Understanding of Trinity in 'Abd al-Jabbār

Kazuko SHIOJIRI

Abbrevation used in this paper;

Qur	al-Qur'ān
M.11	Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-'adl, 11th volume
M.5	Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-'adl, 5th volume

1. General View

It is well known that Islam is rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition and it recognizes both Christian and Jewish as "the people of the Book"[1]. Islam's characteristics and definitions from these two religions are based on its attitude toward them; its acceptance or rejection. Though Islam's attitude to Christianity is milder than the attitude to Judaism[2], the most fundamental distinction between Islam and Christianity is the doctrine of the Trinity. According to the Qur'ān, God is described omnipotent, omniscient, absolute, infinite, merciful, transcendent etc. but the most important nature of God is the uniqueness. The existence of only one God is central doctrine in Islam, and there is no mediator like the Christ, Messaih, or saints as a rule[3]. The monotheism or *tawḥīd* is the main precept throughout the Qur'ān, and this is the biggest point in which Islam differs from Christianity.

Trinity is the central doctrine in Christianity, which made it independent from Judaism, and where Jesus is believed as an incarnation of God. The Christian doctrine of the recognition of Jesus as a son of God is never to be accepted in Islam where the absolute oneness of eternal God is the fundamental religious doctrine.

In the Qur'ān, Jesus is described as one of the greatest prophets in the lineage of biblical prophets who were commissioned by God as messengers of God's words. The Qur'ān says as follows on this point;

> "Oh People of the Book, do not exceed in your faith. And do not say about God except the truth. Indeed, the Messiah (*masīḥ*) Jesus ('*isā*), son of Mary is but a messenger of God (*rasūl Allāh*), His word (*kalimah-h*) which He cast to Mary, and the Spirit (*rūḥ*) from Him. So believe in God and in His messengers. Do not insist that God should be in three (*thalāthah*) and desist from it, so that it is better for you. God is but only one God, God be praised!, and is far from having a son. Whatever is in the heaven and in the earth belongs to Him and is complete in God as a manager." (Qur. 4/171)[4]

In Qur'ān, Jesus is described as the word of God and the spirit of God, and the three, 'word, spirit, Jesus', manifest one entity. However, we must be careful to know that this entity is not

same as God, and we will study this problem later.

Though the Qur'ān clearly denies the incarnation of Jesus saying that God never bears his son, nor He himself was born (19/35, 112/3), Jesus is said to be born by Virgin Mary who was impregnated by God's Spirit.

"We[5] inspired Our Spirit into a woman who had kept her chastity, and made her and her son the Sign (*āyah*) for all world." (Qur. 21/91)

"And We gave the manifestation to Jesus, son of Mary, and assisted him with Holy Spirit (*rūḥ al-quds*)." (Qur. 2/87, cf., 2/253)

The Qur'ān recognizes the virginity of mother of Jesus and this is explained to give birth to a son of perfect purity (19/19), but his death on the cross and the resurrection in three days after the tragedy death are rejected as false tradition (4/157-159). The Qur'ān also affirmed that Jesus was provided and supported with Holy Spirit which is the factor or agent of the Qur'ānic revelation. Without this Spirit any prophet is never ordained to be prophet. God sends the Spirit from his command on to whomsoever He wishes among his servants (40/15). Though Virgin Mary is not a prophet, as there are no female prophets mentioned in Islam, it is clear that she was impregnated with the Holy Spirit and gave birth to one of the greatest prophets in Islamic tradition.

Even though Islam respects Jesus as a great prophet and Mary as a most faithful woman according to the Qur'ānic verses (cf., 5/75), it rejects the theory of worshipping Jesus as an incarnation of God, or as God Himself[6]. The concept of Trinity and the deification of Jesus is rejected in the Qur'ān as follows.

"Those who say that God is the Messiah, son of Mary, are truly infidels. Say: who could resist the sovereignty from God, if He wished to destroy the Messiah, son of Mary, his mother, and all those living on the earth?." (Qur. 5/17)

"Those who say that God is the Messiah, son of Mary, are truly infidels. And the Messiah said: Oh sons of Israel, serve the Lord who is my Lord and also your Lord." (5/72)

"Those who say that God is one third among three (*thālith thalāthah*) are truly infidels while there is no god but the unique One." (5/73)

There are some researches and studies on the images of Jesus⁻ seen in the Qur'ān, but we have very few studies about the arguments of the Trinity in Islamic theology: from which point of view was it rejected, or denied, or accepted? This paper will analyze the theological arguments on the Trinity in Islam mainly through the studies on 'Abd al-Jabbār's position, for or against the Trinity, by the comparison with his theory of the attributes of God.

2. Attributes of God

In Mugni V[8], 'Abd al-Jabbār[9] (935~1024?) examined the Christian Churches which were prevailing in Middle East at his days, and classified them into three groups: Jacobite, Nestorian, and Melchite. The Jacobite is one of the Monophysite Churches that insisted the godhead of Jesus more than his humanity and the Nestorian is, on the contrary, insisted on the separation of his godhead and manhood. The Melchite is one of the Eastern Rite Church that abandoned the Monophysite doctrine and pledged the loyalty to Roman Catholic. At the time of 'Abd al-Jabbār almost Christian Churches that still survive now were established, and the differences among their doctrines and rituals seems to have been known to some extent even by the Muslim scholars[10]. He showed us in his Mughni V, the details of the doctrines and the positions among the churches, both common and opposite. However, here we are bound to the common theories of the churches in order to make clear the opposite points between the Christianity and Islam concerning the problems on the Unity.

In Mu'tazilite, the terms used to explain the Trinity are *aqānīm*[11] and *ittiḥād*, the former means the personae, and the latter the unity or unification. Those words are used not only for refutation to the Trinity in order to defend the God's Unity in Islamic theology, but for explanation of the attributes of God.

In Mu'tazilite argument of the attributes[12], the attributes (*ṣifāt*) of God are not definite existences just as the attributes of the things that are present in this phenomenal world. The attributes of God such as God's being existent, knowing, living, endowed with autonomous power are entailed in the way of "it is as in itself" (*li mā hūwa 'alay-h fī dhāt-h*)[13], or "by itself" (*li dhāt-h*)[14], and manifest to us as His characteristics or states of His Essence. For instance, "Zaid is knowing" (*Zaidun 'ālimun*) shows us the existence of act of knowing that belongs to a man named Zaid. In other word, it shows us the existence of reality of knowledge with Zaid. On the contrary, "The God is knowing" (*Allahu 'ālimun*) dose not show us the existence of act of knowing or reality of knowledge with God. God is knowing to all eternity in the way of "He is as in Himself" or "by Himself". We could say that the attribute of "God is knowing" manifests the reality of God Himself by Himself as His being in His Essence (*dhāt-h*)[15].

Abū Hudhayl affirms that the attributes of God are compared with the Christian Personae (*aqānīm*)[16]. 'Abd al-Jabbār also says that when the attributes of God are as such, they are similar to the Personae of God in the Trinity.

七八

"Christians insist about the Trinity (*ittiḥād*) that when the divine act appears to Jesus, God should be in him. If it were not the case, the appearance of this act to him would be impossible. If they are asked: in what manner dose God appear in his body?, they will answer: it is not on the manner of indwelling (*ḥulūl*), nor on the manner of proximity (*mujāwarah*). It is not described to be in the place (*bi-makān*), nor to move (*yataḥarrak*). This method in itself is required to those who insist on this theory about the human-being (*insān*). However, this theory is nearer to corruption, because they assert that the human-

21

being is not fundamentally understood by reason (*ma'qūl*), and that even so human-being is director (*mudabbir*) of this body in the way not understood by reason (*'alā wajh lā yu'qal*). However, Christians assert the body that is understood and God that is known by the attributes which distinguish God, and they only judged there the Trinity (*ittiḥād*) to be not understood by reason. It is already clear that for people of this opinion, their theory should be ignored in two aspects, and one of them is from Christians." (M.11. p.327. 12-19.)

As this quotation is found midst the ontological arguments on the criterion of human spirit, it is not concerned directly to the attributes of God, but we can see his attitude to the Trinity. Here, as a rationalistic theologian, 'Abd al-Jabbar estimates highly the Christian theory on the human-being as to be understood by reason, and on God as to be known by the attributes, but he refutes their position on the Trinity that is never the object of reason. How God appears in Jesus' body, or how the unity of God and Jesus is realized? There are only very vague and obscure answers all in negations that God is in Jesus body not by indwelling, nor by proximity, nor by occupying the place, nor by moving. But without this unity, the divine act could never appear in Jesus' behavior through which people come to know God.

We see almost the same statements explaining the Trinity in the Definition of Chalcedon[17] recognized officially at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451.). It shows us that Mu'tazilite theologians as well as other Muslim scholars grasped well this Definition at that time. There could have been some arguments between Muslims and Christians concerning the Unity and the Trinity[18].

3. Godhead and Humanity

In the first half of his Mughnī Ⅴ, 'Abd al-Jabbār used most of the pages in treating the arguments on Christianity. He, at first, quoted his predecessor, Al-Jubbā'ī's opinions on the Trinity.

"Our Master, Abū 'Alī [al-Jubba'ī] told; most of Christian Churches except some groups insist that God be the creator (*khāliq*) of everything, that the Creator be living (*ḥayy*) and talking (*mutakallim*), that His life is spirit we call the Holy Spirit (*rūḥ al-quds*), and that His word (*kalām-h*) is knowledge (*'ilm*). Some of them say that the life is His omnipotence (*qudrah*).

They also assert that God, His word (*kalimah-h*), and His omnipotence are eternal. The word (*kalimah*) is the Son and in their opinion it is the Messiah who appears in the body (*jasad*) that once appeared on this earth. They differ what deserves the name of Messaih. Some say that it is word and body, for one unifies another. Some of them insist that the word be without body. Some insist that the body be created, and the word become body and creature when it came to Mary's womb and appeared to people.

All of Christians insist that the word be the Son, and it should be the Son who is given

spirit and word. They insist that these three be one God and one Creator, and consist of one substance (*jawhar*)." (M.5, p.80, 4-15)

Here, the term of "word" has two kinds, *kalām and kalimah*. There is no clear difference between these two terms, but generally *kalām* means "sentence" that consists of more than two words and also has the meaning of the act of speaking, and *kalimah* expresses a word that has single meaning itself[19]. While the God's word (*kalām*) belomgs to God firmly and is synonymous with the God's speaking, it is said to be God's knowledge, omniscience, and God's word (*kalimah*) is somewhat independent of God, and it may be called the Son. Generally, as the two terms have not big contradiction each other, both of them are used likewise in both Al-Jubbā'ī and 'Abd al-Jabbār. According to the quotation above, it is affirmed that the word, *kalimah*, is from God and becomes a son who requires the spirit in order to live, but these three; word, son, and spirit, are not plural existences but consist of one substance. "These three" in the quotation above are not the three in the Trinity, but there "word, son, and spirit" are essential elements that make up Jesus as a Messaih and manifest that God and Jesus are one in one substance.

Though it is really interesting to see various positions among the Eastern Christian Churches concerning the Trinity[20], that 'Abd al-Jabbār shows us in his Mughni V, we have to go forward to study the comparison between the Trinity and attributes of God.

4. Unity (*ittiḥad*) and Oneness (*tawḥid*)

In fact, at the time of early Christianity, the main cause of the disputes and separation among the churches was the relationship between God and the son and its interpretation, and it was mainly the relationship between Jesus, the human son, and Christ, the divine Son. The Holy Spirit, one of the three elements in Trinity, has been recognized easily from the very early period of Christianity, and it was the same in Islam; the Qur'ān tells us about the Holy Spirit which gave birth to Jesus in Mary, and with which God adorned all of the prophets from Adam to Muḥammad. The point of dispute is on the unity of God and the son.

Next to the Al-Jubbā'ī's information about the Trinity, 'Abd al-Jabbār describes his own view on the doctrine with which, he thought, agree the three major Christian groups in the East[21].

"Indeed the God, the Creator, is one substance (*jawhar*) and three personae (*aqānīm*), and the first of these personae is Father, the second is Son, and the third is Holy Spirit (*rūḥ al-quds*). The Son is the word, the Spirit is the life, and the Father is eternal, living, and speaking. These three personae are coincidental in substantiality (*jawharīyah*), and are different in personality (*uqnūmīyah*). The Son is not born yet (*lam yazal mawlud*) from the Father, nevertheless the Father is procreator to the Son, and the Spirit dose not emanate yet (*lam tazal fā'idah*) from the Father and the Son[22]. The nature (*kawn*) of the Son is not

一七六

a son to the father in the way of offspring (*nasl*), but it is just as the word is generated (*ka-tawallud*) from reason, the heat of fire from the fire, and the ray of the sun from the sun.

And they agree that the son unified the individual (*shakhṣ*) whom they call Messaih, and this individual appeared to people, was crucified, and was killed." (M. 5, p.81, 7-16)

This quotation shows us not the unified opinion to all of the three major Churches, but somewhat mixture of the various positions among them. However, it shows us the importance that to the Christians, the Unity of God and Jesus was once happened actually during the course of the history, by which Jesus had become a Massaih. According to 'Abd al-Jabbār, their arguments on the Unity are divided in two aspects. One is whether the Son unified Jesus due to the principle of the Trinity, and the other is whether one who unified (*muttaḥid*) Jesus is substance that is in three personae. If they were to say that the Son unified Jesus, it would be inevitable that the Son be a creator, a producer, an agent and even a god to them, then it leads to the claim that Jesus be a God. Otherwise, they would make the Creator, the God, the father whose word becomes the son without the father. These arguments present us the symbolic relationship between the God and the Son.

Here, "the Son" is not equivalent to "the son". "The Son" is for the incarnated and divine son, the Christ, the Messaih, and "the son" is for Jesus as human and historical who lived and died at the beginning of the 1ˢᵗ century A.D, for I think tha 'Abd al-Jabbār distinguishes the Son and the son clearly in the qualification, even though he used the same vocabulary, *ibn*, for the two.

To 'Abd al-Jabbār, that the Son is born from God never identifies with actual parent-child relationship, as it is said in the Qur'an that God is not begotten nor begetting (112/3). He also shows us negation of the emanation[23] of the Holy Spirit and assertion of the generation (*tawallud*) from the Will of God. The term tawallud indicates derivation or derivative that is produced naturally with certain act or motion as a side effect in Islamic theology, but the act or motion of the root cause is to be identified clearly. Though to our eyes both the Holy Spirit and the Son seem to emanate by themselves from God, there should be the will of God as a root cause. Then 'Abd al-Jabbār summarized the theory into the three positions.

"[The first of] their claims is that the Son is as it is in itself ('*alā mā kāna 'alay-h*), but whether the will (*mashī'ah*) of the son is the will of the Messiah or whether the will of the Messiah is the will of the son, or whether the will of the both side is heterogeneous each other. Nevertheless, it is inevitable that the other wish what one of the two wishes. This is what we require for the unification, even if the nature (*dhāt*) of the God and the nature of the man, or their substance are as they are in themselves. [The second] claim is that the unity already required separation of their natures from what they used to be as they were in themselves. It is inevitable for this argument that He unified Jesus on the manner of proximity (*bi-an jāwara-h*) and Jesus became an end tip of the God. Some of them are said to claim that God mingled (*khālaṭa-h*) and combined (*māzaja-h*) Jesus. Then [the

third] claim is that God is not adjacent but indwells in him. This argument needs one of the two; whether God indwells in every part (ajzā') of Jesus, or in one of his parts." (M. 5, pp.114, 10-115, 1)

We see the three positions in this quotation in sequence. In the first position, it is supposed that the word of "the God, the Father" be the Son, the Messiah, by the will of God but its method is"as it is in itself"('alā mā kāna 'alay-h). This method is very similar to the two ways in which the attributes of God are realized in 'Abd al-Jabbār's theory as we saw before, and we will see it again later. It is thought that even though God and the Son are in different nature each other, they could be unified as they are heterogeneous, and this position seems the doctrine of the Nestorians. This position is considered that God and the man are unified in one persona with these two natures as they are distinguished and heterogeneous. The second is that the two natures are to be transformed by proximity to each other, and Jesus is unified being a part of God, and this position might be the Melchite's. The third is that God indwells in the atoms of Jesus to unify him. There should be two substances and two natures in both God and Jesus in the time of unification, then these two are thought to unify into one. Though 'Abd al-Jabbār says this third position to be Jacobite's, the claims of "mingled and combined" among the second group should be also from Jacobite's doctrine that belongs to Monophysite Churches. In the third position, we can see the claims that God and the man be unified with their natures transformed, but the Godhead is more emphasized the manhood, but there are some delicate differences in interpreting the transformation of the nature, which needs the further investigation in my future article.

Analyzing various opinions concerning the Trinity, it is the divine ability of Jesus that 'Abd al-Jabbār shows his comprehension most.

"By the Christian doctrines, one who unifies (muttaḥid) body of Jesus is God who is capable of production that is never possible for anyone but God. For they believe that God appears to Jesus and then comes to him divine act. It is inevitable that the Son of God and the Word of God unify Jesus. If it were impossible for the Son to act what the Eternal authorized to him with His omnipotence, this claim might be incorrect. Therefore, by this theory and by other claim that one who unifies the body of Jesus be the Father Himself, it come to be possible that the divine act appears both to him and his hand."(ibid., p.115, 11-16)

七
四

Accoding to the Bible, Jesus did many miraculous acts which are to belong to the Divine Sanctuary. For Christian, these Jesus' acts are criterions for the Unity with God, and his resurrection in three days after the crucifixion should be the biggest one. The Massiah, the Christ, is manifested in two substances as godhead and humanity and the factor that unifies them is God. The substance of the Son is completed in three personae. This is the reason why Jesus deserves to be worshipped both in godhead and humanity. Both of Jesus, as a son and the

unified (*muttaḥad*), and the God, as a father and the unifier (*muttaḥid*) deserve to be worshipped for Christian.

These are the theories of Unity in the Trinity that ʿAbd al-Jabbār tells us in his Mughni V. Even though to the Muslims' eyes, Jesus is not the false prophet but in the Qur'ān he is a word of God and His Spirit, and loved by God as one of the greatest prophets as we saw before, ʿAbd al-Jabbār's understanding of Jesus as an agent of the divine acts seems to us farther more tender attitudes among the Islamic theologians.

5. Personae (*aqānīm*) and attributes (*ṣifat*)

It is important for us that ʿAbd al-Jabbār treats the Trinity not for eliminating it as its relevance to the polytheism, but for comparing it with the arguments on attributes of God and for utilizing it as a metaphor for the refutation to the traditional theories [24]. He interprets the method of the realization of the Trinity to "as it is in itself" (*ʿalā mā kāna ʿalay-h*) (ibid., p.114) or in some places, to "in His essence" (*fī dhāt-h*), and these methods are very similar to the way of realization of the attributes of God in Islam. Thus, his critics on the Trinity is that the recognition of the three Eternal Personae in God, the Eternal, will destroy the unity of God (*tawḥīd*), for it will lead the contradiction of recognizing three eternal substances in one eternal substance. His criticism of the Trinity, therefore, is not ontological but epistemological, and on this point the Trinity is criticized as follows.

"Because if these personae (*aqānīm*) were eternal, it is inevitable that the Father should not be able to have special relationship (*yakhtaṣṣ*) with what is incapable to the Son and the Spirit, and that their special relationship (*ikhtiṣāṣ*) with what is incapable to Him, nor the special relationship of each one of the two with what is incapable to the other should be impossible. This will necessitate the conclusion that the Son becomes a father, the Father a son, Father a spirit, and Spirit a father." (ibid., p.86, 10-14)

If the three personae are eternal altogether, the relationship among the Father and other two will be destroyed. The Father is fundamentally able to intervene in the divine sanctuary where it is impossible for the Son and the Spirit to participate. If these three were all to be eternal, almightiness of the Eternal would disappear, and this would lead to destruction of the distinction among the three, Father, Son, and Spirit. The quotation above tells us that the recognition of the three Personae all eternal in one God will rather destroy the transcendence of God, because God's special relationship with other things and others' special relationship with God would be confused and become ineffective, if the absolute distinction among God and other things are disturbed in the Trinity.

For ʿAbd al-Jabbār to recognize the eternity of the three personae is synonymous to the recognition that the eternal attributes of God exist with God, the Eternal, for ever, and this is equal to the claim of the traditionalists [25] in Islamic theology. He criticizes that the Christian

doctrine of the Trinity is very similar to Ibn Kullāb's[26] claim on the disputes of the God's attributes. Ibn Kullāb insists that though the God's attributes are not God, they are nothing but God and the God's attributes are eternal with God (ibid.,p.86)[27].

He introduces to us the opinions of his predecessors on this argument and tries to make the questions clear.

> "Our Masters told on this method that if the Son shared his nature of eternity with the Father, it would be inevitable that his nature should be like the Father's in his essence (*dhāt-h*). If the Father required the Son who is Father's knowledge and word, it is inevitable that the Son should be on the same place of the Father, on the ground that the Son should have a son who is his knowledge and word. Then there should be another son to the son of the Son endlessly." (ibid.,p.86, 15-18.)

In the Trinity, the son is unable to become the Son without the Father's knowledge and the word, and with them the son becomes an existence that manifests the Father's will. If the Son shared the eternity with the Father, both of the two would share the divinity, too. If we recognized the two divinities, there should be another persona to each, and this argument will invite the vicious circle. By adorning the each persona in the Trinity eternity, this argument is introduced into the same framework as the attributes of God.

As we saw above, the attributes of God are realized in the two methods; by the way it is as in itself (*li mā hūwa 'alay-h fī dhāt-h*) and by itself (*li dhāt-h*). The things in this phenomenal world cannot exist by itself but exist only by the causes, but God is omniscient and omnipotent without any cause to the object of His knowledge or His power.

It is now clear that in 'Abd al-Jabbār, even though he refutes the Trinity, the way where the attributes of God are realized in Islam is thought as similar as the way where the three Personae are manifested in the Trinity. Abū Hudhayl already used this hypothesis on his theory of the attributes of God as a metaphor. The doctrine of Christian Trinity is not always rejected in Islamic theology in the arguments on the unity of God (*tawhīd*) as its relevance to the polytheism, but it is applied effectively for the arguments on the attributes of God. To the Mu'tazilite and especially to 'Abd al-Jabbār, the Trinity is an effective metaphor to interpret the attributes of God theoretically and abstractly according to their method of rationalistic theology.

一七二

Notes;

(1) In Islam, the Scriptures revealed to human-being by God are reckoned as Mosaic Pentateuch, David's Psalms, Jesus' Gospel, and the Qur'ān which collected the God's words revealed to Muhammad as the last and the greatest scripture ever. There appear 25 prophets including Muhammad in the Qur'ān, and 20 of them also appear in both Old and New Testaments. Among them are the higher prophets who received the God's words, the Scriptures, and transport to their nations, who are called *rasūl*. In these contexts, Islam regards the Judaism and Christianity as they are on the same tradition, and calls the Jewish and Christian

"the People of the Book". Cf.,Qur, 16/36, 42/13-14.

(2) During Madīnah period, Muḥammad was disturbed largely by the Jweish animosity to newly born Muslim community. For example, Jewish was also accused that they had once made up the conspiracy with Meccans to assault Muḥammad and Muslim community (Qur, 6/92). Except the tragedy persecutions Muslim made on to some of the Jewish colonies in the outskirt of Madīnah during his religious champaign around 625 A.D., Muslim community in fact protected the Jewish as the protected (*dhimmī*) and guaranteed them the freedom of belief, occupation, and moving under the Muslim rule.

(3) Accordint to the authentic Islamic doctrine of *tawḥīd* there is no room for accepting any being to be obeyed as Messiah, Imam, or saints. But in the course of the history, there appear many saints most of whom are among Sufis, the Islamic mystics. In Shī'ite Imāms, the nominated among descendants of 'Alī, the forth Khalīfah, are recognized and obeyed as a Saver and a Mediator between God and man.

(4) I used the official Egyptian edition of the Qur'ān, and I gave my own translation in English.

(5) In Qur'ān, in almost verses, God expresses Himself using the first person plural.

(6) On this argument, John Hick says, "if asked to compare the Christian and Muslim conception of God, the first and most obvious thing to say is that the latters unitarian and the former trinitarian." "Islam and Christian Monotheism" (John Hick, *Islam in a World of Diverse Faith*, ed. Dan Cohn-Sherbok, Wiltshire, 1991), p.2.

(7) Cheilh Bouamrane, "Condition d'un dialogue Islamo-Chrétien", in *Recherches d'Islamologie, Bibliothèque philosophique de Louvain, 26*, Louvain, 1977, pp.59-73.

　　John Hick, "Jesus and Muhammad", in *Islam in a World of Diverse Faiths*, pp.114-118.

　　Muhib.O.Opeloye, "Jesus of Nazareth: A Scriptural Theme to Promote Muslim-Christian Dialogue", in *Muslim-Christian Dialogue, Promise and Problems*, ed. M. Darrol Bryant and S.A.Ali, Minnesota, 1998, pp.177-186. Robert Caspar, "Perspectives de la 〈Théologie comparée〉 entre l'Islam et le Christianisme", in *Recherches d'Islamologie, Bibliothèque philosophique de Louvain, 26*, pp.89-105.

(8) 'Abd al-Jabbār, *al-Mughnī fībwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-'adl*, 5ᵗ volume, ed., Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Khudairi, Cairo,1958.

　　I abbreviate it to M.5 in this paper, and the 11ᵗ volume to M.11.

(9) See my article, "Reason and Revealed Law in Mu'tazilite Ethics"(in *Miscellanea Philosophica*, University of Tsukuba Philosophical Association, 2000), Notes 3, pp. 98-97.

(10) *Milal wa-l-niḥal* (al-Shahrastānī, ed. Muḥammad, Sayyd Kīlānī, Cairo, 1961), 1ˢ volume, pp.220-228.

(11) "*aqānīm*" is plural of uqnūm that means hypostasis or constitutive element.

(12) See my article,"M'utazilah ha no zokuseiron ni miru 'kamino yuiitusei'"in Seisinkagaku, No.34, Nihon Daigaku Tetugakkai, Nihon University, 1995, pp.23-36.

(13) The attributes realized in God in the way of "li mā hūwa 'alai-h fī dhāt-h" are four essential attributes in 'Abd al-Jabbār such as potent (*qādir*), knowing ('*ālim*), living (*ḥayy*), existing (*mawjūd*). These attributes accompany to God always and are absolute, unconditioned, and not-effected by anything but the eternity of God. See Shiojiri (1995), and *Islam no rinri*, Miraisha (Shiojiri Kazuko, 2001), pp.50-54.

(14) The attributes realized in God in the way of "li dhāt-h" are said five attributes realized by the essentiality of God, and they are hearing (*samī'*), seeing (*baṣīr*), perceiving (*mudrik*), willing (*murīd*), hating (*karīh*). These attributes are realized, acknowledged, characterized with the essence, and without the essence, they are never realized. Shiojiri (2001), pp.50-55.

(15) "*dhāt*" means generally "thing", but in the Muslim philosophy it signifies "being" or "self" or "ego", and then "substance" and "essence" that is a translation of the Greek "ousia". For further information,

see the *Encyclopedia of Islam* in CD-ROM Edition.

(16) Milal wa-l-nihal, 1ˢ volume, pp.49-50.

(17) The definition of Chalchedon reaffirmed the definition of the Nicaea and Conatantinople and rejected the views of those who asserted that the humanity of Christ was separable from the Divine Persona and of those who asserted that the Divine Persona was merged or confused with humanity in one. It affirmed that the one Persona existed in two natures, and the two were united unconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, and inseparably. This definition won the majority in the fifth Century A.D. both in East and West except the some Monophysite Churuches in the East.

(18) For example, we find the vindication of the Trinity by John of Damascus (655?-750?) in his *On the Heresy of the ishmaelites* where he tried to defend the Trinity and the oneness of God using Qur'anic terms. He was well acquainted with Arabic and Islamic doctrine, and as a monk at the St. Sabas monastery, he fought for the dialogue between Christian and Muslim. His theory on the Trinity seems very similar to that of Mu'tazilite's, but he sought through Trinity the real existence of the Absolute as ontological arguments while to the Mu'tazilite, the arguments on the attribute of God is epistemological. See *Jonh of Damascus on Islam* (Daniel J. Sahas, Leiden, 1972), pp.67-83. "John of Damascus on the Muslim Heresy" (John W. Voorhis, in *The early Christian-Muslim Dialogue*, ed., N.A. Nweman, Hatfield, 1993), pp.137-162.

(19) *Kitāb al-ta'rīfāt (al-Jurjānī*, Beirut, 1978), pp.194-195.

(20) M.5, pp.80-85.

(21) 'Abd al-Jabbār shows us Jacobite, Nestorian, and Melchite as the major Churches that agree the statements on the Trinity as he understood, but each of these Churches separates in interpreting the nature of the three Personae. In this quotation, as well as his other comments on the differences among these Churches, he takes not only the major theory but mingled some of them.

(22) "The son is not born yet from the Father and ······" is seen in the paragraphs on Nestrian doctrine in Milal saying, "They claim that the Son is not born from the Father, but he only took body and unified the body of the Messiah when born." As Nestorian insist the separation of the nature of Father from that of the Son, they assert that the crucification only happened to Jesus as manhood, not the Son as Godhead, and on this point Nestorian separate from other two groups. Al-Shahrastānī says that this doctrine is near to the Mu'tazilite's on the attributes of God. Milal, pp.224-225.

(23) "Emanation" (fayḍ) is originally Neoplatonic terminology and used as a key term for Cosmogony and Cosmology in both Islamic Philosophy and Theology, and signifies generally the flow of the heavenly manifestation.

(24) See Shiojiri (1995), pp.25, 27.

(25) 'Abd al-Jabbār calls them *mujbirah* (fatalists), but they are of the Sunnī, the core of them are Ash'arite.

(26) 'Abd Allāh ibn Muhammad Kullāb (d.ca.854), See *Tabaqāt shafi 'īyah al-kubura* (Taj al-Din al-Subki, Beirut, n.d.), 2ᵉ Vol, pp.51052.

(27) *Maqalāt al-Islāmīyīn* (al-Ash'arī, ed. Hellmut Ritter, Wiesbaden, 1963), p.169.