'dan tefsir naklettiğini gördük. Bundan, el-Esamm'ın tefsirinin, er-Râzî'nin döneminde mevcut olduğu ve onun bu eseri bizzat kullandığı sonucuna kolayca varılabilir. Nitekim, et-Tevbe 9/40 ayetinin tefsirinde "imamet" meselesine binâen Hz. Ebû Bekr'in faziletini işlerken, bu konuda naklettiği birkaç haber için: "Bu rivayetleri Ebû Bekr el-Esamm'ın tefsirinden rivayet ettik" der.<sup>1</sup>

#### 4- Ebû Ya'kûb eş-Şahhâm (v.233/847)

Ebû Ya'kûb Yûsûf b. Abdillâh (Ebeydillâh) b. İshâk eş-Şahhâm el-Basrî

Hayli mahdut olan hakkındaki bilgilere göre, Ebû Ya'kûb, iki büyük Mutezile şeyhi arasında köprü olmuştur; Ebu'l-Huzeyl el-Allâf'ın talebesi, Ebû Alî el-Cübbâî'nin de hocasıdır. Basra'da iyi bir cedelci olarak tanınmıştır. Abbâsî halifesi el-Vâsık (v.227-232/842-846) zamanında Dîvânü'l-Harâc idareciliğini yapmış ve 80 yaşında iken H.233/847'de vefat etmiştir.<sup>2</sup>

1- er-Râzî, Mefâtîhu'l-Ğayb, XVI/66-67.

2- Bkz. el-Hayyât, el-İntisâr, 45; el-Ka'bi, Zıkr, 74; el-Kâdî, Fazl, 280-281; ez-Zehebi, Siyer, 1/552-553; İbnu'l-Murtezâ, Tabakât, 71-72; İbn Hacer, Lisân, VI/325.

**SHAHĀRIDJA** (much less frequently *shahārīdjī*; sing. *shahrīdjī*), Arabised form of the Persian *shahrīg/shahrīgān*, and the name given to some local notables of 'Irāk who survived the coming of Islam well into the medieval period.

The role of the *Shahāridja* in the Sāsānid period is vexing, since the evidence is all late and all literary. Al-Mas'ūdī states that they were part of the nobility of the Sawād [*q.v.*] and superior in rank to the *dihkāns*; meanwhile, al-Ya'qūbī glosses the *shahrīdjī* as the *ra'īs al-kuwar*, and this has often been taken to mean that they were imperial appointees with broad responsibilities in provincial administration. However, the material testimony is conspicuously silent when it comes to the *Shahāridja* (as opposed to the *shahrabs*), and Gyselen has argued that the *Shahāridja* of the Sāsānid period were representatives of the *dihkāns*, rather than administrative officials; insofar as the later evidence from northern Mesopotamia sheds any light on the Sāsānid period, the *Shahāridja* should certainly be interpreted as local notables, but how they related to the *dihkāns* is less clear.

The earliest attestation of the *Shahāridja* in the Islamic sources comes in Abū Mikhnaf's account of the conquest of Takrīt (here put in year 16/637), where they join a Byzantine force and local Arab tribes in defence of the town: al-Balādhurī also mentions the toponym Tall al-*Shahāridja* in his account of the conquest of Mawṣil, which, if we admit it as authentic, indicates their presence in the north before Islam (for a possible parallel, see Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, 446, on Theophylactus Simocatta). Local Nestorian sources of the 9th century portray the *Shahāridja* as local headmen and wealthy notables, who lived in several towns and villages in the province of Mawṣil; according to Thomas of Marga, they levied onerous taxes on the *dihkāns*. But Thomas also accuses them of holding the aberrant view that "Christ was a mere man" (*barnāshā shhīmā*), and it is therefore hard to know how much of his information is polemical. Although an *ex eventu* prophecy recorded by Thomas suggests that their role in local taxation began to fade at the end of the 2nd Islamic century, they were known in the north as late as Ibn Hawqal's time. The evidence for their presence in 'Irāk (as opposed to Mawṣil) during the Islamic period is so thin and stereotypical that firm conclusions are impossible.

*Bibliography*: Balādhurī, *Futūh*, 332; Tabarī, i, 2474-5, tr. Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, 446-7; Ya'qūbī, *Tārīkh*, i, 203; Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, § 662, and Pellat's *Index*, vi, 417; *Aghānī*, Cairo 1958, xiv, 136; Ibn Hawqal, 217; Thomas of Marga, *The Book of Governors*, ed. and tr. E.A.W. Budge, London 1893, *passim*; S.P. Brock, *A Syriac life of John of Dailam*, in *Parole d'Orient*, x (1981-2), 187/163-4; G. Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer*, Leipzig 1880, 236 ff.; M. Grignaschi, *Quelques spécimens de la littérature Sassanide conservés dans les bibliothèques d'Istanbul*, in *JA*, ccliv (1966), 31-4; M. Morony, *Iraq after the Muslim conquest*, Princeton 1984, 129, 187-90, 204; R. Gyselen, *La géographie administrative de l'empire sassanide: les témoignages sigillographiques*, Paris 1989, 28.

(C.F. ROBINSON)

**SHAHDĀNADJ** (also *shahdānak*, *shāhdānađj*, *shādānak*, *shārānak*) hempseed. In Greek pharmacology and throughout its Arabic counterpart, it was known as a rather minor simple, useful for drying out fluid in the ear by dripping its oil into it, harmful in that it caused headache and sexual dysfunction when eaten in large quantities, and the like. The word was commonly accepted as the Persian equivalent of Greek *cannabis*, Ar. *kinnab*, and hence served as an-

other term for *hashīsh* [*q.v.*]; this may explain why so many different forms were in use.

*Bibliography*: A. Dietrich, *Dioscurides triumphans*, ii, 502-3, 598-9. = *Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Kl., 3. Folge (1988), 172 ff., with full references to the pharmacological works. From the older literature, see I. Loew, *Die Flora der Juden*, Vienna and Leipzig 1928, repr. Hildesheim 1967, i, 255-63, and, for the *hashīsh* aspect, F. Rosenthal, *The Herb*, Leiden 1971, index, 201a.

(F. ROSENTHAL)

#### SHĀHDJAHĀNĀBĀD [see DIHLĪ]

AL-SHAḤḤĀM, ABU YA'QŪB YŪSUF b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ishāk, Mu'tazilī theologian of the Baṣran school (3rd/9th century). His exact dates are unknown. His biographers only say that he was the youngest, or among the youngest, of the disciples of Abu 'l-Hudhayl (d. ? 227/841 [*q.v.*]), that he died aged 80 and that his death was after 257/871, when he was for a while prisoner of the Zandj, when these last overran Baṣra.

As his name implies, he was a seller of fat, and under al-Wāthiq held administrative posts in the taxation office or *dīwān al-kharādj*. According to Ibn al-Nadīm (cited in Ibn Hadjar, *Lisān*, vi, 325), he is said to have even headed this department. According to other sources, he was reportedly simply charged as a "religious figure", and in the general framework of the suppression of abuses, to oversee in this regard the conduct of al-Faql b. Marwān [*q.v.*].

He was a disciple both of Abu 'l-Hudhayl and, it seems, of Mu'ammār [*q.v.*] (thus according to al-Khayyāt, *Intiṣār*, ed. Nader, 45, ll. 15-17), and eventually became head of the Mu'tazilī school in Baṣra. He was the chief master of Abū 'Alī al-Djubbā'ī [*q.v.*]. A trenchant polemicist, he is said to have written numerous refutations, as well as, notably, a Qur'ān commentary (for all biographical details, see 'Abd al-Djabbār, *Faql al-i'tizāl*, Tunis 1974, 280-1; al-Hākim al-Djuṣhamī, *Sharh 'uyūn al-masā'il*, ms. San'ā'. Great Mosque. 'Ilm al-kalām, no. 212, fol. 59a; Ibn al-Murtaḍā, *Tabakāt al-mu'tazila*, Beirut-Wiesbaden 1961, 71-2; and on the episode of the Zandj, 'Abd al-Djabbār, *Tathbūt dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, Beirut 1966, 341).

He is characterised by two main theses:

(1) Concerning the science of God, on the question whether God has known things from all eternity (*lam yazal 'āliman bi 'l-ashyā'*)—a question debated at length in al-Ash'arī, *Maḳālāt*, Wiesbaden 1963, 158-63—he was amongst those answering affirmatively (see *ibid.*, 162, ll. 8-17). This means that he admitted that, given the fact that the universe is created, "things are things even before they come into existence", in other words, that "what is not yet in existence is a thing" (*al-ma'dūm shay'*), a thesis which the majority of later Mu'tazilīs, Baṣrans as well as Baghdādīs, made their own. A relatively late tradition holds that, within the Mu'tazilī school, al-Shahḥām was the first to uphold such a principle (see al-Djuwaynī, *Shāmil*, Alexandria 1969, 124, ll. 6-7; al-Shahrastānī, *Nihāya*, Oxford 1934, 151, ll. 2-5). In reality, his contemporary and compatriot 'Abbād b. Sulaymān [*q.v.*] held the same view (see *Maḳālāt*, 158, ll. 16 ff. and 495, ll. 9 ff.). Al-Shahḥām simply went further, saying that bodies even are bodies before they come into existence, a viewpoint which was later taken up by the Baghdādī al-Khayyāt [*q.v.*] (in his *Faḳh*, ed. 'Abd al-Hamīd, Cairo n.d., 179, ll. 15 ff., al-Baghdādī attributes to al-Khayyāt the reasoning that, in *Maḳālāt*, 162, ll. 12-16, 504, ll. 16 ff., al-Ash'arī attributes to al-Shahḥām).

(2) Regarding God's power, considered in its