

Between *Ḥikma* and *Kalām*: Interrogating the Genre of Shams al-Dīn al-Samarqandī's *al-Ṣaḥāʾif al-ilāhiyya*

Aseel Alfataftah

The quest to know God and his attributes preoccupied Muslim philosophers and theologians for centuries. At the turn of the tenth century, this preoccupation turned into a fierce competition between the *falāsifa* and *mutakallimūn*, who each boasted their intellectual tradition as the sole path to knowing God and reaching a state of certainty about His existence and attributes. However, in the following centuries, and with the rise of Sufism, the competition between the *falāsifa* and *mutakallimūn* receded and turned into a mutual acknowledgment of both traditions as legitimate paths leading to higher truths about the divine. This came in tandem with accepting the limitations inhibiting each tradition when standing alone, particularly when it comes to providing definitive answers to some metaphysical questions. In a recent book, Frank Griffel hypothesized that this epistemic current became the mainstream in the post-classical period. However, there is evidence that a group of post-classical authors diverged from this position and attempted to transcend the epistemic limitations inhibiting *falsafa*, *kalām*, and Sufism by systemically synthesizing them with the aim of reaching a state of certainty about the divine untenable to the followers of other intellectual traditions. This synthesis produced a philosophical system that combines mystical and rational knowledge. It found expression through two literary directions: rational philosophical Sufi treatises and theological summae with mystical connotations. In this paper, I present *al-Ṣaḥāʾif al-ilāhiyya fī ʿilm al-kalām*, a theological summa written by the Māturīdī theologian Shams al-Dīn al-Samarqandī (d. 722/1322) and examine it as an early example of this intellectual trend. I demonstrate that *al-Saḥāʾif* incorporates Ghazalian methodologies and epistemic constructs that

represent Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī's (d. 505/1111) response to his critique of *falsafa*, *kalām*, and Sufism and the path he envisioned for transcending the epistemic deficiencies inhibiting them.