

The Authenticity of the Manuscript of Mâturidi's Kitâb al-Tawhîd: A Re-examination

M. Sait Özervarlı*

This paper attempts to determine the authenticity of the manuscript of Abu Maşûr al-Mâturidi's *Kitâb al-tawhîd*. While some scholars have questioned its authenticity, this paper finds that the copy of the manuscript is authentic and reliable or that it is at least a version of the *Kitâb al-tawhîd*. In this paper, after discussing Mâturidi's importance to *kalâm* and the doubts expressed by other scholars about the manuscript, the published edition by F. Kholeif of the *Kitâb al-tawhîd* is compared mainly to the second most important Maturidite *kalâm* book, the *Tabşirat al-adilla*, by Abu'l-Mu'în al-Nasafi (d. 508/1114) as well as to some other books and materials since they referred to Mâturidi or to this book. Nasafi, when referring to Mâturidi, includes a number of quotations and paraphrases on various subjects that are like those in the published *Kitâb al-tawhîd* providing strong support that the text is Mâturidi's main *kalâm* book. There are also direct references to the *Kitâb al-tawhîd* where in different words the same meanings are expressed. Finally, the paper points out that the early descriptions of the *Kitâb al-tawhîd* by scholars in the Hanafite circle fit that of the surviving manuscript.

The discovery at the beginning of the 1950's of a manuscript by Abû Maşûr al-Mâturidi (d. 333/944) of his important book, *Kitâb al-tawhîd*,¹ has made it possible for his views and developments in the early period of Islamic theology (*kalâm*) to become better known. However, doubts have been voiced by some scholars about the authenticity of this manuscript, which is the only copy found

* M. Sait Özervarlı, Ph.D., is a research fellow at the Center for Islamic Studies (TDV İslâm Arařtırmaları Merkezi), İstanbul.

1 Cambridge Library ms. Add. no. 3651. The manuscript was edited after much delay; Abu Maşûr al-Mâturidi, *Kitâb al-tawhîd*, ed. Fathalla Kholeif (Beirut: Dar al-Machreq, 1970). In this paper references made to *Kitâb al-tawhîd* are to this edition. In fact, this edition does contain mistakes, but another edition by Bekir Topalođlu of Marmara University in İstanbul is underway.

so far.² What is in question is whether or not it is a book by Mâturidi, whether or not it is his Kitâb al-tawhîd or some other book by him, as well as whether or not it is a later compilation of his smaller treatises. Several scholars have taken up these questions, but their studies have not been thorough or complete enough and a more detailed study is needed in order to reach a sound conclusion. Therefore, in this paper I want to re-examine the authenticity of Kitâb al-tawhîd by comparing it mainly to the second most important Maturidite kalâm book, the *Tabşirat al-adilla*, by Abu'l-Mu'în al-Nasafî (d. 508/1114) as well as to some other related books and materials. Before doing this, however, I want to consider Mâturidi and his place in kalâm so that the importance of determining the authenticity of his book is better understood. I also want to mention briefly the doubts that have been expressed by the other scholars.

1. The Place of Mâturidi in the History of Kalâm

Abû Mansûr al-Mâturidi, who lived in Samarqand, the cultural centre of the Mawarâ al-Nahr region in central Asia, has not until recent times been very well known of. Historians of kalâm have under-estimated his contribution to Sunnite doctrine, so there is a lack of academic research about him. In fact, since he was a follower of the Hanafite tradition and the founder of the Maturidite school of kalâm, he is just as important as Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'ari (d. 324/936) in Sunnite theology.

Mâturidi has also been neglected in biographies (*tabaqât*) and in books on the history of Islamic thought despite his great contribution to kalâm. For example, he is not mentioned in Ibn Nadim's *al-Fihrist*, Ibn Khallikân's *Wafâyât*, Şafadi's *al-Wâfi*, Ibn 'Imâd's *Shadharât*, Sam'âni's *al-Ansâb*, Ibn Khaldûn's *Muqaddima*, Suyûti's *Ṭabaqât al-mufasssirin*, nor in Dhahabi's *Siyar a'lam al-nubalâ*. The best *ṭabaqât* sources for Mâturidi are Qureshi's *al-Jawâhir al-Muḍiyya* (the first book on Hanafites),³ Ibn Qutlubogha's *Tâj al-tarâjim*,⁴ and Laknawi's *al-Fawâid al-bahiyya*,⁵ and they mainly repeat almost the same tiny bit of information about his work and some of his teachers and students. In the major kalâm books of the classical period, Mâturidi and his school are again not mentioned. This neglect is still evident even in books that focus on the various theological schools and that mention even the smallest groups in detail, such as Baghdâdi's *al-Farq*, Ibn Hazm's *al-Fişal*, and Shahrastâni's *al-Milal*.

2 The fate of Mâturidi's other significant work, *Ta'wilât al-Qur'ân* was more fortunate since there are several manuscripts of it in different libraries around the world. For information about these and commentaries of the work in Istanbul libraries, see Manfred Götz, "Mâturidi und sein Kitâb Ta'wilât al-Qur'ân", *Der Islam*, 41 (1969), pp. 63-70. The complete publication of *Ta'wilât* by Ibrahim and Sayyid 'Awadayn has been restarted and is still continuing following on the earlier edition of the first volume that they did (Cairo: Majma' al-a'la li al-shu'un al-Islâmiyya, 1971).

3 'Abd al-Qâdir al-Qureshi, *al-Jawâhir al-muḍiyya fi ṭabaqât al-Ḥanafîyya*, ed. 'Abd al-Fattâh M. al-Ḥulû (Cairo: 'Isâ al-Babi al-Ḥalabi, 1979), vol. 3, pp. 360-361.

4 Qâşim Ibn Qutlubogha, *Tâj al-tarâjim*, ed. M. H. S. Yûsuf (Damascus: Dâr al-Qalam, 1992), pp. 249-250.

5 Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥay al-Laknawî, *al-Fawâid al-bahiyya fi tarâjim al-Ḥanafîyya*, (Cairo: Matba'at al-Sa'âda, 1906), p. 195.

On the other hand, among Hanafites, Māturidi has gained a high standing. Pazdawī (d. 492/1099) mentions Māturidi as one of the leaders (*ruesā*) of *Ahl al-sunna wa'l-jamā'a*, which he regarded as their kalām school.⁶ Samarqandi (d. 539/1144), a commentator on Māturidi's *Ta'wilāt*, also presents him as a leader of Sunnis (*Reis Ahl al-sunna*).⁷ Māturidi is also cited in *al-Qand fi dhikri 'ulemāi Samarqand*.⁸ In Hanafite circles Māturidi was the main source referred to in Nasafi and Nūr al-Din al-Sābūni's works. For later Hanafites, for instance Bayādī-zāda, the seventeenth century Ottoman theologian, he is seen as an interpreter of Abū Ḥanifa himself.⁹ Ibn Taymiya (d. 728/1328), a Salafite and opponent of kalām methodology, also refers to Māturidi several times calling him a follower of Abū Ḥanifa.¹⁰

Among Ash'arites it was Taftazāni (d. 793/1390), a commentator on a well-known Maturidite treatise, *al-Aqāid al-Nasafiyya*, who openly discusses this school, its founder, and the main differences between them and Ash'arites.¹¹ Another commentator at about the same time, Subki (d. 771/1370), must also have been aware of Māturidi since he commented on *al-Aqida*, a short treatise that is mistakenly attributed to Māturidi.¹² Subki also cites Māturidi in his *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyya*, which also includes his own poetic treatise, *Qasida al-nūniyya*, about the theological differences between Ash'arites and Hanafites (interestingly not Maturidites).¹³ There are some recent studies focusing on Māturidi's life and theology, too.¹⁴

-
- 6 Abu'l-Yusr al-Pazdawī, *Usūl al-dīn*, ed. Hans Peter Lins (Cairo: Dāru l-hyā al-kutub al-ʿarabi, 1963), p. 3. He sometimes refers to Māturidi's views (see, for some examples, p. 34, 70, 87, 123).
- 7 ʿAlā al-Dīn al-Samarqandi, *Mizān al-uṣūl fi natāij al-uqūl*, ed. M. Zaki ʿAbd al-Bar (Qaṭar: Matābīʿ al-Dawḥa al-Ḥadītha, 1984), p. 3.
- 8 Abū Ḥafṣ ʿOmar al-Nasafi, *al-Qand fi dhikri ʿulemāi Samarqand*, ed. N. M. al-Faryābi (Riyadh: Maktabat al-kawthar, 1991), p. 32, 311 and 420. This edition is based on an incomplete manuscript of *al-Qand* (Istanbul Süleymaniye Library, Tarhanvalide, no. 70), from which two large parts including Māturidi's biography are unfortunately missing, but he is mentioned in a few of the other biographies.
- 9 Bayādī-zāda Aḥmad, *Ishārāt al-marām min ʿibārāt al-Imām* (Cairo: Muṣṭafa al-Bābi al-Ḥalabī, 1949), p. 23, 29. *Isharat* lists the differences between Hanafites/Maturidites and Ash'arites on pp. 53-56. Bayādī-zāda's *al-Uṣūl al-munīfa li'l-Imām Abi Ḥanifa*, which collects and systematizes Abu Hanifa's theological views given in his short treatises, has recently been edited by İlyas Çelebi (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 1996).
- 10 Taqī al-Dīn Ibn Taymiya, *Daʿu taʿarud al-ʿaql wa'l-naql*, vol. 2, ed. M. Rashād Sālim (n.p., Dār al-kunūz al-adabiyya, 1978), p. 245; *al-Imān*, ed. M. al-Zaydi (Beirut: Dār al-kitāb al-ʿarabi, 1993), pp. 372-373; *Majmūʿ fatawa*, vol. 6, ed. A. M. K. al-ʿAṣimi (Riyadh: n.p., 1381 A.H.).
- 11 Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftazāni, *Sharḥ al-Maqāsid*, ed. ʿA. ʿUmayra (Beirut: ʿAlam al-kutub, 1989) vol. 5, pp. 231-232 (*Wa fi diyar Mawarā al-Nahr, al-Māturidiyya, aṣḥābu Abi Mansūr al-Māturidi...*) Gimaret cited Kastali's quotation and noted that he could not find this passage in *Sharḥ al-Maqāsid* (see *Théories*, p. 171, n. 120).
- 12 Tāj al-Dīn al-Subki, *al-Sayf al-Mashhūr fi Aqīdat Abi Mansūr*, ed. M. Saim Yeprem (Istanbul: Privately printed, 1989). A Persian treatise which is attributed to Māturidi entitled *Waṣāya wa-munācāt* or *Fawāid*, (Fatih Library, Istanbul, no. 5426, ff. 235^a-240^a and Hüseyin Çelebi Library, Bursa, no. 1187/8, ff. 112^b-117^a) published in *Farhang-i Iran-zamīn* (9, 1961) by İraj Afshār is quite unlikely to be his because of its mystical content and an approach that is different.
- 13 Subki, *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyya* (Cairo: ʿIsā al-Bābi al-Ḥalabī, 1965), vol. 3, p. 384. Subki indicates that Māturidi differed from Abū Ḥanifa and agreed with the Ash'arites related to the problem of declaring one's faith conditionally (*istithna*) while Baqillāni, who was an Ash'arite, agreed with Abū Ḥanifa that God gives favors to unbelievers, too.
- 14 Among them the following examples are worth mentioning: A. K. M. Ayyūb ʿAli, *Aqīdat al-Islām wa'l-Imām Māturidi* (Dhaka: Islamic Foundation, 1983); ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Fattāh al-Maghribi, *Imām Ahl*

Mâturidi's works reveal that he was aware of intellectual developments in his time since he knew of Aristotle and the translation of his *Logic* (*Kitâb al-manṭiq*) which included the famous categories.¹⁵ In addition, he used the term philosophy (*falsafa*) and philosophers (*falāsifa*) in his work.¹⁶ Another point of originality is his discussion, as the first Islamic theologian (*mutakallim*), of the problem of knowledge (*masâil al-‘ilm*).¹⁷ Moreover, Mâturidi had immense knowledge of dualist beliefs (*Sanawiyya*) and of other old Persian religions. His *Kitâb al-tawḥid* in this way has become a primary source for modern researchers with its rich materials about Manicheanism (*Māniyya*), a group of Brahmans (*Barāhima*), and some controversial personalities such as Ibn al-Rawandī, Abū ‘Īsā al-Warrāq, and Muḥammad b. Shabīb.¹⁸

2. The Doubts about the Authenticity of Kitâb al-tawḥid

Joseph Schacht, in his article that announces the discovery of *Kitâb al-tawḥid*, described the Cambridge manuscript as an authentic book by Mâturidi.¹⁹ However, later on Michel Allard was not so sure stating that, “sur l’authenticité de *Kitâb al-tawḥid*, il est difficile de se prononcer avec certitude”.²⁰ He is surprised that the main kalâm books, at least the ones he studied, did not mention either the Maturidite school or its founder.²¹

Meanwhile, the one surviving manuscript of *Kitâb al-tawḥid* was published by F. Kholeif in 1970, and research by students of Islamic theology began based

al-sunna wa'l-jamāa Abū Mansūr al-Mâturidi wa ārāuh al-kalāmiyya (Cairo: Maktabat Wahba, 1985); Balqāsim al-Gālī, *Abū Mansūr al-Mâturidi: Ḥayātuh wa ārāuh al-kalāmiyya* (Tunis: Dar al-Turki, 1989); Mustafa Cerić, *Roots of Synthetic Theology in Islām: A Study of the Theology of Abu Mansūr al-Mâturidi* (Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization [IS-TAC], 1995). Important articles include Joseph Schacht, “New Sources for the History of Muhammadan Theology”, *Studia Islamica*, I-II (1953-54), pp. 23-42; W. Montgomery Watt, “The Problem of al-Maturidi”, *Mélanges d’Islamologie: Volume dédié à la mémoire d’Armond Abel*, ed. Pierre Salmon (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974), pp. 267-268; R. M. Frank, “Notes and Remarks on the Ṭaba’ī in the Teaching of al-Maturidi”, *Mélanges d’Islamologie: Volume dédié à la mémoire d’Armond Abel*, ed. Pierre Salmon (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974), pp. 137-149; J. Meric Pessagno, “Intellect and Religious Assent: The View of Abū Mansūr al-Mâturidi”, *The Muslim World*, 69/1 (1979), pp. 18-27; Lutpi Ibrahim, “Al-Mâturidi’s Arguments for the Existence of God”, *Hamdard Islamicus*, 3/4 (Winter 1980), pp. 17-22; Salim Dakkāsh, “Mulāḥazāt manḥajīyya wa-aḍwā tārīkhīyya ‘alā ‘Kitâb al-Tawḥid’ li-Ebī Mansūr al-Mâturidi”, *Ḥawliyyāt far‘ al-adab al-‘arabiyya*, Université Saint-Joseph, 2 (1982-1983), pp. 43-59; J. M. Pessagno, “The Uses of Evil in Maturidian Thought”, *Studia Islamica*, 60 (1984), pp. 59-82.

15 *Kitâb al-tawḥid*, p. 147; *Ta’wilāt al-Qur’ān*, Ğ. Selim Ağa Library, Istanbul, no. 40, fol. 13^a.

16 *Kitâb al-tawḥid*, p. 25 and 189.

17 Ibid, pp. 7-11. cf. Schacht, “New Sources”, p. 41 and Dakkāsh, “Mulāḥazāt manḥajīyya”, p. 55.

18 See G. Vajda, “Le Témoignage d’al-Mâturidi sur la doctrine des manichéens, des daysanites et des marcionites”, *Arabica*, 13 (1966), pp. 1-38; Guy Mannot, “Matoridi et le manichéisme”, *Mélanges de l’Institut Dominicain d’Etudes Orientales de Caire*, 13 (1977), pp. 39-66; Sarah Stroumsa, “The Barāhima in Early Kalām”, *Jarusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 6 (1985), pp. 229-241; Josef van Ess, “al-Fārābi and Ibn al-Rewandī”, *Hamdard Islamicus*, 3/4 (Winter 1980), pp. 3-15; J. Meric Pessagno, “The Reconstruction of the Thought of Muḥammad Ibn Shabīb”, *Journal of American Oriental Society*, 104/3 (1984), pp. 445-453.

19 See Schacht, “New Sources”, pp. 24, and 41.

20 Michel Allard, *Le Problème des attributs divins* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1965), p. 421.

21 “Aucun d’entre eux que ce soit Bāqillāni, Ibn Fūrek, Baḡdādi, Baiḥaqi ou Ğuwaini, ne parle d’une école mâturidite de théologie ou de son fondateur”. (Ibid, p. 420).

on it. Several reviews and studies of it were done, too. Daniel Gimaret in his *Théories de l'acte humain en théologie musulmane* while explaining the Maturidite position on human acts dealt also with the question of the authenticity of Māturīdī's Kitāb al-tawḥīd as the primary source of his school of thought. After quoting Schacht's and Allard's opinions given above on the issue, he poses two questions: whether the Cambridge manuscript really was Māturīdī's and if it was, whether the manuscript was his Kitāb al-tawḥīd. By comparing four passages from Nasafi's *Tabṣīrat al-adilla* (Cairo manuscript, Dar al-kutub, 6673) with the Kholeif edition, he answered his first question positively: "Par conséquent, le ms. de Cambridge est bien authentiquement un texte de Māturīdī".²² However, as for his second question, he was not quite sure that the text was the Kitāb al-tawḥīd itself: "il n'est pas du tout sûr que Kh. [Kholeif edition] représentent Tawḥīd de Māturīdī". He argues that some quotations in the *Tabṣīrat al-adilla* from the Kitāb al-tawḥīd were not found in the existing copy of it.²³

The present state of affairs related to the existing copy of the Kitāb al-tawḥīd and its authenticity have been examined by J. Meric Pessagno, as well. He considered the Kitāb al-tawḥīd "a book compiled by a follower from smaller treatises of the master".²⁴ He regarded the use of the customary praise of God (*ḥamdala*) at the beginning of some chapters, which is normally written only on the front page of books, as unusual and questionable.²⁵ Also, he finds the lack of organization, the lack of connection between some of the chapters, and the last chapter added from another manuscript, as other reasons supporting his view.

These opinions will be discussed in the section that follows my own comparison of quotations from *Tabṣīrat al-adilla* and Kitāb al-tawḥīd, where I will also discuss other related materials in order to solve the authenticity problem.

3. A Re-examination of the Kitāb al-tawḥīd's Authenticity

The author of the *Tabṣīrat al-adilla*, Abu'l-Mu'īn al-Nasafi, should be regarded for the Maturidite school in the same way that Baqillānī or al-Gazzālī are for the Ash'arite school, as the second great scholar of the school,²⁶ and the *Tabṣīrat al-adilla*, his main book,²⁷ as the second source. In fact, it is almost like a commentary

22 Gimaret, *Théories de l'acte humain en théologie musulmane* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1980), pp. 175-177.

23 Ibid, p. 178.

24 Pessagno, "Uses of Evil", p. 62.

25 See *Kitāb al-tawḥīd*, p. 96, 110, 221. One of these *ḥamdalas* also begins with *basma*, and the other with the word *nabtaḍlu* which means "we begin".

26 İzmīrlī İsmail Haqqı, *Muḥaṣṣal al-kalām wa'l-ḥikma* (Istanbul: Awqāf-ı İslamiyya Matbaası, 1336 A.H.), p. 7. On the life and works of al-Nasafi, see M. Yurdağūr, "Kurucusundan Sonra Māturīdiyye Mezhebinin En Önemli Kelâmcısı Ebu'l-Mu'īn en-Nesefî'nin Hayatı ve Eserleri", *Diyanet Dergisi*, 21/4 (1985), pp. 27-43.

27 Abu'l-Mu'īn al-Nasafi, *Tabṣīrat al-adilla*, ed. Claude Salamé, 2 vols. (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1993). Another edition based on manuscripts found in Turkish libraries is being prepared for publication by Hüseyin Atay (Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1993). I have used the Salamé edition which is complete, although it contains some mistakes and is based on fewer manuscripts than the Atay edition.

of Mâturidi's *Kitâb al-tawhîd*. It helps us to understand much more easily the ideas and terminology in Mâturidi's work.²⁸ Sâbüni, the author of *al-Kifāya* and *al-Bidāya*, in his discussion with Râzi said that he had not seen any other book more accurate than the *Tabşirat al-adilla*.²⁹ Unfortunately, Nasafi's book has also not been as well known in the history of kalâm as it should have been.³⁰ The connection between Nasafi and Mâturidi in the *Tabşirat al-adilla* is clear and needs no further proof.³¹ Because Nasafi admires Mâturidi, he refers to his ideas several times, and he always supports his views against Mu'tazilite and Ash'arite thinking. In addition, he gives a list of the scholars of the Hanafite-Maturidite school in Transaxonia and their works, which is not available in any other source.³²

Nasafi throughout *Tabşirat al-adilla* refers to the views of Mâturidi mostly as "qāla al-Shaikh al-İmâm Abū Mansūr al-Mâturidi", without naming his work. Not just four quotations, as Gimaret indicated, but quite a number refer to Mâturidi personally, and they are found exactly, or almost exactly, as in the surviving copy of the *Kitâb al-tawhîd*. Below is a list of some of them:

<i>Tabşirat al-adilla</i> (C. Salamé edition)	<i>Kitâb al-tawhîd</i> (F. Kholeif edition)
p. 47, lines 19-20	p. 38, lines 4-5
p. 140, lines 1-6	p. 40, lines 13-19
p. 163, lines 2-11	p. 107, lines 1-11
p. 365, lines 18-21	p. 47, lines 6-9
p. 438, lines 5-7	p. 81, lines 4-7
p. 489, lines 1-4	p. 202, lines 16-18
p. 590, lines 7-13	p. 266, lines 3-10
p. 691, line 15-p. 692, line 7	p. 294, lines 1-8
p. 705, lines 10-18	p. 303, line 15-p. 304, line 1
p. 821, lines 11-17	p. 396, lines 16-20

The occurrence of all of these references and more are extremely significant because a kalâm scholar, when quoting his master, normally uses his main kalâm book, and the *Kitâb al-tawhîd* is Mâturidi's main kalâm book, as Pazdawî, Nasafi, and others have noted. Thus, if the surviving manuscript, which systematically deals with all of the kalâm subjects, is not the *Kitâb al-tawhîd*, then it also can not be

28 Without reading the *Tabşirat al-adilla* one can not evaluate or analyze the *Kitâb al-Tawhîd* (see M. S. Yazıcıoğlu, "Mâturidi Kelâm Ekolünün İki Büyük Siması: Ebû Mansûr Mâturidi ve Ebu'l-Muîn Neseî", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, XXVII [1985], p. 298).

29 Fakhr al-Din al-Râzi, *Munâzarât Fakhr al-Din al-Râzi fi bilâd Mâwarâ al-Nahr*, ed. F. Kholeif (Beirut: Dar al-Mashriq, 1966), pp. 23-24.

30 As Hadji Khalifa emphasized, although "Omar al-Nasafi's *Aqida* was shorter than its Table of Contents, it was much more popular than *Tabşirat al-adilla* (see Hadji Khalifa, *Kashf al-zunûn 'an asâmi al-kutub wa'l-funûn*, eds. Kılısi M. Rifat and Ş. Yalçakaya, Istanbul, 1941-1943, vol. I, p. 337).

31 Cf. Ali Abdulfattâh al-Maghribî, *al-Firaq al-kalâmiyya al-İslâmiyya* (Cairo: Maktabat Wahba, 1986), p. 380.

32 See *Tabşirat al-adilla*, pp. 356-360. This part of the *Tabşirat al-adilla* was edited in an article earlier by Muhammed b. Tavîr at-Tancı in "Abû Mansûr al-Mâturidi", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, I-II (1955), pp. 3-12.

one of his other kalām works which contain only particular subjects. Māturidi's other kalām books, as listed by Nasafi, except for *Kitāb al-maqālāt*, are books that refute certain persons, books, or groups, and they are not systematic kalām works.³³ However, the Māturidi quotations, when checked, are about a variety of kalām subjects. As far as Māturidi's *Kitāb al-maqālāt*, books with this title, such as the *Maqālāt* of al-Ash'arī are known to give information about theological sects and groups (*madhāhib wa firaq*) among Muslims. Therefore, among the complete list of his books, given by Nasafi, there is only Māturidi's *Kitāb al-tawhīd* that is his complete book of kalām. The name of the book itself also indicates this since *'ilm al-kalām* is also known as *'ilm al-tawhīd*.

Besides the clear references made to Māturidi personally in the *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, some of which are listed above, Nasafi also uses passages from Māturidi without referring to him.³⁴ He also provides some examples of Māturidi's style, for example, the word "*hastiyya*", which means existence (in Arabic *wucūd*), although it was Persian, and we find, many times, the same word in the surviving copy of *Kitāb al-tawhīd*.³⁵

Regarding Nasafi's actual references to the *Kitāb al-tawhīd* itself in the *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, which occur at least four times, excluding the one cited among the list of Māturidi's works, some of them are quite exact while some of them express the same meaning using different words.

In his first quotation, in the section in which he rejected the Magian (*Majūs*) idea of having two separate Gods, one good and one evil, Nasafi, gave four reasons (*ḥikma*) for the creation by God of things considered to be evil. What Nasafi explained in a similar way to Māturidi is found in the *Kitāb al-tawhīd* in the section about the wisdom of God in having secret purposes for creating harmful things,³⁶ and also in the section against the ideas of dualists (*Sanawiyya*).³⁷ Nasafi, at the end of this section, refers to a *Kitāb al-tawhīd* section, *masā'il al-ta'dil wa'l-tajwir*, for more details about what justice and injustice are, saying, "wa-warāa hādhihi'l-ma'āni allati bayyanāhā ma'ānin kathiratan dhakaraha al-Shaikh al-Imām Abū Manṣūr al-Māturidī raḥimahullah fī masā'il al-ta'dil wa'l-tajwir min *Kitāb al-tawhīd*, a'radna an zikriha wa'ktafayna bi-hādha al-qadr..."³⁸ In Māturidi's text, in the section that the editor entitled "Divine Acts", the words justice (*'adl*) and injustice (*jawr*) are used frequently, and probably it is to this section that Nasafi was referring. In fact, most of the titles, such as "Divine Acts" have

33 Three of them are written in opposition to Ka'bi's books (*Rad Awā'il al-adilla li-al-Ka'bi*, *Rad Tahdhib al-jadal li-al-Ka'bi*, and *Rad Wa'id al-fussāq li-al-Ka'bi*), to oppose the Qaramiṭa group (*al-Rad 'alā usūl al-Qarāmiṭa* and *al-Rad 'alā furu' al-Qarāmiṭa*), and others include *al-Rad 'alā Usūl al-khamsa li-al-Bāhīll* and *Bayān wahm al-Mu'tazila* (see *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, p. 359).

34 For an example, see *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, pp. 541-543; cf. *Kitāb al-tawhīd*, pp. 256-258.

35 *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, p. 162; cf. for example *Kitāb al-tawhīd*, p. 7, 24, 41, 42.

36 *Kitāb al-tawhīd*, pp. 108-110.

37 *Ibid.*, pp. 113-114, 116. In refuting the ideas of Magians on p. 174-175, he referred to his explanations made before.

38 See *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, p. 98, lines 3-5.

been provided by the editor since the text is divided into chapters or *mas'ala* that are not usually titled. However, for its content "*Mas'ala fi al-ta'dil wa al-tajvir*" would be a more appropriate title than "*Mas'ala fi af'āllillah*", the title Kholeif chose.³⁹ In fact, Nasafi, who strictly followed Māturidi's classification, used the title *Masāil al-ta'dil wa al-tajvir* in his book about this subject.⁴⁰

Nasafi's second and third quotations occur at the end of a long section on God's uncreated speech in which he gives details on different opinions about the possibility of hearing without sound. After citing other views, he emphasized that Māturidi supported the idea that normal hearing cannot happen without sound and that thinking otherwise would be irrational, so he said at the end of his section on the Qur'an that hearing a speech was only through sounds: "wa yastahilu idāfatu kawnihi masmūan ilā ghayr al-ṣawt, fa-kāna'l-qawl bi-cawāzi samā'ī mā laysa bi-ṣawtin khurūjan 'an al-ma'qūl, wa hādha huwa madhhab al-Shaikh Abi Mansūr al-Māturidi, naṣṣa 'aleyhi fi Kitāb al-tawhīd fi ākhir Mas'alat al-Qur'ān wa qāla inna samā'a'l-kalām laysa illa samā'u ṣawtin dāllin 'alayh".⁴¹ Just before this reference, in the second quotation, he expressed the idea that Māturidi, at the beginning of his section on God's attributes, indicated the possibility of hearing through other means than sound. Thus, knowing sounds and inner secrets are also called hearing: "wa qad ashāra al-Shaikh Abū Mansūr al-Māturidi fi awwali Mas'alat al-sifāt min Kitāb al-tawhīd ilā javāzi samāi mā warā'a'l-ṣawt, fa innahu qāl: al-ilmu bi'l-aṣwāt wa khafiyāt al-damir yusammā sam'an".⁴²

Although there seems to be a contradiction between these two passages, as Gimaret pointed out, when they are compared with the Kitāb al-tawhīd, it can be understood that Māturidi makes an exception to his general opinion. He accepts that ordinary hearing would not exist without sounds, but at the same time he does not exclude the possibility of an extraordinary secret hearing which he calls "knowing". Māturidi's view about hearing and the exception he has made can be found in a sentence in the surviving copy of Kitāb al-tawhīd. It is in the chapter on the attributes of God: "wa ayḍan anna ghayr al-ṣawt la yutakallamu fihi bi-tasmi'in, wa jāizun an yutakallama bi-ta'allumin".⁴³ In Māturidi's section about the speech attribute (kalām), which is most probably what Nasafi has called *Mas'alat al-Qur'ān*, by making a connection between the kalām attribute and the Qur'an, he also explains the possibility of hearing the speech of God by means of the tongue, letters, and sounds: "Fa-in qāla qāilun: hal asma'a'llah kalāmahu Mūsā haythu qāl: 'wa-kallama'llāhu Mūsā taklima', qila: asma'ahu bi-lisāni Mūsā wa bi-hurūfin khalaqaha wa ṣawtin anshaah".⁴⁴

39 *Kitāb al-tawhīd*, pp. 215-221. Nasafi, who usually follows Māturidi, started with "*Masāil al-ta'dil wa al-tacwir*" immediately after prophetic subjects (see *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, p. 539).

40 *Tabṣirat al-adilla*, p. 539.

41 *Ibid*, p. 305, lines 1-4.

42 *Ibid*, p. 304, lines 5-6.

43 See *Kitāb al-tawhīd*, p. 51, line 5. Kholeif added the word *kull* at the beginning without any mark, and read the word *bi-ta'allum* as *bi-'ilm* (cf. ms. fol. 24^b).

44 *Ibid*, p. 59, lines 3-8.

The fourth quotation from the Kitāb al-tawhīd in the Tabṣīrat al-adilla appears in the chapter on the human capacity to act (*istiṭā'a*). Nasafi's quote indicates that Maturidi was among those who made a distinction between having the prerequisites that enable the capacity to act which are being in good health and able (*al-siḥḥa wa al-salāma*) and the power to act (*qudra*) itself. Thus, there is the possibility that a healthy and able person could be both powerful or powerless at any instance calling for acting. Thus, a powerful person on one occasion can be powerless at other times. The text in Arabic is this: "wa man qāla minhum innā al-siḥḥa wa al-salāma ḡayr al-qudra, fa-innahu yaqūlu innahu yukhlaqu fi aw-wali aḥwalih imma saḥiḥan sāliman qādiran 'ala'l-fi'l, wa imma saḥiḥan sāliman 'ājizan 'an al-fi'l, wa yajūz an-yakūna fi al-ḥālat al-thāniya wa-mā ba'dahā ḥakadhā, fa sawwā bayn al-aḥwāl wa-lam yufarriq bayna al-ḥālat al-ūlā wa bay-na ḡayrihā min al-aḥwāl, wa ilayhi dhahaba al-Shaikh Abū Manṣūr al-Māturidi raḥimahullah fi Kitāb al-tawḥīd".⁴⁵

Māturidi's distinction related to the human capacity to act is clearly seen in the Kholeif edition of the Kitāb al-tawḥīd: "al-aṣlu 'indanā bi-ism al-qudra annaha 'ala qismayn: aḥaduhumā, salāmat al-asbāb wa siḥḥat al-ālāt wa-hiya tata-qaddam al-af'āl, ḥakikatuhā laysat bi-maj'ūlatin li'l-af'āl, wa-in kānat al-af'āl la taqūm illā biha...wa'l-thāni, ma'nān la yuqdar 'alā tabayyuni ḥaddih bi-shay'in yuṣāru ilayhi siwā annahu laysa illā li'l-fi'l, la yajūz wujūduh bi-ḥālin illā wa yaqa'u bihi al-fi'l 'indama yaqa'u ma'ah".⁴⁶ In addition, Māturidi's view about the possibility of there being change in having the power to act at different times is one of the points on which he disagrees with the Mu'tazilite Abu Qāsim al-Balkhi, known also as al-Ka'bi: "wa-qāla [al-Ka'bi] al-saḥiḥ al-sālim annahu yajūz an-yakhlū 'an al-fi'l waqta kawnih, thumma lam-yajūz abadan. Qāla al-Shaikh raḥimahullah: wa-mā yaqūluh khata'un, bal yajūz dhālik".⁴⁷

The above analysis of the quotations in Tabṣīrat al-adilla from Māturidi and directly from the Kitāb al-tawḥīd should help us to be quite sure that the surviving text of the Kitāb al-tawḥīd is authentic and reliable. It must also be recalled that references can be made without using the exact words used by the source. Looking for paraphrases is also important. We can at least conclude that the manuscript is a version of the Kitāb al-tawḥīd.⁴⁸ Of course, the discovery of some other manuscripts would make authenticating the work much easier.⁴⁹ Another problem is that the date of the transcription of this copy cannot be understood from the manuscript. What has been presented is actually the date the book was purchased at one time. This date is located next to the title of the manuscript and

45 See *Tabṣīrat al-adilla*, p. 567, lines 10-14.

46 See *Kitāb al-tawḥīd*, p. 256, lines 8-10 and 16-17.

47 *Ibid*, p. 279, lines 5-7. Gimaret, also points this out (see *Théories*, p. 178).

48 W. Madelung pointed a similar view in his article "al-Māturidi", in *Encyclopedia of Islam* (New Edition), 6 (1991), p. 846.

49 In a forward, either by the author or the scribe, to the Berlin library manuscript (no. 1841) of Ḥasan Kāfi al-Aḡhisārī's (d. 1025/1616) *Rawḍat al-jannāt fi usūl al-ittiqādāt* dated as 1147 AH., is noted that an old copy of Māturidi's *Kitāb al-tawḥīd* had been seen and examined in Macca (cf. also Hans

is incorrectly given as the transcription (*istinsākh*) date of the text⁵⁰ by Kholāif, Daiber, and Pessagno. The note is actually this: “al-ḥamdu li-llahi min ni‘ami’l-mawlā ‘alā ‘abdiḥ al-faqir ilayhi subḥānah, Muḥammad al-Amin al-Ḥanaḫī al-Shāmi wa-zḥālika bi al-shirā fi niṣfi sha‘bān sana 1150”.⁵¹ The word *bi-al-shirā* (by purchase) could not be read and was omitted and the name of purchaser was misread. In fact, transcription dates are always put at the end and never at the beginning of manuscripts.

Then, there are the questions about the customary praise of God (*ḥamdala*) used more than once since it was put at the beginning of some of the chapters⁵² and the lack of inner organization in the manuscript. Since Māturidi was one of the first Sunni theologians, systematization of Sunni kalām books had not yet been established. Also, the more frequent use of *ḥamdala* could be a part of the author’s style. He might have used the *basmala* and *ḥamdala* expressions whenever he restarted writing or dictating his book to his students such as after some long breaks.⁵³ A few unusual usages should not be allowed to cast doubt on the work’s authenticity nor on whether it is viewed as a systematic kalām book once its contents have proven to be in harmony with the references made to it early on.

Regarding the lack of inner organization in the manuscript, the comment of Abu’l-Yusr al-Pazdawī, who died about one and half centuries after Māturidi, is informative. He described the Kitāb al-tawḥīd as being a “little obscure, lengthy, and difficult in its form”.⁵⁴ This fits perfectly with the surviving manuscript. Almost all of the scholars who have examined the manuscript, including the editor, agree that its language is strange and that due to long sentences full of prepositions the expressions used are usually obscure and confusing.⁵⁵

4. Conclusion

In the light of the references in Nasafi’s *Tabṣīrat al-adilla* and the other evidence presented here, we can conclude that the only manuscript of Māturidi’s Kitāb al-tawḥīd is authentic and reliable. *Firstly*, there are a large number of quotations and paraphrases, where the work they are taken from is not mentioned, on various subjects in Nasafi’s *Tabṣīrat al-adilla*, which is a systematic kalām book

Daiber, “Zur Erstausgabe von al-Māturidi, *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*”, *Der Islam*, 52/2 [1975], p. 302-303). Although such a note does not exist in the published copy of *Rawḍat al-Jannāt* (wrongly attributed to M. Birgiwi, Istanbul; H. Muḥarrām Matbaası, 1305 A. H.), except for a reference to him (see p. 4), it is very important, and therefore, the Makka libraries should be searched for the manuscript. Whether the surviving Cambridge manuscript was the one Aḫisārī saw in Makka remains unknown.

50 See Kitāb al-Tawḥīd, Editor’s Introduction, p. 57; Pessagno, “Uses of Evil”, p. 61; Daiber, p. 302.

51 See the title folio of the manuscript of *Kitāb al-tawḥīd*.

52 Pessagno, “Uses of Evil”, p. 61-62

53 I agree with Professor Richard M. Frank’s personal opinion that disorder and even being unusual is the character of the books of the period (see Pessagno, “Uses of Evil”, p. 62, n. 1).

54 Pazdawī, *Usūl al-din*, p. 3.

55 See Kitāb al-Tawḥīd, Editor’s Introduction, p. 58; Daiber, “Zur Erstausgabe”, p. 303; Josef van Ess, “Review”, *Oriens*, 27-28 (1981), p. 556; Gimaret, *Théories*, p. 178; Dakkāsh, “Mulāḥazāt manḥajjiyya”, pp. 49-51; Ceric, *Synthetic Theology*, p. 52-53.

itself, the originals of which can also be found in the surviving Māturīdī text. Since the Kitāb al-tawhīd is Māturīdī's only systematic kalām book, the variety of quotations about the different subjects of kalām cannot be from his other books on more specific subjects. This strongly supports the idea that the text is Māturīdī's main kalām book. *Secondly*, there are references directly to the Kitāb al-tawhīd and then statements where different words are used to express the same meaning as that found in the surviving text. This indicates that Nasafi was paraphrasing ideas in the Kitāb al-tawhīd or that there were some differences in the various manuscripts of the work, which is normal. The discovery of some other manuscripts of the Kitāb al-tawhīd would clarify this matter. I believe that a serious search through Ottoman and Central Asian libraries will result in the discovery of some other copies. *Thirdly*, the early descriptions of the Kitāb al-tawhīd by scholars in the Hanafite circle, such as Pazdawī, stating that the style it is written in is often obscure and difficult to understand fit perfectly with the surviving manuscript. Its language is strange and not standard Arabic. It contains long sentences full of prepositions, and they are usually confusing. Thus, we are able to conclude that the surviving text is an authentic and a true version of Māturīdī's Kitāb al-tawhīd.

ÖZET

Mātūrīdī'ye Ait Kitābü't-Tevhīd'in Bilinen Tek Nüshasının Otantikliği Meselesi

Ehl-i sünnet'in başlıca kelām mezheplerinden birinin kurucusu olan Ebû Mansûr el-Mātūrīdī'nin (ö. 333/944) temel eseri *Kitābü't-tevhīd*'in halen tek yazma nüshası (Cambridge Ktp. nr. 3651) bilinmektedir. Fethullah Huleyf tarafından tahkik edilerek neşredilen bu nüshanın otantikliği hakkında M. Allard, D. Gimaret ve J. M. Pessagno gibi bazı araştırmacılar tarafından birtakım şüpheler ileri sürülmüştür. Söz konusu araştırmacılar eserin Mātūrīdī'ye aidiyyetinden, ona ait ise bunun *Kitābü't-tevhīd* olup olmadığından emin olamamışlar, ayrıca da Mātūrīdī'nin küçük risâlelerinin sonradan bir araya getirilmesinden ibaret bir derleme olma ihtimali üzerinde durmuşlardır. Ancak yapılan inceleme sonunda Mātūrīdī mezhebinin ikinci önemli kelâmcısı olan Ebû'l-Muîn en-Neseî'nin (ö. 508/1114) *Tebşiratü'l-edille*'de Mātūrīdī'den yaptığı alıntılarının lafzen ya da küçük değişikliklerle mevcut *Kitābü't-tevhīd* nüshasında bulunduğu görülmüştür. Doğrudan *Kitābü't-tevhīd*'e yapılan az sayıdaki atıfların karşılıkları da -ifade farklılığı bulunmakla beraber- söz konusu nüshada mevcuttur. Ayrıca Ebû'l-Yûsuf el-Pezdevî'nin (ö. 492/1099) *Kitābü't-tevhīd*'in dili ve üslûbu hakkındaki nitelemeleri mevcut nüshaya tam mânâsıyla uymaktadır. Böylece günümüze ulaşan yazmanın Mātūrīdī'ye ait *Kitābü't-tevhīd*'in nüshalarından biri olduğu sonucu çıkmaktadır. Eserin başka nüshalarının Anadolu ve Orta Asya'daki kütüphanelerde bulunması da kuvvetle muhtemeldir. Nitekim Hasan Kâfî el-Akhisârî'nin *Ravdâtü'l-cennât fi usûli'l-ittikâdât* adlı risâlesinin bir yazma nüshasında eski tarihli bir *Kitābü't-tevhīd* nüshasının Mekke'de görüldüğü bildirilmektedir. Çok yönlü taramalarla tespit edilecek yeni nüshalar bu konuda daha kesin bir hüküm vermeye yardımcı olacaktır.