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I

The reception of Mutazilî thought within Imâmî Shi'isme2 began in the 3rd/9th century with Abû Ja'far Ibn Qiba al-Râzî (d. Rayy before 319/931)3 and, in the second half of the century, the Banû Nawbakht, particularly Imâmî b. 'All al-Nawbakht (d. 311/924) and al-Hasan b. Mâsû al-Nawbakht (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 Shi'îs5. The first Imâmî scholar under Mu'âtazî influence whose works are partially extant is al-Shaykh al-Mufîd (d. 413/1022). He departed from the traditionalist theological views of his teacher Abû Ja'far Ibn Bâbawayh (d. 381/991) and adopted most of the doctrines of Abû al-Qâsim al-Kâfî al-Balghî (d. 319/931), the prominent theologian of the school of Baghdad6. Al-Mufîd's pupil, al-Shârîf al-Murtaḍî (d. 436/1044) did not share his teacher's preference for the Baghdadîs. As a student of 'Abî al-Jabbâr b. Aţmad al-Hamadhâni (d. 415/1025), head of the Mu'tazili school of Abû Hâshim al-Jubbârî (d. 321/933), the Bahshamiyya, al-Murtaḍî followed the

1. I wish to thank Wilfred Madelung, Camilla Adang, Gregor Schwabe and Hassan Ansari for valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper; Ehsanad Moadarresi for having provided me with a copy of his edition of the fatâwas of Sharaf al-Dîn and al-Mu'taqqî al-Hîlî and Frank Grigilo 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".
5. An additional valuable source for al-Hasan b. Mâsû al-Nawbakhti's Kîtâb al-đrdâ' wa-l-diyyânî, which is otherwise lost is Rûkû al-Dîn Mahmûd b. al-Mâlijîmî's (d. 536/1141) Kîtâb al-muttamad fi nûzûl al-dîn: The extant parts edited and introduced by Wilfred 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 Kîtâb al-đrdâ' wa-l-diyyânî are listed by J. L. Kramers: "al-Nawbakhtî, al-Hasan b. Mâsû", EF, vol. 7, p. 1044.
teachings of this school. The doctrines of the Bahshamiyya remained prevalent among the Twelver Shi'is of the following generations, as was the case for example with al-Murtada's disciple, Shaykh al-Tūfī Abū Ja'far al-Tūsī (d. 459/1067)6.

With al-Murtada the dividing line between Mu'tazili theology and Imāmī doctrine received its final shape. Exempt from Mu'tazili influence were those doctrines in which the general Imāmī dogma proved incompatible with Mu'tazili views, viz. the belief in the Imamate as the very foundation of faith and the concept of belief. Defining ādān as knowledge or asent and verbal confession to the exclusion of works, Twelver Shi'is rejected the Mu'tazili doctrine of mutual annulment of a communication ( específ) and the asent (qiyās), and they denied that the unrepentant grave sinner (fāsiq) holds an intermediary position between the believer and the unbeliever (al-manzila bayn al-manzilayn) and is subject to eternal punishment. Moreover, they affirmed the intercession (šefā'a) of the Prophet and the Imams for the grave sinner of their community. The Imāmī mutakallīmān were also careful to dissociate themselves from the Mu'tazila by explicitly negating any doctrinal dependence, claiming 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 40/660) and, at times, Ja'far b. Șādiq (d. 148/765) to be the true founders of their dogma.7

Towards the end of the 6th/12th century, the teachings of Abū al-Husayn al-Bašrī (d. 436/1044) began to influence the theological thought of the 'Twelver Shi'is. Abū al-Husayn al-Bašrī, who grew up as a Hanafi in law and a Mu'tazili 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 'Ali b. al-Sarnā (d. 418/1027), a disciple of Yahyā b. ʿAdī (d. 363/974)8. He then went to Rayy where he attached himself to Abī al-Jabār to study kalām and legal methodology (ṣāhil al-fiqh), and he is known to have questioned and criticized his teacher in his lectures. While Abī al-Husayn was ostracized by Abī al-Jabār'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'tazili thought. None of his kalām works have survived with the exception of three extensive fragments of his TayṣṢīf al-adillā 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 power.9 The writings of his later follow-up Ruκa al-Dīn Māḥūm b. al-Malāḥīmī al-Khārazmī (d. 536/1141), who lived about a century later, constitute the main source for the reconstruction of Abī al-Husayn's doctrine. These are his Kitāb al-mu'tamād fī ʾisāl al-dīn, the first part of which is a paraphrastic summary of Abī al-Husayn al-Bašrī's TayṣṢīf al-adillā, which is partly preserved,10 his Kitāb al-fī ʾisāl al-dīn, a summary of the Kitāb al-mu'tamād,11 and his Kitāb tuḥṣāt al-mutakallīmin fī al-ruḍū al-fālakīf, a copy of which has recently been discovered.12 Saḥīf al-Dīn Maḥūm b. Abī al-Husayn al-Himṣāshī al-Rūz (d. after 600/1204) is the first Imāmī author known to have adopted the doctrines of Abī al-Husayn al-Bašrī.13


8. His most important kalām works are his commentary on al-Sharīf al-Murtadāh's ʿAṣīr al-dīn wa-l-ṭūnī, kitāb andhū al-ʾisāfī fī 'ilm al-kalām, ed. Abū al-Mulūk al-Bayātī al-Dīnī, Tehran 1362/1981, and his Kitāb al-kāfī fī al-qaysī al-wādī al-ʿānī, Najaf a.d., vol. 2, p. 119f; al-Sharīf al-Murtadāh, al-Amādī 1-2, Beirut 1967, vol. 1, p. 148; the translator's preface to S. Schmidtke, Andsthe-hā-yē kalāmī-kē Ałdīma šīlī, transl. Ahmad Namālī, Mashhad 1999. See also W. Madelung, Mīnanī, p. 18 n. 22; Dīrī 11, p. 24; A. Aḥmadī, Excellence and Precedence: Medieval Islamic Discourse on Legitimate Leadership, Leiden 2002, p. 142. As was the case with their Sunni counterparts, Imāmī mutakallīmān were constantly challenged by traditionalists who rejected all forms of kalām in principle, insisting instead on the necessity of relying exclusively on the hadīth of the Prophet and the Imams. The protagonists of this continuous conflict within Twelver Shi'ism were labelled Akhkhāriyya and Usūliyya, terms that have been employed since the 6th/12th century; see Madelung, Mīnanī, p. 20-21. For a critical discussion of divergent definitions of the Akhkhāri movement and the question of when it emerged, see R. Gleave, Inevitable Doubt: Two Theories of Shīʿi Jurisprudence, Leiden 2000, p. 5f.

The doctrinal views of the Banu 'Awd

II

A noteworthy exception to this trend was a family of scholars, the Banu 'Awd, who flourished during the first half of the 8th/14th century in al-Hilla, one of the centres of Twelver Shi'ite learning at the time. They strictly avoided philosophical positions 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-Malāḥīmī. A collective manuscript (majāţa), written in the hand of Ahmad b. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Awdī between 6 Shabībī 740/6 February 1340 and 24 Dhūl 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 135 leaves (11.93 x 16.50 cm), contains a number of theological and a few legal works. In addition, it contains some writings by various

Wahrnehmung in der spätmittelalterlichen Erkenntnistheorie nach der Darstellung des Taqaddim ann-Naqrā, 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-Shīhī subsequently published an edition of ibn al-Ṭūsī’s work about 1360 (MS. Berlin, Wettstein 1527). That al-Ṭūsī’s ideas were included in later Imāmī theologians is indicated, for example, in al-Naqrā al-Dīn Mayhān al-Baṭrī, Qawā'id al-mar'dār fi 'ilam al-kalām, ed. Ahmad al-Husaynī, Qum 1405/1985, p. 82.


24. See particularly his Qawā'id al-mar'dār fi 'ilam al-kalām.


manuscript includes a doctrinal responsum by a certain al-Sharif al-Tahir, who repeatedly bases his arguments on the Bahshami notion of an attribute of essence (siyfat al-dhâa) (item no. 13). This evidently did not prevent Ahmad b. Sharaf al-Dîn from including this text in the majmû'a.

The 'Awdî's 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 Baghdâdi Mutazîsî, and Abu al-Husayn al-Basrî is reported to have formulated an argument in favor of their position. Later authors argued that he was himself a supporter of the Baghdâdi view on this issue, although it seems that he eventually remained undecided on the matter. Shihab al-Dîn also discussed in his urjûzâ (item no. 15) the question of how it is known that man is the author of his actions, maintaining that this is necessary knowledge (tl'm darârâ): 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 Abu al-Husayn al-Basrî and his followers. The Bahshamiyya had argued that the knowledge that man is the author of his actions is acquired knowledge which follows from the observation that all actions are brought forth in accordance with his motives and aims.

The 'Awdî did not follow Abu al-Husayn al-Basrî in their proof for the existence of the Creator. Sharaf al-Dîn adduces in his creed the traditional kalâm proof that starts out from the temporality of accidents to the temporality of bodies, and argues by analogy between the seen and the unseen world that every generated entity requires a creator (f. 105a). Abu al-Husayn al-Basrî, by contrast, had denied the reality of accidents and had considered the qualities supposedly entailed by accidents as characteristics (akhâm) or states (âhwâl) of the body, replacing the traditional “proof by way of accidents” (darqat al-mâdâni) by the “proof by way of states” (darqat al-âhwâl). More importantly, Abu al-Husayn al-Basrî 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

33. See, for example, Fakhri al-Dîn al-Razi, Muhaqqaq afkar al-mutakaddimîn wa-l-mu'ta'âkhhîrîn, ed. Tâhid Abu al-Kâfir Sad, Beirut 1404/1984, p. 248; Kamal al-Dîn Maytham al-Bahrînî, Qawâ'id al-mardin fî 'ilm al-kalâm, p. 50.

34. Later followers of his doctrines, such as Ibn al-Mâjlabîn and Jâr Allâh al-Zamakhshâri (f. 538/1148) supported the position of the Bahshamiyya. They maintained that God's capability of hearing and seeing is entailed by His being actual. However, a perceivable object exists only when perception is fulfilled. Thus, God is described as eternally capable of hearing and seeing (sâmi' basîr). Yet only when the condition for actual perception is fulfilled, may He be called actually hearing and seeing (zâmi'mu'zâhir). This distinction between the transitive and the intransitive meaning of hearing and seeing originated with Abu Ali al-Jubabi (f. 303/916-16). For references see S. Schmidtke, The Theology of al-'Allâmî al-Hilli, p. 195ff.; S. Schmidtke (ed. trans.), A Mutazite Creed of al-Zamakhsharî (f. 538/1148) (Mutâhâf fi'l-walad ad-dârîn), Stuttgart 1997, p. 20, 38.


57. Ed. Madarresi, p. 138:1-4 (f. 59a:6-9b:2). Al-Muhaqqiq refrains from explicitly naming any group or specific theologian as the upholder of this doctrine.

The doctrinal views of the Banû ‘Awîd

sahba ta‘lliquhâ bihiyyâ; 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 existence. 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-‘Ashârî labelled “eternalists” (azalîyya). A number of theologians tried to formulate a compromise. Abû Yâqûb al-Shâhîm (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 other.

Maintaining that an attribute of essence is attached to an essence independently of its existence through what it is, the Bahshamîs were not confronted with the question of whether a thing may be known prior to its existence. Al-Muhaqqiq rejects the doctrine and the claims it rests upon. None of these, he argues, leads to knowledge ('ilm) or even strong conjecture (zann qawâlî) supporting their position. Al-Muhaqqiq, 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 alms. For unbelief and grave sin can only be ascertained when a person either negates what has been revealed by the Prophet (kufr) or when he acts contrary to what the revealed law prescribes (fâsiq). 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 Muslim. 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 kâfîr or a fâsiq.

Al-Muhaqqiq 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

44. Ed. Madarresi, p. 140:19-22. The relevant section in the manuscript (f. 59b:13f) is badly damaged and the editor could only partly reconstruct the passage.
non-existent claims that God's being known 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 known. 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 omnipotence. Al-Muhaqqiq 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 known, nor explicitly claims that essences are outside God's omnipotence — on the contrary — these objections do not justify the judgment of either unbeliever or grave sin.

Sharaf al-Din blames al-Muhaqqiq in his counter-fatwa for inaccuracies in his outline of the Bahashmi 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 thing. He opens his argumentation by rejecting al-Muhaqqiq'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 other.

For, Sharaf al-Din 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 essence itself into reality (li-anna al-qadar la tata'allaqu bi-ithadh al-dhawi 'indahum wa-innamma tata'allaqu bi-hal yasaminnahad wa-judulad). Moreover, since they describe "states" as something neither known nor unknown (wa-l-akhwil 'indahum la ma'luma wa-l-majhila), they fall into ascribing to God something that is unknown.

The doctrinal views of the Banū al-'Awd

Sharaf al-Din accordingly disagrees with al-Muhaqqiq on the status of the upholders of the view that the non-existent is a real thing. He rejects al-Muhaqqiq's definition of kifr and firs as well as his conclusion that none of the various theses of the enemies 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 kifr as any violation of the definition of the belief (imān) of the people of justice (ahl al-'adl) that includes the basic theological principles of 'Twelver Shi'ism (Mazandar, viz. God and His attributes, divine justice, Muhammad's prophethood and the Imamate of the Imams). Abandoning any of these principles constitutes an infringement of the doctrine of divine unity (wujud) which amounts to plain unbelief. 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 unbelief. To support his view, Sharaf al-Din refers to a number of earlier Imāmī and Mu'tazili authors who, he claims, have similarly argued that the upholder of the said doctrine is an unbeliever, such as al-Shaykh al-Mufid. Shaykh al-Tusi in his (apparently lost) Riḍādat al-taqī, Sadid al-Din al-Ḥimṣama al-Rāzī, Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and Ibn al-Malāhimi (Mahnūd al-Khārajāmī, Sāḥib al-fa'īq).

The discussion about whether or not the non-existent has already lost its reliance among Twelver Shi'is by the 8th/14th century, for the majority of Imāmī theologians since the time of Naṣr al-Din al-Tusi had replaced Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī's concept of the existence by the philosophical notion of essence (māhiyya) and existence (wujud); 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 essence 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 identi-
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 (ishirāk lajšī). For Peripatetics and the majority of Ḥanāfī theologians from the 7th/13th century onwards, by contrast, being is an ambiguous term (bi-t-tashākhkī). Ṣarāf al-Dīn’s fierce condemnation of the Bahshami position in view of the dogmatic outlook of Abū al-Husayn al-Bāṣrī appears therefore somehow anachronistic. That the refusal to adopt the philosophical notion of waq‘ūd was deliberate is evident from the urjāfa by Ṣarāf al-Dīn’s son Shihāb al-Dīn al-Awdī. Therein he outlines the views of the Bahshamiyyas (he speaks of maṣhūdikāt al-mu’tazilā), the Peripatetics and Abū al-Husayn al-Bāṣrī on the issue of existence and clearly supports the view of Abū al-Husayn (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-Awd, with their strict refusal to adopt philosophy into kalām, were quite exceptional in their time. Mainstream Ḥanāfī theology continued to be increasingly influenced by philosophy and later on also by the mystical tradition, as was the case for example with Ḥabīb al-Jumhūr al-Aḥsāʾī (d. after 906/1501).

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)


F. 12b:9-11
Colophon [partly illegible]

2. F. 12b:11-32:4

3. F. 13a:5-55a:9

Al-Nawbkhātī’s book on Shi‘i sects has been edited by Hellmut Ritter (Die Sekten der Schi‘a von al-Hāsan ibn Mūsā an-Nawbkhātī, Istanbul 1931) on the basis of this very majmā’ūd, which he describes in the introduction to the edition (p. v.vii). Ritter misread the name of the scribe as “al-Awmi”. It was evidently on the basis of Ritter’s misreading that the error was repeated by Aḥḥā Buzurg (Dharrīa, vol. 16, p. 179, no. 559; Tabaqat al-dām al-shī‘a, vol. 3, part 2, p. 6) and later scholars such as al-Seyyid Muhammad Rīdā al-Ḥusayny, (“Firaq al-shī‘a, li-l-Nawbakhātī am il-l-Ashāfīr”, Turāthān 1 1405/1984-85), p. 29-51 (p. 34). As Ritter explains in his introduction, the manuscript was first mentioned by D. S. Margoliouth, “Khaṭṭātibya”, Enzyklopaedie des Islam: Geographisches, ethno-graphisches und bibliographisches Wörterbuch der muhammedanischen Völker 1-4, Leiden/Leipzig 1913-1934, vol. 2, p. 1000: “Abū Muhammad al-Hāsan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhātī, Kiti‘ab Firaq Al-Shī‘a (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

بـأ من تكريمه للغـر إلى الله تعالى أحمد بن الحسين الوردي يوم الأحـرام من الشهر الأول من شهر ذهاب الـمبارك سنة أربعين وسعماً وستاً حاضراً، وسيدنا محمد...
6.

F. 92b-97b

أبى جعفر al-Tüsî: Mas'ala fi tahrîm al-fqaa’


F. 97b:2-4

Colophon [partly illegible]

[From: al-Musnad (30/121)]

[From: al-Musnad (30/121)]

7.

F. 97b:5-98b

Brief creed (aqida) by a certain ‘Ali b. Tâhir al-‘Sûrî. No person of this name is mentioned in the Twelver Shi’i biographical literature. Ahmad al-Husaynî suggests in his Ta’rîjîn al-râjîl 1-2, Qum 1414/1993-1994, vol. 1, p. 372, no. 679 that the name as it appears in al-Awfi’s copy is probably an error for Abu ‘Ali al-Husayn b. Tâhir al-‘Sûrî (6th/12th century). It may, however, be the same person as the author of item no. 13 (see below), viz. a certain al-Sharîf al-Tâhirî. On him see Agha Buzurg al-‘I’tidâl, Tabghat al-tâ’i’ir al-shi’â, vol. 2/II, p. 59, 75. Ibn Tâhirî’s views on the subject of muwâda’a (in prayer) are said to have been refuted by Abu ‘Ali al-Hasan b. Mûsârî b. Abî ‘Alî al-‘Sâlihî in the Risâla fi il-mudâqqa (Dhari’a, vol. 21, p. 134, no. 4298). Of his writings, Qa’dâ’ hâqiq al-ikhwân al-mu’mînîn (see Dhari’a, vol. 17, p. 137-38, no. 713) has been edited by Hâmid al-Khaffâfî (Mu’assasat al-bayt li-‘Ithbî al-râjîl: Sâlihîn ma’tâdîr Bihâr al-anwâr, 4. The edition is available online: www.rnfed.net/books/alhlaq/4-moam/index.html [consulted 10/12/2006]). The text of the [partly illegible] ‘aqida is as follows:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الهجة الماركية المكية حديث الإنهاء نطق عن الشيخ علي بن طهار الصوري ... ونور ضريحة

ابن عمره محفزة الأزدي حديث الإنهاء نطق عن الشيخ علي بن طهار الصوري ... ونور ضريحة

اعلم أن معرفة الله تعالى واجبة لأن الإنسان إذا عرف الله تعالى كان أقرب إلى طاعة الله وأبعد من معرفة غيره. وكان الله تعالى ينذر بضرره ولا ينذر بخيره. ولذا، كن في الأملاك، يتمكن أن يكون كن في الشريعة، لأنه ما هو إلا ينتج عن العمل، والعمل هو كل شيء. 

سحابه صغير فيما لا. يدرك مجموع المكتبات، مركز يكون فيه أن ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير. لا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصير ولا ينذر بالخير ولا ينذر بالعاصer
9.
F. 100b–104a
Counter-fatwā by Sharaf al-Dīn al-Ḫusayn al-ʿAwdi, written against the fatwā by al-Muḥaqiq al-Fiḥlī. He insists that the doctrine constitutes unbelief and that its holder must not be given alms (zakāt). Composed apparently after the lifetime of al-Muḥaqiq al-Fiḥlī, who is referred to with the addition of ṭābih an-Nilāḥ (f. 101a:3).

10.
F. 104b:1–11
There is a whole manuscript of this fatwā in the Revardī library. It is likely the copy of the majmūʿa preserved in the Rawḍāt library is intended here (see above n. 59).

11.
F. 105a–107b
Credence by Sharaf al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Qāsim b. al-Ḫusayn b. al-ʿAwdī. No other manuscript of this work is known. The text of the credence is as follows:

Bismillah al-rahmān al-rahim, translated from the French "I testify that there is no god but Allah, and that Muhammad is His Messenger."
البدائلية في الإسلام}

لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة. يمكن أن تكون الصورة غير واضحة أو تحتوي على نص معقد أو غير قابل للقراءة. يرجى تقديم نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي لمساعدتنا في توليد نص بديل.
وهذا دليل من حيث كانت الإرادة عند مثنيت عرض، والأعراض لا تقوم بأفسادها، ولا بد لها من محاولة، وعليه فإن الأسرار محذرة هذه من أن يكون هو غيره، ومن خلال كونه كأنه حكيم في الأعراض يمجد ورجل وهما في الحقيقة عباد نور على وجه آخر، ومثل هذا بأطراف كونه كاهن في الطبيعة، وجميع الأصدقاء بالآلهة، ويعود أن يكون كأنه حكيمًا، وأنه في عباد به ورجل وهما في الحقيقة عباد نور على وجه آخر. 

F. 107b:17
Colophon
تتم السماحة والمجد لله، وصلواته على سيدنا محمد وآلهة الماء، على الله، على الله، على الله... 

F. 108a-b
Al-Ma'sūla li-Sīnān wa-l-jawāb li-l-Shafī' al-Tābir
The title of the responsion is indicated on the upper margin of f. 108a, possibly added by a different hand. The identity of Sīnān is uncertain, while the addressee is presumably identical with the above-mentioned Alī b. Tābir al-Šīrī (see item no. 7). The text of the responsion on the worship of God is as follows:

يسوء الله الرحمن الرحيم
مثاليّةً سالفةً قلّت: من عبد الله من جهة الأرض قد جهل قليل كم صعب واحد. ومن عبد الله من جهة الأرض قد جهل قليل كم صعب واحد. ومن عبد الله من جهة الأرض قد جهل كم صعب واحد. ومن عبد الله من جهة الأرض قد جهل كم صعب واحد. ومن عبد الله من جهة الأرض قد جهل كم صعب واحد. ومن عبد الله من جهة الأرض قد جهل كم صعب واحد. ومن عبد الله من جهة الأرض قد جهل كم صعب واحد. ومن عبد الله من جهة الأرض قد جهل كم صعب واحد.

F. 109a:11-20
Hasan b. Yūsuf b. al-Muṭṭahhar al-Hilli: al-Bāḥ al-ḥādi 'ashar fī mā 'ajabu 'alā 'ammāt al-makallāt fīn min ma'rūf uthal-dīn
The author added this short treatise as the eleventh chapter to his Minhāj al-salāh fī ikhtisār al-mishāb. It was completed on 11 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 723/11th December 1033. For manuscripts, translations, and editions of this popular kalām text see Schmidike, The Theology of al-Āliyā al-Hilli, p. 80-81, no. 36; al-Sayyid Abū Al-Āzīz Tabātabā’ī, Maktabat al-Āliyā al-Hilli, Qum 1416[1996], p. 61-75, no. 21; Mu‘jam al-turāth al-kalāmī, vol. 2, p. 7-10, no. 2527; Dharr’ā, vol. 3, p. 5-7, no. 4.

F. 112b:11-13
Colophon
وأي كن هذا ما كتبته في هذا الكتاب، والله السؤال عن السؤال تأليف الشيخ الإمام العالم جمال الدين بن يوسف بن المطهر الحلبي رحمه الله تعالى، فإنما نقلت من سماحة نفسي، بل بهره الله تعالى تسلمه إلى الله تعالى، واردت في ذلك أن لا تسوء الله وله الطاهرين من

F. 113a-119b
Shihāb al-Dīn Ismā‘īl al-Awdi: versified theological treatise (nasn)
A second manuscript of this text, copied by Muhammad b. Zayn al-Ābedin Mūsawi on 12 Muḥārrah 1282/6th June 1865, is preserved in a collective manuscript owned by the Ayāt Allāh Ma‘ṣūs Narrāfī Library in Qum (MS Ma‘ṣūs Narrāfī...
The doctrinal views of the Banū 'l-Awār

17.

F. 121b-131b
Al-Khulūṣa fī al-kālām

This Imāmī theological treatise of uncertain authorship was evidently very popular among Twelver Shi‘īs from the 7th/13th century, as indicated by the numerous extant manuscript copies of the text. See R. Mach and E. L. Omsby, Handlist of Arabic Manuscripts (New Series) in the Princeton University Library, Princeton 1987, p. 128-129; Muḥammad al-Safidy, colophon, ed. F. 121b-131b. An additional manuscript of the text is held by the British Library (MS Or 10968/2, f. 17b-17a).


F. 131a:11-13
Colophon

عُلِّقَتْ عِيكَ الْفَقْرُ إِلَى اللَّهِ أَنَّبَعَ أَحْمَدَ بْنَ بِنْ عَيْضَارِي بِنْ أَبِي الْقَافِسْ بِنْ الْحُجَّاجِ الأَسْدِيِّ الحَلِيمُ عِنْدَهُ أَنَّكِ بَنْ تَرْتِيب ْعَزُوْذِهِ عِنْدَهُ بِفَضْلِهِ عِنْدَهُ. مَا وَقَعَ مَعْلُوَةَ قُرْبَانِهِ عِنْدَهُ أَنَّهُ عِنْدَهُ أَحْمَدَ بْنَ يُلُوسِيَّةَ بْنِ أَبِي الْقَافِسِ بْنِ الْسَّبْبَهِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ بْنِ الْمُقْتَزَّ مُعْلَمِي أَبِي الْبَنَاءَ بْنِ الْمُدْرَكِ بْنِ النَّافَعِ بْنِ الْمَسْنَوْنِ بْنِ الْحَلِيمِ Bāhla. Q. 97.1-97.11

The text is held by the British Library (MS Or 10968/2, f. 17a-17b).
THREE POLEMIC EXCHANGES AT THE SAFAVID COURT

Devin Stewart
Emory University, Atlanta

Studies of Safavid Iran have shown that immigrant Twelver Shi'i scholars from the region of Jabal 'Amil in Lebanon filled important judicial and religious functions, supported the Shi'i ideology of the Safavid Shabs, and helped to convert a large percentage of the Iranian populace to Twelver Shi'i Islam, translated important works of Twelver Shi'i heritage from Arabic into Persian and made it accessible in commentaries and introductory works. The Amil scholars' ideological support for the Shabs is particularly evident in their defence of Safavid and Twelver Shi'i positions against criticisms levelled by the Ottomans. The following remarks focus on three incidents in which prominent Amil scholars, Husayn b. 'Abd al-Šamad al-Amil and his two sons, Bahá al-Din Muhammad and 'Abd al-Šamad, answered the pointed criticisms of Ottoman ambassadors to the Safavid court during the reign of Shah Tahmásb I (r. 930-84/1524-76) and Shah 'Abbás I (r. 996-1038/1587-1629). These incidents show the complicated relationship between the long and varied tradition of Sunni-Shi'i polemics in the Islamic world and the socio-political circumstances in which particular polemic exchanges occurred. They also explain, in part, the tremendous success of Amil scholars in Iran during the first 130 years of Safavid rule. Even more than their substantial background in Twelver Shi'i religious scholarship, their long experience living and studying with Sunnis, their familiarity with Sunni religious tradition and their skill in debate with Sunni opponents on polemical topics made these scholars in particular attractive to the Safavid Shabs and ensured that they would remain the leading religious authorities in Iran until the mid-seventeenth century.

