The Authenticity of the Manuscript of Māturīdī’s Kitāb al-Tawḥīd: A Re-examination
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This paper attempts to determine the authenticity of the manuscript of Abū Maṣūr al-Māturīdī’s Kitāb al-tawḥīd. 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 Kitāb al-tawḥīd. In this paper, after discussing Māturīdī’s importance to kalām and the doubts expressed by other scholars about the manuscript, the published edition by F. Kholeif of the Kitāb al-tawḥīd is compared mainly to the second most important Māturīdī kalām book, the Ṭabṣīrat al-adilla, by Abu’l-Muʿīn al-Nasafi (d. 508/1114) as well as to some other books and materials since they referred to Māturīdī or to this book. Nasafi, when referring to Māturīdī, includes a number of quotations and paraphrases on various subjects that are like those in the published Kitāb al-tawḥīd providing strong support that the text is Māturīdī’s main kalām book. There are also direct references to the Kitāb al-tawḥīd where in different words the same meanings are expressed. Finally, the paper points out that the early descriptions of the Kitāb al-tawḥīd 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 Abū Maṣūr al-Māturīdī (d. 333/944) of his important book, Kitāb al-tawḥīd, has made it possible for his views and developments in the early period of Islamic theology (kalām) to become better known. However, doubts have been voiced by some scholars about the authenticity of this manuscript, which is the only copy found
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1 Cambridge Library ms. Add. no. 3651. The manuscript was edited after much delay: Abū Maṣūr al-Māturīdī, Kitāb al-tawḥīd, ed. Fathalla Kholeif (Beirut: Dar al-Machreq, 1970). In this paper references made to Kitāb al-tawḥīd are to this edition. In fact, this edition does contain mistakes, but another edition by Bekir Topaloğlu of Marmara University in Istanbul is underway.
so far. What is in question is whether or not it is a book by Māturīdī, whether or not it is his Kitāb al-tawḥīd 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 Kitāb al-tawḥīd by comparing it mainly to the second most important Maturidite kalām book, the Tabṣirat al-adilla, by Abū’l-Muṭ’in al-Nasafī (d. 508/1114) as well as to some other related books and materials. Before doing this, however, I want to consider Māturīdī and his place in kalām 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 Māturīdī in the History of Kalām

Abū Maṣṣūr al-Māturīdī, who lived in Samarqand, the cultural centre of the Māwarā al-Nahr region in central Asia, has not until recent times been very well known. Historians of kalām 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 kalām, he is just as important as Abū’l-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (d. 324/936) in Sunnite theology.

Māturīdī has also been neglected in biographies (tabaqāt) and in books on the history of Islamic thought despite his great contribution to kalām. For example, he is not mentioned in Ibn Nadim’s al-Fihrist, Ibn Khalīl’s Wafayāt, Ṣafāḍī’s al-Wāfi, Ibn Ḫimār’s Shadharāt, Ṣamʿānī’s al-Ansāb, Ibn Khaldūn’s Muqaddima, Suyūṭī’s Tabaqāt al-mufassirīn, nor in Dhahabi’s Siyār aṭ-ṭlam al-nubalā’. The best tabaqāt sources for Māturīdī are Qureshi’s al-Jawāhir al-Mudīyya (the first book on Hanafites), Ibn Qutrubogha’s Tāj al-tarājīm, and Laknawi’s al-Fawāid al-bahiyya, and they mainly repeat almost the same tiny bit of information about his work and some of his teachers and students. In the major kalām books of the classical period, Māturīdī 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 Baghdādī’s al-Faqī, Ibn Hazm’s al-Fīsāl, and Shahristānī’s al-Ḥilal.

2 The fate of Māturīdī’s other significant work, Ta’wilāt al-Qurān 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, “Māturīdī und sein Kitāb Ta’wilāt al-Qurān,” Der Islam, 41 (1969), pp. 63-70. The complete publication of Ta’wilāt by Ibrahim and Sayyid Ṭawadyn has been restarted and is still continuing following on the earlier edition of the first volume that they did (Cairo: Majma’ al-aṭlā’ li-al-shu’un al-islamiyya, 1971).


On the other hand, among Hanafites, Māturūdi has gained a high standing. Pāzdaqwi (d. 492/1099) mentions Māturūdi as one of the leaders (rāsā) of Aḥl al-sunna wa’l-jamāʿa, which he regarded as their kalām school.6 Samarrqandī (d. 539/1144), a commentator on Māturūdi’s Ta’wilāt, also presents him as a leader of Sunnis (Reis Aḥl al-sunna).7 Māturūdī is also cited in al-Qand fī dhikrī ‘ulemālī Samarrqand.8 In Hanafite circles Māturūdī was the main source referred to in Nasaifī and Nūr al-Dīn al-Sālimī’s works. For later Hanafites, for instance Bayādī-zāda, the seventeenth century Ottoman theologian, he is seen as an interpreter of Aḥū Ḥanifa himself.9 Ibn Taqyīmiyya (d. 728/1328), a Salafite and opponent of kalām methodology, also refers to Māturūdī several times calling him a follower of Aḥū Ḥanifa.10

Among Ash’arites it was Taftazānī (d. 793/1390), a commentator on a well-known Maturidite treatise, al-Aqād 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, Subkī (d. 771/1370), must also have been aware of Māturūdī since he commented on al-Aqīda, a short treatise that is mistakenly attributed to Māturūdī.12 Subkī also cites Māturūdī in his Tabaqāt al-Shaffīyya, which also includes his own poetic treatise, Qasidat al-nūniyya, about the theological differences between Ash’arites and Hanafites (interestingly not Maturidites).13 There are some recent studies focusing on Māturūdī’s life and theology, too.14

---

6 Abū’l-Yusur al-Pāzdaqwi, Usūl al-dīn, ed. Hans Peter Lins (Cairo: Dārī Ilḥāb al-kutub al-‘arabi, 1963), p. 3. He sometimes refers to Māturūdī’s views (see, for some examples, p. 34, 70, 87, 123).
8 Abū Ḥāfīẓ Omar al-Nasafi, al-Qand fī dhikrī ‘ulemālī Samarrqand, ed. N. M. al-Faryābī (Riyadh: Maktabat al-kawthar, 1991), p. 32, 311 and 420. This edition is based on an incomplete manuscript of al-Qand (Istanbul Suleymaniye Library, Tarhanvalide, no. 70), from which two large parts including Māturūdī’s biography are unfortunately missing, but he is mentioned in a few of the other biographies.
10 Bayādī-zāda’s al-Usūl al-munifā lī’l-īmām Abī Ḥanīfa, which collects and systematizes Aḥū Ḥanifa’s theological views given in his short treatises, has recently been edited by Ilyas Čelebi (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Ilahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 1996).
13 Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, al-Sayf al-Mashhūr fī Aqīdat Abī Mansūr, ed. M. Salm Yemrim (Istanbul: Privately printed, 1989). A Persian treatise which is attributed to Māturūdī entitled Waṣaṣa wa-munāḍat al Faṣūdī, (Faith Library: Istanbul, no. 5426, ff. 235a-240a and Husaynīn Čelebi Library, Bursa, no. 1187/8, ff. 112b-117b) published in Farhang-i Iran-zamin (9, 1961) by Iraj Afsārī is quite unlikely to be his because of its mystical content and an approach that is different.
14 Subkī, Tabaqāt al-Shaffīyya (Cairo: Iṣa al-Bābi al-Ḥalabī, 1965), vol. 3, p. 384. Subkī indicates that Māturūdī differed from Aḥū Ḥanīfa and agreed with the Ash’arites related to the problem of declaring one’s faith conditionally (istitḥāna) while Baqillānī, who was an Ash’arite, agreed with Abū Ḥanīfa that God gives favors to unbelievers, too.
15 Among them the following works are worth mentioning: A. K. M. Ayyūb ‘Allī, Aqīdat al-Īslām wa’l-īmām Māturūdī (Dhaka: Islamic Foundation, 1983); ‘Allī ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Maghribī, Istiḥāna
Maturidi’s works reveal that he was aware of intellectual developments in his time since he knew of Aristotle and the translation of his *Logic* (*Kitāb al-mantiq*) which included the famous categories. In addition, he used the term philosophy (*falsafa*) and philosophers (*fālāsīf*) in his work. Another point of originality is his discussion, as the first Islamic theologian (*mutakallim*), of the problem of knowledge (*masā'il il-tīm*). Moreover, Maturidi had immense knowledge of dualist beliefs (*Sanawīyya*) and of other old Persian religions. His Kitāb al-tawhīd in this way has become a primary source for modern researchers with its rich materials about Manicheanism (*Māniyya*), a group of Brahmins (*Barāhīma*), and some controversial personalities such as Ibn al-Rawandi, Abū ʿIsā al-Warrāq, and Muhammad b. Shabib.

2. The Doubts about the Authenticity of Kitāb al-tawhīd

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

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

---

16 Kitāb al-tawhīd, p. 25 and 189.
21 “Aucun d’entre eux que ce soit Bāğlīlānī, Ibn Fārek, Bāgdādī, Bāhaqi ou Qiwain, ne parle d’une école maturidi 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 Māturidi’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 Māturidi’s and if it was, whether the manuscript was his Kitāb al-tawḥīd. By comparing four passages from Nasafi’s Tabṣirat 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 Māturidi”.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] représente Ṭawḥīd de Māturidi”. He argues that some quotations in the Tabṣirat 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 (hamdāla) 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 Tabṣirat al-adilla and Kitāb al-tawḥīd, where I will also discuss other relevant materials in order to solve the authenticity problem.

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

The author of the Tabṣirat 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 Tabṣirat al-adilla, his main book,27 as the second source. In fact, it is almost like a commentary

---

24 See Kitāb al-tawḥīd, p. 96, 110, 221. One of these hamdālas also begins with basmala, and the other with the word nabhaddu which means “we begin”.
26 Al-Mu‘īn al-Nasafi, *Tabṣirat 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: Diyabet 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 Māturidī’s Kitāb al-tawḥīd. It helps us to understand much more easily the ideas and terminology in Māturidī’s work.28 Sābūnī, the author of al-Kifāya and al-Bīdāya, in his discussion with Rāzī said that he had not seen any other book more accurate than the Tabṣīrat al-adilla.29 Unfortunately, Nasafi’s book has also not been as well known in the history of kālām as it should have been.30 The connection between Nasafi and Māturidī in the Tabṣīrat al-adilla is clear and needs no further proof.31 Because Nasafi admires Māturidī, he refers to his ideas several times, and he always supports his views against Mu’tazilīte and Ash’arīte thinking. In addition, he gives a list of the scholars of the Hanafite-Maturidīte school in Transaxonia and their works, which is not available in any other source.32

Nasafi throughout Tabṣīrat al-adilla refers to the views of Māturidī mostly as “qāla al-Shaikh al-Imām Abū Maṣûr al-Māturīdī”, without naming his work. Not just four quotations, as Gimaret indicated, but quite a number refer to Maturidī personally, and they are found exactly, or almost exactly, as in the surviving copy of the Kitāb al-tawḥīd. Below is a list of some of them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 47, lines 19-20</td>
<td>p. 38, lines 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 140, lines 1-6</td>
<td>p. 40, lines 13-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 163, lines 2-11</td>
<td>p. 107, lines 1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 365, lines 18-21</td>
<td>p. 47, lines 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 438, lines 5-7</td>
<td>p. 81, lines 4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 489, lines 1-4</td>
<td>p. 202, lines 16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 590, lines 7-13</td>
<td>p. 266, lines 3-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 691, line 15-p. 692, line 7</td>
<td>p. 294, lines 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 705, lines 10-18</td>
<td>p. 303, line 15-p. 304, line 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 821, lines 11-17</td>
<td>p. 396, lines 16-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occurrence of all of these references and more are extremely significant because a kālām scholar, when quoting his master, normally uses his main kālām book, and the Kitāb al-tawḥīd is Māturidī’s main kālām book, as Pazdawi, Nasafi, and others have noted. Thus, if the surviving manuscript, which systematically deals with all of the kālām subjects, is not the Kitāb al-tawḥīd, then it also can not be

28 Without reading the Tabṣīrat al-adilla one can not evaluate or analyze the Kitāb al-Tawḥīd (see M. S. Yazıcıoğlu, “Māturidī Kālām Ekolojisinin İki Büyük Siması: Ebū Mansūr Māturidī ve Ebūl-Muḥin Nesefī”, Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, XXVII [1985], p. 298).
30 As ʿAbīdī Khalīfī emphasized, although ʿOmar al-Nasafī’s Aqīda was shorter than its Table of Contents, it was much more popular than Tabṣīrat al-adilla (see ʿAbidī Khalīfī, Kashf al-ẓunūn fī an asāmī al-kutub waʾl-funūn, eds. Kiliśli M. Rıfat and Ş. Yılmaz, 1941-1943, vol. 1, p. 337).
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’ari 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-tawḥīd 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-tawḥīd.

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 “hastīyya”, 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-tawḥīd.35

Regarding Nasaﬁ’s actual references to the Kitāb al-tawḥīd 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 (nikmā) 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-tawḥīd 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-tawḥīd section, masā’il al-ta’dil wa’t-tajwir, for more details about what justice and injustice are, saying, “wa-warā hādhiihī’l-ma’āni allati bayyanaḥā ma’ānin kathirat an shakirah al-Shaikh al-Imām Abū Maṣūr al-Māturidi rahimahullah fi masā’il al-ta’dil wa’t-tajwir min Kitāb al-tawḥīd, a’radna an zikriha wa’ktayna bi-hādha al-qadr...”38 In Māturidi’s text, in the section that the editor entitled “Divine Acts”, the words justice (‘adḥ) 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 Kaḥa’s books (Rad Awāl al-adilla li-al-Kaḥa, Rad Tadhhib al-jadal li-al-Kaḥa, and Rad Wa’tid al-fussaq li-al-Kaḥa), to oppose the Qaramī group (al-Rad ‘alā usūl al-Qaramīta and al-Rad ‘alā furu’ al-Qaramīta), and others include al-Rad ‘alā Usūl al-khamsa li-al-Bahili and Bayān waham al-Mu’tazila (see Tabṣirat al-adilla, p. 539).
34 For an example, see Tabṣirat al-adilla, pp. 541-543; cf. Kitāb al-tawḥīd, pp. 256-258.
35 Tabṣirat al-adilla, p. 162; cf. for example Kitāb al-tawḥīd, p. 7, 24, 41, 42.
36 Kitāb al-tawḥīd, 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-tajuir” would be a more appropriate title than “Mas’ala fi a’fâllilah”, the title Kholeif chose.\footnote{Kitâb al-tawhîd, pp. 215-221. Nasafi, who usually follows Maturidi, started with “Masâlî al-ta’dil wa al-tacwil” immediately after prophetical subjects (see Tabshirat al-adilla, p. 539).} In fact, Nasafi, who strictly followed Maturidi’s classification, used the title Masâlî al-ta’dil wa al-tajuir in his book about this subject.\footnote{Tabsirat al-adilla, p. 539.}

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 Maturidi 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 yastaẖīl idāfatu kawnīhi masmu’u ilâ ghayr al-šawṭ, fa-kâna’il-qawl bi-cawazı samā’ī mā laysa bi-šawṭin khorūjān ‘an al-maqul, wa hādha huwa madhab al-Shaikh Abî Mansûr al-Maturidi, naṣṣa ‘aleyhi fi Kitâb al-tawhîd fi âkhīr Mas’alat al-Qur’ān wa qâla inna samâ’a’il-kalām laysa illa samâ’u šawṭin dâllîn ‘alayh”.\footnote{Ibid, p. 305, lines 1-4.} Just before this reference, in the second quotation, he expressed the idea that Maturidi, 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 ashrâ’al-Shaikh Abû Mansûr al-Maturidi fi awwâl Mas’alat al-sifât min Kitâb al-tawhîd ilâ jâvâzi samâ’î mâ warâ’a’il-šawṭ, fa innahu qâl: al-ilmu bi’il-āṣwâṭ wa khafîyyât al-dâmir yusammâ samâ’n”.\footnote{Ibid, p. 304, lines 5-6.}

Although there seems to be a contradiction between these two passages, as Gimaret pointed out, when they are compared with the Kitâb al-tawhîd, it can be understood that Maturidi 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”. Maturidi’s view about hearing and the exception he has made can be found in a sentence in the surviving copy of Kitâb al-tawhîd. It is in the chapter on the attributes of God: “wa aydan anna ghayr al-šawṭ la yutakallamu fihi bitaṣmi’in, wa jâzun an yutakalla ma bi-ta’allumin”.\footnote{See Kitâb al-tawhîd, p. 51, line 5. Kholeif added the word kull at the beginning without any mark, and read the word bi-ta’llum as bi’ilm (cf. ms. fol. 24b).} In Maturidi’s section about the speech attribute (kalâm), which is most probably what Nasafi has called Mas’alat al-Qur’ān, by making a connection between the kalâm attribute and the Qur’ān, he also explains the possibility of hearing the speech of God by means of the tongue, letters, and sounds: “Fa-in qâla qâlîn: hal asma’a’illah kalâmahu Mûsâ ḥaythu qâl: ‘wa-kallama’llahu Mûsâ tak’llîma’, qâla: asma’ahu bi-lisâni Mûsâ wa bi-hurûfîn khalaqâha wa-šawṭin anšaah”.\footnote{Ibid, p. 59, lines 3-8.}
The Authenticity of Kitab al-Tawhid

The fourth quotation from the Kitab al-tawhid in the Tabsharat al-adilla appears in the chapter on the human capacity to act (isti'aa'). 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-siitha wa al-salamä) 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 qala minhum inna al-siitha wa al-salamä ghayr al-qudra, fa-innahu yaquli innahu yukhlaqu fi awwali ahwalihi imma sahiihan saliman qadiran 'ala'l-fi'il, wa imma sahiihan saliman ajizan 'an al-fi'il, wa yajuz an-yakuna fi al-halat al-thaniya wa-mä ba'dahä hakadha, fa sawwa bayn al-ahwal wa-lam yufarriq bayna al-halat al-ulä wa bayna ghayrihä min al-ahwal, wa ilayhi dhahaba al-Shaikh Abü Mansûr al-Mâturidi rahimahullah fi Kitâb al-tawhid".45

Mâturidi's distinction related to the human capacity to act is clearly seen in the Kholelf edition of the Kitab al-tawhid: "al-ašlu 'indanä bi-ism al-qudra annahä 'ala qismayn: ahaduhumä, sahâmat al-asbâb wa siîhat al-alat wa-hiya tataqaddam al-afâl, hakikatuha laysat bi-majfûlatin li'l-afâl, wa-in kânat al-afâl la taqum illa biha...wa'l-thânti, ma'nan la yuqdar 'ala tabayyuni haddh bi-shay'in yusâru ilayhi siwâ annahu laysa illa li'l-fi'il, lâ yajuz wujûdhu bi-ḥalini illâ wa yaqã'u bihi al-fi'il 'indama yaqã'u ma'aḥ".46 In addition, Maturidi'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 Qasim al-Balkhî, known also as al-Ka'bi: "wa-qala [al-Ka'bi] al-sahihi al-salim annahu yajuz an-yakhala 'an al-fi'il waqta kawnih, thumma lam-yajuz abadan. Qala al-Shaikh rahimahullah: wa-mä yaquluh khata 'un, bal yajuz dhâlik".47

The above analysis of the quotations in Tabsharat al-adilla from Maturidi and directly from the Kitab al-tawhid should help us to be quite sure that the surviving text of the Kitab al-tawhid 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 Kitab al-tawhid.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

46 See Kitab al-tawhid, p. 256, lines 8-10 and 16-17.
47 Ibid, p. 279, lines 5-7. Gimaret, also points this out (see Théories, p. 178).
49 In a forward, either by the author or the scribe, to the Berlin library manuscript (no. 1841) of Hasan Kâfi al-Aqhisârî's (d. 1025/1616) Rawdat al-jannât fi usûl al-itiqâdât dated as 1147 AH., it is noted that an old copy of Maturidi's Kitab al-tawhid had been seen and examined in Macca (cf. also Hans
is incorrectly given as the transcription (istīnsākh) date of the text\textsuperscript{50} by Kholaif, Daiber, and Pessagno. The note is actually this: “al-ḥamdul-lālah min ni‘ami‘l-mawla ḍala ‘abdih al-faqr ilayhi subhānah, Muḥammad al-ʿAmin al-Ḥanafi al-Shāmī wa-zālika bi al-shirā fī niṣfī shabān sana 1150”.\textsuperscript{51} The word bl-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 (ḥamdāla) used more than once since it was put at the beginning of some of the chapters\textsuperscript{52} and the lack of inner organization in the manuscript. Since Māturidi was one of the first Sunni theologians, systematization of Sunni kālam books had not yet been established. Also, the more frequent use of ḥamdāla could be a part of the author's style. He might have used the basmāla and ḥamdāla expressions whenever he restarted writing or dictating his book to his students such as after some long breaks.\textsuperscript{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 kālam 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-Pazdawi, 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”.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{55}

4. Conclusion

In the light of the references in Nasafi's Tabshirat 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 Tabshirat al-adilla, which is a systematic kālam book

---

\textsuperscript{50} See Kitāb al-Tawḥīd, Editor's Introduction, p. 57; Pessagno, "Uses of Evil", p. 61; Daiber, p. 302.

\textsuperscript{51} See the title folio of the manuscript of Kitāb al-tawḥīd.

\textsuperscript{52} Pessagno, "Uses of Evil", p. 61-62

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{54} Pazdawi, Usāl al-dīn, p. 3.


---
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itself, the originals of which can also be found in the surviving Mâturîdî text. Since the Kitâb al-tawhîd is Mâturîdî's only systematic kalâm book, the variety of quotations about the different subjects of kalâm cannot be from his other books on more specific subjects. This strongly supports the idea that the text is Mâturîdî's main kalâm book. Secondly, there are references directly to the Kitâb al-tawhîd 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 Kitâb al-tawhîd or that there were some differences in the various manuscripts of the work, which is normal. The discovery of some other manuscripts of the Kitâb al-tawhîd 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 Kitâb al-tawhîd by scholars in the Hanafite circle, such as Pazdawi, 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 Mâturîdî's Kitâb al-tawhîd.

ÖZET

Mâturîdî'ye Ait Kitâbî'ât-tevhîdîn
Bilinen Tek Nûshasının Otantikliği Meselesi
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