

THE DOCTRINAL VIEWS OF THE BANŪ AL-‘AWD
(early 8th/14th century):
An analysis of MS Arab. F. 64 (Bodleian Library, Oxford)¹

Sabine SCHMIDTKE
Freie Universität, Berlin

I

The reception of Mu‘tazilī thought within Imāmī Shī‘ism² began in the 3rd/9th century with Abū Ja‘far Ibn Qiba al-Rāzī (d. Rayy before 319/931)³ and, in the second half of the century, the Banū Nawbakht, particularly Ismā‘īl b. ‘Alī al-Nawbakhtī (d. 311/924) and al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī (d. between 300/912 and 310/922)⁴. Since none of their theological writings are preserved, their teachings can only be gleaned from the writings of later Twelver Shī‘is⁵. The first Imāmī scholar under Mu‘tazilī influence whose works are partially extant is al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022). He departed from the traditionalist theological views of his teacher Abū Ja‘far Ibn Bābawayh (d. 381/991) and adopted most of the doctrines of Abū al-Qāsim al-Ka‘bī al-Balkhī (d. 319/931), the prominent theologian of the school of Baghdad⁶. Al-Mufīd’s pupil, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436/1044) did not share his teacher’s preference for the Baghdādīs. As a student of ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad al-Hamadhānī (d. 415/1025), head of the Mu‘tazilī school of Abū Hāshim al-Jubbā‘ī (d. 321/933), the Bahshamiyya, al-Murtaḍā followed the

1. I wish to thank Wilferd Madelung, Camilla Adang, Gregor Schwarb and Hassan Ansari for valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper; Hossein Modarressi for having provided me with a copy of his edition of the *fatwās* of Sharaf al-Dīn and al-Muḥaqqiq al-Hillī and Frank Griffel for help in identifying item no. 19. This study was completed within the framework of the European Research Council’s FP7 project “Rediscovering Rationalism in the Medieval World of Islam”.

2. An overview over this reception process is given by W. Madelung, “Imāmism and Mu‘tazilite theology”, *Shī‘isme imāmīte*, ed. T. Fahd, Paris 1970, p. 13-29 [repr. in W. Madelung, *Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam*. London 1985, no. VII].

3. On him see H. Modarressi, *Crisis and Consolidation in the Formative Period of Shi‘ite Islam: Abū Ja‘far ibn Qiba al-Rāzī and his Contribution to Imāmīte Shi‘ite Thought*, Princeton 1993.

4. Cf. ‘Abbās Iqbāl, *Khānadān-i Nawbakhtī*, Tehran 1345/[1966]²; Ḥasan Anṣārī: “Abū Sahl Nawbakhtī”, *Dā‘irat-i ma‘ārif-i buzurg-i islāmī*, ed. Kāzīm Mūsawī Bujnurdī, Tehran 1374/1996-, vol. 5, p. 579-583.

5. An additional valuable source for al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī’s *Kitāb al-ārā’ wa-l-diyānāt* which is otherwise lost is Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. al-Malāḥimī’s (d. 536/1141) *Kitāb al-mu‘tamad fī uṣūl al-dīn*: The extant parts edited and introduced by Wilferd Madelung and Martin McDermott, London 1991, particularly the section devoted to the philosophers, which contains extensive quotations from this work. See also below n. 12. Other texts containing extracts of the *Kitāb al-ārā’ wa-l-diyānāt* are listed by J. L. Kraemer: “al-Nawbakhtī, al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā”, *EP*, vol. 7, p. 1044.

6. For al-Mufīd’s theological views, see M. J. McDermott, *The Theology of al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022)*, Beirut 1978; P. Sander, *Zwischen Charisma und Ratio: Entwicklungen in der frühen imāmītschen Theologie*, Berlin 1994; T. Bayham-Daou, *Shaykh Muḥīd*, Oxford 2005. Most of his extant theological writings are included in *Muṣannaḥāt al-Shaykh al-Mufīd Abī ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Nu‘mān b. al-Mu‘allim al-Ukbarī al-Baghdādī* 1-13, Beirut 1413/[1993]².

teachings of this school⁷. The doctrines of the Bahshamiyya remained prevalent among the Twelver Shī‘is of the following generations, as was the case for example with al-Murtaḍā’s disciple, Shaykh al-Ṭā‘ifa Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī (d. 459/1067)⁸.

With al-Murtaḍā the dividing line between Mu‘tazilī theology and Imāmī doctrine received its final shape. Exempt from Mu‘tazilī influence were those doctrines in which the general Imāmī dogma proved incompatible with Mu‘tazilī views, viz. the belief in the Imamate as the very foundation of faith and the concept of belief. Defining *īmān* as knowledge or assent and verbal confession to the exclusion of works, Twelver Shī‘is rejected the Mu‘tazilī doctrine of mutual annulment of reward and punishment (*iḥbāṭ*), and they denied that the unrepentant grave sinner (*fāsiq*) holds an intermediary position between the believer and the unbeliever (*al-manzila bayn al-manzilatayn*) and is subject to eternal punishment. Moreover, they affirmed the intercession (*shafā‘a*) of the Prophet and the Imams for the grave sinner of their community. The Imāmī *mutakallimūn* were also careful to dissociate themselves from the Mu‘tazila by explicitly negating any doctrinal dependence, claiming ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 40/660) and, at times, Ja‘far al-Šādiq (d. 148/765) to be the true founders of their dogma⁹.

Towards the end of the 6th/12th century, the teachings of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī (d. 436/1044) began to influence the theological thought of the Twelver Shī‘a. Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, who grew up as a Ḥanafī in law and a Mu‘tazilī in doctrine, initially came to Baghdad to be trained as a physician. This involved him in the study of philosophy; he is known to have studied Aristotelian physics with the Christian Abū ‘Alī b. al-Samḥ (d. 418/1027), a disciple of Yaḥyā b. ‘Adī (d. 363/974)¹⁰. He then went to Rayy where he attached himself to ‘Abd al-Jabbār

7. His most extensive theological works are his *Kitāb al-dhakhīra fī ‘ilm al-kalām*, ed. Aḥmad al-Husaynī, Qum, 1411/1990-1991], and his *Kitāb al-mulakhkhaṣ fī uṣūl al-dīn*, ed. Muḥammad Riḍā Anṣārī Qummī, Tehran 1381/2002]. On the former see also S. Schmidtke, “II Firk. Arab. 111 – A copy of al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā’s *Kitāb al-Dhakhīra* completed in 472/1079-80 in the Firkovitch-Collection, St. Petersburg”, *Ma‘ārif* 20/II (1382/2003), p. 68-84 [Persian].

8. His most important *kalām* works are his commentary on al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā’s *Jumal al-‘ilm wa-l-‘amal, kitāb tamhīd al-uṣūl fī ‘ilm al-kalām*, ed. ‘Abd al-Muhsin Mishkāt al-Dīnī, Tehran 1362/1981, and his *Kitāb al-iqtiṣād fīmā yata‘allaqu bi-l-‘itiqād*, Qum 1400/1980.

9. See e.g. al-Mufīd, *al-Fuṣūl al-mukhtāra min al-‘uyūn wa-l-maḥāsin*, Najaf n.d., vol. 2, p. 119ff; al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, *al-Amālī* 1-2, Beirut 1967, vol. 1, p. 148; the translator’s preface to S. Schmidtke, *Andīshe-hā-ye kalāmī-ye ‘Allāma Ḥillī*, transl. Aḥmad Namā‘ī, Mashhad 1999. See also W. Madelung, “Imāmism”, p. 18 n. 2, p. 22 n. 1, p. 24; A. Afsaruddin, *Excellence and Precedence: Medieval Islamic Discourse on Legitimate Leadership*, Leiden 2002, p. 142. As was the case with their Sunni counterparts, Imāmī *mutakallimūn* were constantly challenged by traditionalists who rejected all forms of *kalām* in principle, insisting instead on the necessity of relying exclusively on the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet and the Imams. The protagonists of this continuous conflict within Twelver Shī‘ism were labelled *Akhbāriyya* and *Uṣūliyya*, terms that have been employed since the 6th/12th century; see Madelung, “Imāmism”, p. 20-21. For a critical discussion of divergent definitions of the *Akhbārī* movement and the question of when it emerged, see R. Gleave, *Inevitable Doubt: Two Theories of Shī‘ī Jurisprudence*, Leiden 2000, p. 5ff.

10. A manuscript of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s redaction of Ḥunayn’s translation of Aristotle’s *Physics* with notes and comments by Ibn al-Samḥ and the Nestorian physician and philosopher Abū al-Faraj b. al-Ṭayyib (d. 435/1043), completed in 395/1004, is extant (Leiden, Cod. Or. 583). See E. Giannakis, “The structure of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s copy of Aristotle’s *Physics*”, *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Arabisch-Islamischen Wissenschaften* 8 (1993), p. 252-258. See also G. Schwarb, “Sahl b. al-Faḍl al-Tustarī’s *Kitāb al-Imā*”, *Genzei Qedem* 2 (2006), p. 61*-105* [p. 87*-88*]. Generally on Abū al-

to study *kalām* and legal methodology (*uṣūl al-fiqh*), and he is known to have questioned and criticized his teacher in his lectures. While Abū al-Ḥusayn was ostracized by ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s other students, and his views and writings on *kalām* generally ignored by later Bahshamī authors, he eventually came to be recognized as the founder of the last innovative school of Mu‘tazilī thought. None of his *kalām* works have survived with the exception of three extensive fragments of his *Taṣaffiḥ al-adilla* which were found in the Abraham Firkovitch Collection of geniza material in St. Petersburg and deal primarily with questions concerning the divine attributes of knowledge and power¹¹. The writings of his later follower Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. al-Malāḥimī al-Kh^wārazmī (d. 536/1141), who lived about a century later, constitute the main source for the reconstruction of Abū al-Ḥusayn’s doctrine. These are his *Kitāb al-mu‘tamad fī uṣūl al-dīn*, the first part of which is a paraphrastic summary of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s *Taṣaffiḥ al-adilla*, which is partly preserved¹², his *Kitāb al-fā‘iq fī uṣūl al-dīn*, a summary of the *Kitāb al-mu‘tamad*¹³, and his *Kitāb tuḥfat al-mutakallimīn fī al-radd ‘alā al-falāsifa*, a copy of which has recently been discovered¹⁴.

Sadīd al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī (d. after 600/1204) is the first Imāmī author known to have adopted the doctrines of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī¹⁵.

Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, see Maṣ‘ūd Jalālī Muqaddam, “Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī”, *Dā‘irat-i ma‘ārif-i buzurg-i islāmī*, vol. 5, p. 367-370; W. Madelung: “Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī”, *EP*, vol. 1, p. 16-19.

11. Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, *Taṣaffiḥ al-adilla*: The extant parts introduced and edited by Wilferd Madelung and Sabine Schmidtke, Wiesbaden 2006. On the Karaites’ reception of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s doctrine see S. Schmidtke, “The Karaites’ encounter with the thought of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī (d. 436/1044): A survey of the relevant materials in the Firkovitch-Collection, St. Petersburg”, *Arabica* 53/1 (2006), p. 108-142; W. Madelung and S. Schmidtke, *Rational Theology in Interfaith Communication: Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s Mu‘tazilī Theology among the Karaites in the Fātimid Age*. Leiden 2006.

12. See Rukn al-Dīn b. al-Malāḥimī al-Kh^wārazmī, *Kitāb al-mu‘tamad fī uṣūl al-dīn*. Meanwhile, further fragments have been discovered in Yemen, and Wilferd Madelung is currently preparing a new, expanded edition of the work (Tehran: Iranian Institute of Philosophy & Institute of Islamic Studies, Free University Berlin [forthcoming]).

13. Ed. W. Madelung and M. McDermott, Tehran, Iranian Institute of Philosophy and Institute of Islamic Studies, Free University, Berlin 2007.

14. Ed. Ḥ. Anṣārī and W. Madelung, Tehran-Berlin 2008. On the manuscript see Ḥ. Anṣārī, “Kitāb-i tāza yāb dar naqd-i falsafa. Paydā shudan-i kitāb-i Tuḥfat al-mutakallimīn-i Malāḥimī”, *Nashr-i dānīsh* 18/3 (2001), p. 31-32.

15. Prior to al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī’s reception of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s theological thought, the latter’s refutations (*naqd*) of al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā’s *Kitāb al-Shāfi* on the Imamate and of his *Kitāb al-Muqni* on the concealment (*ghayba*) of the Twelfth Imam were known to, and refuted by, Imāmī scholars such as Abū ‘Alī Ḥamza Salār b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Daylamī al-Ṭabaristānī (d. 463/1070-71) [cf. Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭīhrānī, *al-Dharī‘a ilā taṣānīf al-shī‘a* 1-25, Beirut 1403-6/1983-86, vol. 10, p. 179-80, no. 378; al-Lajna al-‘ilmiyya fī mu‘assasat al-Imām al-Ṣādiq, *Mu‘jam al-turāth al-kalāmī. Mu‘jam yatanāwalu dhikr asmā’ al-mu‘allaḥat al-kalāmīyya (al-makhḥūḥāt wa-l-maḥbū‘āt) ‘abra al-qurūn wa-l-maktabāt allatī tatawaffaru fihā nusakhuhā* 1-5, Qum 1423/2002, vol. 3, p. 366 no. 6477] and Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Karājikī (d. 449/1057-58), in *Risālat al-tanbīh ‘alā aghlāt Abī al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī* [cf. “Maktabat al-‘Allāma al-Karājikī li-ahād mu‘āshirihī”, ed. al-Sayyid ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Ṭabāṭabā‘ī, *Turāthunā* 43-44 (1416), p. 393; *Mu‘jam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 2, p. 333-34, no. 4022]. Moreover, ‘Abd al-Jalīl b. Abī al-Faṭḥ al-Rāzī is known to have composed a *Naqd al-taṣaffiḥ li-Abī al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī*, apparently a refutation of the latter’s doctrinal views as laid down in the *Taṣaffiḥ al-adilla*; see Muntajab al-Dīn, *Fihrist asmā’ ‘ulamā’ al-shī‘a wa-muṣannifihim*, ed. al-Sayyid ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Ṭabāṭabā‘ī, Beirut

In his *Kitāb al-munqidh min al-taqīd*, composed in 581/1185-86¹⁶, he consistently followed the views of Abū al-Ḥusayn whenever these disagreed with those of the Bahshamiyya. Al-Ḥimmaṣī evidently had immediate access to the theological writings of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī. He repeatedly quotes from his *Kitāb al-ghurar*¹⁷ and refers to his *Tasaḥḫūḥ al-adilla*¹⁸. He also mentions a *risāla* by Abū al-Ḥusayn on miracles of saints, the possibility of which the latter had affirmed against the general position of the Muʿtazila¹⁹, and he often refers to the writings of Abū al-Ḥusayn without mentioning any specific title²⁰. Al-Ḥimmaṣī also had access to *Kitāb al-fāʿiq* by Ibn al-Malāḥimī, to whom he regularly refers as *ṣāhib al-fāʿiq* when quoting from this work²¹.

The teachings of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī continued to influence Imāmī theological thought over the following centuries²². In addition, the amalgamation of

1406/1986, p. 100, no. 226; *Dharīʿa*, vol. 24, p. 286, no. 1466; *Muʿjam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 5, p. 410, no. 12248. None of the refutations mentioned is extant.

16. Ed. Muḥammad Hādī al-Yūsufī al-Gharawī, Qum 1412 [/1991]. For the work and its author, see Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, *Amal al-āmilī* 1-2, ed. Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī, Baghdad 1385/1965, vol. 2, p. 316 no. 963; Muḥsin al-Amīn, *Aʿyān al-shīʿa* 1-11, Beirut 1403/1983, vol. 10, p. 105-7; idem, *Mustadrak aʿyān al-shīʿa* 1-6, Beirut 1408-1415/1987-1995, vol. 1, p. 218-219; *Dharīʿa*, vol. 1, p. 249 no. 1312, vol. 3, p. 60 no. 166, vol. 3, p. 333 no. 1209, vol. 4, p. 222 no. 1114, vol. 4, p. 222 no. 1116, vol. 21, p. 65 no. 3970, vol. 21, p. 95 no. 4101, vol. 23, p. 151-152, vol. 24, p. 290-291 no. 1507; Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭīhrānī, *Ṭabaqāt al-lām al-shīʿa* [1-2, Beirut 1390-91/1971; 3-5, ed. ʿAlī Naqī Munzawī, Beirut 1392-95/1972-75; 6, ed. ʿAlī Naqī Munzawī, Tehran 1362/1983], vol. 2, part 2, p. 295; vol. 3, part 1, p. 178; Ibn al-Malāḥimī, *Muʿtamad*, introduction, p. viii; ʿAbbās b. Muḥammad Riḍā al-Qummī, *al-Kunā wa-l-alqāb* 1-3, Najaf 1376/1956, vol. 2, p. 175-176; E. Kohlberg, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work: Ibn Tawūs and his Library*, Leiden 1992, p. 75, 354-355 no. 590; Yūsuf b. Aḥmad al-Baḥrānī, *Luʿluʿat al-Baḥrayn*, ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Baḥr al-ʿUlūm, Najaf 1386/1966, p. 348-349 no. 117; ʿAbd Allāh al-Nīma, *Falāsifat al-shīʿa: Ḥayātuhum wa-ārāʾuhum*, Beirut 1962, p. 542-544; Muḥammad Bāqir al-Khʿānsārī, *Rawḍat al-jannāt fī aḥwāl al-ʿulamāʾ wa-l-sādāt* 1-8, Qum 1392/1987, vol. 7, p. 158-164, no. 618; ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿIsā al-Afandī, *Riyāḍ al-ʿulamāʾ* 1-5, ed. Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī, Qum 1401/1981, vol. 5, p. 202-203; R. Sellheim, *Materialien zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte* 1-2, Wiesbaden 1976-1987, vol. 1, p. 146-147; see also *ibid.* p. 142-147 for the distinction between Ṣadīd al-Dīn al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī and the later Maḥmūd b. ʿAlī b. Maḥmūd al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī (fl. 749-50/1348-49), author of a commentary on Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's *Qawāʿid al-aqāʿid* entitled *Kashf al-maʿāqīd fī sharḥ qawāʿid al-aqāʿid*, preserved in an apparently unique manuscript (MS Berlin, Wetzstein 1527 = Ahlwardt 1769). A facsimile print of this manuscript has been published: Maḥmūd b. ʿAlī b. Maḥmūd al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī, *Kashf al-maʿāqīd fī sharḥ Qawāʿid al-aqāʿid*, *Facsimile edition of MS Berlin, Wetzstein 1527*. Introduction and Indices by S. Schmidtke, Tehran: Iranian Institute of Philosophy & Institute of Islamic Studies, Free University of Berlin, 1386/2007.

17. Al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī, *al-Munqidh min al-taqīd*, vol. 1, p. 203, 504-505.

18. See e.g. *ibid.*, p. 63.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 401.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 324ff., 327, 434; vol. 2, p. 5, 24, 87, 105-106, 144, 214, 217, 282-283, 339-341.

21. *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 56-57, 208, 344.

22. This is the case, for example, with the anonymous author of *Khulāṣat al-naẓar*, composed during the late 6th/12th or early 7th/13th century (*Khulāṣat al-naẓar: An Anonymous Imāmī Muʿtazilī Treatise [late 6th/12th or early 7th/13th century]*, edited with an introduction by S. Schmidtke and H. Ansari, Tehran 1385/2006). Apart from the writings of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and Ibn al-Malāḥimī, some Imāmī scholars had access to the work of a certain Taqī al-Dīn al-Najrānī (or: al-Baḥrānī) al-ʿAjālī (vocalization uncertain), *Kitāb al-kāmil fīmā balaghanā min kalām al-qudamāʾ*, a systematic juxtaposition of the teachings of the Bahshamiyya and of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī. A unique manuscript of the text is preserved in Leiden (Or 487). Parts of the work have been edited and translated by al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Shāhid (Elsayed Elshahed, *Das Problem der transzendentalen sinnlichen*

theology and philosophy became the rule for Imāmī theologians from the 7th/13th century onwards. It was Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī (d. 672/1274) who first combined theological discussions with philosophical terminology, methodology and style in his *kalām* treatises and accepted a number of philosophical concepts that were compatible with theological doctrine²³. In this he was followed by the majority of later Imāmī *mutakallimūn*, such as Kamāl al-Dīn Maytham b. Maytham al-Bahrānī (d. 699/1300)²⁴, Hasan b. Yūsuf b. al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (d. 726/1325)²⁵ and al-Fāḍil al-Miqdād al-Suyūrī (d. 826/1423)²⁶.

II

A noteworthy exception to this trend was a family of scholars, the Banū al-'Awd, who flourished during the first half of the 8th/14th century in al-Ḥilla, one of the centres of Twelver Shī'i learning at the time. They strictly avoided philosophical terminology and concepts even when they were compatible with their dogmatic positions and they espoused by and large the doctrinal positions of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and Ibn al-Malāḥimī. A collective manuscript (*majmū'a*), written in the hand of Aḥmad b. Sharaf al-Dīn al-'Awdī between 6 Sha'bān 740/6th February 1340 and 24 Dhū al-Ḥijja 742/31st May 1342, is extant in the Bodleian Library in Oxford (MS. Arab. F. 64). The heavily waterstained and partly illegible manuscript, which consists of 133 leaves (11.93 x 16.50 cm), contains a number of theological and a few legal works²⁷. In addition, it contains some writings by various

Wahrnehmung in der spätmu'tazilitischen Erkenntnistheorie nach der Darstellung des Taqīaddīn an-Naḡrānī, Berlin 1983; on this study, see the review by W. Madelung in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48 (1985), p. 128-129). Al-Shāhid subsequently published an edition of the complete text (Cairo 1420/1999). That al-'Ajlī was known to later Imāmī theologians is indicated, for example, in Kamāl al-Dīn Maytham al-Bahrānī, *Qawā'id al-marām fī 'ilm al-kalām*, ed. Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī, Qum 1406/[1986], p. 82.

23. The most renowned is his *Tajrīd al-'aqā'id* (or *Tajrīd al-i'tiqād*). For this work and the commentaries on it, see 'Alī Ṣadrā'ī Khū'i, *Kitābshināsi-yi Tajrīd al-i'tiqād*, Qum 1424/2003; *Dharī'a*, vol. 3, p. 352-355, no. 278; Muḥammad Taqī Mudarris Raḍawī: *Aḥwāl u āthār-i Khwāja Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī*, Tehran 1334/1955-1956, p. 422-433. Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī also composed *Qawā'id al-'aqā'id* (see *Dharī'a*, vol. 14, p. 23, no. 1577, p. 24; vol. 17, p. 186 no. 985; *Mu'jam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 4, p. 468, no. 9757) and in Persian the *Fuṣūl naṣīriyya* that were translated into Arabic by Rukn al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Jurjānī al-Gharawī, a pupil of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī; cf. *Dharī'a*, vol. 4, p. 122-123, no. 585; vol. 16, p. 246-247, no. 980; *Mu'jam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 4, p. 391, no. 9368. Numerous commentaries were written on the translated text; cf. *Dharī'a*, vol. 13, p. 383-385, no. 1437-1445.

24. See particularly his *Qawā'id al-marām fī 'ilm al-kalām*.

25. On him see S. Schmidtke, *The Theology of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī* (d. 726/1325), Berlin 1991.

26. For his doctrinal views see his independent *kalām* work *Kitāb al-lawāmi' al-ilāhiyya fī al-mabāḥiṭh al-kalāmīyya*, ed. Muḥammad 'Alī al-Qāḍī al-Ṭabātabā'ī, Tabrīz 1397/1976. See also his commentaries on writings of al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī, viz. *Irshād al-ṭālibīn ilā nahj al-mustarshidīn*, ed. Mahdī al-Rajā'ī, Qum 1405/1984, and *al-Nāfi' yawm al-ḥaṣhr fī sharḥ al-bāb al-ḥādī 'aṣhar*, ed. Mahdī Muḥaqqiq, Tehran 1365/1986, and his commentary on Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's *Fuṣūl nāṣīriyya: al-Anwār al-jalāliyya li-l-fuṣūl al-naṣīriyya*, ed. 'Alī Ḥājji Ābādī and 'Abbās Jalālī Niyā, Mashhad 1378/1999.

27. A first description of the codex was given by H. Modarressi, *Kharāj in Islamic Law*, London 1983, note following p. 276, and in his "Mufāwaḍa-i dar mas'ala-yi shay'yyat-i ma'dūm", *Jashn-nāma-yi Ustādh Javād Muṣliḥ*, ed. Burhān Ibn Yūsuf, Los Angeles 1372/1993, p. 131-146 [p. 135-139].

members of the family. These include a *fatwā* by Sharaf al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad al-ʿAwdī al-Asadī al-Ḥillī concerning the status of one who upholds the doctrine that the non-existent (*maʿdūm*) is stable (*thābit*) (item no. 9), written in response to an earlier *fatwā* by Sharaf al-Dīn’s older (?) contemporary al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī (d. 676/1277) on the same issue which is also included in the *majmūʿa* (item no. 8); a concise credal treatise, also by Sharaf al-Dīn (item no. 11); a versified theological tract by one of his sons, Shihāb al-Dīn Ismāʿīl (item no. 15), and a short creed in the form of a *waṣīyya* by another son of Sharaf al-Dīn, Aḥmad, the scribe of the *majmūʿa* (item no. 16)²⁸.

Despite their brevity, these treatises show that Sharaf al-Dīn and his sons adopted with some reservations the dogmatic views of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and his school. On the issue of God’s essential attributes and their relation to His essence, the ʿAwdīs maintain that God is powerful, knowing, living and existent by virtue of His essence (*li-nafsihi / li-dhātihi*) (f. 105a, 120a). This agrees with the position of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī who had criticized the Bahshamī notion of states (*aḥwāl*) that had been developed by Abū Hāshim al-Jubbāʾī as a conceptional framework to explain the attributes of God and man²⁹. Abū Hāshim and his followers had argued that the divine essence differs from other essences because of an attribute of essence (*ṣifāt al-dhāt*) descriptive of this essence. Likewise, God is knowing, powerful and existent owing to essential attributes (*ṣifāt dhātiyya*) entailed by His attribute of essence. Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī maintained instead that God differed from other essences by virtue of His essence which is also the ontological foundation of His being knowing, powerful and existent. Be that as it may, the

[Repr. in *Mishkāt* 35 (Summer 1371/1992), p. 186-197; *Tārīkh u farhang-i muʿāṣir* 8 (1372/[1993]), p. 82-91; *Mirāth-i islāmī-yi Irān [Islamic Heritage of Iran]*, ed. Rasūl Jaʿfariyān, vol. 1, Qum 1373/[1994], p. 157-174]. See also the editor’s introduction to Ibn al-Malāḥimī’s *Muʿtamad*, p. ix, n. 23 & 27 and see recently (dated 1387/1/22 = 2008/3/20), Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfiziyyān, “Majmūʿa-yi kalāmī-yi Ibn al-ʿAwdī nushka-yi Kitābkhāna-yi Budliyyān dar Ingilistān”, <http://al-athar.ir/athar/default.php?part=book&id=37> (consulted 30th Sept. 2008). A microfilm copy of the codex is part of the library of al-Sayyid ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī in Qum. A detailed description of the contents of the codex is given below in the appendix.

28. His colophons are to be found on ff. 12b (dated 6 Shaʿbān 740/6th February 1340), 55a (dated Shaʿbān 740/February 1340), 87b (dated 16 Shaʿbān 740/16th February 1340), 92a (27 Shaʿbān 740/27th February 1340), 97b (partly illegible, dated [Ramaḍān] 740/[March] 1340), 98b (dated 6 Ramaḍān 740/6th March 1340), 107b (undated), 112b (dated 23 Dhū al-Ḥijja 741/9th June 1341), 119b (dated 26 Dhū al-Ḥijja 741/12th June 1341), 131b (24 Dhū al-Ḥijja 742/31st May 1342). The biographical literature contains scant information about this family and its members. Yaʿqūb Jaʿfarī, the editor of Shihāb al-Dīn Ismāʿīl’s versified theological treatise, has collected the available information in the introduction to the edition, *Uṣūl fī al-kalām, Kalām* 4 (1371/1993), p. 20-23. He identifies the following persons as members of the family: (1) Abū al-Maʿālī Sālim b. ʿAlī b. Sulaymān b. al-ʿAwdī al-Nīlī (fl. 554/1159-60); (2) Najīb al-Dīn Abū al-Qāsim b. Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-ʿAwdī al-Ḥillī (d. 679/1280-81), the father of (3) Sharaf al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Qāsim b. Ḥusayn al-ʿAwdī (fl. 740/1339-40); his two sons (4) Shihāb al-Dīn Ismāʿīl b. Sharaf al-Dīn Abī ʿAbd Allāh Ḥusayn al-ʿAwdī (d. 741/1340-1341) and (5) Aḥmad b. Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥusayn al-ʿAwdī al-Asadī al-Ḥillī (fl. 741/1340-41); (6) Naṣīr al-Dīn Mūsā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-ʿAwd (d. before 741/1340-1341); his two sons (7) Muḥammad b. Mūsā b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-ʿAwd (fl. 741/1340-41) and (8) Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥusayn b. Mūsā b. al-ʿAwd (fl. 741/1340-41); (9) Bahā al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAwdī al-ʿAmīlī al-Jizzīnī (fl. 961/1554-55).

29. For the Bahshamī doctrine of *aḥwāl*, see R. M. Frank, *Beings and their Attributes: The Teachings of the Basrian School of the Muʿtazila in the Classical Period*, Albany 1978.

manuscript includes a doctrinal responsum by a certain al-Sharīf al-Ṭāhir, who repeatedly bases his arguments on the Bahshamī notion of an attribute of essence (*ṣifat al-dhāt*) (item no. 13). This evidently did not prevent Aḥmad b. Sharaf al-Dīn from including this text in the *majmūʿa*.

The ʿAwdīs moreover reduced God’s perception to His knowledge; to say that God is hearing and seeing can only mean that He knows what man perceives through his senses (f. 105a, 120a). This was the view of the Baghdādī Muʿtazilīs, and Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī is reported to have formulated an argument in favour of their position. Later authors argued that he was himself a supporter of the Baghdādī view on this issue³⁰, although it seems that he eventually remained undecided on the matter³¹. Shihāb al-Dīn also discussed in his *urjūza* (item no. 15) the question of how it is known that man is the author of his actions, maintaining that this is necessary knowledge (*ʿilm ḍarūrī*): since man may be praised or blamed for his actions, he must necessarily be the author of his actions. Otherwise, praise and blame would be unreasonable. This was likewise the view of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and his followers³². The Bahshamiyya had argued that the knowledge that man is author of his actions is acquired knowledge which follows from the observation that man’s actions are brought forth in accordance with his motives and aims³³.

The ʿAwdīs did not follow Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī in their proof for the existence of the Creator. Sharaf al-Dīn adduces in his creed the traditional *kalām* proof that starts out from the temporality of accidents to prove the temporality of bodies, and argues by analogy between the seen and the unseen world that every generated entity requires a generator (f. 105a)³⁴. Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, by contrast, had denied the reality of accidents and had considered the qualities supposedly entailed by accidents as characteristics (*aḥkāṃ*) or states (*aḥwāl*) of the body, replacing the traditional “proof by way of accidents” (*ṭarīqat al-maʿānī*) by the “proof by way of states” (*ṭarīqat al-aḥwāl*). More importantly, Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī had dispensed with the analogy of the seen and the unseen, arguing instead on the basis of the principle of causality that every generated entity requires a

30. See, for example, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Muḥaṣṣal afkār al-mutaqaddimīn wa-l-mutaʾakhhirīn*, ed. Ṭāhā ʿAbd al-Raʿūf Saʿd, Beirut 1404/1984, p. 248; Kamāl al-Dīn Maytham al-Baḥrānī, *Qawāʿid al-marām fī ʿilm al-kalām*, p. 90.

31. Later followers of his doctrines, such as Ibn al-Malāḥimī and Jār Allāh al-Zamaksharī (d. 538/1144) supported the position of the Bahshamiyya. They maintained that God’s capability of hearing and seeing is entailed by His being alive. Whenever a perceivable object exists the condition for perception is fulfilled. Thus, God is described as eternally capable of hearing and seeing (*samīʿ/baṣīr*). Yet only when the condition for actual perception is fulfilled, may He be called actually hearing and seeing (*sāmiʿ/mubṣir*). This distinction between the transitive and the intransitive meaning of hearing and seeing originated with Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī (d. 303/915-16). For references see S. Schmidtke, *The Theology of al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī*, p. 198ff.; S. Schmidtke (ed., transl.), *A Muʿtazilite Creed of az-Zamaḥṣarī* (d. 538/1144) (*al-Minhāḡ fī uṣūl ad-dīn*), Stuttgart 1997, p. 20, 58.

32. See S. Schmidtke: *The Theology of al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī*, p. 125-126 for references.

33. See R. M. Frank: “The autonomy of the human agent in the teaching of ʿAbd al-Ġabbār”, *Le Muséon* 93 (1982), p. 323-355 (p. 326, n. 7 for references).

34. Cf. H. A. Davidson, *Proofs for Eternity, Creation and the Existence of God in Medieval Islamic and Jewish Philosophy*, New York / Oxford 1987, p. 134ff. and also W. Madelung and S. Schmidtke, *Rational Theology in Interfaith Communication*, *passim*.

generator³⁵. Discussing the impossibility of two Eternal beings, Sharaf al-Dīn furthermore employs the argument of *tamānuʿ*, the mutual exclusion of two almighty beings (f. 105b). This had been rejected by Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī³⁶.

Sharaf al-Dīn appears again as a follower of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī in his *fatwā* regarding the upholder of the view that the non-existent is a thing possessed of reality. This controversial view was formulated by Abū Hāshim al-Jubbāʿī and was founded on his theory of states (*ahwāl*). An attribute of essence is necessarily attached to every essence, by which the essence is distinguished from all other essences and is stable (*thābit*), independently of whether it is existent or not. Existence accordingly is a state (*ḥāl*) of an essence that is brought about by an agent (*fāʿil*), while essences and attributes as such are stable (*thābit*) and unchangeable, even in their state of non-existence³⁷. Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and his followers denied that the non-existent is real. For them, “to be stable” is synonymous with “to exist”, and the reality of a thing is therefore identical with its existence. The *fatwās* by al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī and Sharaf al-Dīn (items no. 8 & 9) address the question of whether the upholder of the doctrine that the non-existent is a stable thing is an unbeliever (*kāfir*) or a grave sinner (*fāsiq*), whether he is entitled to receive alms (i.e. whether he is still to be considered a Muslim) and whether one who grants alms to him is free of guilt or not³⁸. The two scholars agree in their rejection of this position, yet they come to different conclusions as regards the legal status of the upholder of this doctrine.

Al-Muḥaqqiq opens his *fatwā* with a brief outline of the Bahshamī doctrine³⁹. This doctrine, he summarizes, can be reduced to three main claims (*daʿāwā / ʿaqāʿid*): (a) an essence is stable prior to its coming into existence (*wasf al-dhāt qabla al-wujūd bi-l-thubūt*); (b) attributes of essence are attached to essences already in the state of their non-existence and hence they can be distinguished from each other (*wasf al-dhāt fī ḥāl al-ʿadam bi-ṣifāt al-ajnās al-mūjiba li-tamyīz al-dhawāt bi-qadrihā*); (c) it is only by virtue of the attributes of essence that a relation is established between knowledge and capability on the one hand, and non-existent essences on the other. Otherwise, essences could neither be known nor could they be subject to capability, i.e. be brought into existence (*inna al-ʿulūm wa-l-qudar wa-mā shākalahā min al-mutaʿalliqāt bi-aghayārihā innamā tataʿallaqu bi-l-maʿdūmāt bi-wāsiyat tilka al-ṣifāt wa-law khalat minhā la-mā*

35. See W. Madelung, “Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s proof for the existence of God”, *Arabic Theology, Arabic Philosophy. From the Many to the One: Essays in Celebration of Richard M. Frank*, ed. J. E. Montgomery, Leuven 2006, p. 273-280.

36. Cf. Rukn al-Dīn b. al-Malāḥimī al-Khʿārazmī, *al-Fāʿiq fī uṣūl al-dīn*, p. 95 ff.

37. On this issue, see R. M. Frank, “Al-maʿdūm wa-l-mawjūd, the non-existent, the existent and the possible in the teaching of Abū Hāshim and his followers”, *Mélanges de l’institut dominicain d’études orientales du Caire* 14 (1980), p. 185-210; F. Klein-Franke, “The non-existent is a thing”, *Le Muséon* 107 (1994), p. 375-390.

38. Ed. Modarressi, p. 139:4-7 (= f. 99a:1-5): *mā taqūlu al-sāda al-fuqahāʾ aʿimmat al-dīn wa-hudāt al-muslimīn fī ithbāt al-maʿdūm hal huwa ḥaqq am lā li-anna al-muʿtaqid bi-dhālika hal yuḥkamu ʿalayhi bi-l-kufr aw al-fisq wa-hal yajūzu an yuʿṭā shayʿan min al-zakāt am lā wa-in uʿṭiya shayʿan hal tubarraʾ dhimmat al-muʿṭī lahu am lā?*

39. Ed. Modarressi, p. 139:11-140:7 (= f. 99a:6-99b:2). Al-Muḥaqqiq refrains from explicitly naming any group or specific theologian as the upholder of this doctrine.

ṣahḥa taʿalluquhā bihā)⁴⁰. The last-mentioned claim is of relevance to the issue of God’s omnipotence and particularly His omniscience. The question whether, and if so, how God knows the non-existent was debated among earlier Muslim theologians. The starting point of the discussion was the widely accepted premise that only “things” can be objects of knowledge. Some theologians who define “things” as existent argued that God knows things only when they come into existence⁴¹. Others, who were mainly concerned to prove divine omniscience, concluded that things are existent from eternity; such was the view of a group whom al-Ashʿarī labelled “eternalists” (*azaliyya*)⁴². A number of theologians tried to formulate a compromise. Abū Yaʿqūb al-Shaḥḥām (d. after 257/871), for example, argued that things already existed in the divine mind before entering into real existence; as such they are neither non-existent nor existent. Rather, a certain “thing-ness” is to be attributed to them due to which they can be distinguished from each other⁴³. Maintaining that an attribute of essence is attached to an essence independently of its existence through what it is, the Bahshamīs were not confronted with the question of whether a thing may be known prior to its existence.

Al-Muḥaqqiq rejects the doctrine and the claims it rests upon. None of these, he argues, leads to knowledge (*ʿilm*) or even strong conjecture (*ẓann qawī*) supporting their position⁴⁴. Al-Muḥaqqiq, however, maintains that the upholder of this doctrine is neither an unbeliever nor a grave sinner but is a Muslim. As such he is also entitled to receive alms⁴⁵. For unbelief and grave sin can only be asserted when a person either negates what has been revealed by the Prophet (*kufīr*) or when he acts contrary to what the revealed law prescribes (*fiṣq*). As long as this is not the case and the person otherwise acts according to the prescriptions of the revealed law, he is to be considered a Muslim⁴⁶. Since the revealed law does not specifically contain anything that either prescribes or prohibits any of the three aforementioned claims, the upholder of this doctrine cannot be considered to be either a *kāfir* or a *fāsiq*⁴⁷.

Al-Muḥaqqiq adduces two objections aiming to prove that the doctrine that the non-existent is a thing constitutes an inadmissible limitation of the divine attributes of omniscience and omnipotence, and is therefore to be classified as unbelief. According to the first objection, the upholder of the doctrine of the reality of the

40. Ed. Modarressi, p. 140:8-14 (= f. 99b:3-8).

41. Such views are ascribed to Jahm b. Ṣafwān (d. 128/745), Hishām b. al-Ḥakam (d. 179/796) and Hishām b. ʿAmr al-Fuwatī (d. before 218/833). See Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyin: Die dogmatischen Lehren der Anhänger des Islam*, ed. H. Ritter, Wiesbaden 1980³, p. 158, 489, 493-494; W. Madelung, “The Shīʿite and Khārījite contribution to pre-Ashʿarite Kalām”, *Islamic Philosophical Theology*, ed. P. Morewedge, Albany 1979, p. 120-139 [repr. in W. Madelung, *Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam*, no. VIII], p. 123, 125.

42. Al-Ashʿarī: *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyin*, p. 489; see also J. van Ess, *Die Erkenntnislehre des ʿAḍudaddīn al-Īcī* (Übersetzung und Kommentar des ersten Buches seiner *Mawāqif*), Wiesbaden 1966, p. 193.

43. See van Ess, *Erkenntnislehre*, p. 192-93; S. Schmidtke, *The Theology of al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī*, p. 197-198 n. 137.

44. Ed. Modarressi, p. 140:19-22. The relevant section in the manuscript (f. 99b:13ff) is badly damaged and the editor could only partly reconstruct the passage.

45. Ed. Modarressi, p. 141:22-26 (= f. 100b:9-15).

46. Ed. Modarressi, p. 140:23-141:5 (= f. 100a:1-11).

47. Ed. Modarressi, p. 141:6-9 (= f. 100a:11-15).

non-existent claims that God’s being knowing can only be asserted once the reality of the non-existent entity has been affirmed. Since, however, the non-existent is not real, so the objection continues, the upholder of this doctrine denies God’s being qualified by the attribute of being knowing⁴⁸. The second objection says that the upholder of this doctrine asserting the reality of the essences (prior to their existence) in fact denies that a capable entity has any effect on the essences themselves. Thus he affirms that these are not subject to divine omnipotence⁴⁹. Al-Muḥaqqiq has similar responses to both objections. Since the revealed law does not specifically invalidate any of the claims of the upholder of this doctrine and since the latter neither denies that God possesses the attribute of being knowing, nor explicitly claims that essences are outside God’s omnipotence – on the contrary – these objections do not justify the judgment of either unbelief or grave sin⁵⁰.

Sharaf al-Dīn blames al-Muḥaqqiq in his counter-*fatwā* for inaccuracies in his outline of the Bahshamī doctrine and sets out to correct them by pointing out the weaknesses and mistakes in the teaching of those who hold that the non-existent is a thing⁵¹. He opens his argumentation by rejecting al-Muḥaqqiq’s account of the doctrine that it is only by virtue of the attributes of essence that a relation is established between knowledge and capability on the one hand, and non-existent essences on the other⁵². For, Sharaf al-Dīn continues, as far as capability is concerned, its relation is restricted, according to their doctrine, to producing the essence’s state of existence while it does not extend to bringing forth the essences themselves into reality (*li-anna al-qadar lā tataʿallaqu bi-iḥdāth al-dhawāt ʿindahum wa-innamā tataʿallaqu bi-ḥāl yusammūnahā wujūdan*). Moreover, since they describe “states” as something neither known nor unknown (*wa-l-aḥwāl ʿindahum lā maʿlūma wa-lā majhūla*), they in fact ascribe to God something that is unknown.

48. Ed. Modarressi, p. 141:10-12 (= f. 100a:15-17): *fa-in qīla: inna al-muthbit yazʿumu annahu lā yuthbatu waṣf Allāh subḥānahu bi-kawnihi ʿāliman illā baʿda ithbāt al-maʿdūm wa-l-maʿdūm laysa bi-thābit [fa-l-muthbit yanfī ʿan] al-bāriʿ ṣifat al-ʿālimiyya*.

49. Ed. Modarressi, p. 141:16-17 (= f. 100b:4-6): *al-muthbit yaḥkumu bi-thubūt al-dhawāt wa-lā yajʿalu li-l-qādir taʿthīran fī nafs al-dhāt fa-yakūnu qad athbata mā huwa khārij ʿan qudrat Allāh taʿālā*.

50. Ed. Modarressi, p. 141:13-15 (= f. 100b:1-4): *qulnā: daʿwā al-muthbit dhālika laysa mimmā warada al-sharʿ bihi bi-ḥaythu yakūnu mukhālafatuhu kufran aw fīsqan bal huwa mimmā takallafa aṣḥāb al-anzār wa-l-kufr laysa illā inkār waṣfihi bi-kawnihi ʿāliman wa-l-muthbit lā yunkiru dhālika al-waṣf; p. 141:18-21 (= f. 100b:6-9): qulnā: al-kufr laysa illā al-taṣrīḥ bi-anna al-dhawāt khārija ʿan qudrat Allāh wa-dhālika lā yaqūluhu al-muthbit bal yaqūlu hiya maqḍūra lahu wa-kawn dhālika lāziman lahu ʿalā raʿy al-nāfi lā yalzamu minhu kufr al-muthbit wa-lā fusūquhu idh malzūm al-kufr laysa bi-kufr illā maʿa taslīm al-malzūm [Modarressi writes *al-kufr* although the manuscript has *al-malzūm*].*

51. Ed. Modarressi, p. 143:11-12 (= f. 101a:8-10): *qawluhu fī ḥikāyat madhhabihim wa-taqrīr iʿtiqādihim: al-qadar wa-l-ʿulūm tataʿallaqu bi-l-dhawāt bi-ṭibār thubūt al-ṣifa*. This is a summary of the following statement of al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī (ed. Modarressi, p. 140:12-14 = f. 99b:6-8): *inna al-ʿulūm wa-l-qadar wa-mā shākalahā min al-mutaʿalliqāt bi-aghayārihā innamā tataʿallaqu bi-l-maʿdūmāt bi-wāṣiṭat tilka al-ṣifāt wa-law khalat minhā la-mā ṣaḥḥa taʿalluquhā bihā*. As was the case with al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī, Sharaf al-Dīn does not ascribe this doctrine to any specific school or theologian.

52. Ed. Modarressi, p. 142:5-10 (= f. 101a:2-5): *waqaftu ʿalā al-jawāb alladhī ajāba bihi Abū al-Qāsim Jaʿfar b. Saʿīd raḥimahu Allāh ʿan muʿtaqīd al-ithbāt hal huwa kāfir aw muʿmin fa-raʿaytu qad takhaṭṭā al-ṣawāb wa-taʿaddāhu wa-taʿāmā ʿan al-ḥaqq wa-tanāsāhu fa-aḥbabtu an ubayyina fīhi ghalāṭahu wa-akshifa li-l-nāzirīn saqāhu*.

Sharaf al-Dīn accordingly disagrees with al-Muḥaqqiq on the status of the upholders of the view that the non-existent is a real thing. He rejects al-Muḥaqqiq’s definition of *kufr* and *fiṣq* as well as his conclusion that none of the various theses of the defenders of this doctrine is explicitly forbidden by Scripture, so that these people are not to be classified as either unbelievers or grave sinners. He defines *kufr* as any violation of the definition of the belief (*īmān*) of the people of justice (*ahl al-‘adl*) that includes the basic theological principles of Twelver Shī‘i Mu‘tazilism, viz. God and His attributes, divine justice, Muḥammad’s prophethood and the Imamate of the Imams⁵³. Abandoning any of these principles constitutes an infringement of the doctrine of divine unity (*tawḥīd*) which amounts to plain unbelief⁵⁴. This is the case with the upholders of this doctrine, who deny that divine omnipotence extends to the bringing forth of the essence itself and who therefore implicitly claim that the objects of God’s capability are finite. Now, maintaining that God’s capability is limited is plain unbelief⁵⁵. To support his view, Sharaf al-Dīn refers to a number of earlier Imāmī and Mu‘tazilī authors who, he claims, have similarly argued that the upholder of the said doctrine is an unbeliever, such as al-Shaykh al-Mufīd⁵⁶, Shaykh al-Ṭūsī in his (apparently lost) *Riyādat al-‘uqūl*⁵⁷, Sadīd al-Dīn al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī, Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and Ibn al-Malāḥimī (*Maḥmūd al-Kh^wārazmī ṣāḥib al-fā‘iq*)⁵⁸.

The discussion about whether or not the non-existent is a thing had already lost its relevance among Twelver Shī‘is by the 8th/14th century, for the majority of Imāmī theologians since the time of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī had replaced Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s concept of the existent by the philosophical notion of essence (*māhiyya*) and existence (*wujūd*); because of its absolute perfection, God’s existence is identical with His essence since existence is necessary in the case of the Necessarily Existent. As for contingent beings, existence comes accidentally to their essences as their existence is less perfect than is the case with the Necessarily Existent and they require a producer in order to come into existence. The views of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and the philosophers therefore imply entirely different notions of existence. According to Abū al-Ḥusayn, the existence of a thing is iden-

53. Ed. Modarressi, p. 143:10-11 (= f. 101b:16-102a:1): *al-īmān huwa al-‘ilm bi-llāh ta‘ālā wa-ṣifātihi nafyan wa-ithbātān wa-‘adlihi wa-nubuwwat al-nabī (s) wa-ṣifātihi wa-mā yata‘allaqu bihā wa-l-imāma wa-mā yata‘allaqu bihā*.

54. Ed. Modarressi, p. 143:12-14 (= f. 102a:1-3): *fa-ma‘rifat dhālika huwa al-īmān wa-l-ikhlāl bi-shay‘ min ‘ulūm hādhihi al-jumla aw al-qawl bi-mā ya‘anu fī ba‘dihā wa-yanfīhi yakūnu ‘ā‘idan ‘alā al-tawḥīd bi-l-naqd wa-qālū anna hādha huwa al-kufr al-ṣarīḥ*.

55. Ed. Modarressi, p. 143:15-19 (= f. 102a:3-8): *wa-lladhī yadullu ‘alā anna al-muthbit yazharu fī aqwālihi mā yanqudu hādhihi al-jumla annahu ya‘taqidu anna al-bāri‘ lā yaqḍuru ‘alā iḥdāth nafs al-dhāt wa-anna qudratahu innamā tata‘allaqu bi-ḥāl ghayr al-dhāt wa-huwa mawjūd fī aqwālihim wa-hādha yadullu ‘alā anna al-dhawāt khārija ‘an maqdūrihi wa-fī dhālika tanāḥī maqdūrātihi wa-man qāla bi-tanāḥī maqdūrihi kāna kāfiran ṣarīḥan*.

56. Shaykh al-Mufīd deals with the issue in his *Awā‘il al-maqālāt* (ed. Ibrāhīm al-Anṣārī al-Khū‘īnī, Beirut 1414/1993 = *Muṣannafāt al-Shaykh al-Mufīd*, 4) under the heading *al-qawl fī al-ma‘dūm* (§ 92, p. 98), where he states that in reality (*‘alā al-ḥaqīqa*) the non-existent is neither substance, accident nor thing, and that it is a thing only metaphorically (*majāzan*). However, although al-Mufīd also indicates other positions on this issue, he refrains from passing judgment on those who hold them.

57. For this work, see *Dharī‘a*, vol. 11, p. 340, no. 2020; *Mu‘jam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 3, p. 488, no. 7166.

58. Ed. Modarressi, p. 144:26-145:5 (= f. 103a:9-17).

tical with the reality of that thing in the external world; existence is therefore identical with essence, not additional to it. Thus the existence of a thing includes all its characteristics and is identical with its individual identity, and the various existent beings share existence only in expression (*ishtirāk lafẓī*). For Peripatetics and the majority of Imāmī theologians from the 7th/13th century onwards, by contrast, being is an ambiguous term (*bi-l-tashkīk*). Sharaf al-Dīn’s fierce condemnation of the Bahshamī position in view of the dogmatic outlook of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī appears therefore somehow anachronistic. That the refusal to adopt the philosophical notion of *wujūd* was deliberate is evident from the *urjūza* by Sharaf al-Dīn’s son Shihāb al-Dīn al-ʿAwdī. Therein he outlines the views of the Bahshamiyya (he speaks of *mashāyikh al-muʿtazila*), the Peripatetics and Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī on the issue of existence and clearly supports the view of Abū al-Ḥusayn (f. 115a).

That the various writings discussed here were preserved in an apparently unique manuscript written in the hand of a member of the family suggests that the Banū al-ʿAwd, with their strict refusal to adopt philosophy into *kalām*, were quite exceptional in their time⁵⁹. Mainstream Imāmī theology continued to be increasingly influenced by philosophy and later on also by the mystical tradition, as was the case for example with Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsāʿī (d. after 906/1501)⁶⁰.

Appendix: Contents of MS. Bodleian Library (Oxford) Arab. F. 64

1.

F. 1a-2b (15 lines to the page), f. 3a-12b:8 (17/21 lines to the page)

Fragments of al-Sharīf al-Murtadā’s treatise dealing with the question of whether man is a free agent or compelled in his actions, *Inqādh al-bashar min al-jabr wa-l-qadar*. The text has been edited in *Rasāʿil al-Sharīf al-Murtadā* 1-3, Qum 1405/[1984-85], vol. 2, p. 175-257 and in *Rasāʿil al-ʿadl wa-l-tawḥīd* 1-2, ed. Muḥammad ʿImāra, Cairo 1408/1988², vol. 1, p. 283-349. The first fragment (f. 1a-2b) corresponds to p. 184:9 [ed. ʿImāra, p. 291:9] (*wa-kull*)-187:16 [294:8] (*al-absār*). F. 6b:9-12b:8 corresponds to p. 231:10 [329:11] (*fī shatmihi*)-247 [342] (being the end of the text). The text prior to f. 6b:9 differs completely from the printed versions of the text (prior to p. 231:10 [329:11]) and may reflect a different recension, perhaps the paraphrased version by Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī⁶¹.

On the text, see *Dharīʿa*, vol. 2, p. 401-2, no. 1612; *Muʿjam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 1, p. 512-13, no. 2265.

59. Hassan Ansari informs me that fragments of a copy of the Bodleian *majmūʿa* are preserved in the private library of Muḥammad ʿAlī Rawḍāʿī in Iṣfahān; cf. below, Appendix no. 8.

60. See S. Schmidtke, *Theologie, Philosophie und Mystik im zwölferschiitischen Islam des 9./15. Jahrhunderts. Die Gedankenwelt des Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsāʿī (um 838/1434-35-nach 906/1501)*, Leiden 2000; *eadem*, “Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsāʿī und sein Spätwerk *Sharḥ al-bāb al-ḥādī ʿashar*”, *Reflections on Reflections. Near Eastern Writers Reading Literature. Dedicated to Renate Jacobi*, ed. Angelika Neuwirth and Andreas Christian Islebe, Wiesbaden 2006, p. 119-145.

61. This version also circulated among Jewish scholars as is indicated by a one-leaf fragment from the Cairo Genizah (MS Cambridge University, T-S NS 223.088). See A. Shvitiel and F. Niessen, *Arabic and Judaeo-Arabic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections, Taylor-Schechter New Series*, Cambridge 2006, p. 244; G. Schwarb, “Sahl b. al-Faḍl al-Tustarī’s *Kitāb al-ʾImā*”, p. 80*.

F. 12b:9-11

Colophon [partly illegible]

... تمت الرسالة والحمد لله رب العالمين وصلى الله على ...
كتبها الفقير إلى الله تعالى أحمد بن الحسين العودي الحلي يوم السبت سادس شهر شعبان
المبارك سنة [أربعين ...] حامداً لربه جل وعز ومصلياً على [سيدنا] محمد ...

2.

F. 12b:12-13a:4

A partly illegible report about al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf al-Thaqaḥī (d. 95/714) asking the Baṣran scholars al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728), Wāṣil b. ‘Aṭā’ (d. 131/748-749), ‘Amir al-Sha’bī (d. between 103/721 and 110/728) and ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd (d. 144/761) to put into writing their views concerning predestination and free will (*al-qaḍā’ wa-l-qadar*). The recension contained in our *majmū’a* differs slightly from Abū al-Faṭḥ al-Karājīkī’s (d. 449/1057) version (*Kanz al-fawā’id* 1-2, ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Nīma, Qum n.d. vol. 2, p. 364-365). On the report see also S. A. Mourad, *Early Islam between Myth and History: Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110H/728CE) and the Formation of his Legacy in Classical Islamic Scholarship*, Leiden 2006, p. 198ff.

3.

F. 13a:5-55a:9

Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī (d. between 300/912 and 310/922): *Firaq al-shī’a*

Al-Nawbakhtī’s book on Shi’i sects has been edited by Hellmut Ritter (*Die Sekten der Schī’a von al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā an-Nawbakhtī*, Istanbul 1931) on the basis of this very *majmū’a*, which he describes in the introduction to the edition (p. *wāw*). Ritter misread the name of the scribe as “al-‘Awmī”. It was evidently on the basis of Ritter’s misreading that the error was repeated by Āghā Buzurg (*Dharī’a*, vol. 16, p. 179, no. 559; *Tabaqāt a’lām al-shī’a*, vol. 3, part 2, p. 6) and later scholars such as al-Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī, (“Firaq al-shī’a, li-l-Nawbakhtī am li-l-Ash’arī?”, *Turāthunā* 1 1405/[1984-85], p. 29-51 [p. 34]). As Ritter explains in his introduction, the manuscript was first mentioned by D. S. Margoliouth, “Khaṭṭābīya”, *Enzyklopaedie des Islām: Geographisches, ethnographisches und biographisches Wörterbuch der muhammedanischen Völker* 1-4. Leiden/Leipzig 1913-1934, vol. 2, p. 1000: “Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī, *Kitāb fīhi Madhāhib Firaq Ahl al-Imāma* (MS. aus dem Besitz von A. G. Ellis Esq.)”. It was Alexander George Ellis (d. 1941) who provided Ritter with a copy of this text and most likely of the entire codex.

F. 55a:10-12

Colophon

فرغ من كتابته الفقير إلى الله تعالى أحمد بن الحسين العودي يوم الأحد الرابع من العشر الأول من
شهر شعبان المبارك من سنة أربعين وسبعمائة حامداً لله ومستغفراً من ذنبه بمنه وكرمه

Added in small handwriting, possibly by a different hand:

بلغ مقابلةً على نسخة فصحت إلا ما زاغ عنه النظر ...

4.

F. 55b-87b

Abū al-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. ‘Uthmān al-Karājikī (d. 449/1057): *Ma‘din al-jawāhir wa-riyādat al-khawāṭir*.

This treatise containing Prophetic *aḥādīth* arranged in ten chapters has been edited by ‘Alī Riḍā Hizār (Qum 1422/2001) on the basis of three manuscripts, not including the present one. On the text and its author see *Dharī‘a*, vol. 21, p. 221-222, no. 4708; vol. 24, p. 130, no. 649 (Persian translation by ‘Abbās b. Muḥammad Riḍā b. Abī al-Qāsim al-Qummī, entitled *Nuzhat al-nawāzīr fī tarjamat ma‘din al-jawāhir*); GAL (= Brockelmann, Carl, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* 1-2, Leiden 1943²), vol. 1, p. 434; GALS (= Brockelmann, Carl, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, Supplementband 1-3, Leiden 1937-1942), vol. 1, p. 602; Kohlberg: *A Medieval Muslim Scholar, passim*.

F. 87b:13-14

Colophon

علقه الفقير إلى الله تعالى أحمد بن الحسين العودي الأسدي الحلبي عفا الله عنه وفرغ من نسخه يوم الجمعة سادس و عشر (؟) من شهر شعبان المبارك من سنة أربعين وسبعمئة

5.

F. 88a-92a

Al-Shaykh al-Mufīd: *Kitāb al-nukat fī muqaddimāt al-uṣūl*.

An edition of this *kalām* treatise has been published by Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā al-Husaynī al-Jalālī on the basis of the codex described here and the following two additional manuscripts: (1) a copy preserved in the library of Āyat Allāh al-Sayyid al-Ḥakīm (Najaf) (MS 364/1) which was available to him in a microfilm copy owned by the Dānīshgāh Library in Tehran (MF 3343); (2) a copy preserved in the Rawḍatī Library in Iṣfahān, copied by al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Mūsawī al-Iṣfahānī. For a description of these two manuscripts, see *Mu‘jam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 5, p. 419, no. 12297. The edition was published in *Turāthunā* 30-31 (1413/1993), p. 445-509, and in vol. 10 of *Muṣannafāt al-Shaykh al-Mufīd*, second *Risāla* (with separate pagination). It is also available on the website of the *Shabakat al-shī‘a al-‘ālamīyya* [http://shiaweb.org/shia/almufid/al-nekat_fi_al-aosal/ (consulted 09/10/2008)].

F. 92a:12-13

Colophon

تم الكتاب والحمد لله رب العالمين والصلاة على خير خلقه محمد وآله الطاهرين فرغ من نسخه أفقر عباد الله تعالى أحمد بن الحسين بن العودي عفا الله عنه يوم السبت الرابع والعشرين من شهر شعبان من سنة أربعين وسبعمئة

6.

Ff. 92b-97b

Abū Ja‘far al-Tūsī: *Mas‘ala fī tahrīm al-fuqqā’*

For the text cf. *Dharī‘a*, vol. 20, p. 385, no. 3560; H. T. Modarressi, *An Introduction to Shī‘ī Law: A Bibliographical Study*, London 1984, p. 200, where in addition to our Bodleian manuscript three manuscript copies are listed. This legal treatise has been published in *al-Rasā’il al-‘ashr li-Shaykh al-ṭā’ifa al-imāmīyya Abī Ja‘far Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī al-Tūsī (385-460)*, ed. Mu‘assasat al-nashr al-islāmī, Qum n.d., p. 253-266.

F. 97b:2-4

Colophon [partly illegible]

... [من شهر رمضان] المعظم من شهور سنة أربعين وسبعمئة ... عفا الله عنه

7.

F. 97b:5-98b

Brief creed (*‘aqīda*) by a certain ‘Alī b. Tāhir al-Ṣūrī. No person of this name is mentioned in the Twelver Shī‘i biographical literature. Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī suggests in his *Tarājīm al-rijāl* 1-2, Qum 1414/[1993-1994], vol. 1, p. 372, no. 679 that the name as it appears in al-‘Awdī’s copy is probably an error for Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥasan b. Tāhir al-Ṣūrī (6th/12th century). It may, however, be the same person as the author of item no. 13 (see below), viz. a certain al-Sharīf al-Tāhir. On him see Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭīhrānī, *Ṭabaqāt a’lām al-shī‘a*, vol. 2/II, p. 59, 75. Ibn Tāhir’s views on the subject of *muwāsa‘a* (in prayer) are said to have been refuted by Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Maṣūb b. Abī al-Ṣalāḥ in the *Risāla fī al-mudāyaqa* (*Dharī‘a*, vol. 21, p. 134, no. 4298). Of his writings, *Qadā’ huqūq al-ikhwān al-mu‘minīn* (see *Dharī‘a*, vol. 17, p. 137-38, no. 713) has been edited by Ḥāmid al-Khaffāf (Mu‘assasat āl al-bayt li-ihyā’ al-turāth: Silsilat maṣādir Bihār al-anwār, 4. The edition is available online: www.rafed.net/books/akhlaq/h-moam/index.html [consulted 10/12/2006]). The text of the [partly illegible] *‘aqīda* is as follows:

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
عقيدة مباركة الابتداء حميدة الانتهاء نقلت عن الشيخ علي بن طاهر الصوري ... ونور ضريحه
بمحمد وآله (؟) الطاهرين
اعلم أن معرفة الله تعالى واجبة لأن الإنسان إذا عرف الله تعالى كان أقرب إلى طاعته وأبعد من
معصيته والله تعالى لا يُعرف بالضرورة ولا [ولا: مكرر في الأصل] بالمشاهدة ولا بالخبر ولا
بالتقليد بل يعرف بالنظر الذي هو الفكر والفكر يكون في الجواهر والأجسام والأعراض المحدثه
فإذا عرف حدوثها عرف أن لها محدثاً أحدثها وهو ليس بمحدث وهو تعالى قادر لصحة وقوع
الفعل منه وعالم لإحكام الفعل منه، حي موجود لصحة كونه قادراً عالماً، سميع بصير في الأزلية
سامع مبصر فيما لا ...، مدرك لجميع المدركات، مرید وكاره أعني أنه ليس بمحتاج ... كالأبصار
[198] ... الجواهر ولا ... عدل ... لا يفعل القبيح ولا يأمر ... ولا يريد، ونعتقد بنبوته سيدنا ومولانا
محمد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم وأنه أشرف الرسل والأنبياء معصوم من الزلل قبل
النبوته وبعدها خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعده إلى يوم القيامة وأن الله تعالى صدقه في دعواه وأظهر على
يده معجزات (؟) تدل على صحة نبوته وهو القرآن المجيد وغيره من المعجزات التي خرق بها

العادات مثل شكوى البعير وكلام الذراع وتسبيح الحصى وإنباع المأ من بين أصابعه وإطعام الخلق الكثير من الطعام اليسير وغير ذلك ويعتقد إمامة مولانا وسيدنا أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب عليه السلام والأحد عشر من أولاده وهم الحسن والحسين وعلي بن الحسين ومحمد بن علي وجعفر بن محمد وموسى بن جعفر وعلي بن موسى ومحمد بن علي وعلي بن محمد والحسن والمهدي محمد بن الحسن صلوات الله عليهم أجمعين ويعتقد أنه أفضل خلق الله تعالى من بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم معصوم من الزلزل قبل الإمامة وبعدها وقد نص الله تعالى عليه بقوله (إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَيُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَهُمْ رَاكِعُونَ) [سورة المائدة (5): 55] ولم يعلم من لدن [98ب] آدم إلى يومنا هذا أن أحداً يصدق بالخاتم في الزكاة غير أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب صلى الله عليه وسلم وقد نص النبي عليه السلام بقوله: أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنه لا نبي بعدي، وقوله عليه السلام: من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه ومن كنت نبيه فعلي إمامه، اللهم وال من والاه وعاد من عاداه وخذل من خذله وأنصر من نصره. وقد نص النبي على الحسن والحسين بقوله عليه السلام: ابناي هذان إمامان قاما أو قعدا صمنا أو نطقا وقد [ورد (?)]، [الأصل] نص النبي عليه السلام على الحسين وعلى التسعة من أولاده عليهم السلام بما رواه سلمان الفارسي رحمة الله عليه قال: دخلت على النبي صلى الله عليه والحسين بي على جالس على فخذه، فقال: يا سلمان، إن ابني هذا سيد ابن سيد أبو سادة حجة بن حجة أبو حجج إمام بن إمام أبو أئمة تسعة من ولده تأسعهم قائمهم صلى الله عليهم أجمعين. وهذه جملة كافية فيما وضعت له أدنى ما يجزئ. والحمد لله ... وصلى الله على سيدنا محمد وآله الطيبين الطاهرين وسلم عليهم تسليماً.

F. 98b

Colophon

علقه الفقير إلى الله تعالى أحمد بن الحسين العودي الأسدي الحلبي عفا الله عنه سادس من (?) شهر رمضان المعظم من شهور سنة أربعين وسبعمائة

8.

F. 99a-100b

Fatwā by Najm al-Dīn Abū al-Qāsim Jaʿfar b. Saʿīd (“al-Muḥaqqiq al-Hillī”, d. 676/1277) concerning the status of one who upholds the doctrine that the non-existent (*maʿdūm*) is a stable (*thābit*, *ḥaqq*) thing. Najm al-Dīn rejects the doctrine but does not charge the holder of it with unbelief (*kufr*) or grave sin (*fusūq*)⁶². According to the editor’s introduction to Jaʿfar b. al-Ḥasan Muḥaqqiq al-Hillī’s *al-Maslak fī uṣūl al-dīn wa-talīhi al-risāla al-mātiʿiyya*, ed. Riḍā Ustādī, Mashhad 1373/1994, p. 18, no. 15, another manuscript of this *fatwā* is preserved in one of the private libraries of Iṣfahān (*risāla fī ʿadam kufr man iʿtaqada bi-ithbāt al-maʿdūm lam yuḥbaʿ baʿd wa-nuskha minhā mawjūda fī maktabat aḥad aʿlām Iṣbahān dāmat ayyāmuhā*). It is likely that the copy of the *majmūʿa* preserved in the Rawḍātī library is intended here (see above n. 59).

62. Āghā Buzurg erroneously ascribed this *fatwā* to al-Muḥaqqiq al-Karakī (d. 940/1534). See *Dharīʿa*, vol. 5, p. 182, no. 799 (*jawāb suʿāl ʿan ithbāt al-maʿdūm*); vol. 10, p. 192-193, no. 480 (*al-Radd ʿalā jawāb al-Muḥaqqiq al-Karakī*). See also Āghā Buzurg al-Tīhrānī, *Ṭabaqāt aʿlām al-shīʿa*, vol. 4/II (*al-qarn al-āshir*), p. 69. The mistake is repeated in *Muʿjam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 2, p. 456-457, no. 4605 (*jawāb al-suʿāl fī ithbāt al-maʿdūm*).

9.

F. 100b-104a

Counter-*fatwā* by Sharaf al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn al-ʿAwdī, written against the *fatwā* by al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī. He insists that the doctrine constitutes unbelief and that its holder must not be given alms (*zakāt*). Composed apparently after the lifetime of al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī, who is referred to with the addition of *raḥimahu Allāh* (f. 101a:3)

Both *fatwās* have been edited by H. T. Modarressi on the basis of the present manuscript: “Mufāwaḍa-i dar masʿala-yi shayʿiyyat-i maʿdūm”, *Jashn-nāma-yi Ustādḥ Javād Muṣliḥ*, ed. Burhān Ibn Yūsuf, Los Angeles 1372/1993, p. 131-146. His edition of the text has been reproduced repeatedly: in *Mishkāt* 35 (summer 1371/1992), p. 186-197, in *Tārīkh u farhang-i muʿāṣir* 8 (1372/[1993]), p. 82-91, and in *Mīrāth-i islāmī-yi Īrān [Islamic Heritage of Iran]*, ed. Rasūl Jaʿfariyān, vol. 1, Qum 1373/[1994], p. 157-174.

10.

F. 104b:1-11

Excerpt from a work of al-Kulaynī [on *tawḥīd*]: *mimmā rawaynāhu min kitāb al-Kulaynī* (cf. Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī* 1-8, ed. ʿAlī Akbar al-Ghafārī, n.p. 1388/[1968-1969]³), vol. 1, p. 105, no. 3:

محمد بن الحسن عن سهل بن زياد عن محمد بن إسماعيل بن بزيع عن محمد بن زيد قال: كتبت إلى الرضا أسأله عن التوحيد فأملى عليّ: الحمد لله فاطر الأشياء بما يشاء، ومبتدعها ابتداءً بقدرته وحكمته، لا من شيء فيبطل الاختراع ولا لعلة فلا يصح الابتداع، خلق ما شاء كيف شاء، متوحداً بذلك لإظهار حكمته وحقيقة ربوبيته، لا تضبطه العقول ولا تبلغه الأوهام ولا تدركه الأبصار ولا يحيط به مقدار، عجزت دونه العبارة وكلت دونه الأبصار وضل فيه تصاريف الصفات، احتجب بغير حجاب محجوب واستتر بغير ستر مستور، عرف بغير رؤية ووصف بغير صورة ونعت بغير جسم؛ لا إله إلا الله الكبير المتعالي. تم والحمد لله وحده

11.

F. 105a-107b

Creed by Sharaf al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Qāsim b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-ʿAwdī. No other manuscript of this work is known. The text of the creed is as follows:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم تصنيف الشيخ الإمام العالم الفاضل الكامل العلامة شرف الدين أبو عبد الله الحسين بن أبي القاسم بن الحسين بن العودي عفا الله عنه.
معرفة الله تعالى واجبة لوجوب شكره على أصول النعم، ولا طريق إلى معرفته إلا بالنظر فوجب النظر لوجوب ما لم يتم الواجب إلا به. والنظر هو الفكر، والفكر يكون في الجواهر والأجسام والأعراض التي لا تدخل تحت مقدرنا، والأجسام محدثة، لأنها لا تخلو من الحوادث، وما لم يخل من المحدث فهو محدث مثله، وكل محدث يحتاج إلى محدث بالضرورة كالبناء والكتابة، والصانع جلت عظمته قديم لانتهاء الحوادث إليه.
ويجب أن يكون قادراً لوقوع الفعل منه على وجه الجواز، وهو تعالى عالم لوقوع الأحكام وتكرره منه، وهو حي لثبوت كونه قادراً عالماً، وهو موجود لاستحالة وقوع الفعل من المعدوم. ويستحق

هذه الصفات لنفسه لا لمعان قديمة لبطلان قديم ثان معه، ولا لمعان محدثة لاستحالة حصولها منه أو من غيره من دون حصولها، وهو مدرك للمدركات سميع بصير لثبوت كونه عالماً بتفاصيل المعلومات والمسموعات والمبصرات، [105ب] وهو مرید وكاره لوقوع الفعل منه على وجه دون وجه وفي وقت دون وقت، وهو غني، لأن الحاجة لا تكون إلا لنفع أو لدفع ضرر وهما من توابع اللذة والألم وهما من توابع الشهوة والنفار وهما عرضان محتاجان إلى محل، وهو يتعالى عن ذلك. ولا يصح عليه الرؤية لاستحالة المقابلة أو حكمها عليه، ولا يجوز أن يكون جوهراً أو جسماً أو عرضاً لثبوت قدمه وحدثها أجمع، ولا يجوز أن يدرك بشيء من الحواس، لأنها لا يدرك بها إلا ما كان جسماً أو جوهراً أو عرضاً، وهو يتعالى عن ذلك. وليس له مانية ولا صفة زائدة على ما ذكرناه لاستحالة إقامة دليل على ذلك، وهو واحد لاستحالة وقوع الفعل مع فرض الممانعة من اثنين أو أكثر من ذلك، ولقوله تعالى (قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ) [سورة الإخلاص (112):1]، وهو متكلم لوقوع الكلام منه وكلامه محدث، لأنه مؤلف من الجروف والأصوات المعقولة، ولقوله تعالى (مَا يَأْتِيهِمْ مِنْ ذِكْرٍ مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ مُحَدَّثٍ إِلَّا اسْتَمَعُوهُ وَهُمْ يَلْعَبُونَ) [سورة الأنبياء (21):2]، وهو قادر على القبيح، لأنه قادر لذاته، والقادر للذات غير متناهي المقدر، ولأنه أقدر منا، وهو لا يفعله ولا يريده ولا يأمر به لعلمه بقبحه وغناه عنه، فعلى هذا جميع ما فعله وأمر به وأباحه حسن لا وجه من وجوه القبح فيه.

والنبوة حسنة لا ينفك حسننها من وجوبها، لأنه [106أ] لا يمتنع أن يكون في أفعالنا ما هو مفسدة مقرب إلى فساد وما هو حسن مقرب إلى صلاح، ولا نعلم الفرق بينهما ضرورة، لأن معرفة الله تعالى لا تكون ضرورية، وهذا فرع عليها، والفرع لا يكون أقوى من الأصل فلم يبق يتميز لنا إلا بالبعثة فوجبت البعثة لذلك ولم ينفك وجوبها عن حسننها. والنسخ حسن، لأنه من فعله تعالى، وهو تابع للمصالح وهو جائز عقلاً وواقع سمعاً. والدليل على نبوة نبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم ادعاؤه النبوة وظهور المعجزات عليه، ومعجزاته القرآن العظيم وغيره مما ظهر على يده. ووجه إعجاز القرآن أنه تحدى به العرب مع قدرتهم على الفصاحة الزائدة في النظم والنثر والخطب والشعر فعجزوا عن معارضته وعدلوا عنها إلى الحروب وسفك الدماء، والعاقلة لا يعدل عن الأسهل إلى الأشق إلا للجزع عنه، ولو عرض لنقلت المعارضة لأنها كانت تكون حجتهم، فلما لم تنقل علمنا أنه لم يعارض. والمعجزات الأخر مثل انشقاق القمر وحنين الجذع وتسييح الحصاء وإنباع الماء من بين أصابعه وإطعام الخلق الكثير من الطعام اليسير والعلم بهذه المعجزات كون نقلها متواتراً. وهو معصوم عن المعاصي كلها لظهور المعجزات على يده ولأجل حصول التفسير [106ب] عن قبول قوله عند وقوع المعصية منه والرئاسة (؟) واجبة عقلاً بشرطين، أحدهما ارتفاع العصمة عن المكلفين الآخر لثبوت (؟) التكليف بدليل أن الناس متى كان لهم رئيس مهيب متصرف منبسط اليد (؟) كانوا إلى الصلاح أقرب وعن الفساد أبعد، وهذا معلوم ضرورة. والإمام يجب أن يكون معصوماً، لأنه لو لم يكن كذلك احتاج إلى إمام آخر، وذلك يؤدي إلى القول بأئمة لا نهاية لهم وهو محال، ويجب أن يكون حاوياً صفات الكمال بأسرها لقبح تقديم المفضول على الفاضل، ويجب أن يكون منصوباً عليه لعدم العلم بمن هذه صفته إلا لعالم الغيوب أو يظهر على يده معجز يدل على صدقه. والإمام بعد النبي صلى الله عليه وعلى آله علي بن أبي طالب لحصول النص عليه من الله بقوله تعالى (إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَيُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَهُمْ رَاكِعُونَ) [سورة المائدة (5):55]، وهذه الآية نزلت في علي عليه السلام بإجماع الأمة، وبنص النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم عليه النص الجلي المنقول بالتواتر يوم الدار، وبقول النبي له: أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنه لا نبي بعدي، ومن جملة منازل هارون من موسى الإمامة، وبقوله: من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه. والإمام بعد علي ولده الحسن عليهما السلام

بنص أبيه عليه عند وفاته وبنص النبي عليه وعلى أخيه الحسين عليهما السلام [107] بقوله ولداي هذان إمامان قاما أو قعدا صمتا أو نطقا. والإمام بعد الحسن أخوه الحسين بنص أخيه (?) عليه عند وفاته، وبهذا النص المذكور عن النبي عليهما، وبنص النبي أيضاً عليه بقوله: ولدي هذا إمام بن إمام أخو إمام أبو أئمة تسعة تاسعهم قائمهم. وهذا بعينه دليل على إمامة التسعة من ولده. وصحيفة جابر الأنصاري تُعَيِّن أسماءهم، ونص كل واحد منهم على ولده أيضاً دليل على إمامته، وقول النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم: خلفت فيكم الثقلين، كتاب الله وعترتي أهل بيتي حبلان ممدودان لن يفترقا حتى يردا على الحوض. والأمة بين قائلين، قائل يقول بصحة الإمامة بالاختيار، وقائل يقول بالنص والعصمة، وكل من قال بالعصمة والنص قال أن الأئمة هؤلاء. فالقول بالعصمة والنص وأن الأئمة غير هؤلاء قول ثالث يبطله الإجماع، وقد ثبت وجوب اعتبار النص والعصمة فتعَيِّن القول بإمامتهم وإلا خرج الحق عن الأمة. وغيبة الإمام حسنة، لأنها من فعله وهو معصوم، وإلا يخلو إما أن يكون سببها من الله أو منه أو من الناس. لا جائز أن يكون من الله، لأنه لا يفعل قبيحاً، ولا منه لهذه الحجة أيضاً، فلم يبق إلا أن يكون من الناس والسبب فيها الخوف على النفس فمتى زال الخوف ظهر، والله الموفق للصواب.

تمت والحمد لله رب العالمين وصلواته على سيدنا محمد وآله الطاهرين.

12.

F. 107b

Mas'ala min kalām al-Shaykh al-Mufīd

This text, which deals with the issue of God's being willing, has been edited on the basis of the single manuscript described here in *Muṣannaḥāt al-Shaykh al-Mufīd*, vol. 10, treatise no. 4 (with separate pagination). It is included in *al-Mu'jam al-i'tiqādī* (electronic resource): *Mazīd min al-nuṣūṣ fī tafṣīr ṣifāt Allāh ta'ālā min maṣādir madhhabinā wa-madhāhib al-mukhālifīn*, Markaz al-muṣtafā (s), p. 110. It is possible that the passage is a paraphrase of a similar section included in al-Karājīkī's *Kanz al-fawā'id* (vol. 1, p. 79-81) which is not ascribed to al-Mufīd, though it precedes a section (*faṣl*) entitled *Min kalām shaykhinā al-Mufīd radiya Allāhu 'anhu fī al-irāda* (starting on p. 81; the text of *Kanz al-fawā'id* [vol. 1, p. 78-85] is quoted in *Muṣannaḥāt al-Shaykh al-Mufīd* by the editor as a *takmila* to *Mas'ala min kalām al-Shaykh al-Mufīd*). The authenticity of the text as a statement by al-Shaykh al-Mufīd is uncertain since it relies exclusively on the evidence of the Bodleian codex. The text of the note is as follows:

مسألة من كلام الشيخ المفيد رضي الله عنه
لا يخلو [يخلوا، الأصل] تعالى جده أن يكون مريداً لنفسه أو بإرادة، ولا يجوز أن يكون مريداً
لنفسه، لأنه لو كان كذلك لوجب أن يكون مريداً للحسن والقبيح، وقد دل الدليل على أنه لا يريد
القبيح ولا يفعله. ولا يجوز أن يكون مريداً بإرادة، لأنها لا تخلو [تخلوا، الأصل] من أن تكون
موجودة أو معدومة، ولا يجوز أن تكون معدومة، لأن المعدوم ليس بشيء ولا يوجب لغيره حكماً.
وإن كانت موجودة لم يخل أن تكون قديمة أو محدثة، فإن كانت قديمة وجب تماثلها للقديم تعالى.
وكذلك السوادان والبيضان، فيجب تماثل القديمين كذلك. وأيضاً فلو كان مريداً بإرادة قديمة،
لوجب قدم المرادات بأدلة قد ذكرت في مواضعها، فلم يبق إلا أن يكون تعالى مريداً بإرادة محدثة،

وهذا باطل من حيث كانت الإرادة عند مثبتيتها عرض، والأعراض لا تقوم بأنفسها، ولا بد لها من محل، ولم يخل [تخل، الأصل] محل هذه من أن يكون هو أو غيره، ومحل كونه تعالى محل شيء من الأعراض لقدمه. ولا يجوز أن يكون مريداً بإرادة محدثة تحل في غيره لوجوب رجوع حكمها إلى المحل، ولا يصح أن يكون حكمها راجعاً إلى محلها ويكون تعالى مريداً بها، ووجودها لا في محل غير معقول، وإثبات ما ليس بمعقول يؤدي إلى الجهالات، فثبت أنه مريد مجازاً لا حقيقة، فتأمل ذلك.

F 107b:17

Colophon

تمت المسألة والحمد لله وحده وصلواته على سيدنا محمد وآله الطاهرين علقها العبد الفقير إلى الله تعالى أحمد بن الحسين بن الحلي عفا الله عنه

13.

F. 108a-b

Al-Mas'ala li-Sinān wa-l-jawāb li-l-Sharīf al-Ṭāhir

The title of the responsum is indicated on the upper margin of f. 108a, possibly added by a different hand. The identity of Sinān is uncertain, while the addressee is presumably identical with the above-mentioned 'Alī b. Ṭāhir al-Ṣūrī (see item no. 7). The text of the responsum on the worship of God is as follows:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
مسألة سألت فقلت: من عبد الله من جهة الاسم فقد جهل أكثر مما علم، ومن عبد الاسم والمعنى فقد أشرك، ومن عبد من ليس يعرفه فقد أحال على عدم، ومن قال أنه في خلقه فقد جعل له مكاناً يحويه، ومن قال أنه خارج عن خلقه فقد نفى وجوده، فكيف أعبد ولمن أعبد ولا بد من عبادة؟
الجواب وبالله التوفيق: إن الذي يجب على المكلف عبادته هو المسمى سبحانه، لا الاسم، ولا المعنى، ولا من لا يعرفه، إذ عبادة الاسم وهو غير المسمى توجه لها إلى غير من تحق له، ولا شبهة في جهل فاعل ذلك بل في كفره. وعبادة مجموعي الاسم الذي تحق له والاسم الذي هو غيره، فهذا [وهذا، الأصل] محض الشرك. وعبادة من لا يعرف دالة على جهل فاعلها وكفره، فلم يبق إلا أن المسمى سبحانه هو الذي يجب عبادته، ويلزم المكلفين معرفته وهو محدث الأجسام القادر العالم الحي الموجود لما هو عليه من صفة ذاته في الأزلية لا يزال كذلك في الأبدية، المدرك لكونه حياً ليس به شيء من الآفات، المرید الكاره الذي لا صفة له زائدة على هذه الصفات. ولا يشبه شيئاً من المحدثات ولا يجوز عليه حاجة ولا تدركه حاسة. ولا ثاني له في قدم ذاته، فاعرفه وأخلص في طاعته.

إن قلت: كيف أعرف، قلنا: إذا نظرت في الأجناس المتجددة على الإنسان حالة كونه نطفةً إلى حالة ضعفه وموته، علمت أنه لا بد لها من محدث جدها، وبعلم تقديرها علمنا أن محدثها غيرنا، وصحة الفعل منه يدل على كونه قادراً. وتعرف أنه عالم بصحة الفعل المحكم منه، وبصحة هاتين الصفتين له ثبت كونه حياً موجوداً ويعلم استحقاقه تعالى لهذه الصفات الأربعة فيما لم يزل لاستحالة أن [108ب] يجدها لنفسه أو يجدها له غيره، وإذا كان استنادها إلى مجرد ذاته أو إلى معنى قديم يبطل بأن مجرد الذات يشاركه فيه غيره، والمعنى القديم يبطل بما يبطل به قديم ثان صح استنادها إلى ما هو عليه في الأزلية من صفة ذاته، وحصول مقتضى ومقتضاه منتقب يعلمك أنه لا يزال عليها في الأبدية، واقتضاء كون الحي حياً لكونه مدركاً بشرط وجود المدرك وارتفاع

الموانع والآفات، وكونه سبحانه كذلك يقتضي كونه مدركاً، ووقوع أفعاله على وجه دون وجه آخر وفي حال دون أخرى برهان كونه مريداً، وثبوت كونه ناهياً يدل على كونه كارهاً، وعدم الطريق إلى إثبات صفة زائدة على ذلك ينفي [تنفي، الأصل] ثبوتها له تعالى، وقدمه سبحانه بحيل أن يشبه شيئاً من المحدثات، وبانتفاء جسميته ينتفي انتفاعه واستضراره، وبانتفائها [وإبانتفائها، الأصل] ينتفي حاجته، وعلمك بعدم جواز إثبات ما لا يعقل وأن حكم الإدراك المعقول يختص بالأجسام والأعراض وأنه تعالى [وحيد] في القدم فتأمل ذلك تأمل من طلب الهدى واطرح الهوى تعرف المعبود ونعوته [وبعونه، الأصل] سبحانه. ومع حصول هذه الجملة تفهم الجواب [ومع حصول الجواب تفهم هذه الجملة، الأصل] عن قولك: من قال أنه في خلقه فقد جعل له مكاناً يحويه، ومن قال أنه خارج عن خلقه فقد نفى وجوده، تأمل أيضاً قول أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام: إنه سبحانه مع كل شيء لا بمقارنة و[فرق] كل شيء لا بمزايلة، وقوله عليه السلام: إنه تعالى ليس في الأشياء بوالج ولا عنها بخارج [نهج البلاغة 4-1، تحقيق محمد عبده، بيروت، ج 2 ص 122]. واحذر وأن تتوهمه أو تتهمه، فقد قال أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام: التوحيد أن لا تتوهمه، والعدل أن لا تنتهمه، فهذه جملة كافية في الجواب، والله الموفق للصواب والحمد لله رب العالمين

14.

F. 109a-112b:10

Ḥasan b. Yūsuf b. al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī: *al-Bāb al-ḥādī ʿashar fīmā yaajibū ʿalā ʿāmmat al-mukallaḫīn min maʿrifat uṣūl al-dīn*

The author added this short treatise as the eleventh chapter to his *Minhāj al-ṣalāḥ fī ikhtisār al-miṣbāḥ*. It was completed on 11 Dhū al-Ḥijja 723/11th December 1323. For manuscripts, commentaries, translations and editions of this popular *kalām* text see Schmidtke, *The Theology of al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī*, p. 80-81, no. 36; al-Sayyid ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Tabātabāʾī, *Maktabat al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī*, Qum 1416/[1996], p. 65-71, no. 25; *Muʿjam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 2, p. 7-10, no. 2527; *Dharīʿa*, vol. 3, p. 5-7, no. 4.

f. 112b:11-13

Colophon

... وليكن هذا آخر ما ذكرناه في هذا الباب والله الموفق للصواب تأليف الشيخ الإمام العالم جمال الدين حسن بن يوسف بن المطهر الحلي رحمه الله تعالى قيل إنها نقلت من نسخة بخطه قدس الله روحه ...
علقها العبد الفقير إلى الله تعالى أحمد بن الحسين العودي الأسدي الحلي عفا الله عنه نهار السبت الثالث والعشرين من شهر ذي الحجة من شهور سنة أحد وأربعين وسبعمائة حامداً ومصلياً على رسوله وآله الطاهرين تم

15.

F. 113a-119b

Shihāb al-Dīn Ismāʿīl al-ʿAwdī: versified theological treatise (*naẓm*)

A second manuscript of this text, copied by Muḥammad b. Zayn al-Ābidīn Mūsawī on 12 Muḥarram 1282/6th June 1865, is preserved in a collective manuscript owned by the Āyat Allāh Marʿashī Najafī Library in Qum (MS Marʿashī

2754). One of the editors, Yaʿqūb Jaʿfarī, suggests that this later copy was made from our Bodleian Library manuscript (Introduction, p. 24). The text has been edited twice on the basis of the two known manuscripts, once by Yaʿqūb Jaʿfarī (“Urjūza fī al-kalām”, *Kalām* 4 [1371/1993], p. 20-38), and again by Muḥammad Ridā Anṣārī Qummī (“Urjūza fī sharḥ al-yāqūt fī ʿilm al-kalām”, *Mirāth-i islāmī-yi Irān [Islamic Heritage of Iran]*, ed. Rasūl Jaʿfariyān, vol. 8, Qum 1377/1998, p. 513-533). Neither of the editors consulted a third manuscript of the text, preserved in the Library of the University of Tehran (see *Muʿjam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 1, p. 221-22, no. 742).

F. 119b:16, continued in the margin
Colophon

تمت والحمد لله وحده وصلواته على محمد وآله الطاهرين علقه الفقير إلى الله تعالى [أحمد بن الحسين العودي] السادس وعشرين من شهر ذي الحجة من شهر سنة إحدى وأربعين وسبعمائة أحسن الله تقضيها بمنه وكرمه إن شاء الله تعالى
قوبلت على النسخة المكتوبة بخط المصنف فصحت

16.

F. 120a-121a

Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-ʿAwdī: *Waṣīyya*

No other manuscript of the text is known.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم وصلى الله على سيدنا محمد وآله الطاهرين
هذا ما أوصى به العبد الفقير إلى الله تعالى المحتاج إلى عفو ربه أحمد بن الحسين بن أبي القاسم
بن الحسين بن العودي الأسدي الحلبي:
إنه قدّم بين يديه ذخيرةً وعهداً بقاء الله به حين قدومه على الله تعالى وعلى دار منعوت نعيمها
بالبقاء وخروجه من دار منعوت بالغرور والفناء شهادتين، إحداهما [أحدهما، الأصل] شهادة
أن لا إله إلا الله وحده المنفرد بصفات يستحقها لذاته، وهو كونه قادراً عالماً حياً موجوداً قديماً
سميماً بصيراً، أي عالم بالمسموعات والمبصرات، مريداً وكارهاً، وأنه عدل حكيم لا يفعل القبيح
ولا ما يجري مجراه من الإخلال بالواجب تنزيهاً لذاته عن التشبيه بشيء من سائر موجوداته،
وأنه كلف الخلق لتمام حكمته وإحساناً إليهم وتفضلاً، وأمرهم ونهاهم لتمام لطف التكليف وخلقهم
لغرض يخصهم وهو التكليف لإيصال المنافع وهو الثواب التي لا يحسن الابتداء بمثلها، وبعث
الأنبياء لتمام الحكمة وإعلام المكلفين بتفاصيل التكليف الشرعية. وأشهد أنه خصنا بمحمد صلى
الله عليه وآله محمد بن عبد الله بن عبد المطلب ... رسول [20ب] الله لأنه ظهر على يده المعجز
كالقرآن وغيره تصديقاً لما ادعاه من الرسالة، وأن القيام بشريعته والعمل بها من الواجبات ...
التي لا يجوز الإخلال بها لتمام طاعته، وأن النبي صلى الله عليه وآله معصوم من سائر القبائح
الصغائر والكبائر قبل النبوة وبعدها في حال الأداء وغيره، وأن النبي صلى الله عليه وآله نصب
بعده حافظاً [حافضاً، الأصل] لشريعته ولطفاً لأُمَّته وهو علي بن أبي طالب [بالنص المتواتر
من النبي عليه السلام ولأنه أفضل لقوله تعالى (وأنفسنا وأنفسكم) (3/61)، والجملة مشطوبة في
الأصل] ومساوي أفضل أفضل ولقوله عليه السلام أقضاكم علي ولأنه أعلم [أعلم: إضافة في
هامش الأصل] وأزهد من غيره طلق الدنيا ثلثاً والأدلة لا تحصي كثرة، ثم من بعده ولده الحسن،
ثم الحسين، ثم علي بن الحسين، ثم محمد بن علي، ثم جعفر بن محمد، ثم موسى بن جعفر، ثم علي

بن موسى، ثم محمد بن علي، ثم علي بن محمد، ثم الحسن بن علي، ثم محمد بن الحسن صاحب الزمان عليهم السلام بنص كل سابق على لاحقه وبالأدلة السابقة له. وأشهد أن الموت حق، وسؤال منكر ونكير في القبر حق، والنشور حق، وأن الله يبعث من في القبور، وأن الحساب حق، وأن الصراط والميزان حق، وإنطاق الجوارح وتطير الكتب إلى مكانها، وقد أخبر النبي الصادق بها فيجب الاعتراف بها ومن ذلك الثواب والعقاب [121] وأن الجنة وما قرب (؟) فيها من النعيم حق، والنار وعقابها حق، فأما ما ... بهذا ألقى الله تعالى، وبه أوصيكم سائر الإخوان ومن بعدي، ولا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله العلي العظيم
والحمد لله رب العالمين وصلى الله على سيدنا محمد وآله الطاهرين وسلم تسليماً إلى يوم الدين هذه الوصية قد اشتملت على الأصول الخمسة وهي أصول الإيمان فمن عرفها تحقيقاً كفاه في دخول الجنة وحصول الثواب الجزيل والنجاة من العذاب ومن جهل واحداً منها فهو في أسفل درك الشقاء والعبء أحمد المذكور أولاً مقر بذلك كتب بخطه عفا الله عنه

17.

F. 121b-131b

Al-Khulāṣa fī al-kalām

This Imāmī theological treatise of uncertain authorship was evidently very popular among Twelver Shī‘is from the 7th/13th century, as is indicated by the numerous extant manuscript copies of the text. See R. Mach and E. L. Ormsby, *Handlist of Arabic Manuscripts (New Series) in the Princeton University Library*, Princeton 1987, p. 128-129; *Mu‘jam al-turāth al-kalāmī*, vol. 3, p. 201-2, no. 5662. An additional manuscript of the text is held by the British Library (MS Or. 10968/2, f. 17b-26a).

The text has been edited twice: by Riḍā Mukhtārī and Ya‘qūb ‘Alī Burjī, “al-Khulāṣa fī ‘ilm al-kalām, ta’līf Quṭb al-Dīn Sabzawārī (?)”, *Mīrāth-i islāmī-yi Īrān [Islamic Heritage of Iran]*, ed. Rasūl Ja‘fariyān, vol. 1, Qum 1371/[1992], p. 340-365, and again by al-Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Jalālī, “al-Khulāṣa fī ‘ilm al-kalām. Taṣnīf ... Quṭb al-Dīn al-Sabzawārī”, *Turāthunā* 34 (1413/[1992-1993]), p. 124-226). The latter edition is available online [<http://www.al-jalali.net/books/044/html>] (website consulted 24.04.2006). Neither of the editors consulted the present manuscript for their respective editions.

F. 131a:11-13

Colophon

علقها العبد الفقير إلى الله تعالى أحمد بن الحسين بن أبي القاسم بن العودي الأسدي الحلبي عفا الله عنه وذلك بتاريخ نهار الخميس رابع وعشرين شهر ذي الحجة من شهر سنة اثني وأربعين وسبعمائة

18.

F. 131a:14-16

Excerpt from an unidentified treatise containing a proof for the unity of God. The text of the (partly illegible) excerpt is as follows:

لو فرضنا موجودين واجبي الوجود، فلا بد أن يشتركا في الوجود وقد تباينا في التقديرين (؟)
والمغايرة إذ م به المشاركة مغاير لما به المباينة، فيكون كل واحد منهما مركبا، وكل مركب ممكن،
فإذ لو فرضنا واجبين اللذان يكونان ممكنين وهو محال ... الواجبين محال

19.

F. 131b

Excerpt from a work by Abū Hāmid al-Ghazālī in which he replies to a question on Qurʾān 15:29 and 38:72, being the beginning of his *al-Maḍnūn al-Ṣaghīr*, also known as *al-Ajwiba al-ghazālīyya fī al-masāʾil al-ukhrāwiyya* or *Kitāb al-naḥkh wa-l-taswiya* (Brockelmann, GALS, vol. 1, p. 747, no. 16; M. Bouyges, *Essai de chronologie des œuvres de al-Ghazali (Algazel)*, édité et mis à jour par M. Allard, Beirut 1959, p. 99-100). The text has been printed as item no. 4 in a collective volume of Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Ghazālī's writings entitled *Kitāb iljām al-ʿawāmm ʿan ʿilm al-kalām* published in Cairo in 1309/[1891].

20.

F. 132a-133b

Fragment of forty *ḥadīth* (beginning and end missing)

The fragment is evidently written by a different hand and not an original part of the codex.