

Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī on the Torah and its Abrogation*

Sabine SCHMIDTKE

Abū al-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. al-Ṭayyib al-Baṣrī (d. 436/1045) was a student of *qāḍī al-quḍāt* ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamadhānī (d. 415/1025), the head of the Bahshamiyya, while at the same time being trained in medicine and philosophy. He criticized the principles of the Bahshamiyya in an attempt to correct some of their concepts and arguments in order to defend Mu‘tazilī notions more effectively against objections of their opponents. While Abū al-Ḥusayn was ostracized by his fellow students and later Bahshamī Mu‘tazilīs because of his criticism of ‘Abd al-Jabbār, his thought left a major impact on the later development of *kalām*. Although next to nothing has been preserved of Abū al-Ḥusayn’s theological writings, much of his thought can be reconstructed on the basis of the writings of later followers and, at times, his opponents.¹

It was still during his lifetime that his doctrines came to the attention of Karaite Jews, among whom they soon found many followers. That the Karaites became familiar with Abū al-Ḥusayn’s teachings at a very early stage is indicated by two refutations by the leading Karaite theologian of his time, Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf al-Baṣrī (d. ca. 431/1040), of Abū al-Ḥusayn’s innovative proof for the existence of the Creator.² During the latter third of the 5th/11th century the authoritative Karaite theologian in Egypt, Sahl b. al-Faḍl (Yāshār b. Ḥesed) al-Tustarī, fully endorsed

* This publication was prepared within the framework of the European Research Council’s FP 7 project “Rediscovering Rationalism in the Medieval World of Islam”. Thanks are due to Camilla Adang and Wilferd Madelung for helpful remarks on an earlier draft of this paper.

¹ On Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, see MADELUNG Wilferd (2007), “Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. Three*. Brill, Leiden, Fasc. 2007-1, p. 16-19.

² MADELUNG Wilferd and SCHMIDTKE Sabine (2006), *Rational Theology in Interfaith Communication. Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s Mu‘tazilī Theology among the Karaites in the Fātimid Age*, Brill, Leiden, p. 13-59 [Yūsuf al-Baṣrī’s Refutation of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s Proof for the Existence of God]; *id.* (2007), “Yūsuf al-Baṣrī’s First Refutation (*Naqd*) of Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s Theology,” in ADANG Camilla, SCHMIDTKE Sabine and SKLARE David (eds.), *A Common Rationality. Mu‘tazilism in Islam and Judaism*, Ergon, Würzburg, p. 229-296. – See also MADELUNG Wilferd (2006), “Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s proof for the existence of God,” in MONTGOMERY James E. (ed.), *Arabic Theology, Arabic Philosophy. From the Many to the One. Essays in Celebration of Richard M. Frank*, Peeters, Leuven, p. 273-280.

Abū al-Ḥusayn's criticism of the principles of the school of 'Abd al-Jabbār and encouraged the study of his theology in the Karaite community of Egypt. Three large fragments of Abū al-Ḥusayn's most extensive work on rational theology, *Taṣaffuḥ al-Adilla*, are preserved in the Abraham Firkovitch collection in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, presumably coming from the *geniza* of the Karaite synagogue in Cairo. One of them bears a note in Hebrew stating that the work constitutes an endowment to Yāshār b. Ḥesed al-Tustarī and his descendants.³ Although Yūsuf al-Baṣīr refers in one of his refutations to Abū al-Ḥusayn's other major book on theology, *Kitāb Ghurar al-Adilla*, no fragment of this work has so far surfaced in any of the Karaite repositories.

Within Sunnī Islam, it was apparently the grammarian, physician and man of letters Abū Muḍar Maḥmūd b. Jarīr al-Ḍabbī al-Iṣfahānī (d. 508/1115) who brought the doctrine of Abū al-Ḥusayn to Khwārazm, where it was accepted and spread by Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Malāḥimī al-Khwārazmī (d. 536/1141), the leading Mu'tazilī scholar of his time.⁴ When Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) visited Khwārazm during the second half of the 6th/12th century, he stated that the Bahshamiyya and the school of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī were the only two remaining Mu'tazilī schools in that region.⁵ Abū al-Ḥusayn's *Taṣaffuḥ al-Adilla* was summarized by Ibn al-Malāḥimī in his voluminous *Kitāb al-Mu'tamad fī Uṣūl al-Dīn*. In the introduction Ibn al-Malāḥimī states that he intends to complete his own work in the

³ ABŪ AL-ḤUSAYN AL-BASRĪ (2006), *Taṣaffuḥ al-Adilla*. The extant parts introduced and edited by MADELUNG Wilferd and SCHMIDTKE Sabine, Harrasowitz, Wiesbaden. – On Sahl al-Tustarī, see SCHWARB Gregor (2006), "Sahl b. al-Faḍl al-Tustarī's *Kitāb al-Imā'*," *Ginzei Qedem* 2, p. 61*-105*. On the Tustarī family, see also RUSTOW Marina (2008), *Heresy and the Politics of Community. The Jews of the Fatimid Caliphate*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca/ London.

⁴ Cf. YAQŪT AL-ḤAMAWĪ (1907-26), *The Irshād al-Arīb ilā Ma'rifat al-Adīb; or, Dictionary of Learned Men of Yāqūt*, 7 vol., ed. MARGOLIOUTH David S., Brill, Leiden, vol. VII, p. 147, where Abū Muḍar is simply credited with introducing Mu'tazilism to Khwārazm. Madelung and McDermott suggest that this general statement must be read with caution and that it may have been specifically the thought of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī that was introduced by Abū Muḍar to Khwārazm. See the editors' introduction to IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad (1991), *Kitāb al-Mu'tamad fī Uṣūl al-Dīn*. The extant parts edited by McDERMOTT Martin and MADELUNG Wilferd, al-Hoda, London, p. v; see also LANE Andrew J. (2006), *A Traditional Mu'tazilite Qur'ān Commentary. The Kashshāf of Jār Allāh al-Zamaksharī (d. 538/1144)*, Brill, Leiden, p. 247 sq. – More information about the spread of Mu'tazilism in Khwārazm may be gleaned from an incompletely preserved and still unedited biographical dictionary by the Khwārazmī author Abū al-Karam 'Abd al-Salām al-Andarabānī; see PROZOROV Stanislav M. (1999), "A Unique Manuscript of a Biographical Dictionary by a Khorezmian Author," *Manuscripta Orientalia* 5/2, p. 9-17. The single extant manuscript of the text is part of the collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies (call number: C2387) and in the above-mentioned article, Prozorov announces that he is currently preparing a critical edition of the text.

⁵ FAKHR AL-DĪN AL-RĀZĪ (1398/1978), *I'tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa-al-Mushrikīn*, Maktabat al-Kulliyāt al-Azharīyya, Cairo, p. 42: *wa-lam yabqā fī zamānīnā min sā'ir firaq al-Mu'tazila illā hātān al-firqatān aṣḥāb Abī Ḥāshim wa-aṣḥāb Abī al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī*.

spirit of Abū al-Ḥusayn (the author had died while he was writing the section on the denial of the vision of God by the faithful in paradise), although the work is only partly preserved.⁶ Following the request of his students and friends, Ibn al-Malāḥimī composed an abridgment of the *Mu'tamad*, entitled *Kitāb al-Fā'iq fī Uṣūl al-Dīn*, which is completely preserved and covers the issues of *kalām* in its entirety.⁷ It is likely that in this work Ibn al-Malāḥimī made extensive use of Abū al-Ḥusayn's other systematic *kalām* work, *Kitāb Ghurar al-Adilla*, which is otherwise completely lost. While throughout the *Fā'iq* he refrains from mentioning the work explicitly, Ibn al-Malāḥimī was evidently familiar with *Kitāb al-Ghurar* as is indicated by occasional references to it in the *Mu'tamad*. Ibn al-Malāḥimī further composed a detailed refutation of philosophical doctrines, *Kitāb Tuḥfat al-Mutakallimīn fī l-Radd 'alā l-Falāsifa*, which also contains numerous references to Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and his *Taṣaffuḥ*.⁸

While there is little evidence that the Zaydīs had access to any of the theological writings of Abū al-Ḥusayn himself, they were evidently familiar with the works of Ibn al-Malāḥimī. Zaydīs apparently also had access to another significant text by a later follower of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, viz. the *Kitāb al-Kāmil fī l-Istiḡṣā' fīmā Balaghanā min Kalām al-Qudamā'* by the otherwise unknown Taqī al-Dīn al-Baḥrānī (or al-Najrānī) al-'Ajālī—a systematic comparison between the doctrines of the Bahshamīs and those of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī written between 536/1141 and 675/1276-7, which is preserved in a single manuscript (Leiden, Or. 487).⁹ While the doctrines of the Bahshamiyya remained prevalent among later Zaydīs, the theological writings of Ibn al-Malāḥimī became part of the Zaydī curriculum from the 6th/12th century onwards.¹⁰

⁶ See IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ, *Mu'tamad*, ed. MCDERMOTT and MADELUNG, p. 5, 13-19. – Recently, some additional portions of Ibn al-Malāḥimī's *al-Mu'tamad* have come to light in various private libraries in Yemen, and a revised and enlarged edition of the work is currently being prepared.

⁷ IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ AL-KHUWĀRAZMĪ Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad (2007), *Kitāb al-Fā'iq fī Uṣūl al-Dīn*, edited with an Introduction by MADELUNG Wilferd and MCDERMOTT Martin, (Series in Islamic Philosophy and Theology – Text and Studies) Iranian Institute of Philosophy and Institute of Islamic Studies at the Freie Universität Berlin, Tehran.

⁸ IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ AL-KHUWĀRAZMĪ Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad (2008), *Tuḥfat al-Mutakallimīn fī al-Radd 'alā l-Falāsifa*, edited with an Introduction by ANSARI Hassan and MADELUNG Wilferd, (Series in Islamic Philosophy and Theology – Text and Studies) Iranian Institute of Philosophy and Institute of Islamic Studies at the Freie Universität Berlin, Tehran.

⁹ AL-BAHRĀNĪ [OR: AL-NAJRĀNĪ] AL-'AJĀLĪ Taqī al-Dīn (1420/1999), *Al-Kāmil fī l-Istiḡṣā' fīmā Balaghanā min Kalām al-Qudamā'*, ed. AL-SHĀHĪD al-Sayyid Muḥammad, Wizārat al-Awqāf, al-Majlis al-'A'lā li-al-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyya, Lajnat Ihyā' al-Turāth, Cairo. – See also MADELUNG Wilferd (1985), "Review of EL SHAHED Elsayyed (1983), *Das Problem der transzendenten sinnlichen Wahrnehmung in der spätmu'tazilītischen Erkenntnistheorie nach der Darstellung des Taqīaddīn an-Najrānī*, Berlin," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48, p. 128-129.

¹⁰ Manuscripts of Ibn al-Malāḥimī's *Mu'tamad* and his *Fā'iq* seem to have been preserved exclusively in Yemeni libraries; see the introductions to the respective editions (*supra*, n. 4 and 7). His *Tuḥfa* is preserved

Abū al-Ḥusayn's writings were also closely studied by the Ash'arite theologian Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) who subsequently adopted many elements of Abū al-Ḥusayn's thought which he interpreted in the light of the doctrine of his own school. However, although al-Rāzī evidently had access both to Abū al-Ḥusayn's and Ibn al-Malāḥimī's writings on *kalām* and was intimately familiar with their doctrines, his presentation of Abū al-Ḥusayn's thought must be read with caution, as his aim is to show the inconclusiveness of his doctrine. Rāzī's writings nevertheless constitute a valuable source for the reconstruction of Abū al-Ḥusayn's views, as they contain extensive quotations from the latter's works—both the *Ghurār* and the *Taṣaffuḥ*—as well as quotations from works by Ibn al-Malāḥimī which are lost (as, e.g., his *Kitāb fī l-Ḥudūd*).¹¹

Twelver Shī'ites, who, like the Zaydīs, had been under Mu'tazilite influence since the 3rd/9th century, were initially reluctant to adopt the doctrinal views of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī. Their animosity presumably resulted from the latter's refutations 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. Abū al-Ḥusayn's refutations were known to and criticized by a number of Imāmī scholars, viz. Abū 'Alī Ḥamza Salār b. 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Daylamī (d. 463/1070-71)¹² and Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Karājaki (d. 449/1057-58).¹³ Moreover, 'Abd al-Jalīl b. Abī al-Faṭḥ al-Rāzī is known to have composed a *Naqḍ al-Taṣaffuḥ li-Abī l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī*, apparently a refutation of the latter's views as laid down in the *Taṣaffuḥ al-Adilla*.¹⁴ None of the refutations mentioned is extant.

in a single manuscript that was discovered in Lucknow, India. It is a late 12th/17th century copy from an earlier copy dated Rajab 693/June 1244. To judge by the formulas of blessing used, the scribe of this *Vorlage* was a Zaydī.

¹¹ These can particularly be found in his still unedited *Nihāyat al-'Uqūl fī Dirāyat al-Uṣūl*, one of his earlier comprehensive *kalām* works. – On the chronology of Rāzī's theological writings, see SHIHAEH Ayman (2005), "From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī: 6th/12th Century Developments in Muslim Philosophical Theology," *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 15, p. 141-179; GRIFFEL Frank (2007), "On Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Life and the Patronage he Received," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 18/3, p. 313-344.

¹² Cf. ĀGHĀ BUZURG AL-ṬIHRĀNĪ Muḥammad Muḥsin (1403-6/1983-86), *Al-Dharī'a ilā Taṣānīf al-Shī'a*, 25 vol., Dār al-Aḍwā', Beirut, vol. X, p. 179-80, n° 378; AL-LAJNA AL-'ILMIYYA FĪ MU'ASSASSAT AL-IMĀM AL-ŠADIQ (1423/1381/2002), *Mu'jam al-Turāth al-Kalāmī. Mu'jam yatanāwalu dhikr asmā' al-mu'allafāt al-kalāmīyya (al-makḥṭūāt wa-al-maṭbū'āt) 'abra al-qurūn wa-al-maktabāt allatī tatawaffaru fīha nusakḥuhā*, 5 vol., Intishārāt Tawḥīd, Qum, vol. III, p. 366, n° 6477.

¹³ *Risālat al-Tanbīh 'alā Aghlāt Abī al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī*, cf. AL-ṬABĀTABĀ'Ī al-Sayyid 'Abd al-'Azīz (ed.) (1416), "Maktabat al-'Allāma al-Karājaki li-Aḥad Mu'āṣirihī," *Turāthunā* 43-44, p. 393; *Mu'jam al-Turāth al-Kalāmī*, vol. II, p. 333-34, n° 4022.

¹⁴ See IBN BĀBUYA AL-QUMMĪ Muntajab al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. 'Ubaydallāh (1406/1986), *Fihrist Asmā' 'Ulamā' al-Shī'a wa-Muṣannifihim*, ed. AL-ṬABĀTABĀ'Ī al-Sayyid 'Abd al-'Azīz, Dār al-Aḍwā', Beirut, p. 100, n° 226; ĀGHĀ BUZURG AL-ṬIHRĀNĪ, *Dharī'a*, vol. XXIV, p. 286, n° 1466; *Mu'jam al-Turāth al-Kalāmī*, vol. V, p. 410, n° 12248.

Towards the end of the 6th/12th century Abū al-Ḥusayn's doctrinal views began to influence Twelver Shī'ī *kalām*. Soon they replaced the earlier-held doctrines of the Bahshamiyya. Both Abū al-Ḥusayn's *Ghurar al-Adilla* and his *Taṣaffuḥ al-Adilla* were used extensively by Sadīd al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. 'Alī al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī (d. after 600/1204), one of the first Imāmī Shī'ites to adopt the teachings of Abū al-Ḥusayn. Ḥimmaṣī's acquaintance with the writings of Abū al-Ḥusayn is indicated by the numerous references to and quotations from both works throughout his comprehensive *kalām* treatise, *al-Munqidh min al-Taqlīd*, completed on 9 Rabī' I 581/9 June 1185 (in many cases Ḥimmaṣī simply refers to or quotes from Abū al-Ḥusayn without naming any specific work title).¹⁵ Ḥimmaṣī also made frequent use of Ibn al-Malāḥimī's *Kitāb al-Fā'iqa*, whom he usually calls *Ṣāhib al-Fā'iqa*, though there are no indications that he also had the latter's *Kitāb al-Mu'tamad* at his disposal. Ḥimmaṣī may have introduced the writings of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and Ibn al-Malāḥimī to Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī who had, according to Twelver Shī'ī sources, studied with him for some time.¹⁶ It is therefore possible that al-Fakhr al-Rāzī was familiar with Ḥimmaṣī's writings, particularly his major work in the field of *kalām*, *al-Munqidh min al-Taqlīd*.

Ḥimmaṣī's numerous references to and quotations from Abū al-Ḥusayn provide valuable insights into the latter's otherwise completely lost *Kitāb al-Ghurar* and

¹⁵ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ AL-RĀZĪ Sadīd al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. 'Alī (1412-1414/1991-1993), *Al-Munqidh min al-Taqlīd*, ed. AL-YUSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ M. H., 2 vol., Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, Qum. For a list of extant manuscripts, see *Mu'jam al-Turāth al-Kalāmī*, vol. V, p. 305 as well as www.aghazoz.org.ir [accessed 17/11/2008]. In *Mu'jam al-Turāth al-Kalāmī* a second, earlier edition of the work is mentioned, prepared by 'Abd Allāh al-Nūrānī, Qum 1407. This information could not be verified by the present writer. – For the *Munqidh min al-Taqlīd* and its author, see also AL-'ĀMILĪ AL-ḤURR Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (1385/1965), *Amal al-Āmil*, ed. AL-ḤUSAYNĪ Aḥmad, 2 vol., Maktabat al-Andalus, Baghdad, vol. II, p. 316, n° 963; AL-AMIN Muḥsin (1403/1983), *A'yān al-Shī'a*, ed. AL-AMIN Ḥasan, 11 vol., Dār al-Ta'āruf, Beirut, vol. X, p. 105-107; AL-AMIN Muḥsin (1408-15/1987-95), *Mustadrakāt A'yān al-Shī'a*, ed. AL-AMIN Ḥasan, 6 vol., Dār al-Ta'āruf, Beirut, vol. I, p. 218-219; ĀGHĀ BUZURG AL-ṬĪHRĀNĪ, *Dhart'a*, vol. I, p. 249, n° 1312; vol. III, p. 60, n° 166; vol. III, p. 333, n° 1209; vol. IV, p. 222, n° 1114; vol. IV, p. 222, n° 1116; vol. XXI, p. 65, n° 3970; vol. XXI, p. 95, n° 4101; vol. XXIII, p. 151-152; vol. XXIV, p. 290-291, n° 1507; ĀGHĀ BUZURG AL-ṬĪHRĀNĪ Muḥammad Muḥsin (n.d.), *Ṭabaqāt A'lām al-Shī'a*, vol. II, ed. MUNZAWĪ 'Alī Naqī, Mu'assasat Ismā'īliyyān, Qum, part 2, p. 295; IBN AL-MALĀHIMĪ, *Mu'tamad*, ed. McDERMOTT and MADELUNG, introduction, p. viii; AL-QUMMĪ 'Abbās b. Muḥammad Riḍā (1376/1956), *Al-Kunā wa-al-Aḳāb*, 3 vol., al-Maṭba'a al-Haydariyya, Najaf, vol. II, p. 175-176; KOHLBERG Etan (1992), *A Medieval Scholar at Work. Ibn Ṭawūs and his Library*, Brill, Leiden, p. 75, 354-355, n° 590; AL-BAHRĀNĪ Yūsuf b. Aḥmad (1386/1966), *Lu'lu'at al-Bahrayn*, ed. BAHR AL-'ULUM Muḥammad Ṣādiq, Maṭba'at al-Nu'mān, Najaf, p. 348-349, n° 117; AL-NĪ'MĀ 'Abd Allāh (1962), *Falāsifat al-Shī'a. Ḥayātuḥum wa-Ārā'uḥum*, Dār Maktabat al-Hayāt, Beirut, p. 542-544; AL-KHWĀNSĀRĪ Muḥammad Bāqir (1382-/1962-), *Rawḍat al-Jannāt fī Aḥwāl al-'Ulamā' wa-al-Sādāt*, ed. RAWḌĀTĪ Muḥammad 'Alī, 8 vol., Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, Tehran, vol. VII, p. 158-164, n° 618; AL-AFANDĪ 'Abd Allāh b. 'Isā (1401/1981), *Riḳāḍ al-'Ulamā' wa-Hiyāḍ al-Fudalā'*, ed. AL-ḤUSAYNĪ Aḥmad, 5 vol., Maktabat Āyat Allāh al-Mar'ashī al-'Āmma, Qum, vol. V, p. 202-203.

¹⁶ See the editor's introduction to *al-Munqidh min al-Taqlīd*, vol. I, p. 5-12.

its characteristics. These are at times confirmed both by Ibn al-Malāhimī's *Fā'iḡ* which in some sections at least shows striking similarities and at times even verbatim correspondences with Ḥimmaṣī's *Munqidh*, and occasionally by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī in some of his writings. One of the noteworthy characteristics of the *Kitāb al-Ghurar* is its author's unusual familiarity with the Bible and Christian and particularly Jewish exegesis. This can clearly be seen in the section of Ḥimmaṣī's *Munqidh* devoted to Biblical predictions of the advent of the prophet Muḥammad¹⁷ and from a lengthy passage in Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Qur'ān commentary *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*,¹⁸ both of which are apparently entirely based on Abū al-Ḥusayn's *Ghurar*. That the work was exceptional in this respect is also suggested by Mas'ūd b. 'Umar al-Taftazānī (d. 793/1390) in his *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid*.¹⁹ In his discussion of the Biblical predictions of the advent of the prophet Muḥammad in his *Ghurar al-Adilla*, Abū al-Ḥusayn relies extensively on an apologetic tract in support of Islam entitled *Kitāb al-Dīn wa-l-Dawla*, by the Nestorian convert to Islam Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Sahl Rabbān al-Ṭabarī (d. ca. 251/865),²⁰ and he mentions that he had contacts with Jewish interlocutors who informed him about questions relating to the Bible and introduced him in some cases to the original Hebrew text, as is indicated by one Biblical quotation that is also given in the original language (though in the edition it is transcribed into Arabic characters).²¹

¹⁷ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YUSUFI AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 504 sqq.

¹⁸ AL-RĀZĪ Fakhr al-Dīn (n.d.), *Al-Taḥṣīn al-Kabīr* [= *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*], 32 vol., Tehran, juz' 3, p. 36, 2 – 39, 10.

¹⁹ AL-TAFTAẒĀNĪ Mas'ūd b. 'Umar (1409/1989), *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid*, 5 vol., ed. 'UMAYRA 'Abd al-Raḥmān and SHARAF Ṣāliḥ Mūsā, 'Ālam al-Kutub, Beirut, vol. I, p. 43, 13-14: *wa-la-qaḍ jama'a Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī fī Kitāb Ghurar al-Adilla mā yūqifū min nuṣūṣ al-tawrāh 'alā ṣiḥḥat nubuwwat Muḥammad (ṣal'am)*. An earlier reference to Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's *Talkhīṣ al-Muḥaṣṣal* (p. 43, 11) suggests that Taftazānī is quoting this remark from the latter work, which is, however, not the case.

²⁰ See ADANG Camilla (2007), "A Rare Case of Biblical 'Testimonies' to the Prophet Muḥammad in Mu'tazilī Literature. Quotations from Ibn Rabbān al-Ṭabarī's *Kitāb al-Dīn wa-al-Dawla* in Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī's *Ghurar al-Adilla*, as preserved in a work by al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī," in ADANG, SCHMIDTKE and SKLARE (eds.), *A Common Rationality*, p. 297-330. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's use of Ibn Rabbān's *Kitāb al-Dīn wa-al-Dawla* had already been noted by Moshe Perlmann in his PhD dissertation, *A Study of Muslim Polemics Directed Against the Jews*, PhD thesis, University of London, September 1940, p. 97, and in PERLMANN Moshe (1941), "Note on the authenticity of 'Alī Ṭabarī's 'Book of Religion and Empire'," *The Moslem World. A Christian Quarterly Review of Current Events, Literature & Thought Among Mohammedans* 31/3, p. 308 [republished in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library Manchester* 26/2 (May-June, 1942), p. 246]; see also my "Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and his transmission of biblical materials from *Kitāb al-Dīn wa-al-Dawla* by Ibn Rabbān al-Ṭabarī: The evidence from Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*," in *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, (forthcoming). The evidence given by Ḥimmaṣī and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī that Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī was using Ibn Rabbān's *al-Dīn wa-al-Dawla* is further corroborated by Zaydī sources. See my "The Zaydī Reception of Biblical Materials from Ibn Rabbān al-Ṭabarī's *Kitāb al-Dīn wa-l-Dawla*" (forthcoming).

²¹ In his *Mu'tamad*, Ibn al-Malāhimī quotes from the *responsa* of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī to a certain Dāwūd b. Sulaymān (also Dāwūd b. Abī Sahl) al-Miṣrī. The name may suggest that the questioner was a Jew or

Close familiarity with the Bible and Jewish tradition is also evident in Ḥimmaṣī's discussion of abrogation (*naskh*) in which he polemicizes against the Jews who refuse to accept that the Qur'ān abrogates the Mosaic revelation and the legal rulings it contains.²² Although the references to Abū al-Ḥusayn are less frequent in this section compared with the section on Biblical predictions of the advent of Muḥammad, and no explicit mention is made of the *Kitāb al-Ghurar*, there is good reason to assume that the entire chapter is again a close adaptation of the relevant chapter from Abū al-Ḥusayn's *Ghurar al-Adilla*. The wording of the only reference to Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī²³ suggests that large portions of this chapter are taken from one of his works. Moreover, the corresponding, albeit briefer, chapter in Ibn al-Malāḥimī's *Kitāb al-Fā'iq*,²⁴ with striking parallels in structure and often verbatim correspondences to Ḥimmaṣī's *Munqidh*, suggests that both Ibn al-Malāḥimī and Ḥimmaṣī were drawing on the same source, viz. Abū al-Ḥusayn's *Kitāb al-Ghurar*, the only theological work of his in which this issue had been covered. The theoretical possibility that Ḥimmaṣī had the *Fā'iq* as his source can safely be excluded since the entire chapter in the *Fā'iq* is much more concise than the corresponding chapter of the *Munqidh*. Moreover, Ibn al-Malāḥimī also explicitly relies on Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī when adducing examples from the Bible and Jewish exegesis. The explicit reference occurs in a lengthy section within this chapter, which runs largely parallel in the *Munqidh* and in the *Fā'iq*.²⁵ Abū al-Ḥusayn's unusual familiarity with the Bible and Jewish tradition, together with his detailed polemical refutation of the Jewish position, may also explain why his *Ghurar al-Adilla* was apparently less popular with the Jews than was the case with his *Tasaḥḥuf al-Adilla*.

Both al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī and Ibn al-Malāḥimī open the chapter with a list of Jewish groups, as was typical for the *kalām* tradition (both Mu'tazilite and Ash'arite); the distinction between the Jewish *firaq* was only made with regard to their position on abrogation (*naskh*).²⁶ According to Ḥimmaṣī, the following three views were

perhaps a Jewish convert to Islam. Coming from Egypt, he presumably became a disciple of Abū al-Ḥusayn, posing questions to him. See MADELUNG and SCHMIDTKE, *Rational Theology in Interfaith Communication*, p. 9. Dāwūd may have been the Jewish interlocutor referred to by Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī. – He may be identical with Abū Sulaymān David b. Bapshād, son of a Persian Karaite and a wealthy patron of Karaite learning in Fustāt. See on him RUSTOW, *Heresy and the Politics of Community*, p. 148 sq.

²² AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YUSUFI AL-GHARAWI, vol. I, p. 430-40: *Al-Qawl fī naskh al-sharī'a*. The text with some corrections is also offered in the Appendix to this contribution. In the following, reference will always be given both to the Qum edition and to the respective paragraphs of the text in the Appendix.

²³ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 434, 14 (= § 6): *wa-dhakara al-Shaykh Abū al-Ḥusayn annahu qāla lahu ba'd al-Yahūd*.

²⁴ IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ, *K. al-Fā'iq*, ed. MADELUNG and McDERMOTT, p. 355-360: *Bāb fī dhikr shubah al-munkirīn li-nubuwwatihī 'alayhi al-salām wa-al-jawāb 'anhā*.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 357: *wa-ḥakā shaykhunā Abū al-Ḥusayn 'an al-Tawrāt aḥkāman qarana bihā al-ta'bīd ...*

²⁶ Cf. WASSERSTROM Steven M. (1985), *Species of Misbelief. A History of Muslim Heresiography of the Jews*. PhD thesis, University of Toronto, p. 16 and *passim*.

maintained by the different Jewish groups:²⁷ (1) the abrogation of the law revealed to Moses is not permissible from a rational point of view (*naskh al-sharī'a ghayr jā'iz 'aqlan*); (2) abrogation is conceivable from the point of view of reason, yet impossible on scriptural grounds; (3) both reason and scripture allow the possibility of the abrogation of the Mosaic law in principle. However, the upholders of this view did not acknowledge Muḥammad's prophethood and denied that his scripture abrogated the Bible since his claim to prophethood was not confirmed by a miracle (*mu'jiz*) or any other proof (*dalāla*). Ibn al-Malāḥimī presents a shorter list that does not include the last mentioned view.²⁸

Both authors open their reply with a definition of *naskh*,²⁹ followed by a justification—very detailed in the *Munqidh*,³⁰ much briefer in the *Fā'iq*³¹—as to why *naskh* is reasonable, and a distinction between abrogation (*naskh*) and a change of intent on the part of God (*badā'*). Their elaborations agree with the answers of earlier Mu'tazilite authors to the Jewish opponents who do not allow the possibility of abrogation from the point of view of reason—the first group of Jews according to Ḥimmaṣī's and Ibn al-Malāḥimī's list of Jewish *firaq*.

Whereas Ibn al-Malāḥimī concludes the refutation of the first Jewish position at this point, turning now to those who allow abrogation on rational grounds while considering it inconceivable on scriptural ones,³² Ḥimmaṣī adds Biblical proofs for the permissibility of abrogation on rational grounds. He starts out mentioning four cases of abrogation that can be observed in the Hebrew Bible:³³ (1) Jacob was allowed to be married to two sisters simultaneously (Leah and Rachel, referring to Gen. 29, 1-30, esp. 21 *sqq*), while this custom was prohibited at the time of Moses (*cf.* Lev. 18, 18); (2) God granted Noah that “every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things,”³⁴ the only exception being “flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat,” (Gen. 9, 3-4, which is rendered in an abbreviated version as follows: *innī qad ja'altu kull dābba ḥayya ma'kalan laka wa-li-dhurriyyatika wa-aṭlaqtu ka-dhālika lakum kull nabāt al-'ushb mā khalā al-dam fa-lā ta'kulūhu*) while at the time of Moses many living beings were forbidden for consumption; (3) the sons of Adam were allowed

²⁷ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YŪSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 430, 3 – 11.

²⁸ IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ, *K. al-Fā'iq*, ed. MADELUNG and MCDERMOTT, p. 355, 10 – 14.

²⁹ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YŪSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 430, 11 – 431, 10; IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ, *K. al-Fā'iq*, ed. MADELUNG and MCDERMOTT, p. 355, 15 – 357, 4.

³⁰ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YŪSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 431, 11 – 433, 13.

³¹ IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ, *K. al-Fā'iq*, ed. MADELUNG and MCDERMOTT, p. 355, 15 – 357, 4.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 357, 5 *sqq*.

³³ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YŪSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 433, 14 – 434, 11 (= § 1-4).

³⁴ Unless otherwise stated, the King James Version has been used for Biblical quotations.

to marry Adam's daughters (*cf.* Gen. 5, 1-30), a custom that was forbidden at the time of Moses (*cf.* Lev. 18, 6-9); (4) whereas at the time of Joshua God ordered the Children of Israel to set up the tabernacle of the congregation first in mount Ebal (according to an earlier command to Moses; *cf.* Deut. 27, 4 *sqq.*; Josh. 8, 30-33) and then at Shiloh (*cf.* Josh. 18, 1), this was later on replaced by Salomon's temple, with the direction of prayer being changed accordingly. Ḥimmaṣī's detailed description of this case contains Biblical material taken from Exod. 16, 35; II Sam. 6, 1-17; II Sam. 7; I Kings 6; II Kings 23 and I Chron. 22 and 28.³⁵

A reference at the end of these four cases to Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, pointing to an explanation he was given by Jewish informants on the last mentioned case,³⁶ suggests that all four cases adduced in this section originated with Abū al-Ḥusayn.

Moreover, while it was common for Muslim writers to list cases of alleged abrogation in the Bible as proof that abrogation is conceivable on rational grounds, and while some of the four cases adduced by Ḥimmaṣī and most likely already by Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī were known to earlier authors,³⁷ the exact quotation of the relevant Biblical passage in example (2) and the very detailed exposition of example (4) is apparently without precedent in earlier Muslim literature.

The same applies to the two examples next adduced by Ḥimmaṣī (most likely again drawing on Abū al-Ḥusayn's *Ghurar* although no reference is given) in order to prove that before the time of Moses there had already been legal provisions that were subsequently abrogated by the Mosaic law.³⁸ While earlier authors were familiar with and had employed this argument, Ḥimmaṣī's—and most likely Abū al-Ḥusayn's—intimate familiarity with the relevant Biblical passages seems again to be without precedent. The first example refers to Noah and what God had imposed on him as retaliation for murder. It includes a quotation of Gen. 9, 6, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man,"

³⁵ Ibid., vol. I, p. 433, 14 – 434, 13 (= § 3).

³⁶ Ibid., vol. I, p. 434, 14 (= § 6): *dhakara al-Shaykh Abū al-Ḥusayn annahu qāla lahu ba'd al-Yahūd inna ...*

³⁷ See, e.g. MĀNAKDİM (1416/1996), [*Ta'liq*] *Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Khamsa*, ed. 'UTHMĀN 'Abd al-Karīm [as a work by 'Abd al-Jabbār], Maktabat Wahba, Cairo, p. 579, where three cases are mentioned, among them (1) and (3) referred to by Ḥimmaṣī. – Among Jewish authors, an extensive list of ten cases adduced by defenders of abrogation is given by SA'ADYA GAON (5730/1970), *Kitāb al-Mukhtār fī al-Amanāt wa-al-I'tiqādāt* (Arabic and Hebrew), ed. QAFIḤ Yosef, Sūra, Jerusalem/ New York, p. 139-43 (*id.* [1948], *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, tr. from the Arabic and the Hebrew by ROSENBLATT Samuel, Yale Univ. Press, New Haven/ London, p. 167-73). Cases (3) and (4) referred to by Ḥimmaṣī are listed by Sa'adya as (1) and (10). – The ten cases listed by Sa'adya may have originated with the Jewish sceptic of the second half of the 9th century C.E., ḤIWĪ al-Balkhī; *cf.* ROSENTHAL Judah (1947-48), "Ḥiwī Balkhī. A Comparative Study," *Jewish Quarterly Review* NS 38, p. 329-31; ADANG Camilla (1996), *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible. From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm*, Brill, Leiden, p. 201 *sq.*

³⁸ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YŪSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 434, 19 – 435, 1 (= § 6).

followed by the Hebrew original in transliteration. The passage is identified as being taken from *al-juz' al-thānī min al-sifr al-awwal min al-tawrāh*, which is correct as the verse belongs to *Parashat Noah*, the second portion of the Book of Genesis. The second example is a (paraphrastic) quotation from Gen. 17, 12 (*al-juz' al-thālith min al-sifr al-awwal*, correctly indicating *Parashat Lech Lecha*, the third portion of the Book of Genesis) stating that Abraham was ordered to circumcise the newly born when he is eight days old (*idh shara'a 'alā Ibrāhīm 'alayhi al-salām khitānat al-mawlūd fī l-yawm al-thāmin min mlādihī*).

The section is concluded by the following *ilzām* questions addressed to the Jewish opponents.³⁹ Once it has been established that there existed a (revealed) law prior to the Mosaic revelation, did the law revealed to Moses contain any additions to what had been revealed before or not? If this were not the case, the Mosaic revelation would have been futile (*'abath*) and therefore could not have been of divine origin, which, of course, constitutes unbelief for the Jews. If it did contain something additional to the formerly revealed legal rulings, this must imply that it contains prohibitions of what had formerly been permitted. Even if the Jews deny this, the example (and here a third example is referred to) of the Sabbath confirms this: the Torah prohibits working on the Sabbath whereas this had been permitted before. This section echoes debates among earlier Jewish authors on the issue whether God may add precepts to His revealed law. Both the Rabbanite Sa'adya Gaon (d. 942 C.E.) and the Karaite Abū Yūsuf al-Qirqisānī (fl. first half 10th c. C.E.) allowed this possibility arguing that God's adding (but not removing) precepts to the earlier laws at the time of Moses (Sa'adya) or, in theory at least, even after the time of Moses (al-Qirqisānī) does not constitute abrogation.⁴⁰ To what extent Ḥimmaṣī— or Abū al-Ḥusayn— was familiar with the writings of earlier Jewish thinkers or whether he got to know these arguments through contacts with Jewish interlocutors, cannot be decided.

Both Ibn al-Malāḥimī and al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī deal next with the second Jewish group, viz. those who consider abrogation to be conceivable on rational grounds while holding that scripture prevents it.⁴¹ The principal Jewish argument for this position were Biblical passages supporting the eternal validity of the Mosaic law,⁴² and among earlier Muslim (Mu'tazilite) authors, the Biblical injunction to keep the Sabbath *forever* was the best—often the only—known passage among these. The relevant Biblical passage is Exod. 31, 13-17 which is rendered by Ḥimmaṣī and

³⁹ Ibid., vol. I, p. 435, 2-11 (= § 8).

⁴⁰ Cf. ADANG, *Muslim Writers*, p. 198-210.

⁴¹ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YUSUFI AL-GHARAWI, vol. I, p. 435, 12 *sqq.* (= § 9 *sqq.*); IBN AL-MALĀHIMI, *K. al-Fā'iq*, ed. MADELUNG and McDERMOTT, p. 357, 5 *sqq.*

⁴² See, e.g., SA'ADYA GAON, *Beliefs and Opinions*, tr. ROSENBLATT, p. 157 *sqq.*

Ibn al-Malāḥimī in conformity with most earlier Muslim authors in an abbreviated version as *tamassakū bi-al-sabt abadan*. Both authors add the exact wording of the Biblical text for the term *abadan*, “eternally”, stating: *tamassakū bi-al-sabt ‘ahdan lakum wa-dhurriyyatikum al-dahr, aw [qāla]: mā dāmat al-samawāt wa-al-arḍ* which is rarely found in earlier Muslim sources.⁴³ The first of the two alternatively given renderings is an exact translation of the relevant Hebrew text of Exod. 31, 16 “[Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath] throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant” (ושמרו בני-ישראל את-השבת לעשות את-השבת לדרתם ברית עולם). The alternative rendering, *mā dāmat al-samawāt wa-al-arḍ*, is not used in the Biblical context for the Sabbath but is frequently employed in the Bible to designate the eternal validity of the Mosaic law (e.g., Exod. 20, 11 or Exod. 31, 17).

Ḥimmaṣī and Ibn al-Malāḥimī counter the Jewish claim for the eternal validity of the Mosaic law in two ways. They first adduce the characteristic Muslim response according to which in the course of history the transmission of the Biblical text has been interrupted so that the Torah that the Jews possess nowadays is not identical with the one that had been revealed to Moses.⁴⁴

The second strategy to counter the Jewish claim is more unusual for Muslim writers at the time of Ibn al-Malāḥimī, Ḥimmaṣī—and, certainly, Abū al-Ḥusayn, their likely source—, both in its argumentation and the accuracy of the scriptural evidence that is adduced to support the argumentation. The argument is that although there are numerous and frequent expressions in the Biblical text with the literal meaning of eternity, they should not be understood as such but are used only for the purpose of intensifying the meaning of long duration for a limited period of time.⁴⁵ Ibn al-Malāḥimī explicitly ascribes this argument to Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, and the close similarity between the *Fā’iq* and the *Munqidh* leaves no doubt that Ḥimmaṣī must have relied on the same source as Ibn al-Malāḥimī.⁴⁶

Ḥimmaṣī then adduces three scriptural passages that include expressions of “eternity”, contrasting them with other passages relevant to the same context in which the meaning of “eternity” becomes more relative. With the exception of the third scriptural passage, these are also adduced by Ibn al-Malāḥimī, though

⁴³ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YŪSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 435, 12-15 (= § 9); IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ, *K. al-Fā’iq*, ed. MADELUNG and McDERMOTT, p. 357, 5-7.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 435, 16-18 (= §10); *ibid.*, p. 357, 8-9.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 435, 19 – 436, 12 (= §§ 11-12); *ibid.*, p. 357, 10 *sqq.*

⁴⁶ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YŪSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 435, 19-20 (= § 11): *fa-ḥī al-tawrāt alfāz al-ta’bīd kathīra wa-al-murād bi-hā al-mubālagha ḥī ḥūl al-mudda dān al-dawām*; IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ, *K. al-Fā’iq*, ed. MADELUNG and McDERMOTT, p. 357, 13-14: *wa-ḥakā shaykhunā Abū al-Ḥusayn ‘an al-tawrāt aḥkāmān qarāna bihā al-ta’bīd wa-urīda bihā awqāt munqaṭī’a*.

in a less complex manner. The first is an abbreviated paraphrastic rendering of (i) Exod. 21, 2-6 (“If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself: if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master has given him a wife and she has born him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master’s, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free: Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever [*le-‘olam*]”) which runs as follows: [*innahu*] *yustakhdamu sitt sinīn thumma yu‘taqu fī al-sābi‘a fa-in abā [al-‘itq] fa-l-yuthqab udhnuhu wa-yustakhdam abadan*.⁴⁷ So as to further qualify the meaning of “forever” (*le-‘olam* here translated as *abadan*), both authors then refer to another Biblical passage that is rendered as “he shall serve for fifty years” (*yustakhdam khamṣīn sana*),⁴⁸ a reference to the fiftieth year, the year of jubilee as laid down in Lev. 25, 8 *sqq.* Neither Ḥimmaṣī nor Ibn al-Malāḥimī offers any explanation for the passage, but replacing the term “forever” by the period of fifty years so as to allow for the possibility of abrogation was well attested in Jewish literature, as for example in Sa‘adya Gaon’s *Kitāb al-Amānāt wa-al-I‘tiqādāt* (*The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*), written about a century before Abū al-Ḥusayn’s lifetime.⁴⁹

The next scriptural examples are the instructions for the Passover sacrifice as laid down in (ii) Exod. 12, 1-12 (and Num 9, 11 *sqq.*), again for eternity (*abadan*), while this was later on qualified, in the absence of the Temple.⁵⁰

The last scriptural passage adduced by Ḥimmaṣī but not by Ibn al-Malāḥimī is a paraphrase of (iv) Exod. 29, 38-39, 42 (“Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar; two lambs of the first year day by day continually [שנים ליום תמיד]. The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even: ... This shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations [עולת תמיד] at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord ...”)—a passage that is correctly identified as belonging to *al-sifr al-thānī* (= Exodus) of the

⁴⁷ Ibid., vol. I, p. 435, 20-21 (= § 11); *ibid.*, p. 357, 14-15.

⁴⁸ Ibid., vol. I, p. 435, 21-22 (= § 11); *ibid.*, p. 357, 15-16.

⁴⁹ SA‘ADYA GAON, *Beliefs and Opinions*, tr. ROSENBLATT, p. 171: “Now some of the proponents of the theory of abrogation base their view on an analysis of the term ‘forever’ (*‘olam*) concerning which they assert that they note that it has in the Hebrew language a variety of meanings. One of these is ‘fifty years.’ The other is ‘the lifetime of the thing referred to.’ The third, again, is ‘as long as the world will exist.’”

⁵⁰ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YŪSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 435, 22 – 436, 3 (= § 11); IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ, *K. al-Fā‘iq*, ed. MADELUNG and McDERMOTT, p. 357, 16 – 358, 3.

Pentateuch.⁵¹ The term expressing eternity is rendered in the *Munqidh* as *qurbān dā'im li-aḥqābikum*, a fairly close translation of the Hebrew עולת תמיד לדרתכם. Other than was the case with the earlier scriptural passages including expressions denoting “eternity”, Ḥimmaṣī does not mention whether or to what extent this ruling of eternal validity had later on been qualified.

Both al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī and Ibn al-Malāḥimī now have an extensive section of disputations with Jewish opponents (in the style of *fa-in qālū—qulnā lahum*) in the course of which they argue that if none of these expressions denotes eternity in a literal sense, the argument of the Jews for the eternal validity of the Mosaic law based on the eternal obligation to keep the Sabbath has no foundation.⁵² In the course of this presumably fictitious disputation, Ḥimmaṣī also adduces two Jewish traditions that go back, according to the wording used,⁵³ to Jewish informants. Although he does not mention Abū al-Ḥusayn in this context, it is likely that these Jews were *his* rather than Ḥimmaṣī's immediate interlocutors. According to one Jewish tradition, the Book of Ezekiel (Ḥizqīl) contains additions (*ziyādāt*) to the prescribed acts of devotion (*ibādāt*) laid down by Moses which constitute abrogation in meaning (*naskh fī al-ma'nā*) and are an indication that the regulations of the Torah can in fact be abrogated.⁵⁴ This argument agrees with a view encountered in Rabbinic literature to the effect that Ezekiel's vision of the future temple and its priestly laws seemingly contradict the rules of the Pentateuch, which nearly led to the exclusion of the Book of Ezekiel from the Bible. The second Jewish tradition relates to the Passover sacrifice: the reason why this obligation was suspended later on is that it applied to the Banū Hārūn (the priestly family) only. Since it was impossible later on to establish whether a person belongs to the Banū Hārūn or not, this obligation was suspended by a prophet who emerged after the time of Moses.⁵⁵

Both al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī and Ibn al-Malāḥimī conclude this hypothetical disputation by pointing out that while there is no doubt with regard to the claim that the Prophet Muḥammad is the seal of the prophets, there is no such consensus with regard to Moses, especially since the Christians do not agree on this. Since the veracity of Muḥammad's prophethood has been asserted on the basis of his miracles and since it has been attested by way of *tawātur* that the Qur'ān is a miracle, the

⁵¹ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YUSUFI AL-GHARAWI, vol. I, p. 436, 3-4 (= § 11).

⁵² *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 436, 13 *sqq.* (= §§ 13 *sqq.*); IBN AL-MALĀḤIMĪ, *K. al-Fā'iq*, ed. MADELUNG and McDERMOTT, p. 358, 4 *sqq.*

⁵³ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YUSUFI AL-GHARAWI, vol. I, p. 437, 5 (= § 14): *qad dhakara ba'ḍuhum*; p. 437, 22 (= § 16): *wa-qad qāla ba'ḍ al-Yahūd.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 432, 4-12 (= § 14).

⁵⁵ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YUSUFI AL-GHARAWI, vol. I, p. 437, 22 – 438, 2 (= § 16).

Jewish refusal to accept the abrogation of the Mosaic legislation following the advent of the Prophet Muḥammad and the revelation of the Qurʾān has lost its foundation.⁵⁶

The third group—those who allow the possibility of abrogation on the grounds of reason and revelation but do not accept the prophethood of Muḥammad—is dealt with briefly by Ḥimmaṣī at the end of the chapter, referring the readers to a later section in which the proofs of Muḥammad’s prophecy will be dealt with in depth, while Ibn al-Malāḥimī does not address their position.⁵⁷

Ḥimmaṣī’s *kalām* writings remained authoritative among Twelver Shīʿites for more than a century, after which they were apparently largely replaced by the works by Ḥasan b. Yūsuf b. al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (“al-‘Allāma al-Ḥillī”, d. 726/1325) which then became more popular.⁵⁸ His discussion on the abrogation of the Pentateuch is reflected in an anonymous Imāmī *kalām* work, *Khulāṣat al-Naẓar*, which was composed in the late 6th/12th or early 7th/13th century. Although the refutation of the Jews with respect to the abrogation of the Pentateuch is briefer than in the *Munqidh*, it clearly follows the pattern of the latter work and includes most of the scriptural evidence that had been adduced by al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Ibid., vol. I, p. 438, 12 *sqq.* (= §§ 16-18); IBN AL-MALĀHIMI, *K. al-Fāʿiq*, ed. MADELUNG and McDERMOTT, p. 359.

⁵⁷ AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ, *Munqidh*, ed. AL-YŪSUFI AL-GHARAWĪ, vol. I, p. 440, 2-7 (= § 19).

⁵⁸ This conclusion, which is based mainly on the observation that in the later Twelver Shīʿī literature there are no further references either to the work or its author, and on the popularity of the *kalām* writings of the ‘Allāma al-Ḥillī which were repeatedly copied and commented upon, is somewhat contradicted by the manuscript evidence. As far as is known today, four copies of Ḥimmaṣī’s *Munqidh* are extant, all produced relatively late: MS Qum, Marʿashī 8896, copied in the 10th/16th century; MS Qum, Marʿashī 8737, copied in the 13th/19th century; MS Tehran, Dānishgāh 6744, copy completed on 10 Šafar 1278/17 August 1861; see above, n. 15. An additional manuscript, completed on 23 Jumādā II 1192/19 July 1778, is preserved in the Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥaddith Urmawī collection in Qum. I am grateful to Morteza Karimīniya for having drawn my attention to this manuscript.

⁵⁹ See SCHMIDTKE Sabine and ANSARI Hassan (eds.) (2006), *Khulāṣat al-Naẓar. An Anonymous Imāmī-Muʿtazilī Treatise (late 6th/12th or early 7th/13th century)*, edited with an Introduction, (Series on Islamic Philosophy and Theology - Text and Studies, 2) Iranian Institute of Philosophy and Institute of Islamic Studies at the Freie Universität Berlin, Tehran, p. 151 *sqq.*

APPENDIX

In the following, the relevant portions of the chapter discussed are quoted in full [= *Munqidh*, vol. I, p. 433, 14–440, 7]. Although Ḥimmaṣī's work has been preserved in several manuscripts,⁶⁰ none of these have been accessible to the present writer. The edition at her disposal is, moreover, at times flawed. Corrections and emendations are indicated in the footnotes. The numbers in square brackets that appear in the following text refer to the pages in the edition of the *Munqidh*.

(١) ثم يقال لهم: أليس الجمع بين الأختين في النكاح كان مباحاً ليعقوب [cf. Gen. 29, 21 sqq.] وقد حرّمه الله تعالى في زمن موسى عليه السلام [cf. Lev. 18, 18] ولم يحرمه قبل بعثة موسى؟ ولم يدل ذلك على أنه قد ظهر له ما كان خافياً عليه أو خفى عنه ما لم يكن خافياً.

(٢) وأيضاً ففي التوراة أن الله تعالى قال لنوح عليه السلام عند خروجه من السفينة: «إني قد جعلت كل دابة حية مأكولاً لك ولذريتك وأطلقت كذلك⁶¹ لكم كل نبات العشب⁶²، ما خلا الدم فلا تأكلوه» [Gen. 9, 3-4]. وقد حرّم الله تعالى على موسى وبني إسرائيل كثيراً من الحيوان.

(٣) وكان آدم عليه السلام يزوّج الأخ من ولده أخته [cf. Gen. 5, 1-30] وحرّم الله ذلك على موسى [cf. Lev. 18, 6-9].

(٤) وأمر موسى وبني إسرائيل إذا عبروا أرض الأردن أن يبنوا لله مذبحاً في جبل [434] عيبال⁶³ [cf. Deut. 27, 4]. فلما جاوز بنو إسرائيل الأردن بنى يوشع بن النون المذبح الذي أمر الله به موسى في جبل عيبال⁶⁴ ووضع بنو إسرائيل عليه القرايين [cf. Josh. 8, 30-33]. وبنى يوشع بن النون بيتاً لله في ذلك المكان وسماه شيلو [cf. Josh. 18, 1]. ومكث بنو إسرائيل أربعمئة سنة وأربعين سنة يحجّون ذلك المذبح والبيت [cf. Exod. 16, 35 and I Kings 6, 1]، وهو قبلتهم التي يقصدون إليها، ولو أن رجلاً حجّ في تلك السنين إلى موضع بيت المقدس لكان ضالاً عندهم. ولما مضت تلك المدة عادوا يصلّون إلى مضرب وإلى ألواح وهم مقيمون في البلاد [cf. II Sam. 6, 1-17]. ثم أوحى الله إلى نبي⁶⁵ من بني إسرائيل في منامه أن يبني له بيتاً في موضع الصخرة من بيت المقدس [cf. II Sam. 7]. فلما انتبه أوحى الله تعالى إليه: لست أنت الذي

⁶⁰ See above, n. 58.

⁶¹ كذلك: ذلك.

⁶² العشب: الغشب.

⁶³ عيبال: عينال.

⁶⁴ عيبال: عينال.

⁶⁵ نبي: بني.

تبني هذا البيت لأنك سفكتَ الدماء ولكن بينيه سليمان [cf. I Chron. 22, 8-10; 28, 1-6] وبنى سليمان ذلك البيت [cf. I Kings 6]. وحجت إليه بنو إسرائيل وتركوا البيت والمذبح الذي أمر الله به موسى وبناه يوشع بن نون [cf. II Kings 23].

(٥) ولم تدلّ هذه الاشياء كلّها على أنه ظهر لله تعالى ما كان خافياً عليه أو خفي عنه ما كان ظاهراً له.
 (٦) ذكر الشيخ أبو الحسين أنه قال له بعض اليهود: إن الذي بنى البيت قال: إن هذا مكتوب، فقلت له: أقال أن هذا مكتوب عند موسى؟ قال: لا، ولكن نعلم أن موسى بيّن ذلك كلّ، ولم ينقل إلينا بيانه. فقلت له: فجوّز أن يكون موسى أوجب التمسك بالسبب أبداً، إلا أن يجيئ نبي بنسخه، ولم ينقل هذا الاستثناء.
 (٧) ثم يقال لهم: هل كان قبل نزول التوراة شرع أم لا؟ إن قالوا: لم يكن شرع قبل نزولها وجحدوا، قلنا لهم: أليس في الجزء الثاني من السفر الأول من التوراة حين شرع الله تعالى على نوح عليه السلام القصاص في القتل؟ ذلك قوله: «شوفيخ ذام ها اذام با اذام داموا يشافيخ» [שפך דם האדם באדם דמו שפך]. تفسيره: من سفك دم إنسان فليحكم الحاكم بسفك دمه [Gen. 9, 6]. وفي الجزء الثالث من السفر الأول: إذ [435] شرع على إبراهيم عليه السلام ختانة المولود في اليوم الثامن من ميلاده [cf. Gen. 17, 12].

(٨) فإذا أقرّوا بأنه قد كان شرع قبل نزول التوراة⁶⁶، قلنا لهم: ما تقولون في التوراة؟ هل أتت بزيادة على تلك الشرائع أم لا؟ فإن لم تأت بزيادة فقد صارت عبثاً عندهم، إذ لا زيادة فيها على ما تقدم ولم يعن شيئاً، فلا يجوز أن تكون صادرة عن الله تعالى، فيلزمهم أن التوراة لا تكون من عند الله، وذلك كفر على مذهبهم. وإن كانت التوراة أتت بزيادة، فهل في تلك الزيادة تحريم ما كان مباحاً أم لا؟ إن قالوا: ما أتت بتحريم ما كان مباحاً من قبل، بطل قولهم بأن التوراة حرمت الأعمال الصناعية في يوم السبت بعد أن كان مباحاً، وهذا هو النسخ في المعنى. ومن تتبع أحكامهم التي يتدينون بها وجد أمثال ما ذكرناه كثيراً مما فيه النسخ.

(٩) فأما من ادعى أن الشرع منع من النسخ وإن لم يمنع العقل منه فإنه يحتجّ بما حكيناه عنهم من نقلهم عن موسى عليه السلام أنه قال: «تمسكوا بالسبب أبداً»، فقال: «تمسكوا بالسبب عهداً لكم ولذريكم الدهر» [cf. Exod. 31, 16]، أو «ما دامت السماوات والأرض» [cf. Exod. 20, 11 or Exod. 31, 17]، قال: فلا يجوز أن يصدق من جاء بنسخ ذلك.

(١٠) والجواب عنه أن ما نقلوه عن موسى عليه السلام غير معلوم ولا مسلم، لأن نقل التوراة التي في أيديهم ونقل أخبارهم غير متّصل بل منقطع بما فعل بهم بختنصر.

⁶⁶ التوراة: التوراة.

(١١) ثم وإن لم ننازعهم في صحة نقلهم، ففي التوراة ألفاظ التأييد كثيرة والمراد بها المبالغة في طول المدة دون الدوام، فمن ذلك قوله في العبد: «إنه يستخدم ست سنين ثم يعتق في السابعة، فإن أبي فليتقّب أذنه ويستخدم أبداً» [cf. Exod. 21, 2, 5-6; also Deut. 15, 12]. وقال في موضع آخر: «يستخدم خمسين سنة» [cf. Lev. 25:10 sq.]. وقيل في البقرة التي أمروا بذبحها: «يكون ذلك لكم سنةً أبداً» وانقطع التعبد بها⁶⁷ عندهم. وكذا أمروا في قصة دم [436] الفصح⁶⁸ الذي تعبدوا به أن يجعلوه في أبوابهم ويذبحوا الجمل ويأكلوا لحمه ملحوجاً ولا يكسروا عظماً ويكون ذلك الجمل سنةً أبداً [cf. Exod. 12, 1 sq., 12, 14]. وقد زال التعبد بذلك. وفي السفر الثاني قال الله تعالى: «قربوا إليّ كل يوم خروفين سنةً خروفٍ عدوةً وخروفٍ عشيةً بين المغارب، قربان دائم لأحقابكم» [cf. Exod. 29, 38 – 39, 42].

(١٢) فهذه ألفاظ تقتضي الدوام كالألفاظ التي ذكروها في السبب وما أريد بها الدوام. فما أنكروا في مثل ذلك من ألفاظ السبب، سيما وقد ورد من البشارات بالنبى عليه السلام على ما نشير إليه ونبيته إن شاء الله ما يجوز⁶⁹ معه أن يكون النبى عليه السلام ناسخاً للسبب ورافعاً لتأييده كما ارتفع تأييد ما عدناه، لأننا إذا رأينا ألفاظ التأييد وما أريد بها التأييد لم نأمن أن يكون كذلك ألفاظ التأييد في السبب وأن يكون النبى الذي بشر به، أو الذي دلّت عليه دلالةً سوى البشارة، بيّن أن ألفاظ التأييد ليست على الدوام وأنها كسائر الألفاظ التي لم يرد بها الدوام.

(١٣) فإن قالوا: إن الألفاظ التي ذكرتموها قد بيّن موسى أنه لم يرد بها الدوام فلو كان السبب كذلك لبيّنه، قلنا لهم: أبيّن موسى انقطاع تلك العبادات وأنها غير دائمة حين تعبد بها أو بعد ذلك؟ فإن قالوا: بيّن ذلك بعد زمان متراخ، وهكذا يقتضي ظاهر التوراة، لأنه قال في موضع: «يتقّب أذن العبد ويستخدم أبداً»، وقال في موضع آخر: «يستخدم خمسين سنة» [cf. § 11]. ولم يقولوا ولم ينقلوا أنه بيّن في ذلك الموضع. قلنا لهم: فإذا جاز أن يأمر موسى بالشيء أبداً وعلى الأحقاب، ثم يبيّن بعد ذلك أنه ما أراد التأييد، جاز أن يبيّن ذلك نبى آخر إذا كان البيان تأخر في كلا الحالين.

(١٤) فإن قالوا: إن موسى بيّن مراده بهذه الألفاظ في الحال. [437] قلنا: لو بيّن ذلك لنقل منه كما نقل بيانه المتراخي. فإن قالوا: يجوز أن لا ينقل ولكن نحن نعلم أن البيان صدر منه في الحال لعلمنا بأن البيان لا يتأخر. قلنا لهم: فجوزوا أن يكون بيان نسخ السبب صدر منه في الحال ولم ينقل منه، كما لم ينقل ما ذكرتم. وقد ذكر بعضهم أن حزقيل ذكر زيادات في عبادات يعتقدون أن تلك الزيادات تلزمهم عند مجيء منتظرهم.

⁶⁷ التعبد بها: الشهيد به، والتصحيح عن كتاب الفائق لابن الملاحي.

⁶⁸ الفصح: الفصح.

⁶⁹ يجوز: يحرز.

ثم هم مختلفون فيها، فمنهم من قال أن موسى عليه السلام ما ذكر تلك الزيادات، ومنهم من يقول: ذكرها ولكنها لم تنقل عنه. فنقول⁷⁰ لمن قال أنه لم يذكرها أصلاً: أليس تلك الزيادات ترفع إباحة تركها؟ وهذا نسخ في المعنى، فقد وقع ما هو في معنى النسخ بعد موسى على يد نبي آخر، فجوزوا مثله في السبب. ونقول لمن قال أنه ذكرها ولم ينقل عنه: جوز أنه قد بين انقطاع التعبد بالسبب ولم ينقل عنه خاصة، والهوى وحب المذهب يدعوكم إلى ترك نقل ذلك.

(١٥) فإن قالوا: إنما يلزمنا أن نقول: قد بين موسى عليه السلام انقطاع التعبد بالسبب لو نسخه من صحت نبوته. قلنا: أنتم دفعتم نبوة نبينا عليه السلام لأنه نسخ ما لم يبين موسى عليه السلام انقطاعه فإذا لم تعلموا أن موسى لم يبين ذلك بطل دليلكم، فيجب⁷¹ أن لا تقطعوا بذلك على أنه ليس بنبي. وبعد، فإن كلامهم هذا يقتضي أن يقطعوا على أن موسى عليه السلام قد أشعرهم بنسخه مهما صحت نبوة محمد عليه السلام: فليقتصروا على مطالبتنا بالمعجزات الدالة على نبوته حتى نذكرها لهم ونبين صحتها، وليتركوا الاحتجاج بما لا يعلمونه من أنه نسخ ما لم يبين موسى انقطاعه.

(١٦) وقد قال بعض اليهود: إن قصة البقرة إنما انقطع التعبد بها لأن المتعبد بها هم بنو هارون، ثم بين نبي آخر بعد موسى أن المتولي لذلك هو من نقطع [438] على أنه من بني هارون، لا من نطته كذلك. وإذا لم نعلم بني هارون قطعاً زال التعبد بذبح البقرة لزوال شرطه. فيقال لهم: إن موسى عليه السلام هل بين هذا الشرط أم لا؟ إن قالوا: لا، وإنما بيته نبي بعده، قلنا لهم: فجوزوا أن يكون من شرط التمسك بالسبب أن لا يبعث نبي من العرب، ولم يبين ذلك موسى وإنما بيته محمد عليه السلام. وإن قالوا: إن موسى عليه السلام بين انقطاع التعبد بذبح البقرة، قلنا: فكان يجب أن ينقل ذلك عنه وأنتم لا تنقلون هذا عنه. فإن قالوا: نحن نعلم أن موسى عليه السلام كان يتدين بدوام شرعه وأن لا ينقطع ولا ينسخ بمثل ما تعلمون أنتم أن نبيكم كان يعتقد ويتدين بأن شريعته لا تسخ، ولا يحتج في ذلك بألفاظ التأييد حتى تردوا علينا بما رددتموه، قلنا: نحن نعلم علماء لا يخالطه شك وريب أن نبينا عليه السلام كان يتدين بأن شرعه لا ينسخ وأنه خاتم النبيين، مثل علمنا بالبلدان والوقائع ومثل علمنا بوجوده تعالى وادعائه النبوة لا يمكنكم أن تدعوا مثل ذلك، لأنه لو كان كذلك لوجب في كل من خالطكم أن يعلم ذلك، وخلافه معلوم لأننا نعلم ذلك والنصارى على كثرتهم وقراءتهم لكتبكم لا يعلمون ذلك، وجماعة منكم لا يعلمون ذلك بل يقولون: الأمر فيه مشتبّه، ويقتصرون على مطالبتنا بالمعجزة. ألا ترى أن العلم بتدين نبينا عليه السلام بدوام شرعه وكونه خاتم النبيين، لما كان على الحد الذي وصفناه،

⁷⁰ فنقول: فنقول.

⁷¹ فيجب: فيوجب.

شاركنا فيه المسلم وغير المسلم والصدیق والعدو، فكل من علم وجوده وادعاءه النبوة علم أنه كان يتدين بما ذكرناه، ومثل ذلك لا يمكنكم ادعاؤه.

(١٧) [439] وبعد، فإذا ثبت نبوة نبيِّنا عليه السلام بما ظهر عليه من المعجزات، على ما نبيَّته إن شاء الله تعالى، بطل قول من ادعى تأييد شرع موسى أو غيره من الأنبياء عليهم السلام، لأنه لو صح تأييد شرع واحد منهم لما دلت المعجزات التي قامت وظهرت عليه على نبوته عليه السلام وصحة شرعه مع ما فيه من مخالفة الشرائع المتقدمة في أكثر الأحكام. فإن قيل: لم صرتم بأن تنظروا في معجزات نبيِّكم فتعلموا بها صحة نبوته وبطلان ما تمسكنا به من الخبر المقتضي بظاهره لدوام شرع موسى وتأييده أو صحة تأويله على ما تأولونه عليه أولى من أن تنظروا أولاً في خبرنا فتعلموا صحته. وإذا علمتم صحته قطعتم على بطلان نبوة من تدعون نبوته. قلنا: صحة معجز نبيِّنا الذي هو أظهر آياته ومعجزاته، وهو القرآن الموجود في أيدينا، مبنية على أمور عقلية لا يدخلها الاحتمال والاشتباه لأنها مبنية على ظهور القرآن عليه وتحديه العرب به وأنهم لم يعارضوه. وذلك كله معلوم ضرورةً وعلماً لا يدخله شكٌّ وريب مثل العلم بالبلدان والوقائع والعلم بأن ما هذا صفته معجز دالٌّ على صدق من ظهر عليه طريقه أيضاً اعتبار العقل الذي لا يدخله الاحتمال. وليست هذه المباني والقواعد ولا واحد منها من جنس الكلام الذي يدخله الاحتمال والحقيقة والمجاز والعمل بظاهره أو تركه. والاستدلال بالخبر الذي تدعونه مبنيةً على صحته لا يعلم إلا بعد أن يعلم أن صفة التواتر ثابتة في جميع أسلاف اليهود في كل زمان، ثم إذا صح وثبت نقله فهو كلام يدخله الحقيقة والمجاز والخصوص والعموم والاحتمال للتأويل المخالف لما يقتضيه ظاهره.

(١٨) إذا تقرر هذا فمعلوم أن التمسك بما لا يحتمل والنظر فيه وبناء المحتمل عليه أولى من عكسه وهو التمسك بالمحتمل والنظر فيه وبناء ما لا يحتمل عليه، [440] فظهرت الأولوية التي طلبها السائل في جانب ما ينظر فيه بحمد الله ومنه.

(١٩) وأما من أجاز النسخ عقلاً ولم يدع منع الشرع منه، وأنكر نبوة نبيِّنا عليه السلام، لزعمه وادعائه أنه ما دلت على نبوته دلالةً ولا قامت عليه معجزة، فالردُّ عليه هو بأن نبيِّن صحة نبوته عليه السلام بما ظهر عليه من المعجزات الواضحة والآيات اللائحة التي لا تخفى دلالتها على صدقه في ادعائه النبوة عند التأمل الصحيح وبذل الإنصاف وما نحن فاعلون لذلك بعون الله وحسن توفيقه.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Arabic article *al-* and the Arabic prefix *Ibn* as well as the prefixes of titles in Western names (de, von) have been disregarded in the alphabetical order.

Sources

- ABŪ AL-ḤUSAYN AL-BASRĪ (2006), *Taṣaffiḥ al-Adilla*. The extant parts introduced and edited by MADELUNG Wilferd and SCHMIDTKE Sabine, Harrasowitz, Wiesbaden.
- ĀGHĀ BUZURG AL-ṬIHRĀNĪ Muḥammad Muḥsin (1403-6/1983-86), *al-Dhart‘a ilā Taṣānīf al-Shī‘a*, 25 vol., Dār al-Adwā’, Beirut.
- Id.* (n.d.), *Ṭabaqāt A‘lām al-Shī‘a*, vol. II, ed. MUNZAWI ‘Alī Naqī, Mu‘assasat Ismā‘īliyyān, Qum.
- AL-AFANDĪ ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Īsā (1401/1981), *Riyāḍ al-‘Ulamā’ wa-Ḥiyāḍ al-Fuḍalā’*, ed. AL-HUSAYNĪ Aḥmad, 5 vol., Maktabat Āyat Allāh al-Mar‘ashī al-‘Āmma, Qum.
- AL-‘ĀMILĪ AL-ḤURR Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (1385/1965), *Amal al-Āmil*, ed. AL-ḤUSAYNĪ Aḥmad, 2 vol., Maktabat al-Andalus, Baghdad.
- AL-AMĪN Muḥsin (1403/1983), *A‘yān al-Shī‘a*, ed. AL-AMĪN Ḥasan, 11 vol., Dār al-Ta‘āruf, Beirut.
- Id.* (1408-15/1987-95), *Mustadrakāt A‘yān al-Shī‘a*, ed. AL-AMĪN Ḥasan, 6 vol., Dār al-Ta‘āruf, Beirut.
- IBN BĀBUYA AL-QUMMĪ Muntajab al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. ‘Ubaydallāh (1406/1986), *Fihrist Asmā’ ‘Ulamā’ al-Shī‘a wa-Muṣannifihim*, ed. AL-ṬABĀTABĀ‘Ī al-Sayyid ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Dār al-Adwā’, Beirut.
- AL-BAHRĀNĪ [OR: AL-NAJRĀNĪ] AL-‘AJĀLĪ Taqī al-Dīn (1420/1999), *al-Kāmil fī al-Istiḳṣā’ fī-mā Balaghānā min Kalām al-Qudamā’*, ed. AL-SHĀHĪD al-Sayyid Muḥammad, Wizārat al-Awqāf, al-Majlis al-A‘lā li-al-Shu‘ūn al-Islāmiyya, Lajnat Iḥyā’ al-Turāth, Cairo.
- AL-BAHRĀNĪ Yūsuf b. Aḥmad (1386/1966), *Lu‘lu‘at al-Baḥrayn*, ed. BAHR AL-‘ULŪM Muḥammad Ṣādiq, Maṭba‘at al-Nu‘mān, Najaf.
- AL-ḤIMMAṢĪ AL-RAZĪ Sadīd al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. ‘Alī (1412-1414/1991-1993), *al-Munqīdh min al-Taqlīd*, ed. AL-YUSUFĪ AL-GHARAWĪ M. H., 2 vol., Mu‘assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, Qum.
- AL-KHWĀNSĀRĪ Muḥammad Bāqir (1382-/1962-), *Rawḍat al-Jannāt fī Aḥwāl al-‘Ulamā’ wa-al-Sādāt*, ed. RAWḌĀTĪ Muḥammad ‘Alī, 8 vol., Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, Tehran.
- IBN AL-MALĀHIMĪ AL-KHUWĀRAZMĪ Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad (1991), *Kitāb al-Mu‘tamad fī Uṣūl al-Dīn*. The extant parts edited by McDERMOTT Martin and MADELUNG Wilferd, al-Hoda, London.
- Id.* (2007), *Kitāb al-Fā‘iq fī Uṣūl al-Dīn*, edited with an Introduction by MADELUNG Wilferd and McDERMOTT Martin, (Series in Islamic Philosophy and Theology – Text and Studies) Iranian Institute of Philosophy and Institute of Islamic Studies at the Freie Universität Berlin, Tehran.
- Id.* (2008), *Tuḥfat al-Mutakallimīn fī al-Radd ‘alā l-Falāsifa*, edited with an Introduction by ANSARI Hassan and MADELUNG Wilferd, (Series in Islamic Philosophy and Theology – Text and Studies) Iranian Institute of Philosophy and Institute of Islamic Studies at Freie Universität Berlin, Tehran.
- MĀNAKDĪM (1416/1996), *[Ta‘līq] Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Khamsa*, ed. ‘UTHMĀN ‘Abd al-Karīm [as a work by ‘Abd al-Jabbār], Maktabat Wahba, Cairo.

- AL-QUMMI ‘Abbās b. Muḥammad Riḍā (1376/1956), *Al-Kunā wa-al-Alqāb*, 3 vol., al-Maṭba‘a al-Ḥaydariyya, Najaf.
- AL-RĀZĪ Fakhr al-Dīn (1398/1978), *I’tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa-al-Mushrikīn*, Maktabat al-Kulliyāt al-Azharīyya, Cairo.
- Id.* (n.d.), *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr [= Maḥāṭih al-ghayb]*, 32 vol., Tehran.
- SA‘ADYA GAON (1948), *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, tr. from the Arabic and the Hebrew by ROSENBLATT Samuel, Yale Univ. Press, New Haven/ London.
- Id.* (5730/1970), *Kitāb al-Mukhtār fī al-Amānāt wa-al-I’tiqādāt* (Arabic and Hebrew), ed. QAFIḤ Yosef, Sūra, Jerusalem/ New York.
- SCHMIDTKE Sabine and ANSARI Hassan (eds.) (2006), *Khulāṣat al-Nazar. An Anonymous Imāmī-Mu‘tazilī Treatise (late 6th/12th or early 7th/13th century)*, edited with an Introduction, (Series on Islamic Philosophy and Theology - Text and Studies, 2) Iranian Institute of Philosophy and Institute of Islamic Studies at the Freie Universität Berlin, Tehran.
- AL-TAFTAZĀNĪ Mas‘ūd b. ‘Umar (1409/1989), *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid*, 5 vol., eds. ‘UMAYRA ‘Abd al-Raḥmān and SHARAF Ṣāliḥ Mūsā, ‘Ālam al-Kutub, Beirut.
- YĀQŪT AL-ḤAMAWĪ (1907-26), *The Irshād al-Arīb ilā Ma‘rifat al-Adīb; or, Dictionary of Learned Men of Yāqūt*, 7 vol., ed. MARGOLIOUTH David S., Brill, Leiden.

Studies

- ADANG Camilla (1996), *Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible. From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm*, Brill, Leiden.
- Id.* (2007), “A Rare Case of Biblical ‘Testimonies’ to the Prophet Muḥammad in Mu‘tazilī Literature. Quotations from Ibn Rabban al-Ṭabarī’s *Kitāb al-Dīn wa-al-Dawla* in Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s *Ghurar al-Adilla*, as preserved in a work by al-Ḥimmaṣī al-Rāzī,” in ADANG Camilla, SCHMIDTKE Sabine and SKLARE David (eds.), *A Common Rationality. Mu‘tazilism in Islam and Judaism*, Ergon, Würzburg, p. 297-330.
- GRIFFEL Frank (2007), “On Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s Life and the Patronage he Received,” *Journal of Islamic Studies* 18/3, p. 313-344.
- KOHLBERG Etan (1992), *A Medieval Scholar at Work. Ibn Ṭāwūs and his Library*, Brill, Leiden.
- AL-LAJNA AL-‘ILMIYYA FĪ MU‘ASSASSAT AL-IMĀM AL-ṢĀDIQ (1423/1381/2002), *Mu‘jam al-Turāth al-Kalāmī. Mu‘jam yatanāwalu dhikr asmā’ al-mu‘allafāt al-kalāmiyya (al-makḥḥūfāt wa-al-maḥbū‘āt) ‘abra al-qurūn wa-al-maktabāt allatī tatawaḥḥaru fihā nusakhuhā*, 5 vol., Intishārāt Tawḥīd, Qum.
- LANE Andrew J. (2006), *A Traditional Mu‘tazilite Qur’ān Commentary. The Kashshāf of Jār Allāh al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144)*, Brill, Leiden.
- MADELUNG Wilferd (1985), “Review of ELSHAHED Elsayyed (1983), *Das Problem der transzendenten sinnlichen Wahrnehmung in der spätmu‘tazilītischen Erkenntnistheorie nach der Darstellung des Taqīddīn an-Naḡrānī*, Berlin,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48, p. 128-129.
- Id.* (2006), “Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī’s proof for the existence of God,” in MONTGOMERY James E. (ed.), *Arabic Theology, Arabic Philosophy. From the Many to the One. Essays in Celebration of Richard M. Frank*, Peeters, Leuven, p. 273-280.
- Id.* (2007), “Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. Three*. Brill, Leiden, Fasc. 2007-1, p. 16-19.

- MADDELUNG Wilferd and SCHMIDTKE Sabine (2006), *Rational Theology in Interfaith Communication. Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī's Mu'tazilī Theology among the Karāites in the Fāṭimid Age*, Brill, Leiden.
- Id.* (2007), "Yūsuf al-Baṣrī's First Refutation (*Naqḍ*) of Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī's Theology," in ADANG Camilla, SCHMIDTKE Sabine and SKLARE David (eds.), *A Common Rationality. Mu'tazilism in Islam and Judaism*, Ergon, Würzburg, p. 229-296.
- AL-NI'MA 'Abd Allāh (1962), *Falāsifat al-Shī'a. Hayātuhum wa-Ārā'uhum*, Dār Maktabat al-Hayāt, Beirut.
- PERLMANN Moshe (1940), *A Study of Muslim Polemics Directed Against the Jews*, PhD thesis, University of London, London.
- Id.* (1941), "Note on the authenticity of 'Alī Ṭabarī's 'Book of Religion and Empire'," *The Moslem World* 31/3, p. 308 [republished in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library Manchester* 26/2 (May-June, 1942), p. 246].
- PROZOROV Stanislav M. (1999), "A Unique Manuscript of a Biographical Dictionary by a Khorezmian Author," *Manuscripta Orientalia* 5/2, p. 9-17.
- ROSENTHAL Judah (1947-48), "Ḥiwi Balkhi. A Comparative Study," *Jewish Quarterly Review* NS 38, p. 329-31.
- RUSTOW Marina (2008), *Heresy and the Politics of Community. The Jews of the Fatimid Caliphate*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca/ London.
- SCHMIDTKE Sabine (forthcoming), "Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī and his transmission of biblical materials from *Kitāb al-Dīn wa-al-Dawla* by Ibn Rabbān al-Ṭabarī: The evidence from Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*," in *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*.
- Id.* (forthcoming), "The Zaydī Reception of Biblical Materials from Ibn Rabbān al-Ṭabarī's *Kitāb al-Dīn wa-l-Dawla*".
- SCHWARB Gregor (2006), "Sahl b. al-Faḍl al-Tustarī's *Kitāb al-Īmā'*," *Ginzei Qedem* 2, p. 61*-105*.
- SHIHADDEH Ayman (2005), "From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī: 6th/12th Century Developments in Muslim Philosophical Theology," *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 15, p. 141-179.
- AL-ṬABĀṬĀBĀ'Ī al-Sayyid 'Abd al-'Azīz (ed.) (1416), "Maktabat al-'Allāma al-Karājākī li-Aḥad Mu'āṣirihī," *Turāthunā* 43-44.
- WASSERSTROM Steven M. (1985), *Species of Misbelief. A History of Muslim Heresiography of the Jews*. PhD thesis, University of Toronto.