The Authenticity of the Manuscript of Māturidī's Kitāb al-Tawḥīd: A Re-examination

M. Sait Özervarlı*

This paper attempts to determine the authenticity of the manuscript of Abū Mansūr al-Māturidī’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 Māturidī’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 Māturidīte kalām book, the Taḥṣīrat al-adilla, by Abū’l-Muḥn al-Nasafī (d. 508/1114) as well as to some other books and materials since they referred to Māturidī or to this book. Nasafī, when referring to Māturidī, 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 Māturidī’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 Mansūr al-Māturidī (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

* M. Sait Özervarlı, Ph.D., is a research fellow at the Center for Islamic Studies (TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi), Istanbul.
1 Cambridge Library ms. Add. no. 3651. The manuscript was edited after much delay: Abu Mansūr al-Māturidī, 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 Maturidi, whether or not it is his Kitāb al-tawhīd 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-tawhīd by comparing it mainly to the second most important Maturidite kālām book, the Tabširat al-adilla, by Abu’l-Mu‘īn al-Nasafī (d. 508/1114) as well as to some other related books and materials. Before doing this, however, I want to consider Maturidi and his place in kālām 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 Maturidi in the History of Kālām

Abū Manṣūr al-Maturidi, who lived in Samarqand, the cultural centre of the Mawrā al-Nahr region in central Asia, has not until recent times been very well known. Historians of kālām 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 kālām, he is just as important as Abu’l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī (d. 324/936) in Sunnite theology.

Maturidi has also been neglected in biographies (tabaqāt) and in books on the history of Islamic thought despite his great contribution to kālām. For example, he is not mentioned in Ibn Nadim’s al-Fihrist, Ibn Khallikān’s Wafayāt, Šafādi’s al-Wāfī, Ibn ʿImād’s Shadharāt, Samānī’s al-Ansāb, Ibn Khaldūn’s Muqaddima, Suyūṭī’s Ṭabaqāt al-mufassirīn, nor in Dāhābī’s Siyyar al-ʿalam al-nubalā. The best tabaqāt sources for Maturidi are Qureshi’s al-Jawahir al-Mudīyya (the first book on Hanafites), Ibn Qutlubogha’s Tāj al-tārājīm, and Laknawi’s al-Fawādī al-bahīyya, and they mainly repeat almost the same tiny bit of information about his work and some of his teachers and students. In the major kālām books of the classical period, Maturidi 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 Baghdādi’s al-Farq, Ibn Hazm’s al-Fīṣal, and Shahristānī’s al-Milal.

2 The fate of Maturidi’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, “Maturidi und sein Kitāb Ta’wilāt al-Qurān”, Der Islam, 41 (1969), pp. 63-70. The complete publication of Ta’wilāt by Ibrahim and Sayyid ʿAwadāyn has been restarted and is still continuing following on the earlier edition of the first volume that they did (Cairo: Majma’ al-ʿarafa lil-al-Shuʿun al-Islamiyya, 1971).


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

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

---

6 Abu l-Yusr al-Pazdawi, Usūl al-dīn, ed. Hans Peter Lins (Cairo: Darū Ḥiyā al-kutub al-ʿarabī, 1963), p. 3. He sometimes refers to Māturīdī’s views (see, for some examples, p. 34, 70, 87, 123).
8 Abū Ḥafs ʿOmar al-Nasafī, al-Qand fī dhikri ʿulemāl Samarqandī, 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 Süleymaniye Library, Taraḥānvalide, no. 70), from which two large parts including Māturīdī’s biography are unfortunately missing, but he is mentioned in a few of the other biographies.
12 Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, al-Sayf al-Mashhūr fī Aqidat Abī Mansūr, ed. M. Saim Yerem (İstanbul: Privately printed, 1989). A Persian treatise which is attributed to Maturidī entitled Waṣāya wa-munāqāt or Fawāid, (Fatih Library, Istanbul, no. 5426, ff. 235a-240a and Hüseyin Celebi Library, Bursa, no. 1187/8, ff. 118b-117b) published in Farhang-i Iran-zamin (9, 1961) by İraj Afsar is quite unlikely to be his because of its mystical content and an approach that is different.
13 Subkī, Tabaqāt al-Shafiʿīyya (Cairo: ʿĪsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalābī, 1965), vol. 3, p. 384. Subkī indicates that Maturidī differed from Abū Ḥanīfa and agreed with the Ash’arites related to the problem of declaring one’s faith conditionally (istithna) where Baqlianī, who was an Ash’arī, agreed with Abū Ḥanīfa that God gives favors to unbelievers, too.
14 Among them the following examples are worth mentioning: A. K. M. Ayyūb ʿAll, Aqidat al-Islām wa’l-Imām Māturīdī (Dhaka: Islamic Foundation, 1983); ʿAli ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ al-Maʿṣūrī, ʿImām Aḥ
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 (falsāfiya) in his work. Another point of originality is his discussion, as the first Islamic theologian (mutakallim), of the problem of knowledge (masā'il al-'ilm). Moreover, Maturidi had immense knowledge of dualist beliefs (Sanawīyya) and of other old Persian religions. His Kitāb al-tawḥīd in this way has become a primary source for modern researchers with its rich materials about Manicheanism (Māniyya), a group of Brahman (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-tawḥīd

Joseph Schacht, in his article that announces the discovery of Kitāb al-tawḥīd, 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-tawḥīd, 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-tawḥīd was published by F. Kholeif in 1970, and research by students of Islamic theology began based

---


16 Kitāb al-tawḥīd, p. 25 and 189.
21 “Aucun d’entre eux que ce soit Bāqillānī, Ibn Fāreḵ, Baḏāḏī, Baḥaḵi or Šuwayni, ne parle d’une école māturidite 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 Māturidī’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 Māturidī’s and if it was, whether the manuscript was his Kitāb al-tawḥīd. By comparing four passages from Nasāī’s Tabsīrat 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 Māturidī”.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 Tawḥīd de Māturidī”. He argues that some quotations in the Tabsīrat 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 Tabsīrat 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 Tabsīrat al-adilla, Abu’l-Mu’in al-Nasāī, should be regarded for the Maturidite school in the same way that Baqillānī or al-Gazzālī are for the Ash’arīte school, as the second great scholar of the school,26 and the Tabsīrat al-adilla, his main book,27 as the second source. In fact, it is almost like a commentary

23 Ibid, p. 178.
25 See Kitāb al-tawḥīd, p. 96, 110, 221. One of these hamdalas also begins with basmala, and the other with the word nabhadiyya which means “we begin”.
27 Abu’l-Mu’in al-Nasāī, Tabsīrat al-adilla, ed. Claude Salamé, 2 vols. (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1993). Another edition based on manuscripts found in Arabic 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 Māturidī’s Kitāb al-tawḥīd. It helps us to understand much more easily the ideas and terminology in Māturidī’s work. Sābūnī, the author of al-Kīfāya and al-Bidāya, in his discussion with Rāzī said that he had not seen any other book more accurate than the Tābṣirat al-adilla. Unfortunately, Nasafi’s book has also not been as well known in the history of kālām as it should have been. The connection between Nasafi and Māturidī in the Tābṣirat al-adilla is clear and needs no further proof. Because Nasafi admires Māturidī, he refers to his ideas several times, and he always supports his views against Muʿtazilite and Ashʿarite thinking. In addition, he gives a list of the scholars of the Hanafite-Māturidī school in Transaxonia and their works, which is not available in any other source.

Nasafi throughout Tābṣirat al-adilla refers to the views of Māturidī mostly as “qāla al-Shaikh al-Īmām Abū Manṣūr al-Māturidī”, without naming his work. Not just four quotations, as Gimaret indicated, but quite a number refer to Māturidī 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 Tābṣirat al-adilla one can not evaluate or analyze the Kitāb al-Tawḥīd (see M. S. Yazıcıoğlu, “Māturidī Kelām Ekollünün İkī Büyük Siması: Ebū Mansūr Māturidī ve Ebū'l-Muḥn Nesefī”, Ankara Üniversitesi Ilahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, XXVII [1985], p. 298).
30 As Ḥādī Khalīfa emphasized, although ‘Omar al-Nasafi’s Aqīda was shorter than its Table of Contents, it was much more popular than Tābṣirat al-adilla (see Ḥādī Khalīfa, Kashf al-ṣūnūn ‘an asāmi al-kutub wa'l-funūn, eds. Killīṣī M. Rīfāt and Ş. Yaltkaya, Istanbul, 1941-1943, vol. I, p. 337).
one of his other kalam works which contain only particular subjects. Maturidi's other kalam books, as listed by Nasaфи, except for Kitab al-maqalat, are books that refute certain persons, books, or groups, and they are not systematic kalam works. However, the Maturidi quotations, when checked, are about a variety of kalam subjects. As far as Maturidi's Kitab al-maqalat, books with this title, such as the Maqalat of al-Asi'ari are known to give information about theological sects and groups (madhhab wa firaq) among Muslims. Therefore, among the complete list of his books, given by Nasaфи, there is only Maturidi's Kitab al-tawhid that is his complete book of kalam. The name of the book itself also indicates this since 'ilm al-kalam is also known as 'ilm al-tawhid.

Besides the clear references made to Maturidi personally in the Tabsirat al-adilla, some of which are listed above, Nasaфи also uses passages from Maturidi without referring to him. He also provides some examples of Maturidi's style, for example, the word "hastiliyya", which means existence (in Arabic wucud), although it was Persian, and we find, many times, the same word in the surviving copy of Kitab al-tawhid.

Regarding Nasaфи's actual references to the Kitab al-tawhid itself in the Tabsirat al-adilla, which occur at least four times, excluding the one cited among the list of Maturidi'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 (Majus) idea of having two separate Gods, one good and one evil, Nasaфи, gave four reasons (nikma) for the creation by God of things considered to be evil. What Nasaфи explained in a similar way to Maturidi is found in the Kitab al-tawhid in the section about the wisdom of God in having secret purposes for creating harmful things, and also in the section against the ideas of dualists (Sanawiyya). Nasaфи, at the end of this section, refers to a Kitab al-tawhid section, masail al-ta'dil wa'l-tajwid, for more details about what justice and injustice are, saying, "wa-warrah badhhi'l-ma'ani allati bayyananha ma'ani kathiratan dhakaraha al-Shaikh al-Imam Abū Mansūr al-Maturidi rahimahullah fi masail al-ta'dil wa'l-tajwid min Kitab al-tawhid, a'radna an zikriha wa'ktafayna bi-hadhka al-qadr..." In Maturidi'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 Nasaфи 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 Awail al-adilla il-al-Ka'bi, Rad Tahdhib al-jadai li-al-Ka'bi, and Rad Wa'id al-fussaq li-al-Ka'bi), to oppose the Qaramita group (al-Rad 'ala usul al-Qaramita and al-Rad 'ala furu al-Qaramita), and others include al-Rad 'ala Usul al-khamsa li-al-Bahili and Bayan wahin al-Mu'tazila (see Tabsirat al-adilla, p. 359).
34 For an example, see Tabsirat al-adilla, pp. 541-543; cf. Kitab al-tawhid, pp. 256-258.
35 Tabsirat al-adilla, p. 162; cf. for example Kitab al-tawhid, p. 7, 24, 41, 42.
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 Tabsirat 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 al-fā'lilīlah*”, the title Kholeif chose.39 In fact, Nasafi, who strictly followed Maturidi’s classification, used the title *Masā'il al-ta'dil wa al-tajuir* 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 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 sound: “wa yastahīlu ʿidāfatu kawnihī masmuʿan ilā ghayr al-ṣawt, fa-kānaʾl-ṣawī bi-cawāzi samāʾi mā laysa bi-ṣawtīn khorūjan ‘an al-maʿqūl, wa ḥādha huwa madhhab al-Shaikh Abī Mansūr al-Maturidi, naṣṣaʿaleṣḥī fī Kitāb al-tawhīd fī ākhir Masʿalāt al-Qurʾān wa qāla inna samāʾaʾl-ṣawtīn laysa ila samāʾu ʿsawtīn dallīn ʿalayh”.41 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 ashārā al-Shaikh Abī Mansūr al-Maturidi fī āwwalī Masʿalāt al-sītāt min Kitāb al-tawhīd ilā javāzī samāʾi mā warāʾaʾl-ṣawt, fa innahu qāl: al-ilmū biʾl-ṣawtīn wa khafīyyāt al-dāmir yusammā samʿān”.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 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 Kitāb al-tawhīd. It is in the chapter on the attributes of God: “wa ayḍān anna ghayr al-ṣawt la yutakallamu fihi bitasmiʿin, wa jaʿīzun an yutakallama bi-taʿallumīn”.43 In Maturidi’s section about the speech attribute (kalam), which is most probably what Nasafi has called *Mas′alat al-Qur′ān*, by making a connection between the kalam 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 qāla qāilun: hai asmaʾaʾllah kalamahu Mūsā ḥaythu qāl: ‘wa-kallamaʾl-lāhu Mūsā taklima’, qila: asmaʾahu bi-lišāni Mūsā wa bi-hurūfīn khalaqaḥa waṣawtīn anshaah.”.44

39 Kitāb al-tawhīd, pp. 215-221. Nasafi, who usually follows Maturidi, started with “Masā’il al-ta’dil wa al-tajuir” immediately after prophetical subjects (see Tabṣirat al-adilla, p. 539).
41 Ibid, p. 304, lines 5-6.
42 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. 24b).
The Authenticity of Kitāb al-Tawhid

The fourth quotation from the Kitāb al-tawhid in the Ṭabṣirat al-adilla appears in the chapter on the human capacity to act (istīfa'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-sīḥa 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 ma qāla minhum inna al-sīḥa wa al-salāma ghayr al-qudra, fa-innahu yaqūlu innahu yuḥklaqu fī aw-wali aḥwaliḥ imma saḥīḥan sālīman qadīran ‘ala’l-fi'il, wa imma saḥīḥan sālīman ‘ajīzān ‘an al-fi'il, wa yajūz an-yakūna fī al-ḥalat al-thāniya wa-ma ba'dahā hākadha, fa sawwā bayn al-aḥwāl wa-lam yufrāqī bayna al-ḥalat al-tūla wa bayna ghayrīhā min al-aḥwāl, wa ilayhi dhahaba al-Shaikh Abū Manṣūr al-Māturidi raḥīmahullāh fī Kitāb al-tawḥīd”.

Māturidi’s distinction related to the human capacity to act is clearly seen in the Kholeif edition of the Kitāb al-tawḥīd: “al-ašlū ‘indanā bi-ism al-qudra anna-ha ‘ala qismayn: aḥaduhumā, salāmat al-asbāb wa siḥṣat al-ālāt wa-hiyya tataqaddam al-aftar, ḥakikatuha laysat bi-majfūlātīn li'l-aftal, wa-in kānat al-aftal la taqum illa biḥa...wa-l-thāntī, ma’nān la yuqdar ‘ala tabayyunī ḥaddih bī-shayin yuṣāru ilayhi siwā annahu laysa illa li'l-fi'ilī, lā yajūz wujūduh bi-ḥālin illā wa qaqa'ū bihi al-fi'il ‘indama yaqā'u ma'ah”. 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'bī: “wa-qāla [al-Ka'bī] al-sāḥīḥ al-sālim annahu ya-jūz an-yakhlīḥ ‘an al-fi'il waqti kawnih, thumma lam-yajūz abadan. Qāla al-Shaikh raḥīmahullāh: wa-ma yaqūlūh khata’un, bal yajūz dhalik”.

The above analysis of the quotations in Ṭabṣirat 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. Of course, the discovery of some other manuscripts would make authenticating the work much easier. 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 Ṭabṣirat 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).
49 In a forward, either by the author or the scribe, to the Berlin library manuscript (no. 1841) of Ḥasan Kāf al-Aṣḥāṣārī’s (d. 1025/1616) Rawdat al-jannāt ft ustūl al-itqādat 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 (istilnsâkh) date of the text\textsuperscript{50} by Kholaif, Daiber, and Pessagno. The note is actually this: “al-ḥamdul lî-lâhî min ni‘ami‘l-mawlâ ‘alâ ‘abdîh al-faqîr ilâyhi subhânah, Muḥammad al-Amin al-Ḥanâfî al-Shâmi wa-zhâlika bi al-shîrâ fi niṣṣî sha‘bân sana 1150”.\textsuperscript{51} The word bi-al-shîrâ (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 chapters\textsuperscript{52} and the lack of inner organization in the manuscript. Since Māturidî was one of the first Sunni theologians, systematization of Sunni kalâm 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.\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 kalâm 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 Mâturidî, is informative. He described the Kitâb al-tawhîd 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 Tabsirat al-adilla and the other evidence presented here, we can conclude that the only manuscript of Mâturidî’s Kitâb al-tawhîd 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 Tabsirat al-adilla, which is a systematic kalâm book

\textsuperscript{50} Daiber, “Zur Erstausgabe von al-Mâturidî, Kitâb al-Tawhîd”, Der Islam, 52/2 [1975], p. 302-303. Although such a note does not exist in the published copy of Rawdat al-Jannât (wrongly attributed to M. Birgwi), Istanbul: H. Muḥarram 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 Aḥisârî saw in Makka remains unknown.

\textsuperscript{51} See Kitâb al-Tawhîd, Editor’s Introduction, p. 57; Pessagno, “Uses of Evil”, p. 61; Daiber, p. 302.

\textsuperscript{52} See the title folio of the manuscript of Kitâb al-tawhîd.
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itself, the originals of which can also be found in the surviving Maturidi text. Since the Kitab al-tawhid is Maturidi'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 Maturidi's main kalâm book. Secondly, there are references directly to the Kitab al-tawhid 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 Kitab al-tawhid or that there were some differences in the various manuscripts of the work, which is normal. The discovery of some other manuscripts of the Kitab al-tawhid 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 Kitab al-tawhid by scholars in the Hanafiite 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 Maturidi's Kitab al-tawhid.

ÖZET

Maturidî'ye Ait Kitabü't-Tevhid'in
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