

'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī's Theological Works, The Chronology, Authorship Journey, and Interrelations

Münzir Şeyhhasan**

Abstract: 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī (d. 756/1355) is regarded as one of the most significant thinkers of the late Ash'arite school. He authored numerous works in the domains of theology and other sciences, many of which exerted a significant influence on Islamic thought, particularly with regard to their methodological approaches. The most prominent and well-known works of al-Ījī in theology are *Al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya*, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, *Al-Mawāqif*, and *Risāla fī kalām Allāh*. In addition to these, he has another work, *al-'Uyūn*, which is a summary of *Jawāhir al-kalām* and is preserved in manuscript form. Of these major works, the most historically and academically significant is undoubtedly *al-Mawāqif*.

Al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya represents the author's final work, and it is widely accepted that he composed it just twelve days prior to his death. When *al-'Uyūn*/*Uyūn al-Jawāhir* is analysed, it is understood from both the author's introduction and the content that it is a summary of *Jawāhir al-kalām*. This finding indicates that *al-'Uyūn* was composed subsequent to *al-Jawāhir*. Indeed, the ambiguity in the chronology of al-Ījī's theological works primarily concerns two works: *Jawāhir al-kalām* and *al-Mawāqif*. Presently, it is a widely accepted view that al-Ījī wrote *Jawāhir al-kalām* after completing *al-Mawāqif*. After all, the two works are similar in terms of their section headings and themes, and it seems logical to conclude that al-Ījī simply omitted detailed proofs and discussions in *al-Jawāhir*, keeping its focus purely on core arguments. However, an examination of the prefaces of both books reveals that al-Ījī dedicated *al-Jawāhir* to the Ilkhanid vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashid al-Dīn (d. 736/1335) and *al-Mawāqif* to Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq (d. 758/1357) of the Injū dynasty. This information suggests that *al-Jawāhir* was composed before *al-Mawāqif*. Contemporary studies have therefore posited the hypothesis that *Jawāhir al-kalām* was written before *al-Mawāqif*, contradicting the prevailing perspective that *Jawāhir al-kalām* is a summary of *al-Mawāqif* and was written subsequent to it.

In order to ascertain the existence of all available versions of *al-Mawāqif*, a comprehensive analysis of all copies of the work was conducted, with particular emphasis on al-Ījī's own autograph copy. Firstly, the authorship of the copy in the Topkapı Palace Museum Library was determined. Furthermore, in determining the versions of the text and its final form, the corrections made by al-Kirmānī to the text of *al-Mawāqif* in his work *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif* were also taken into consideration.

The present article sets out to ascertain the chronology of al-Ījī's five theological works. It has been determined that *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, and *al-'Uyūn* were written in the chronological order listed above, and that they are in an organic relationship with each other, with *al-Mawāqif* serving as the original text, *al-Jawāhir* serving as a concise rendering of *al-Mawāqif*, and *al-'Uyūn* being yet another concise rendering of *al-Jawāhir*. Furthermore, it is observed that the author demonstrates a degree of conceptual stability in his theological works, as he presents no significant alterations to his thought processes. This conclusion is reached by comparing the subjects of al-Ījī's works, examining their manuscripts, and taking into account the information found in significant commentaries on his works.

Keywords: *Kalām*, al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, *al-'Uyūn*, *al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya*, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, Abū Ishāq

* Assist. Prof., University of Istanbul, Faculty of Theology, Department of Kalām, munzir.seyhhasan@istanbul.edu.tr

Introduction

Determining the composition dates of the works of prominent scholars is of significant value, as it provides insight into various aspects of the history of Islamic thought. Understanding the chronology of these texts is of great significance, as it facilitates deeper comprehension of the political, social, and intellectual atmosphere in which they were written. Furthermore, it aids us in identifying the motivations behind their composition and the potential influence of rulers on their production. Moreover, the historical context enables the reader to observe the evolution of scholars' perspectives and theoretical frameworks.¹ In light of these considerations, the present study aims to ascertain the development and transformation of the theological thought of 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī (d. 756/1355), who is regarded by some historians as the *mujaddid* of his era. The study will address the composition and chronological order of his theological works, thematic relations between these texts, and their substantive differences.

Studies have determined that al-Ījī authored five works and treatises on theology, including *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, *al-'Uyūn*, *al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya*, and *Risāla fī kalām Allāh*.

According to al-Ījī's student Iftikhār al-Dīn al-Dāmaghānī (d. 775/1374), *al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya* was written twelve days prior to al-Ījī's death.² There is no extant evidence to suggest any scholarly dispute regarding the composition date of this work.³ The treatise is a concise work on *'aqida*, which alludes to theological arguments and debates without engaging with them directly.⁴ A plethora of commentaries and glosses have been published on this text.

Given the well-established composition date of *al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya*, it is unnecessary to allocate a separate heading for this work when determining the chronological order of al-Ījī's oeuvre. In a similar fashion, due to the indeterminate composition date of *Risāla fī kalām Allāh*,⁵ a discrete heading was not assigned to this work.

1 Mostowfi, Hamdollah, *Tārīkh-e gozida*, ed. Edward G. Browne (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1910), 808.

2 Iftikhār al-Dīn al-Dāmaghānī, *al-Qawā'id al-Shamsiyya fī Sharḥ al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Ayasıfya, 2307), 2a.

3 Kâtib Çelebi, *Kashf al-Zunūn* (Baghdad: Maktabah al-Muthannā, 1941), 2, 1144.

4 M. Ali Koca, "Akaid-Kelâm İlişkisi Bağlamında Akaid Literatürünü Okumak: İc'nin Akaid Risâlesi Örneği", *İslâm İlim ve Düşünce Geleneğinde Adudüddin el-İcî*, (Istanbul: İSAM Publications, 2017), 229-230, 253.

5 In the manuscripts this text is mentioned with different names.

This concise treatise on the nature of *kalām* has been translated into Turkish by Eşref Altaş. Al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413) attributes the treatise to al-Ījī based on his own narration and included it in his commentary *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*⁶ thereby confirming its attribution to him; he contributed to the work by interpreting this treatise.⁷ Despite a meticulous examination of the twelve extant copies of the treatise,⁸ two of its commentaries, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* and *Kashkūl*, as well as the secondary literature on al-Ījī, no information regarding the composition date of the treatise has been found in any of these sources.

A comparative analysis of al-Ījī's three other works, namely *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, and *al-'Uyūn*, reveals an organic connection between them. However, the composition dates of these texts are not known. Consequently, the present article focuses on the chronology and analysis of these three works.

Despite the fact that *al-'Uyūn* is referenced by some of al-Ījī's students and is included in several theological and *ṭabāqāt* books, it has so far been eclipsed by the *al-Mawāqif* and *al-Jawāhir*, receiving comparatively little scholarly attention. Reza Pourjavady made a brief reference to the work, which is currently in manuscript form, and stated that a copy of the book is available.⁹ Consequently, it was deemed appropriate to provide a concise introduction to this work at the outset. Following the presentation of information pertaining to *al-'Uyūn*, the subsequent discussion will entail an analysis of the relationship between *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām* and *al-'Uyūn*, with this analysis being facilitated by a comparative examination of their

6 al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, critical ed. Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn al-Nāsānī (Egypt: Matba'a al-Sa'āda, 1325/1907), 8, 103-104.

7 See Eşref Altaş, "Aḍudiiddin el-İcī'nin *Risāle Fī Kelāmillaḥ* Adlı Eserinin Tahkik ve Tercümesi", *İslâm İlim ve Düşünce Geleneginde Aḍudiiddin el-İcī* (Istanbul: İSAM Publications, 2017), 391-399. Altaş states that Bahā al-Dīn al-Āmili included this treatise in his work *Kashkūl* (1/240) without attributing it to al-Ījī, and that Kemalpashazāda (d. 940/1534) had an independent commentary on this treatise. Mu'in al-Dīn al-Ījī (d. 905/1500) criticised al-Ījī's treatise in his *Risāla fī al-kalām al-naḥṣī*. A copy of his treatise in question is registered in the Hüseyin Pasha collection of the Süleymaniye Library with the shelfmark number 752/3 (31a-50b). See Muhammed Eroğlu, "İcī, Mu'niida din", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 2000), 21414-416.

8 Altaş mentioned six copies of the treatise in his study and the other copies we have identified are as follows: Süleymaniye Library, Antalya Tekelioğlu, 859/4, 53a; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Reşid Efendi, 1032/35, 199a-199b; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Esad Efendi, 3821/5, 35a-35b; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 2375, 174a; Konya Regional Directorate of Manuscripts, 5852/22, 134a, Bursa: Inebey Library, Hüseyin Çelebi, 606, 5a.

9 See Reza Pourjavady, "The Legacy of 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī", *Philosophical Theology in Islam Later Ash'arism East and West*, ed. Ayman Shihadeh and Jan Thiele (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020), 347.

respective contents. Ultimately, the present study will examine the chronological order of the author's theological works, their manuscripts and final versions (recension), and whether there is a change in his ideas as a result of these comparisons.

A thorough examination of *al-'Uyūn* reveals that it is a concise synopsis of *Jawāhir al-kalām*, as evidenced by both its introduction and its content in general. Consequently, a close analysis of this work reveals that it was written after *al-Jawāhir al-kalām* as the two resemble one another in their subject matter, organisation and style. This being the case, it is important to note that the primary issue concerning the composition chronology of al-Ījī's works lies between *al-Jawāhir* and *al-Mawāqif*, and not *al-'Uyūn*.

Prior to embarking on a detailed examination of *al-'Uyūn* and its comparison with the other two works, it is imperative to address certain salient points concerning the chronological disagreement between *al-Mawāqif* and *Jawāhir al-kalām*. The predominant scholarly perspective is that al-Ījī initially authored *al-Mawāqif*, and subsequently penned *Jawāhir al-kalām* as a synopsis. Nevertheless, these scholars have yet to furnish substantiating evidence for their assertions beyond the superficial resemblance between the two works.

Contemporary scholars have posited that al-Ījī dedicated *Jawāhir al-kalām* to the Ilkhanid vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn (d. 736/1335) and *al-Mawāqif* to Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq (d. 758/1357), a member of the Īnjū dynasty, and that *Jawāhir* was therefore composed prior to *al-Mawāqif*. Furthermore, it is contended by these scholars that *Jawāhir al-kalām* represents a preliminary version of *al-Mawāqif*, a hypothesis that is supported by the observation of a congruence between the two literary works with regard to both subject matter and organisational structure. Van Ess (d. 2021), renowned for his contributions to the field of al-Ījī studies, authored an article on the subject that is widely cited in academic discourse, specifically when he states: 'The exact relationship between the *Mawāqif* and the *Jawāher* has still to be investigated. Both works are structured after the same pattern and contain almost the same material, but the *Jawāher* is shorter'.¹⁰ In the present study, an attempt is made to resolve the question of chronology between the two works by examining divergent opinions and evidence on the subject. This examination has resulted in the determination of the compositional order of *al-'Uyūn* and has put light on the relationship between these works.

10 J. Van Ess, "ʿAzod-al-Dīn Ījī", *Encyclopædia Iranica* (Accessed 27 March 2024).

The present study notes an absence of reference to the manuscripts of al-Ījī's works under consideration by those on either side of debate concerning the compositional order of *Jawāhir* and *al-Mawāqif*. While the manuscripts will be referred to when the evidence for the prevailing view is mentioned, an attempt is made here to analyse and justify the details of the alternative view as well as other ideas based on the information in the manuscripts in general. The principal reference sources of the study then are the manuscripts of both books. In this context, a total of fifty-two manuscripts of *al-Mawāqif* and fifteen manuscripts of *Jawāhir al-kalām* have been identified and analysed. By referring to the notes of appropriation, transcription (*istinsākh*), study (*muṭāla'a*), correction (*taṣḥīḥ*), benefits (*fawā'id*), and marginalia (*minhiyyāt*) etc. located at the beginnings, endings or in the margins of these manuscripts, the objective was to identify significant information not previously included in our sources. This includes the composition order of both works, the individuals responsible for their reading, and the commentaries made on them. In order to obtain further information on the subject, the commentaries and glosses written on these two books and more than twenty of their manuscript copies have also been included among the sources of the study. Consequently, the names of some of al-Ījī's lesser-known students have been identified, along with some of their commentaries on their teacher's works, which are still in manuscript form. Furthermore, the present article is informed by biographical and *ṭabaqāt* works dealing with al-Ījī and his writings, as well as contemporary research and studies on the author.

In the first section of the article, the name of *al-'Uyūn*, its authorship, manuscript copies, and its position within the literary landscape are analysed. Subsequently, a comparative analysis is conducted of *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām* and *al-'Uyūn*. In the second section, the various views on the composition dates of *al-Mawāqif* and *Jawāhir al-kalām*, and the grounds on which they are based, are discussed in detail. In the third section, the final version of *al-Mawāqif* is determined by first analysing a copy believed to be the author's own holograph, in order to ascertain its authenticity. Subsequently, an analysis is conducted on the textual corrections present within al-Kirmānī's commentary. Finally, the text of *al-Mawāqif* is compared in select sections on the basis of the author's copy, the corrections made by al-Kirmānī and al-Jurjānī in their commentaries, and another copy of the work. The conclusion of the study presents the findings from the research, along with the author's preferred perspective on the subject. The appendix contains the catalogue records of the examined manuscripts of *al-Mawāqif* and *Jawāhir al-kalām*, along with a table containing significant information such as authorship and date of transcription.

1. The Relationship and Analysis of al-Ījī's Theological Works

This section provides an introduction to the author's work *al-'Uyūn*, given the paucity of extant research on the subject and its current status as a manuscript. This is followed by a comparative analysis of the topics addressed in *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām* and *al-'Uyūn*. Subsequently it ascertains whether there are any doctrinal discrepancies are evident within al-Ījī's theological works.

1. 1. al-Ījī's *'Uyūn al-Jawāhir*

This work is referred to as *'Uyūn al-Jawāhir* in some sources.¹¹ In one manuscript copy, it is referred to as *al-'Uyūn*,¹² and in the works of al-Kirmānī and al-Yazdī, two of the author's students, it is also referred to as *al-'Uyūn*.¹³ Therefore, the name *al-'Uyūn* was preferred in this study. There is no doubt that this work belongs to al-Ījī. It is also evident that this work by al-Ījī was cited in subsequent scholarly publications.¹⁴

Two copies of *al-'Uyūn*, (which, as a work, is almost half the length of *Jawāhir al-kalām*),¹⁵ have been identified. The first of these is preserved in the Süleymaniye Library, Carullah Efendi collection, no. 1259, between folios 1b-30b of the manuscript, and appears with the name *'Uyūn al-kalām* on its frontispiece (*zahrīyya*) page. It is evident that this copy is missing one of its chapters, specifically the chapter following the attribute of knowledge in the section on 'Positive Attributes in the Section on Divine Theology'. This phenomenon, however, cannot be attributed to a deficiency

11 See Abū al-Thana' Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Ālūsī, *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'azīm wa al-sab'ī al-mathānī*, critical ed. 'Alī 'Abd al-Bārī 'Aṭīyya (Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 1415), 2, 226; Moḥammad 'Alī Mudarris Tabrīzī, *Rayḥānat al-Adab fī tarājīm al-ma'rūfīn bi al-kunya aw al-laqaḥ* (Tehran: 1328-33 AH.), 4, 143.

12 Al-Ījī, *al-'Uyūn* (Tehran: Malek National Library, 1789), 80.

13 Abū 'Abd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. 'Alī al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Amcazāde Hüseyin, 317), 158a, 159a, 267b, 311b, 316a; Mu'īn al-Dīn al-Yazdī, *Mawāhib-i Ilāhī dar Tārīkh-i Āl-i Muzaffar*, ed. Sa'īd Nafīsī (Tehran: 1326 AH.), 1, 243.

14 Ḥāfiz-i Abrū, *Zubdat al-Tawārīkh*, ed. Seyyed Kamāl Ḥāj Seyyed Javādī (Tehran: 1372 AH.), 1, 254; Ālūsī, *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī*, 2, 226; Tabrīzī, *Rayḥānat al-Adab*, 4, 143; Muḥammad Bāqir b. Zayn al-'ābidīn b. Ja'far al-Mūsawī al-Khwānsārī, *Rawzāt al-Jannāt fī Aḥwāl al-'Ulamā' wa al-Sādāt* (Tehran: Ismā'īliyan Library, 1390), 5, 49.

15 In the codex from the Malik National Library, no. 1789, there are two works by the same scribe (*mustansikh*) with the same number of lines on each page, first *Jawāhir al-kalām* which is 78 pages and then *al-'Uyūn* which is 41 pages.

in the original work itself, but rather to an incomplete transcription. The manuscript, which was scribed at the start of the month of Rajab in the year 749, was written by a scribe known as 'Tāj Kāfī'.

The second copy is registered in Tehran (Malik National Library) with the inventory number 1789. The work entitled *al-'Uyūn* is located between pages 80-121 of this codex, which also includes al-Ījī's *Jawāhir al-kalām* and *al-Fawā'id al-Ghiyāthiyya*, all of which were copied by the same scribe. This copy was dated in the month of Rajab in 750. The title of the work is given as *al-'Uyūn* at the beginning of the copy and on the frontispiece page. Despite its lack of formal scholarly records in comparison to the Carullah copy, the work is nonetheless valuable on account of its completeness.

Since *al-'Uyūn* has not yet been published, no commentary has been written on it. However, Mu'īn al-Dīn Junayd al-Shīrāzī (d. 801/1399) asserts that Iftikhār al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Naṣr Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Dāmaghānī (d. 775/1374) authored a commentary on al-Ījī's *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, and *al-'Uyūn*.¹⁶ To date, no extant version of al-Dāmaghānī's commentary on the three aforementioned works has been found. However, copies of his commentary on al-Ījī's treatise *al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya*, entitled *al-Qawā'id al-shamsiyya fī sharḥ al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya*, are known to exist.¹⁷

In the introduction to *al-'Uyūn*, al-Ījī, without dedicating the work to any of the dynasties of the period, states the rationale for its composition as follows: 'This is a concise work on *uṣūl al-dīn* and the rational sciences. The views of different sects have been included, as have the main issues and the core proofs on the basic topics. A summary of the relevant ideas has been prepared to facilitate memorisation'.¹⁸ This statement indicates that al-Ījī's aim in composing *al-'Uyūn*, which is shorter than *Jawāhir*, was his intention to produce a theological work in a volume that could be

16 Junayd al-Shīrāzī and Abū al-Qāsim Mu'īn al-Dīn Junayd b. Mahmūd, *Shadd al-izār fī ḥaṭṭi al-awzār 'an zuwwāri al-mezār*, ed. Moḥammad Qazvīnī and Iqbāl al-Āshtiyānī (Tehran: Chaphāne-i Majlis, 1328), 66-67.

17 For copies of this commentary of Dāmaghānī, see Beyazıt 3155, Beyazıt 2935; Ayasofya 2307; Esad Efendi 3584; Hacı Mahmud Efendi 1348.

18 Al-Ījī, *al-'Uyūn* (Malek National Library, 1789), 81.

memorised. The work exhibits a high degree of similarity to *Jawāhir al-kalām* with regard to subject matter, structure, organization, and style. Indeed, identical sentences are found in many places. However, it is evident that certain objections and proofs in *Jawāhir al-kalām* have been omitted. It is also evident that the majority of the summarisation occurs within the section entitled '*jawhar (jawāhir)*' and 'the celestial orb and planets'. As will be demonstrated in the ensuing comparison section, all the primary topics in *Jawāhir al-kalām* are also encompassed in *al-'Uyūn*.

Furthermore, the following statements in al-Kirmānī's commentary makes it possible to establish a chronological sequence for *al-'Uyūn* relative to *al-Mawāqif* and *Jawāhir al-kalām*: "In his book *Al-Jawāhir*, the author added generosity to the attributes mentioned in *al-Mawāqif*. He also added mercy to those mentioned in *al-'Uyūn*".¹⁹ The use of the term 'added' suggests that these works were composed at a subsequent date.

1. 2. Comparison of Topics and Titles in *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām* and *al-'Uyūn*

Al-Ījī's *al-Mawāqif* is notable for its systematic structure. The book is organised into six primary chapters (*mawāqif*), which are further subdivided into sub-chapters (*marsad*) and sub-topics (*maksad*). The work encompasses a broad range of topics. Furthermore, it addresses these issues in a systematic manner, underpinned by empirical proofs and rational methodological frameworks. Consequently, the work has garnered sustained interest from scholars and students for centuries, resulting in numerous commentaries and glosses. Moreover, the work was considered a primary reference source in madrasas, which were the official educational institutions of the period. Just as there are the significant parallels between *Jawāhir al-kalām* and *al-'Uyūn*, substantial similarities are also observed between *al-Mawāqif* and *Jawāhir al-kalām* with regard to the titling and structure of their topics. The primary distinction between these two literary works lies in their respective scope, with *al-Jawāhir* exclusively addressing particular cases (*masā'il*) whereas *al-Mawāqif* also incorporates extended discussions.

19 Al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Amcazâde Hüseyin, 317), 316a. Kirmānī's expression "he added it in *al-Jawāhir*" also appears in two different places, 104b, 335a-335b.

The following table compares the subjects and titles of the three books under consideration. It should be noted that the table only includes the main sections (*mawāqif*) and sub-sections (*marsad*) of *al-Mawāqif*.²⁰

<i>al-Mawāqif</i>	<i>Jawāhir al-kalām</i> ²¹	<i>al-'Uyūn</i> ²²
1st Mawqif: Premises	1. Premises	1. Premises
1. <i>Marsad</i> : What should be mentioned at the beginning of every science	1. 1. Knowledge	1. 1. Knowledge
2. <i>Marsad</i> : Description of Knowledge	1. 2. Description of Knowledge	1. 2. Description of Knowledge
3. <i>Marsad</i> : Parts of Knowledge	1. 3. Parts of Knowledge	1. 3. Parts of Knowledge
4. <i>Marsad</i> : Proof of Necessary Knowledge		
5. <i>Marsad</i> : Speculative Reasoning (Naẓar)	1. 4. Speculative Reasoning (Naẓar)	1. 4. Speculative Reasoning (Naẓar)
6. <i>Marsad</i> : The Method of Speculative Reasoning	1. 5. The Method of Speculative Reasoning	1. 5. The Method of Speculative Reasoning
2nd Mawqif: General Ontology (<i>al-umūr al-'amma</i>)	2. General Ontology (<i>al-umūr al-'amma</i>)	2. General Ontology (<i>al-umūr al-'amma</i>)
Premises: Division of Knowledge	2. 1. Division of knowledge	2. 1. Division of knowledge
1. <i>Marsad</i> : Existence and Non-existence	2. 2. Existence and Nonexistence	2. 2. Existence and Nonexistence
2. <i>Marsad</i> : Quiddity	2. 3. Quiddity	2. 3. Quiddity
3. <i>Marsad</i> : Necessity, Possibility, Impossibility	2. 4. Necessity, Possibility, Impossibility	2. 4. Necessity, Possibility, Impossibility
4. <i>Marsad</i> : Unity and Multiplicity	2. 5. Unity and Multiplicity	2. 5. Unity and Multiplicity
5. <i>Marsad</i> : Cause and Effect	2. 6. Cause and Effect	2. 6. Cause and Effect

²⁰ See Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* fi 'ilm al-kalām (Beirut: Ālem al-kutub, n.d.).

²¹ Since the headings in *al-Jawāhir* are not explicitly stated by the author, they were added by its commentators based on the context of the subject. See Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī, "Kitāb *Jawāhir al-kalām Mukhtaṣar al-Mawāqif*", critical ed. Abū al-'Alā' al-Afīfī, *Majallah Kulliyah al-Ādāb*, 2/2 (December 1934); Süleyman Ermihan, *Aduddüddin el-İc'nin "Cevâhîrü'l-Kelâm" İsimli Eserinin Tahkik ve Tahlili* (Master's Thesis, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, 2020).

²² The headings of *al-'Uyūn* are generated based on the manuscript copy of the work and its context.

3 rd <i>Mawqif</i> : Accident (<i>‘araḍ</i>)	3. Accident (<i>‘araḍ</i>)	3. Accident (<i>‘araḍ</i>)
1. <i>Marsad</i> : Universal Topics of the Accident	3. 1. Description of the Accident	3. 1. Description of the Accident
2. <i>Marsad</i> : Quantity	3. 2. Quantity	3. 2. Quantity
3. <i>Marsad</i> : Quality	3. 3. Qualification	3. 3. Qualification
4. <i>Marsad</i> : Proportions	3. 4. Proportions	3. 4. Proportions
5. <i>Marsad</i> : Iḍāfa	3. 5. Iḍāfa	3. 5. Iḍāfa
4 th <i>Mawqif</i> : Substance (<i>jawhar</i>)	4. Substance (<i>jawhar</i>)	4. Substance (<i>jawhar</i>)
1. <i>Marsad</i> : Body	4. 1. Body	4. 1. Body
2. <i>Marsad</i> : Accident and the States of Bodies	4. 2. Accident and the States of Bodies	4. 2. Accident and the States of Bodies
3. <i>Marsad</i> : Abstract Soul	4. 3. Souls	4. 3. Souls
4. <i>Marsad</i> : Intellect	4. 4. Intellect	4. 4. Intellect
5 th <i>Mawqif</i> : Divine Theology	5. Divine Theology	5. Divine Theology
1. <i>Marsad</i> : Divine Essence	5. 1. Divine Essence	5. 1. Divine Essence
2. <i>Marsad</i> : The Sanctification of the Necessary	5. 2. The Sanctification of the Necessary	5. 2. The Sanctification of the Necessary
3 rd <i>Marsad</i> : Waḥdāniyyāt	5. 3. Waḥdāniyyāt	5. 3. Waḥdāniyyāt
4. <i>Marsad</i> : Positive Attributes	5. 4. Positive Attributes	5. 4. Positive Attributes
5. <i>Marsad</i> : Things That Can Be Attributed to Allah	5. 5. Things That Can Be Attributed to Allah	5. 5. Things That Can Be Attributed to Allah
6. <i>Marsad</i> : The Acts of Allah	5. 6. The Acts of Allah and the Acts of the Servant	5. 6. The Acts of Allah and the Acts of the Servant
7. <i>Marsad</i> : Names of Allah	5. 7. Names of Allah	5. 7. Names of Allah
6 th <i>Mawqif</i> : Sam‘iyyāt	6. Sam‘iyyāt	6. Sam‘iyyāt
1. <i>Marsad</i> : Issues Concerning Prophethood	6. 1. Prophethood	6. 1. Prophethood
2. <i>Marsad</i> : Hereafter	6. 2. The Hereafter	6. 2. The Hereafter
3. <i>Marsad</i> : Shari‘ah Names and Rulings	6. 3. Faith and Blasphemy	6. 3. Faith and Blasphemy
4. <i>Marsad</i> : Imāmah	6. 4. Imāmah	6. 4. Imāmah

A thorough analysis of the subjects, headings, *masā'il* and order of the three works reveals a striking similarity between them. Unlike the other two works, *al-Mawāqif* incorporates proofs, objections, answers and quotations. As Afifi observes, *Jawāhir al-kalām* is so concise that reads as if it was written in a coded language,²³ and in fact *al-'Uyūn* is an even more concise version of *Jawāhir al-kalām*. The evident congruence in terms of subject matter, title, organisation and *masā'il* indicates an organic relationship between the three works.

1. 3. Subject Analysis of al-Ījī's Theological Works

In order to trace the development of al-Ījī's ideas as set out in his five theological works and to ascertain whether there have been any changes in his views, a comparison will be made of certain topics to identify any potential differences between them.

Given the established organic relationship between *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, and *al-'Uyūn*, an attempt here is made to identify their differences through a comparative analysis. A comparison is also made between the two works entitled *Risāla fī kalām Allāh*, *al-'Aqā'id al-aḍudiyya*, and the results of this analysis are reported herein.

The central theme of the *Risāla fī kalām Allāh* is that al-Ash'arī's assertion that '*Kalām* is the *naḥs* meaning', is not universally interpreted by his adherents as implying that the attribute of *kalām* encompasses solely this meaning. Rather, al-Ash'arī's assertion should be interpreted as implying that *kalām al-naḥs* encompasses both verbal expressions and semantic content. It is intrinsic to the nature of God, but is also inscribed on scrolls, articulated by tongues, and imprinted in hearts. As an attribute, it extends beyond the realms of reading, writing and memorisation.²⁴ Al-Ījī's understanding of the attribute of *kalām* is also mentioned in *al-Mawāqif* as it is here. Indeed, al-Ījī's statement in the introduction of *al-Mawāqif* that 'The Qur'an is ancient, recited in tongues and written in volumes (*maṣāḥif*);' is commented on by al-Jurjānī in accordance with the understanding found in the *Risāla fī kalām Allāh*.²⁵

23 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī, "*Kitāb Jawāhir al-kalām Mukhtaṣar al-Mawāqif*", critical ed. Abū al-'Alā' Afifi, *Majallah al-Kulliyah al-'Ādāb* 2/2 (December 1934), 134.

24 Altaş, "Aḍudüddin el-İcî'nin *Risāle Fî Kelâmillah* Adlı eserinin Tahkik ve Tercümesi", 392.

25 Al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, 1, 20-21.

Once again, in the theology section of *al-Mawāqif*, in the chapter on Kalam, it can be seen that he presents various views and objections on the subject, without contradicting this understanding.²⁶ Furthermore, within al-Ījī's *tafsīr*, (titled *Tahqīq al-tafsīr* and completed in 723/1323)²⁷ there are expressions similar to his views in the *Risāla*.²⁸

Al-Ījī's *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya* is a treatise on theology that divides the subject into Theology (*Īlahiyyāt*), Matters of revelation (*sam'īyyāt*), and prophethood (*al-Nubuwwāt*), and does not engage in debates. In *al-Mawāqif*, al-Ījī allocates theology and *sam'īyyāt* to the final two chapters as the principal topics, examines prophethood as the primary topic following *sam'īyyāt*, and investigates issues pertaining to the Eschatology (*ma'ād*) subsequent to prophethood. In *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya*, the division of theology, *sam'īyyāt*, and prophethood is preserved, but there is a difference in their order. A further topic in which *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya* differs from *al-Mawāqif* in terms of organisation is that of angels. This discrepancy can be attributed to the differing categorisation of the topic within these two works. Specifically, while *al-Mawāqif* places it under the rubric of prophethood, *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya* classifies it under the purview of theology.²⁹

Based on the evidence available, it is this author's conclusion that there is no difference between *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya* and *al-Mawāqif* in terms of substance. For instance, in *al-Mawāqif*, the issue of the compulsory nature of speculative reasoning (*naẓar*) for the sake of knowledge is thoroughly examined, and the objections raised are addressed.³⁰ In *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya*, the following statement is made in confirmation of this view: 'It is imperative to engage in speculative reasoning for the purpose of attaining knowledge. This is because knowledge is said to be acquired through speculative reasoning, thus obviating the necessity for a teacher'.³¹ In the sec-

26 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 293-295; al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, 1, 103-118. See al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Şehid Ali Paşa, 1684), 162b-163b.

27 See al-Ījī, *Tahqīq al-Tafsīr* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Damad İbrahim Paşa, 134), 369b.

28 See al-Ījī, *Tahqīq al-Tafsīr* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Damad İbrahim Paşa, 135), 533b; Harun Ögmuş, "Adudüddin el-İcî'nin Tefsirciliği ve Tahkikü't-Tefsīr Adlı Eser" in *İslâm İlim ve Düşünce Geleneğinde Adudüddin el-İcî*, ed. Eşref Altaş (Istanbul: İSAM Publications, 2017), 490.

29 Koca, "Akaid-Kelâm İlişkisi Bağlamında Akaid Literatürünü Okumak: İcî'nin Akaid Risâlesi Örneği", 256.

30 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 26-28.

31 al-Ījī, *al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya*, in Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawwānī, *Sharḥ al-'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyya*, (Beirut: Dar al-Ihyā al-Turās al-Arabī, 1437/2016), 237.

tion entitled '*al-Mawāqif*', it is stated that the names of Allah are revealed (*tawḳīfī*).³² This assertion is made under a specific heading located at the conclusion of the theology chapter. In addition, in *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya*, it is stated that the names of Allah are revealed (*tawḳīfī*).³³ In a similar vein, while *al-Mawāqif* states that Anthropomorphism (*tajsīm*) does not lead to disbelief and responds to the arguments of those who practice *takfīr*,³⁴ *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya* states that Anthropomorphism (*tajsīm*) is not disbelief but an religious innovation (*bid'ā*).³⁵

Evidently, throughout *Risāla fī kalām Allāh*, *al-Mawāqif*, and *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya*, there is no significant change or transformation in al-Ījī's ideas; the only differences relate to the arrangement and exposition of some topics between the latter two works.

While the other three works (*al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, and *al-'Uyūn*) share an organic relationship in the form of originality, summary and essence, some minor differences also exist. Indeed, as al-Kirmānī points out and based on some of our observations, al-Ījī, while writing these three works, introduced slight variations on some issues and occasionally made additional explanations. Nevertheless, it would be erroneous to interpret these minor discrepancies as a change of the author's perspective. The following examples will demonstrate this claim:

1. In *al-Mawāqif*, the definition of the intellect is mentioned as follows when describing the attribute of knowledge (*'ilm*) in the sub-section on qualities:

قال الإمام الرازي: والظاهر أنه غريزة يتبعها العلم بالضروريات عند سلامة الآلات³⁶

However, in *Jawāhir al-kalām*³⁷ and *al-'Uyūn*³⁸, 'عدم المانع' is mentioned instead of 'سلامة الآلات'. This does not suggest a change in al-Ījī's view however, as he is merely quoting al-Rāzī.

32 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 333.

33 al-Ījī, *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya*, 239.

34 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 394.

35 al-Ījī, *al-'Aqā'id al-'aḍudiyya*, 241.

36 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 146.

37 al-Ījī, "*Jawāhir al-kalām*", critical ed. Afifi, 170.

38 al-Ījī, *al-'Uyūn* (Malek National Library, 1789), 97.

2. In *al-Mawāqif* in the sub-chapter on the animal soul he states:

النفس الحيوانية وتسمى قواها نفسانية، وهي إما مدركة وإما محرقة³⁹

The phrase in *Jawāhir al-kalām*⁴⁰ and *al-ʿUyūn*⁴¹ appears as ‘مدرّكة وإما فاعلة’ concerning the division of the animal soul. Here, too, there is no change in al-Ījī’s substantive opinion, as he is simply choosing the expression ‘*muḥarrika*’ instead of ‘*fāʿila*’. In other words, the change is only in the sense that the same concept is met with different expressions.

3. In the Divine Theology section of *al-Mawāqif*, at the end of the chapter on Positive Attributes, under the heading ‘Attributes Disputed in their Ascription to God,’ al-Ījī discusses the attributes of perdurance (*baqāʾ*), pre-eternity (*qidam*), dominion (*istiwāʾ*), face (*wajh*), hand (*yad*), eye (*ʿayn*), side (*janb*), foot (*qadam*), finger (*iṣbaʿ*), right (*yemin*), and Divine Origination (*takwīn*).⁴² In *Jawāhir al-kalām*, the attribute of generosity (al-karam) is also mentioned.⁴³ In *al-ʿUyūn* the attributes of ‘generosity’ and ‘mercy’ (al-Raḥma) are added.⁴⁴

4. In the section on accidents in the third chapter of *al-Mawāqif*, under the heading of ‘The Categories of Accidents According to the Philosophers,’ al-Ījī discusses the philosophical view that there are nine categories of accidents. After listing these categories, al-Ījī argues that these nine categories are not *ultimate genera*, that accidents are not limited to these nine categories, and he responds to Avicenna who claims the opposite.⁴⁵ In *Jawāhir al-kalām*⁴⁶ and *al-ʿUyūn*⁴⁷, there is an addition that is not found in *al-Mawāqif*: the argument that ‘accident’ itself is not the genus for these nine categories.

39 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 235.

40 al-Ījī, “*Jawāhir al-kalām*”, critical ed. Afifi, 194, 196.

41 al-Ījī, *al-ʿUyūn* (Malek National Library, 1789), 105, 106.

42 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 296-298.

43 This addition is not included in Afifi’s edition; however, it can be found in certain manuscripts. See al-Ījī, *Jawāhir al-kalām* (Istanbul: Topkapı Palace Museum Library, III. Ahmed, 1801), 40a; al-Ījī, *Jawāhir al-kalām* (Tehran: Malek National Library, 1789), 62; al-Ījī, *Jawāhir al-kalām* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Carullah, 1302), 41a.

44 al-Ījī, *al-ʿUyūn* (Malek National Library, 1789), 112.

45 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 97-99.

46 al-Ījī, “*Jawāhir al-kalām*”, critical ed. Afifi, 157.

47 al-Ījī, *al-ʿUyūn* (Malek National Library, 1789), 19.

5. In the theology chapter of *al-Mawāqif*, under the heading of 'God's Actions', al-Ījī gives an *ilzāmī* (binding) reply to the Mu'tazilites, stating: 'If the Mu'tazilite argument is binding upon those who say that the servant is not independent in his actions, this view is also binding for the Mu'tazilites for several reasons: 1) It is impossible for a servant to perform an act Allah knows will not occur, and it is obligatory for a servant to perform an act that He knows will be realised. 2) What God wills to exist among the acts of the servant will certainly be realised, and what He wills not to exist will certainly not be realised.'⁴⁸ In al-Ījī's *Jawāhir al-kalām*, in addition to what Allah knows and wills, he adds the expression 'what Allah reports'.⁴⁹ In other words, it is impossible that something Allah foretold would not be an act of the servant to be performed by the servant. On the other hand, the acts of the servant, which He has foretold to exist, must be performed by the servant.

6. In the theology section of *al-Mawāqif*, one point of disagreement with the Mu'tazilites concerns the appointed term of life (*ajal*) for a murdered person. According to *Ahl al-Ḥaqq*, the murdered person died by his appointed time and his death was caused by the act of Allah. According to the Mu'tazilites, however, the death of the murdered person is caused by the act of the murderer; if the murderer had not killed him, he would have lived until his naturally appointed time.⁵⁰ In *Jawāhir al-kalām*, there is a response to this view of the Mu'tazilites that is not in *al-Mawāqif*: While causing death is *maqdūr* (under the murderer's power), but its opposite, sustaining life, is not under his power.⁵¹ Therefore, this view of the Mu'tazilites implies that one who is capable of one of the two opposites is not capable of the other, which, according to them, is false. For they believe that the one who is capable of one of the two opposites is also capable of the other.

Based on these relatively insignificant differences, it can be concluded that al-Ījī did not fundamentally change his ideas or undergo a major transformation while writing these works. This is because the differences mentioned above mostly result from expressing the issue more clearly and are not related to the essence of the argument. Based on the limited number of differences between these works and the preceding analysis, it can be concluded that a stability of ideas characterizes al-Ījī's theological works, that there is no radical transformation, and that a consistency and harmony prevails in his views.

⁴⁸ al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 315.

⁴⁹ al-Ījī, "*Jawāhir al-kalām*", critical ed. Afifi, 211.

⁵⁰ al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 320.

⁵¹ al-Ījī, "*Jawāhir al-kalām*", critical ed. Afifi, 212.

2. On The Chronology of *al-Mawāqif* and *Jawāhir al-kalām*

The comparison between al-Ījī's *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, and *al-ʿUyūn* demonstrates an organic relationship among the three works. Since it is clear that *al-ʿUyūn* is a summary of *Jawāhir al-kalām*, the issue of chronology is confined to the other two works. There are two possibilities regarding the order of composition of *al-Mawāqif* and *Jawāhir al-kalām*: (i) Al-Ījī first wrote *al-Mawāqif* and then abridged it to form *al-Jawāhir*, and (ii) al-Ījī first wrote *al-Jawāhir* and then expanded it into *al-Mawāqif*, while preserving the topics, titles, and order of content.

2.1 First opinion: *al-Mawāqif* was written before *Jawāhir al-kalām*

An ideal method for determining the chronology of an author's works is to identify internal citations. However, al-Ījī did not make any such cross-references in the works in question. Nevertheless, the generally accepted and widespread opinion is that al-Ījī first wrote *al-Mawāqif* and then summarised it into *Jawāhir al-kalām*. Kātib Chalabī (d. 1067/1657) writes "The author abridged *al-Mawāqif* and called it *Jawāhir al-kalām*,"⁵² which clearly states that *Jawāhir al-kalām* is a summary of *al-Mawāqif*, albeit without providing any evidence. Contemporary researchers such as Afifi⁵³ and ʿĀshiq Husayn⁵⁴ have repeated Kātib Chalabī's statements though without any further verification. The original evidence presented in support of this view is as follows:

2.1.1. *The Explanations of al-Ījī's Students*

Statements found in the commentaries written by al-Ījī's students confirm the view that *al-Mawāqif* was composed before *Jawāhir al-kalām*.

Explanation of Shams al-Tabrizī:

Al-Ījī's student Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd (d. after 755/1354), also known as Shams al-

52 Kātib Çelebi, *Kashf al-Zunūn*, 2, 1893.

53 al-Ījī, "*Jawāhir al-kalām*", critical ed. Afifi, 133-134.

54 ʿĀshiq Husayn, "Muqaddima" in *al-Fawā'id al-Ghiyāssiyya fī ulūm al-balāgha*, ed. ʿĀshiq Husayn (Cairo: Dar al-Kitāb al-Misrī, 1412/1991), 20.

Tabrīzī,⁵⁵ stated in his work *al-Zahā'ir fī sharḥ al-Jawāhir*⁵⁶ -which he completed in 755 (1354) in the city of Sirhān- that al-Ījī first wrote *al-Mawāqif* and then abridged this work and composed *Jawāhir al-kalām*. His precise statement reads as follows:

Maḥmūd al-Ījī ... the ink of enquiry, the depth of enquiry, my *shaykh*, my master ... wrote *al-Mawāqif*, a self-contained work that contains the sought after proofs their entirety, and frees one from doubts. Then he summarised it in such a way that made it beautiful, complete, satisfying, and enchanting with the *halal* magic. He called it *Jawāhir al-kalām*. This work is the essence of the rarest of gems, a precious and unique pearl, clear in expression, delicate in volume, free from unnecessary expressions, and free from digressions and incomprehensible expressions.⁵⁷

These statements of al-Ījī's student al-Tabrīzī, written in 755/1354⁵⁸ while his teacher was still alive, are significant because they clearly show that *al-Mawāqif* was written before *Jawāhir al-kalām*. Al-Tabrīzī even references *al-Mawāqif* in this commentary directly,⁵⁹ and it is also known that he both owned⁶⁰ and corrected a copy of *al-Mawāqif*.⁶¹

The Statement of Abū 'Abd Allāh Ḥāmid b. Muḥammad b. Ḥāmid al-Khālīdī.⁶²

A manuscript in the Topkapi Palace Library titled Ahmed III collection, no. 1801, contains both *Jawāhir al-kalām* and *al-Mawāqif*. On the frontispiece, there is an ownership and study record indicating that one al-Khālīdī took lessons from al-Ījī.⁶³ At the

55 He also wrote a work entitled *al-Maṭālib al-'āliya wa al-maqāṣidd al-sinīyya*, which is in the Library of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Wetzstein II 1781 CE. See Reza Pourjavady, "The Legacy of 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī", 356. Tabrīzī also states in the introduction to his commentary *al-Zahā'ir fī sharḥ al-Jawāhir* that he visited Crimea, where he met Amīr 'Alā al-Dīn b. Amīr 'Īsā Bey ... al-Amīr al-Husaynī. Apart from this, no other information about al-Tabrīzī has been found. However, there is no doubt that he was al-Ījī's student. In the introduction of his commentary, he clearly states that he was al-Ījī's student. See Shams al-Dīn al-Tabrizi, *al-Zahā'ir fī sharḥ al-Jawāhir* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Fatih, 3197), 2a, 3a.

56 Al-Tabrizi's *al-Zahā'ir fī sharḥ al-Jawāhir* is in manuscript form and has not yet been published. The only known copy of it consists of 186 folios and is registered in the Fatih collection of the Süleymaniye Library with the inventory number 3197. This version was copied in 765 Hijri.

57 Al-Tabrizi, *al-Zahā'ir* (Fatih, 3197), 2a-2b.

58 See al-Tabrizi, *al-Zahā'ir* (Fatih, 3197), 186a.

59 See al-Tabrizi, *al-Zahā'ir* (Fatih, 3197), 7a, 12a, 166a, 185b.

60 See al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Bursa: İnebey Library, Hüseyin Çelebi, 606) 170b.

61 See al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Damad İbrahim Paşa, 806) 217a.

62 Aḍud al-Dīn 'Abd al-Dīn 'Abd al-'Abd al-Ghaffār al-Ījī, *Jawāhir al-kalām* (III. Ahmed, 1801), 1a.

63 al-Ījī, *Jawāhir al-kalām* (III. Ahmed, 1801), 1a.

end of *al-Mawāqif* in this manuscript, there is a collation by al-Khalidī stating that he compared this copy with a copy read to the author in 763:

‘This work was reviewed and annotated by Ḥāmid b. Muḥammad b. Ḥāmid al-Khalidī on Monday 5 Sha‘bān, 763 (30 May 1362). May Allah continue his life in goodness. In addition, this copy was re-examined in Dhū‘l-Qa‘dah 773 and compared with a copy that was read to the author, may Allah have mercy on him.’⁶⁴

In this copy, *al-Mawāqif* appears after *Jawāhir al-kalām*. Before the text of *al-Mawāqif* begins, we find the following note by al-Khalidī:

In the field of theology, the book *al-Mawāqif* was written by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ījī, the beloved of mankind, our respected master, the purifier of religious and rational sciences, and the supporter of truth and religion. ... The owner of this book and its offspring, *al-Jawāhir*, is Ḥāmid b. Muḥammad b. Ḥāmid al-Khalidī, the weakest of the servants of Allah, the Glorious. May Allah grant him access to the hidden treasures of the book.⁶⁵

The phrase ‘*ma‘a far‘ihī al-musammā bi al-Jawāhir*’ in al-Khalidī’s marginal note indicates that *Jawāhir al-kalām* is a summarised version of *al-Mawāqif*. Although this statement is not conclusive proof that *al-Mawāqif* was written before *Jawāhir al-kalām*, the word ‘*far‘*’ suggests the meaning of derivation, and is considered strong evidence for supporting the view that *al-Mawāqif* was written before *Jawāhir al-kalām*.

2. 1. 2. *Statements of the commentators of Jawāhir al-kalām*

There are many commentaries on *Jawāhir al-kalām*.⁶⁶ However, most of them are still

64 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif fī ‘ilmi al-kalām* (Istanbul: Topkapı Palace Museum Library, III. Ahmed, 1801), 231a.

65 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (III. Ahmed, 1801), 51a.

66 There are various commentaries (*shurūḥ*) on the work titled *Jawāhir al-kalām*. Some of these are as follows: [1] A copy of the commentary on *Jawāhir al-kalām* written by an author whose name we have not been able to identify is recorded in the Süleymaniye Library, Ragıp Paşa, no. 775 in Süleymaniye Library, Ragıp Paşa, no. 764 (1363). [2] *Sharḥ Jawāhir al-kalām* by ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Bukhārī (d. after 770/1369), also known as ‘Alā’ al-Tanbīhī. This commentary was completed in 770 (1369). A copy of this commentary is in a private library known as Ibn ‘Ābidīn in Damascus. This copy has no inventory number. The other copies are registered in Tashkent Biruni Institute no. 548 and the British Museum no. 188. [3] Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Senūsī al-Hasanī’s (d. 895/1490) *Sharḥ Jawāhir al-kalām*. No copy of this commentary has been found, but al-Fasī stated in the introduction to his commentary on *Jawāhir al-kalām* that he commented on some parts of al-Senūsī’s book. [4] ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd al-Qādir b. ‘Alī b. Yūsuf al-Fāsī’s (d. 1096/1685)

in manuscript form and only a few of them have been published. One of these commentaries is by Ibrāhīm al-Khalabī al-Madārī⁶⁷ (d. 1190/1776), entitled *Silk al-nizām Sharḥ Jawāhir al-kalām*.⁶⁸ In the introduction of his commentary, al-Madārī states that *al-Jawāhir* is a summary of *al-Mawāqif*:

'I found that *Jawāhir al-kalām*, which is the summary of *al-Mawāqif* written by Qāḍī 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī, is the most comprehensive book in the science of theology. I realised that this work, which contains proofs and demonstrations, omits only a small part of *al-Mawāqif*.⁶⁹

These words of al-Madārī, the commentator of *al-Jawāhir*, show that the work was written after *al-Mawāqif*. Indeed, abridgement (*ikhtiṣār*) is a process performed on lengthy works. In one copy of *al-Jawāhir*, al-Madārī wrote a note in his own hand: '*Jawāhir al-kalām* is the work of Qāḍī 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī. He abridged this work from his book called *al-Mawāqif*;⁷⁰ thereby stating for the second time and even more explicitly that *al-Jawāhir* is a summary of *al-Mawāqif*.

2. 1. 3. Evidence from the manuscripts of *Jawāhir al-kalām*

It is often the case that manuscripts sometimes contain significant information about a work and its author that cannot be found in other sources. Therefore, in this study, in order to find comments or information about the composition date of *Jawāhir al-kalām*, an effort was made to locate and analyse as many manuscript copies of the work as possible. To this end a total of fifteen copies were identified and

commentary on *Jawāhir al-'ulūm*. This commentary was completed in 1078 (1668). There is a copy of the work in Süleymaniye Library, Nuruosmaniye, no. 2163. Sahāwī states that al-Kirmānī had a commentary on *Jawāhir al-kalām* called *al-Ẓawāhir*. See Abū al-Hayr Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sahāwī, *al-Ḍaw' al-lāmi' li-ahli al-qarn al-tāsi'* (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-Hayat, n.d), 10, 260.

67 For more detailed information about Ibrahim al-Halabī al-Madārī's life and works, see Münzir Şeyhhasan, "İbrahim el-Halebî el-Medârî ve el-Lûm'a Adlı Eseri", in *al-Lum'a fî al-hudûs wa'l-qidam wa'l-qadā wa'l-qadar wa tahqiq al-taqlif*, critical ed. Münzir Şeyhhasan (Istanbul, İSAM Publications, 2022) 15-43.

68 This work was published in 2022; however, the *muḥaqqiq* (editor) neglected the author's autograph copy and other quality copies that were available for the publication.

69 Ibrahim al-Halabī al-Madārī, *Silk al-nizām Sharḥ Jawāhir al-kalām* ed. Ghulām Haydar al-Siddīkī (Amman: Dar al-Nūr al-Mubīn, 2022), 37.

70 al-Ījī, *Jawāhir al-kalām* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Laleli, 2171), Frontispiece.

thirteen of them were reviewed. Seven of these copies have the phrase ‘*Mukhtaşar al-Mawāqif*’ on the frontispiece or at the beginning of the text immediately after the title of the book.⁷¹ This indicates that *al-Jawāhir* was understood to be an abridgment of *al-Mawāqif*. Although this evidence does not provide a conclusive proof like Shams al-Tabrīzī’s explicit statement, it can be considered as supporting and complementary corroborating evidence.

2. 1. 4. Evidence from the Marginal Notes and *Ṭabaqāt* Books

Paratextual elements such as *fawā'id* (notes of benefit), *minhuwwāt* (marginalia), and *ta'liqāt* (glosses) in manuscripts are important for both understanding the text as well as shedding light on historical context and scholarly networks. In this respect, two pieces of evidence related to this inquiry have been identified in the marginalia of some manuscripts:

First, Kātib Chalabī states in *Kashf al-ẓunūn* that Shams al-Dīn al-Fanārī (d. 834/1431) wrote a commentary on *Jawāhir al-kalām*.⁷² However, no manuscript copy of this work is known to have survived and no other evidence has been found to confirm that al-Fanārī wrote such a work. Nonetheless, we have found support for the accuracy of this information in a *minhuwwāt* note written by al-Fanārī’s grandson Hasan Çelebi (d. 891/1486) in the margin of his work *Hāshiya ‘alā Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*. Hasan Çelebi points out that Shams al-Dīn al-Fanārī had a commentary on *Mukhtaşar al-Mawāqif*, i.e. *Jawāhir al-kalām*, through the statement ‘This is what our *muḥaqqiq* grandfather *mawlānā* al-Fanārī mentioned in his commentary on *Mukhtaşar al-Mawāqif*.’⁷³ Likewise, in another *minhuwwāt* note, he says, ‘The above-mentioned subject is what our grandfather mentioned in his commentary on *Mukhtaşar al-Mawāqif*.’⁷⁴

71 See Appendix: Manuscripts of *Jawāhir al-kalām* that we analysed.

72 Kātib Çelebi, *Kashf al-ẓunūn*, 2, 1893. Kadir Gömbeyaz attributes such a work to al-Fanārī only on the basis of *Kashf al-ẓunūn* and without any other evidence. See Kadir Gömbeyaz, “Molla Fenari’ye Nispet Edilen Eserlerde Aidiyet Problemi ve Molla Fenari Bibliyografyası”, in *International Molla Fanari Symposium (4-6 December 2009 Bursa) - Proceedings*, ed. Tefik Yücedoğru and others. (Bursa: Bursa Metropolitan Municipality, 2010), 490.

73 Hasan Çelebi, *Hāshiya ‘alā Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Carullah, 1176), 47a.

74 Hasan Çelebi, *Hāshiya ‘alā Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Murad Molla, 1357), 51b.

Secondly, Khojazāda Muşliḥ al-Dīn Efendi (d. 893/1488), in the margin of his work *Hāshīya 'alā Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, quotes the following statements from al-Fanārī's *Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar al-Mawāqif*: 'Our master al-Fanārī, in his commentary on the commentary of the *mukhtaṣar* of *al-Mawāqif*, known as *al-Jawāhir al-Mawāqif*, stated the following: This is the author's copyright and does not belong to any other person. However, the commentary of *al-Wikāya* is not like that'.⁷⁵ These statements accord with Hasan Çelebi's statements. In fact, it is confirmed here that *Jawāhir al-kalām* is a summary of *al-Mawāqif* and that al-Fanārī wrote a commentary on this summary.

2. 2. Second Opinion: Jawāhir al-kalām was written before al-Mawāqif

The view that *Jawāhir al-kalām* was written by al-Ījī after *al-Mawāqif* and that it is a summary of *al-Mawāqif* is prevalent. As we have outlined, this view exists due to some of al-Ījī's students, most of the commentators of *Jawāhir al-kalām*, important scholars such as Hasan Çelebi, Kâtib Chalabî, Khojazāde Musliḥ al-Dīn Efendi, researchers such as Afifi and 'Ashiq Ḥusayn, and notes found in manuscript copies of *Jawāhir al-kalām*. Tahsin Görgün, on the other hand, argues that *al-Jawāhir* was composed before *al-Mawāqif*, based on the dedications in the *dibājas* of *al-Mawāqif* and *Jawāhir al-kalām*, and that the famous and widespread opinion should be revised based on this evidence.⁷⁶

A comparative reading of the dedications in the introductions of these two works and the earliest extant manuscripts suggests that *Jawāhir al-kalām* was written before *al-Mawāqif*. In the *dibāja* of *al-Jawāhir*, the author states that the work is dedicated to the Ilkhanid vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn, who died in 736 (1335).⁷⁷ In comparison, the *muqaddimah* of *al-Mawāqif* states that the work is dedicated to Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq, who died in 758 (1357, twenty-two years after the death of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad).⁷⁸ These dedications imply that

75 Hocazāde Muslihuḍdin Efendi, *Hāshīya 'alā Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Damad İbrahim Paşa, 784), 66a.

76 Tahsin Görgün, "İcā, Adudüddin Kadı Ebü'l-Fazl Abdurrahman b. Rükneddin b. Abdurrahman", in *İslām İlim ve Düşünce Geleneğinde Adudüddin el-İcā*, ed. Eşref Altaş (Istanbul: İSAM Publications, 2017), 66-67.

77 al-Ījī, "*Jawāhir al-kalām*", critical ed. Afifi, 136.

78 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 6.

al-Jawāhir was composed before *al-Mawāqif*.⁷⁹ All of the manuscripts of *Jawāhir al-kalām* we analysed contain a dedication to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad.⁸⁰ Forty of the fifty-two copies of *al-Mawāqif* contain a dedication to Abū Ishāq.⁸¹ To better appreciate this finding, it is useful to have some awareness of the history of this period.

It is evident that Īcī served under the patronage of Öljaitü Khān (d. 716/1316), who ruled between 703/1304 and 716/1316, and held the position of *qāḍī* in the city of Sulṭāniyya.⁸² After the death of Öljaitü Khān, his son Abū Saʿīd Bahādur Khān (d. 736/1335) ruled between 716/1316 and 736/1335.⁸³ During the reign of Bahādur Khān, al-Ījī became a *qād al-memālik* in Sulṭāniyya. Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh Hamadānī (d. 718/1318)⁸⁴ served first as vizier to Öljaitü Khān and then to his son Abū Saʿīd. However, Rashīd al-Dīn was dismissed in 717/1317 and executed in 718/1318 on charges of poisoning Öljaitü Khān.⁸⁵

The vizier Rashīd al-Dīn had many children, one of whom was Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, who himself served as vizier to Abū Saʿīd Khān between 727–736/1327–1335.⁸⁶ As vizier, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad summoned al-Ījī to come to Shīraz. Al-Ījī

79 When discussing *al-Mawāqif*, Kâtib Çelebi states that al-Ījī dedicated this work to the vizier of Hudabende, Ghiyāth al-Dīn. Other authors have followed Kâtib Çelebi in this regard. However, none of the copies of *al-Mawāqif* we analysed have a dedication to Ghiyāth al-Dīn. On the contrary, in most of these copies, and especially in al-Ījī's own calligraphic copy of *al-Mawāqif*, we see that the work in question is dedicated to Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq. However, the following possibility may also be the explanation: When al-Ījī wrote the first version of *al-Mawāqif*, he dedicated the work to the vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn; Kâtib Çelebi may have seen the copies of this first version and based on this, he may have said that the work was dedicated to the vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn. Although the writing years of the first version of *al-Mawāqif* (730–733) coincide with the period when the vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn was in office (727–736), we believe that this possibility is weak. This is because it is rare for a work that is incomplete and still in manuscript form to be dedicated to a vizier. We have also not come across any source that mentions such information prior to Kâtib Çelebi. See Kâtib Çelebi, *Kashf al-Zunūn*, 2, 1893; Zebihullah Safā, *Tārīh-i Edebiyāt-i der Iran* (Tehran: Intishārat-i Firdaws, 1366), 3, 47; Âşık Hüseyin, "Mukaddime", 11.

80 See Appendix: Manuscripts of *Jawāhir al-kalām* that we analysed.

81 See Appendix: Manuscripts of *al-Mawāqif* that we analysed.

82 See Osman Gazi Özgüdenli, "Olcaytü Han", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 2007), 33, 345–347.

83 See Abdülkadir Yuvalı, "Ebû Said Bahadır Han", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 1994), 10, 218–219.

84 Some sources give his death date as 727/1327. See Tahsin Görgün, "Îcî, Adudüddin", 32.

85 See Safā, *Tārīh-i Edebiyāt-i der Iran*, 3, 46; Osman Gazi Özgüdenli, "Reşidüddin Fazlullâh-ı Hemedânî", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 2008), 35, 19–21.

86 See Safā, *Tārīh-i Edebiyāt-i der Iran*, 3, 46–47.

travelled to Shīraz and served as a *qāḍī* there in 727/1327. Although we cannot determine exactly how long he stayed in Shīraz, based on the sources, we can say that he went to Shebenkara after staying there for some time. After the death of Abū Saʿīd in 736/1335 and the execution of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad in the same year, al-Ījī returned to Shīraz and became *qāḍī al-quḍāt* in Shīraz under the patronage of Amr Abū Ishāq (d. 758/1357).⁸⁷

Born in 721/1321, Abū Ishāq ascended to the throne at the age of twenty-two after his elder brother Masʿūd Shāh was killed around 743/1342. When the founder of the Muzaffarid dynasty, Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muzaffar (d. 765/1364), moved to take Shīrāz, Abū Ishāq sent al-Ījī to him as a mediator in 754/1353.⁸⁸ When no favourable result was obtained, al-Ījī secretly left the city in 754 while Shīrāz was under siege. Therefore, we can say that the possibility of al-Ījī's meeting with Abū Ishāq and dedicating a work to him took place between 743-754.

Considering this information, we can conclude that al-Ījī wrote *al-Jawāhir* before *al-Mawāqif*. This is because the dedication in *al-Jawāhir* must be chronologically earlier than the dedication in *al-Mawāqif*. As stated, the dedication in *al-Jawāhir* is addressed to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn, who patronised al-Ījī before Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq and died at an earlier date. Based on this evidence, Görgün defends the second view that *al-Mawāqif* was composed later and claims that al-Ījī wrote *al-Mawāqif* in his maturity. Therefore, he argues that *al-Jawāhir* must be the first form or draft of *al-Mawāqif*.⁸⁹

As a result of our examination of the manuscripts of these works, we have found further evidence that *Jawāhir al-kalām* was composed before *al-Mawāqif*. This evidence is al-Ījī's dedication to Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq in the *dibāja* of his own autograph copy of *al-Mawāqif*, which he completed in 753/1352.⁹⁰ Seeing as al-Ījī's dedication of his own handwritten copy of *al-Mawāqif* is to Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq, who died at a later date, indicates that this work was composed at a later time.

87 See Görgün, "İcî, Adudüddin", 32-33, 65-67; Rıza Kurtuluş, "İncülular", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 2000), 22, 280-281.

88 Boccnurdî, Kāzım Mūsāvî, *Dāiretu'l-Maārif-i Bozorg-i Islāmî*, critical ed. Kāzım Mūsāvî Boccnurdî, (Tehran: Merkez-i Dāiretu'l-Maārif-i Bozorg-i Islāmî, 1993/1372 AH), 5, 161-165.

89 See Görgün, "İcî, Adudüddin", 65-67; Yusuf Şevki Yavuz, "Cevāhirü'l-Kelām", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 1993), 7, 432-433; Mustafa Sinanoğlu, "el-Mevākif", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 2004), 29, 422-424.

90 Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Istanbul: Topkapı Palace Museum Library, Koşuşlar, 861), 2b.

Further evidence supporting this view is found in the oldest known copy of *Jawāhir al-kalām* which was uncovered during our research. This copy was written by one of al-Ījī's students in 738/1337, and it was collated with the author's copy. In the introduction of this copy, there is a dedication to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn.⁹¹ The colophon record is as follows: 'It was written by the servant Quṭb al-Muzanī in the year 738, at the end of Jumādā al-Awwal'.⁹² The fact that a copy of *Jawāhir al-kalām* was transcribed in 738 indicates that this work was written before that date. Therefore, it is probable and plausible that he dedicated *al-Jawāhir* to the vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn. Seeing as the vizier was executed in 736/1335, the work must have been completed prior to his death.

Considering this evidence on the order of composition, it is not easy to choose between the two overall views. Although the commentary on *Jawāhir al-kalām* written by al-Ījī's student Shams al-Dīn al-Tabrīzī is strong evidence in favour of the first view, the author's autograph of *al-Mawāqif* and the dedication to Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq in its introduction are strong evidence in favour of the second view. In addition, the fact that some copies of *Jawāhir al-kalām* are dated earlier than any known copy of *al-Mawāqif* also supports this latter view.

2. 3. Third Opinion: Shams al-Dīn al-Kirmānī's Alternative View

Upon a detailed examination of the manuscripts of both works and their commentaries in detail, it is this author's opinion that Shams al-Dīn al-Kirmānī (d. 786/1384), al-Ījī's student and the first commentator of *al-Mawāqif*, is the one who offers a way to reconcile the two competing views and provides a logical solution to the issue. Kirmānī began writing *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif* while al-Ījī was still alive and completed it in 757. In the introduction to this commentary, al-Kirmānī states that al-Ījī wrote *al-Mawāqif* up to the chapter on '*khalq al-a'māl*'. He then did not write on this work for twenty years, and it was only after this long interval that he returned to both complete and thoroughly revise it.⁹³ Al-Kirmānī's statement on the subject is as follows:

91 al-Ījī, *Jawāhir al-kalām* (III.Ahmed, 1801), 1b.

92 al-Ījī, *Jawāhir al-kalām* (III.Ahmed, 1801), 49b.

93 Kirmānī's view that there are two versions of *al-Mawāqif* has been touched upon in two recent studies. See Pourjavady, "The Legacy of 'Aḥud al-Dīn al-Ījī", 353-355; Bilal Taşkın and Muhammad Emin Efe, "Muhaddis Bir Kelâmcı: Şemseddin el-Kirmânî ve el-Mevâkıf Şerhi (Bilgi ve Nazar Bahsi Özeline Bir Değerlendirme)", *Journal of Islamic Studies* 12/1 (2022): 99.

Know that the Master first wrote this book up to the issue of '*khalq al-a'māl*' and then returned to complete this book, the writing of which had been interrupted for twenty years. Those who liked this book undertook to copy it during this interim period before it was proofread. Since they transcribed the book before it was written in a finalized and revised form, there were many alterations, corruptions, errors and falsifications among these manuscripts. These are not due to the ambiguous statements of profound scholars, but only to the carelessness of the transcribers. Therefore, the completed part of the book is free from the initial errors. In the commentaries on the work, the author does not bear any responsibility for the objections to the wording of the text. On the contrary, such issues are due to the carelessness and poor copying of the manuscript copies by the scribes.⁹⁴

It is clear from al-Kirmānī's statement that al-Ījī wrote *al-Mawāqif* in two stages. In the first stage, he started writing the work and progressed as far as the issue of '*khalq al-a'māl*,' i.e., the argument that 'If there were no freedom in the servant's actions, the religious obligation (*taklīf*) would be cancelled.'⁹⁵ This issue is included in the fifth *mawqif* (on theology), the sixth *marṣad*, and the first intention of the book.⁹⁶ In this respect, we can say that the subject is almost at the end of the book. Indeed, it is followed by another '*Marṣad*' and then the '*sixth mawqif*' (*ṣam'iyyāt*), which is the last chapter of *al-Mawāqif*. Twenty years later, al-Ījī resumed work on the book, completing the remaining sections and revising the parts he had already written, resulting in the second version of *al-Mawāqif*.

Al-Kirmānī emphasises this claim by repeating it once more in the commentary. He gives a detailed explanation at the end of the issue of '*khalq al-a'māl*' and states that this text is the last chapter of *al-Mawāqif* in most copies. He states that al-Ījī completed this section after more than twenty years with the following statements:

And know that this is the last chapter according to most extant copies of the book. This is because it was written in the fourth decade of the eighth century and was interrupted until the sixth decade of the same century. He resumed the writing of the book and the completion of the remaining chapters after a break of more than twenty years. May Allah keep it alive as a helper of the religion and the people of the religion and a supporter of Islam and the Muslims.⁹⁷

94 al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Amcazâde Hüseyin, 317), 3a.

95 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 314; al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Amcazâde Hüseyin, 317), 334a.

96 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, 314. According to al-Kirmānī, the first version of *al-Mawāqif* ends here.

97 al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Amcazâde Hüseyin, 317), 334a.

Al-Kirmānī's statement above shows that the first version of *al-Mawāqif* was written between 730 and 739. The copy of *al-Mawāqif* written in al-Ījī's own handwriting in 753 shows that there does exist a copy of the second version and that it was completed between 750-753/1349-1352. From what al-Kirmānī reports, we can conclude that the first version of *al-Mawāqif* was written at least twenty years before this date, i.e. between 730-733. However, Ḥamd Allāh al-Mustawfī's (d. after 740/1340) *Tārīkh-e gozida*,⁹⁸ which was completed in 730/1330, states that al-Ījī wrote *Sharḥ al-Mukhtaṣar*, *al-Mawāqif*, and *al-Fawā'id al-Ghiyāthiyya*.⁹⁹ Therefore, according to this information given by Ḥamd Allāh al-Mustawfī, both *al-Mawāqif* and the other two works were written before 730. However, it is explicitly stated that al-Ījī wrote *Sharḥ al-Mukhtaṣar* in 734.¹⁰⁰ From this point of view, we can say that the information provided by Ḥamd Allāh al-Mustawfī is not reliable. In the final analysis, we believe that the dating of the first version of *al-Mawāqif* between 730-733 is more accurate according to the data we have.

From al-Kirmānī's explanations in two different places in his work *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, we can infer that the first view is correct. In other words, al-Ījī first wrote the initial draft of *al-Mawāqif*, then abridged it, added a chapter on sam'īyyāt and called it *Jawāhir al-kalām*. He then revised and completed *al-Mawāqif* and produced the second version. We have one of the author's autograph copies representing this second version, and its completion is dated 753. Based on al-Kirmānī's statement, the date of writing the first version of *al-Mawāqif* corresponds to 730-733. The date of the writing of *Jawāhir al-kalām*, on the other hand, appears to be before the death of the vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn, that is, before 736/1335. Therefore, this timeline places the composition of *Jawāhir al-kalām* in the

واعلم أنَّ هذا آخر ما يوجد من هذا الكتاب بحسب أكثر النسخ المشهورة في الأطراف، والسبب فيه أنَّ تصنيفه إلى هاهنا صدر منه في سني العشر الرابع من المائة الثامنة فاتفق له فترة إلى العشر السادس منها، ثم شرع في تأليفه بما بينهما من عشرين سنة وأكثر حتى كمل الباقي، أبقاه الله اعتضاداً للدين وذويه، واستظهاراً للإسلام وأهاليه.

98 Mostowfi, Hamdollah, *Tārīkh-e gozida*, 8; Abdülkerim Özeydin, "Tārīh-i Güzide", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: TDV Publications, 2011), 40, 82-83.

99 Mostowfi, Hamdollah, *Tārīkh-e gozida*, 808.

100 Al-Ījī, *Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar al-muntaḥā al-uṣūlī* (Princeton University Library, Garrett, 808H), 215b; Kātib Çelebi, *Kashf al-ẓunūn*, 2, 1853; Tuncay Başoğlu, "Müteahhir Dönem Fıkıh Usulünde Adudüddin el-İcī'nin Şerhü'l-Muhtasar'ı", in *İslām İlīm ve Düşünce Geleneğinde Adudüddin el-İcī*, ed. Eşref Altaş (İstanbul: İSAM Publications, 2017), 431-432.

interval between the first version of *al-Mawāqif* and the vizier's death. This is a reasonable time for the abridgement of *al-Mawāqif*.

Al-Kirmānī's opinion also clarifies the reason for the dedication of the second version of *al-Mawāqif* (*mubayyaḍa*, or fair copy) to Abū Ishāq (d. 758/1357). This is because al-Ījī stayed under his patronage in Shīrāz. In addition, the completion of the author's autograph copy of *al-Mawāqif* in Shīrāz is stated in al-Ījī's own handwriting in its endowment record. Kirmānī's comment also explains the existence of early copies of *al-Jawāhir*. The oldest copy of *al-Jawāhir* that we have analysed was completed in 738. The author's autograph copy of *al-Mawāqif* that we have access to was written in 753. From this, it is understood that the existing copies of *al-Mawāqif* were reproduced from the second and complete version. This is because the first version of *al-Mawāqif* was incomplete and, naturally, copies were not therefore widely reproduced from this version.

3. Versions of *al-Mawāqif* and the Author's Manuscript

As previously discussed, there are two main versions of *al-Mawāqif*. The first is the initial version, which was written around 730/1330 and left incomplete, and the second is the complete, final version written between 750-753/1349-1352. This is supported by an autograph annotation in al-Ījī's handwriting at the end of a complete copy of *al-Mawāqif*, completed in 753. There are some corrections and changes in the margin of this copy, which is registered in the Koğuşlar collection of the Topkapi Palace Museum Library with the inventory number 861.

On the other hand, when we analyse al-Kirmānī's *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, which itself states that there are two versions of al-Ījī's *al-Mawāqif*, we see that al-Ījī corrected the text of *al-Mawāqif* in many places. Al-Kirmānī stated that he compared various copies in his possession. When we compare these corrections with the author's copy, we see that there are some discrepancies. This raises the issue of the definitive status of this copy and several questions: Is the extant autograph copy the final version of *al-Mawāqif*? Did al-Kirmānī ever see this particular manuscript? Is there any other copy or final version of the work that has not reached us?

First, this study will seek to verify whether the Topkapi manuscript is an autograph copy by al-Ījī. Then, by analysing the corrections to *al-Mawāqif* proposed with-

in al-Kirmānī's *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, an attempt will be made to determine the number of versions of *al-Mawāqif* and identify its final version. Finally, this article will compare the textual corrections proposed in al-Kirmānī's commentary with the text of the author's autograph copy. In addition, it will evaluate the previously mentioned collated copy of *al-Mawāqif*, and the copy or copies that al-Jurjānī used while writing his commentary, examining them in terms of their differences.

3. 1. The Authenticity of the Topkapi Palace Museum Library Manuscript

The copy of *al-Mawāqif* registered in the Koğuşlar collection of the Topkapi Palace Museum Library with the inventory number 861 contains various pieces of evidence showing that it was written in al-Ījī's own handwriting. The most important of these is the author's statement in the copy's endowment record:

'This book was written by the weak servant 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Ghaḥfār, who is in need of Allah's mercy and forgiveness. He is known as 'Aḍud al-Ījī al-Şiddiqī. May Allah forgive his sins and cover his faults. This book was completed in the year seven hundred and fifty-three. Its completion took place in the city of Şirāz, Dār al-Mulk, in the first days of Jumādā al-Ākhira. May Allah protect this city from calamities and bless it with justice, prosperity and goodness.'¹⁰¹

Another point that confirms that the copy belongs to the author is the statement on the frontispiece page: "The book *al-Mawāqif* on the science of theology is in the handwriting of its author."¹⁰² Sometimes such copies may be mistaken for the author's autograph because the scribes copy the author's completion note as it stands and then do not write their own transcription record, or because they want to make the manuscript appear more valuable by stating on the frontispiece page that the copy was written in the author's handwriting. In this case, additional evidence is needed to support the authenticity of the copy as an autograph. One of the ways to confirm this is to compare the script in the copy with other samples of handwritings known to belong to the author. Another sample of al-Ījī's handwriting is found in an *ijāza* (license to transmit) at the end of a copy of Sirāj al-Dīn al-Urmawī's (d. 682/1283)

101 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 143b.

102 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), Zahriye.

Lubāb al-Arbaʿīn,¹⁰³ which al-Ījī wrote in his own hand for his student Şadr al-Dīn al-Hamawī (d. 739/1338). When we compare the copy of *al-Mawāqif* with the script of this *ijāza*, we see that there is a significant similarity between them. From this point of view, we can conclude that this *ijāza* and the autograph copy in our possession were both written by al-Ījī.

In al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī's *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, several pieces of evidence support the claim that this copy of *al-Mawāqif* was written in al-Ījī's handwriting. They are as follows:

1. Jurjānī states in *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*: 'Then the author added the following phrase to his autograph copy: "Otherwise, if we stipulate that it is possible".¹⁰⁴ When we examine the author's copy, we see that at the end of the phrase "Otherwise, if we stipulate that it is possible",¹⁰⁵ an addition was made with the record correct. "*sah-ha*". In other words, as al-Jurjānī pointed out, this phrase was added to the text.
2. In another example, al-Jurjānī states the following: '(They agreed/*Ittafaqu*) and in the author's copy: They confirmed/*Athbatu*.¹⁰⁶ When we analyse the author's copy, we see that it is written as 'They approved/*Ittafaqu* as al-Jurjānī states.¹⁰⁷
3. In another context, al-Jurjānī uses the following expressions: 'Know that the text in the author's autograph copy was mentioned as '*al-munfaṣil*', but he changed it to '*al-muttaṣil*' in his own handwriting'.¹⁰⁸ When we analyse the author's copy, we see that the change mentioned by al-Jurjānī was made.¹⁰⁹

In these three instances, al-Jurjānī clearly refers to readings in what he identifies as al-Ījī's autograph copy, and these readings correspond to the manuscript in question. Elsewhere, al-Jurjānī states that this copy is the original version and makes explanations in the following way:

103 Sirāj al-Dīn al-Urmawī, *Lubāb al-Arbaʿīn* (Istanbul: the Süleymaniye Library, Carullah, 1252), 82b.

104 Al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, 1, 267-277.

105 al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 10b.

106 Al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, 5, 4.

107 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 30a.

108 Al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, 5, 61.

109 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 33a.

1. '(He qualified them), but in the original: He qualified him'.¹¹⁰ When we examine the author's copy, we see that the expression is indeed 'made him qualified'.¹¹¹
2. Elsewhere, al-Jurjānī states: 'Know that in the original and in many copies it is mentioned as follows: (it is the fourth body) The author has made this the fourth of the reasons for the impossibility of space being a surface. What is correct is that it is a derivative of the third reason, as we have explained.'¹¹² When we look at the author's copy, we see that the expression is exactly as al-Jurjānī states.¹¹³
3. In another place al-Jurjānī uses the following expressions: 'This expression (and the eclipse of the sun) is found in the original copy of the work. Therefore, the author quoted Ibn al-Haytham's words, but crossed out the word 'eclipse' with a pen'.¹¹⁴ When we examine the author's copy, we find a line over the word 'eclipse'.¹¹⁵

Further evidence confirming that this copy of *al-Mawāqif* was written in al-Ījī's handwriting is found in the notes attributed to Sa'd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī (d. 792/1390) in the margin of a copy of *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* transcribed by al-Khayālī (d. 875/1470). It is understood from these notes that al-Taftāzānī saw the copy written in al-Ījī's handwriting. The statement in *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* is as follows: (وهو غني) عن (أن يباهي) (أن يُباهي) غيرة ويفاخره، (وأجل) من (أن يُباهي).¹¹⁶

The note in the margin of the copy in question is as follows:

وفي خط المصنف: 'أغنى أن يُباهي' بفتح الهاء، 'وأجل أن يباهي' بكسر الهاء. نُقِلَ من خط العلامة التفتازاني.¹¹⁷

And below this note is the sentence 'وهو غني (نسخة) من خط المصنف، كذا بخط' Here, al-Taftāzānī clearly states that the phrase written in al-Ījī's handwriting is 'rich'. When we analyse the author's autograph copy in our possession, we see that the expression is exactly as stated.¹¹⁸

110 Al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, 1, 10.

111 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 1b.

112 Al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, 5, 136.

113 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 37a.

114 Al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, 7, 134.

115 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 70a.

116 Al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, 1, 30.

117 Al-Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Köprülü Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa, 839), 5a.

118 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 2b.

We also see that the issue mentioned by al-Taftāzānī in the section on state (*al-ḥāl*) of *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid* where he says "According to the original copy, al-Ījī says"¹¹⁹ is found in the author's autograph copy.¹²⁰

All of these points of evidence confirm that this copy of *al-Mawāqif* is in al-Ījī's handwriting.

3. 2. Analysis of al-Kirmānī's Revisions of *al-Mawāqif* and Versions of *al-Mawāqif*

Analysing the corrections to *al-Mawāqif* in al-Kirmānī's commentary provides important information for identifying the various versions of *al-Mawāqif* and determining its final form. In *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, al-Kirmānī mentions the differences between the various manuscripts of *al-Mawāqif* in many places and explains his method for adjudicating between these variants in the preface of the commentary. He states that he made corrections to the text either on the basis of the manuscripts in his own possession or by asking his teacher al-Ījī directly. As a matter of fact, al-Kirmānī states that he started writing his own commentary while al-Ījī was still alive and that he corrected his copy by reading *al-Mawāqif* to his teacher.

In the introduction of the commentary, al-Kirmānī explains the reason for why there are differences between the various manuscripts of *al-Mawāqif*, as well as the method of allocating preference between them with the following statements:

Know that the Master first wrote this book up to the issue of "*Khalq al-a'māl*" and then returned to complete this book after a twenty-year hiatus. During this time, those who liked this book undertook to copy it before it was proofread. Because they transcribed the book before it was finalized and revised, there were many changes, corruptions, errors and distortions between the manuscripts. These are not due to ambiguous statements by profound scholars, but only [due] to the carelessness of the transcribers. Therefore, one could not find in the complete form of the author's work the errors which could be found in its first draft. In the commentaries on the work, the author does not bear any responsibility for the objections to the wording of the text. On the contrary, they are due to the fact that the scribes relied on the draft manuscript and were careless, and their transcription poor ... I endeavoured to correct these statements either by quoting from his handwriting- for I have the manuscript of the first version and was with the au-

119 Al-Taftāzānī, *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid fi 'ilmi al-kalām* (Pakistan: Dār al-Ma'arif al-Nu'maniyya, 1401/1981), 1, 90-91.

120 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 17b-18a.

thor when the rest of the text was completed- or by asking the author directly, for I was granted the success of beginning this commentary before his death. However, the author passed away while I was starting the sixth chapter *mawqif*, and I completed the rest of the text after his death. May Allah reward him with His mercy.¹²¹

It is clear from this fragment that al-Kirmānī saw the draft copy in al-Ījī's handwriting, which represents the first incomplete version of *al-Mawāqif*.¹²² Moreover, al-Ījī was present with al-Kirmānī while he was completing *al-Mawāqif* and occasionally discussed it with al-Ījī while writing his commentary.¹²³ However, at no point here does al-Kirmānī explicitly refer to the author's autograph copy (Koğuşlar, 861), which is a complete text and effectively serves as the second, revised edition of *al-Mawāqif* complete with corrections and additions, and nor does he mention this copy when he discusses manuscript differences in the body of his actual commentary. Therefore, we are of the opinion that this copy was not in al-Kirmānī's possession at all. This is further supported by the following reasoning.

Al-Kirmānī meticulously presents the differences between the various copies of *al-Mawāqif* as well as the textual status of these copies. If he had the author's final autograph copy, he would certainly have mentioned it and emphasised that it was the author's copy. Furthermore, al-Kirmānī states the following when discussing a textual variant in his commentary:

121 al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif*, (Amcazāde Hüseyin, 317), 3a-3b.

اعلم أنَّ الأستاذ سَوَّدَ أولاً هذا الكتاب إلى مسألة خلق الأعمال، ثم بعد تركه عشرين سنة لفترات الزمان تصدى للإكمال، والمحصلون لشغفهم به وشغفهم له استنسخوه في زمان ذلك الإعراض قبل التصحيح، واشتغلوا به قبل النقل إلى البياض والتنقيح، فلهذا وقع في النسخ منها اختلافات كثيرة، وتصحيف وغلط واختلالات غزيرة، وتحريف وشطط، وليس ذلك إلا من سهو الناسخين، لا من تزلزل العلماء الراسخين، ولأجله لم يوجد في القدر المؤلف إكمالاً مثل ما وقع مما سلف أولاً إخلالاً، فكل ما يورد في شرحه من الاعتراضات بحسب اللفظ فليس شيء منه على المصنف وتعقلاته؛ بل على الناقل من السواد وسوء نقلاته، وما تطرَّق إليه الضعف من طرف المعنى فيه فهو على ما ينقله عن الغير وما يدانيه؛ إذ تصورات الخاصة ليست إلا مصححة، وتصرفاته المختصة لا يوجد إلا منقحة، لا أقول إنه واجب العصمة مما يقع للبشر؛ لكن هذا الحكم إنما هو على سبيل الأغلب والأكبر، وإني سعت في تصحيح اللفظ إما نقلاً عن خطه إذ حصل عندي مسودة الأول، وكنت ملازماً عند تأليف القدر المكمل، وإما استكشافاً منه؛ إذ قد ساعدني التوفيق على الاشتغال بهذا التعليق قبل انتقاله إلى دار الأُنس وارتحاله إلى جوار القدس، اللهم إلا من مفاتيح الموقف السادس إلى آخره، فإني أكملت بعد الابتلاء بهجره، جزاه الله خير ما يعطي أحداً من أجره.

122 Kirmānī emphasises this elsewhere, see *al-Kawāshif* (Amcazāde Hüseyin, 317), 229a, 280b, 289b.

123 In his commentary, al-Kirmānī points out that he discussed some issues of *al-Mawāqif* with al-Ījī. See Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Şehid Ali Paşa, 1684), 163b.

'As it is known, the word "*al-Shaykh*" in the copies is a corruption of the word "al-Masiḥī",¹²⁴ because it is al-Masiḥī who claims that the types of nourishment are four. This is my preference through reasoning. However, according to the narration in my copy that I heard from [al-Ījī]—which is the most correct of the corrected copies—it is "al-Masiḥī".¹²⁵

In contrast, this contested expression appears in the author's autograph copy as follows: 'Ibn Sīnā said: *al-ghādhīya* is four'.¹²⁶ In this copy, the name in question is 'Ibn Sīnā'. al-Kirmānī clearly does not make any reference to Ibn Sīnā here, but he certainly would have if he had access to this autograph copy. The fact that he does not suggests that he did not have the copy at all. Even al-Kirmānī's statement that 'the most correct of the corrected copies is the one I heard from [al-Ījī]' indicates that he did not actually possess the final author's autograph copy of *al-Mawāqif*, for after all, the autograph version is a complete copy effectively acts as the second edition of *al-Mawāqif*. Instead, he characterises his own copy as having been read to and corrected by the author. Indeed, in another place he says the following: 'In my copy that I read to him'.¹²⁷ This statement indicates that al-Kirmānī read to al-Ījī his copy of *al-Mawāqif*, which was scribed by someone else, and corrected the text while reading it to him.¹²⁸

In al-Kirmānī's commentary, different copies of *al-Mawāqif* are mentioned. He sometimes refers to them as 'in the author's draft manuscript', 'in the new copy' or 'in the corrected copy', and sometimes as 'the most accurate corrected copy', which he uses to indicate his own copy that he considers authoritative. These expressions suggest that al-Kirmānī had more than one corrected copy in his possession.¹²⁹ Indeed, al-Kirmānī's commentary was completed in 757 and five of the copies of *al-Mawāqif* we analysed were copied before this date.¹³⁰

124 Here, '*al-Shaykh*' is Avicenna, and 'al-Masiḥī' is Abū Sahl al-Masiḥī (d. 401/1010) who is a physician and philosopher.

125 Al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Amcazāde Hüseyin, 317), 261b-262a.

126 Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 76a.

127 Al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Amcazāde Hüseyin, 317), 75a.

128 Al-Kirmānī emphasised this both in the introduction to the commentary and in several places in the book. See al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Amcazāde Hüseyin, 317), 3b, 75a, 202b, 261b-262a, 281b.

129 Al-Kirmānī points to this in his commentary. See al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Amcazāde Hüseyin, 317), 249b.

130 See Appendix: Manuscript Copies of *al-Mawāqif* that we examined. Kirmānī also points out in his commentary that the copies of *al-Mawāqif* are widespread and famous. See al-Kirmānī, *al-Kawāshif* (Şehid Ali Paşa, 1684), 163b.

Considering the above information, the answer to the previous question 'Is there a corrected manuscript copy of *al-Mawāqif* other than the author's autograph copy we have?' is yes. This is because both the corrections pointed out by al-Kirmānī and the following statement on the margin of the last leaf of the Ayasofya 2375 copy of *al-Mawāqif*, which was inscribed in 757, support the existence of such a copy. The statement reads: 'It has been compared with a copy that was corrected from the author's original'.¹³¹ As we will see later, this copy actually differs from the author's autograph copy.

Among the copies representing the second version of *al-Mawāqif*, there is a copy that was inscribed in 752.¹³² The existence of a copy from 752, a year before the author's autograph was completed in 753, combined with al-Kirmānī's explanation and the available data indicates that there is more than one copy representing the second version of *al-Mawāqif*. The author's autograph copy that we do have is in fact not the first copy representing the second version of the text. Therefore, al-Ījī either wrote another autograph copy or created the second version by correcting and supplementing a copy of the older version. We can substantiate this opinion as follows:

1. The Tehran copy of 752 is complete but contains many errors. When the final sections of this copy are compared with the author's autograph copy, some differences are observed.¹³³ Since this copy is dated earlier than the author's copy, it cannot have been copied from the author's autograph copy. However, since it is complete, it cannot have been copied from the first version. Therefore, it is likely that there is another copy representing the second, completed version.
2. The fact that the author's autograph copy is meticulously written, that there are corrections and additions in the margins, and that some words are crossed out shows that this copy is a *mubayyiḍa* (fair copy) and that it has been revised. We also know that *al-Mawāqif* was dedicated to Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq and that there is a record of Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq at the end of this copy. Therefore, it is thought that al-Ījī, after revising and completing *al-Mawāqif*, rewrote the work in his own hand, corrected it and presented it to Abū Ishāq.

¹³¹ Al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Ayasofya, 2375), 170a.

¹³² See al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Tehran University, Hukuk (Law), 306).

¹³³ There is a prefix in the Tehran copy before the section on *tazyil*. See al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif*, (Koğuşlar, 861), 138b; (Tehran, 306), 136b: الناس في ضلال in the Tehran copy and الناس ضلال in the author's copy. See al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 140a; (Tehran, 306), 138a.

3. In addition, according to the colophon record of the author's autograph copy, this copy was completed in Shīraz in the first days of 753 Jumādā al-Ākhira. The Ayasofya 2374 copy of *al-Mawāqif* was copied on Sunday, 18 Ramadan 753, which is roughly three months after the author's autograph copy. Although this period is sufficient for the inscription of a work, the differences between them show that these two copies were not inscribed from each other.¹³⁴ Therefore, it is probable that there is an unknown copy representing the second version.

In the final analysis, we can say that al-Ījī wrote the autograph copy which we do currently have, but al-Kirmānī probably did not examine it himself. We are also of the opinion that the first copy, which represents the second version of *al-Mawāqif*, is not the extant autograph in question. According to al-Kirmānī's statements, he read *al-Mawāqif* to al-Ījī and corrected his copy in accordance with al-Ījī's response. Therefore, we think that besides the author's final autograph copy, there are other copies that were corrected based on readings that may have occurred at a date later than the finalization of the autograph. Probably, while reading *al-Mawāqif* to al-Ījī, the students had their own copies to hand and corrected them based on what they heard from their teachers during class. Therefore, it is not sufficient to rely solely on the author's autograph copy when presenting the text of *al-Mawāqif*. It is especially important to compare it with al-Kirmānī's corrections and other corrected copies.

3. 3. Comparison of al-Kirmānī and al-Jurjānī's revisions of *al-Mawāqif*, the Autograph version of *al-Mawāqif*, and Other Manuscripts

Here, some of al-Kirmānī's corrections to the text of *al-Mawāqif*, the author's copy of *al-Mawāqif*, the Ayasofya copy, al-Jurjānī's *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* and a few passages are compared. The notes column analyses these comparisons and supports our general findings.

¹³⁴ In the copy of Ayasofya, 2374, there is a prefix before the chapter of *tazyil*. See al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 138b; (Ayasofya, 2374), 138a. Again in the al-Mughiriyya sect: الناس في ضلال in the copy of Ayasofya, 2374, while in the author's copy it is الناس ظلال. See al-Ījī, *al-Mawāqif* (Koğuşlar, 861), 140a; (Ayasofya, 2374), 139b.

Kirmānī's Corrections (Amjāzāde Husayn, 317)	<i>al-Mawāqif</i> , (Author's copy: Koğuşlar, 861)	<i>al-Mawāqif</i> , (Ayaşofya, 2375) ¹³⁵	al-Jurjānī, <i>Sharḥ al-Mawāqif</i>	Note
<p>‘فعلّم أن ما وقع في النسخ بلفظ “الشيخ” تصحيف من لفظة “المسيحي”؛ إذ هو... هذا بحسب الدراية، وأما بحسب الرواية ففي نسختي التي سمعت منها عنه التي هي أم النسخ المصححة بلفظة “المسيحي”...’ 262و</p>	<p>‘وقال ابن سينا: الغاذية أربع، وعد الأربع منها’. 76و</p>	<p>‘وقال المسيحي: والغاذية أربع، وعد الأربع منها’. 92و إ في الهامش: ‘قال ابن سينا: الغاذية أربع، وعد الهاضمة منها. خ’. لكن فوقها عبارة: ‘الظاهر أنه ليس بصواب’.¹³⁶</p>	<p>‘(وقال ابن سينا) بل المسيحي على ما في المباحث (الغاذية أربع)، وعد هذه (الأربع منها)’. 7/381.</p>	<p>This note supports the possibility that al-Kirmānī did not see the author's copy. It also shows al-Jurjānī's method of preference.</p>
<p>‘قوله: (الواحد بالنسبة) زيد في نسختي التي قرأت عليه: “ثم إما أن يكون حاصلاً فيه...”’. 75و</p>	<p>The addition found in Kirmānī's correction is not included here. 25a.</p>	<p>The addition found in Kirmānī's correction is not included here. 32b.</p>	<p>The addition found in Kirmānī's correction is not included here. 3/46.</p>	
<p>‘قوله: (فثبت أن السرعة والبطء) لفظ السرعة ههنا من طغيان الآلة؛ بل كلمتي أن والواو أيضاً، ولهذا محيت عن المتن عند القراءة على المصنف، فعلى هذا لفظ البطء فاعل ثبت، لا اسم أن’. 202ظ.</p>	<p>‘فثبت أن البطء بلا تخلل سكتة’. 75ظ. The word ‘as-sur‘a’ is not found in this copy.</p>	<p>‘فثبت أن البطء بلا تخلل سكتة’. 96ظ. The word ‘as-sur‘a’ is not found in this copy.</p>	<p>‘فثبت أن السرعة والبطء بلا تخلل سكتات’. 6/253.¹³⁷</p>	<p>This and the previous notes indicate that al-Kirmānī read <i>al-Mawāqif</i> to al-Ījī and corrected his copy in the meantime.</p>

¹³⁵ At the end of this copy appears the following statement: “It has been collated (*muqābalaḥ*) with a copy which is corrected from the original of the author”.

¹³⁶ This note confirms that this copy has been corrected and collated (*muqābalaḥ*).

¹³⁷ Here al-Jurjānī must have preferred another copy rather than the author's copy.

<p>‘وقد أخرج المؤلف من لفظ: “والذي أحسبهم” إلى آخره عن الكتاب، وقال: كلام القوم وإن كان محتملاً لأمر لكن ما لم يصرحوا به لا يليق الحمل عليه. وجعله في النسخة الجديدة من الحواشي’. 48ظ</p>	<p>There are no subtractions and additions that al-Kirmānī says were made by al-Ījī. 17b-18a. However, there is a م between the lines at the beginning of this paragraph and لا at the end. It is possible to understand these two prepositions as meaning that the expressions between them will be omitted.</p>	<p>There are no subtractions and additions that al-Kirmānī says were made by al-Ījī. 23b-24a.</p>	<p>There are no subtractions and additions that al-Kirmānī says were made by al-Ījī. 3/2-3. However, al-Jurjānī says the following after this statement: ‘It is said that the author omitted this passage from the text of the book.’ 3/3¹³⁸</p>	<p>This note indicates that al-Kirmānī read <i>al-Mawāqif</i> to al-Ījī and corrected his copy while discussing it with him.</p>
<p>‘قوله: (قمن) أي جدير، وقد سقط هذا اللفظ عن بعض النسخ ولا بد منه رواية؛ إذ عليه خط المصنف ودرسته ودرأته؛ إذ لا يخلو تركه عن تمحل في التركيب’. 281ظ</p>	<p>‘خير’. 82و.</p>	<p>‘خير’. 98ظ.</p>	<p>‘(خير)’. 7/227.</p>	<p>This note indicates that al-Kirmānī heard <i>al-Mawāqif</i> from al-Ījī and studied with him.</p>
<p>‘قوله: (في هذه المواضع الثلاثة) ... وقد خط في بعض النسخ المقروءة على المصنف على لفظة (الثلاثة)’. 249ظ.</p>	<p>Is in accordance with al-Kirmānī’s correction and does not contain the word الثلاثة. 72b.</p>	<p>Is in accordance with al-Kirmānī’s correction and does not contain the word الثلاثة. 87b.</p>	<p>‘(وفي هذه المواضع الثلاثة) لفظة الثلاثة إما زائدة أو أراد بها ما بين خط الاستواء’. 139/152.</p>	<p>Shows that there were several copies read to the author.</p>

¹³⁸ Here al-Jurjānī has shown his method of preference and it can be assumed that he may have seen al-Kirmānī’s commentary.

¹³⁹ It is understood from this that al-Jurjānī did not see the author’s copy. He probably took the text from another copy.

<p>قوله: (مكابرة) وجد بعده في نسخة الأصل التي بخط المصنف: "فقد ثبت أن الجسم لا يخلو عن الحوادث..." وفقد في أكثر النسخ ولا بد منه كما ترى، ولعل تركه لظن الناسخ أنه ليس من المتن لأنه على الحاشية مكتوب في أم الكتاب. 280 ط</p>	<p>Is different from the first version of <i>al-Mawāqif</i>. This is because this omission is absent. 82a.</p>	<p>This is found in the margin of the copy. 98b¹⁴⁰</p>	<p>This is absent. 7/226.</p>	<p>This note suggests that al-Kirmānī saw the first version of <i>al-Mawāqif</i> in the author's writing.</p>
<p>وفي نسخة خط المصنف وأكثر النسخ لفظ "دون النظر" مفقود. 289 ط.</p>	<p>Is different from the first version of <i>al-Mawāqif</i> because of the expression <i>dūn al-naẓar</i>. 83b.</p>	<p>Is different from the first version of <i>al-Mawāqif</i>. Because of the expression <i>dūn al-naẓar</i>. 100b.</p>	<p>It is different from the first version of <i>al-Mawāqif</i>. Because there is the expression <i>dūn al-naẓar</i>. 7/235.</p>	<p>This note indicates that al-Kirmānī saw the first version of <i>al-Mawāqif</i> written in the author's writing.</p>
<p>قوله: (والكسوف) أمر الأستاذ بضرب القلم عليه. 244 و.</p>	<p>Is in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction.</p> <p>ويطله ما ذكرنا من أمر الكسوف. 70 و.</p>	<p>Is in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction.</p> <p>ويطله ما ذكرنا من أمر الكسوف. 84 ط.</p>	<p>'(والكسوف) وقع هذا اللفظ في نسخة الأصل، ولذلك أقر المصنف كلام ابن الهيثم إلى هذا الموضع؛ لكنه ضرب عليه بالقلم آخر؛ إذ لا وجه لصحته. 7/134.</p>	<p>Shows al-Jurjānī's method of preference. Although it is understood from al-Kirmānī's statement that he saw the author's copy, we are of the opinion that he did not see this copy based on the other examples mentioned above.</p>

140 This note reinforces the fact that the copy has been corrected (*taṣḥīḥ*) and collated (*muqābalah*).

<p>وقوله: (وهذا إنما يتم) دخل عليه من فعل المصنف، وقد زاد في النسخة الجديدة على الكتاب بعد لفظة "التوهم" (وأيضاً فإن الكلام في تلك الحركة المخصوصة لا في مطلق الحركة).¹²⁷ و</p>	<p>Is in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction and there is an addition. 38a.</p>	<p>It is in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction and there is an addition. 47b.</p>	<p>It is in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction and there is an addition. 5/152-154.</p>	
<p>وقد زيد في بعض النسخ بعد لفظة "الوضع" "للاندماج".¹³² و</p>	<p>There is a surplus. 39b.</p>	<p>There is no surplus 49a.</p>	<p>Surplus is not mentioned in the text but is in al-Jurjānī's commentary. 5/175.</p>	
<p>فعرف أنه لا احتياج إلى زيادة لفظة "لا تفريق" بعد الهواء كما في بعض النسخ؛ بل هو زيادة مخرقة.¹³² و</p>	<p>Is not in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction, since it contains the phrase <i>lā tafriq</i>. 39b.</p>	<p>Is not in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction, since it contains the phrase <i>lā tafriq</i>. 49a.</p>	<p>Is not in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction, since it contains the phrase <i>lā tafriq</i>. 5/176.5/176.</p>	
<p>فالأولى هي النسخة لم يجعل فيها مسألة الجسم المحفور وجهًا مستقلاً، وكانت فيها بدل لفظة الرابع كلمة واو العطف، كما نقله الإمام في الملخص.¹²⁴ ط-125 و</p>	<p>Is not in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction. 37a.</p>	<p>Is not in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction. 46b.</p>	<p>Is in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction and also points to the form in the author's copy. 5/136.¹⁴¹</p>	<p>Reveals al-Jurjānī's method of preference.</p>
<p>ولهذا قال بلفظة قيل، فعلم أن ما وقع بلفظة "قلنا" في الدليل الأول سهو القلم، والأولى "قيل" كما في النسخة المصححة. 43 ط-44 و</p>	<p>It is not in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction. 17a.</p>	<p>Is in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction. 22b.</p>	<p>Is not in accordance with al-Kirmānī's correction. 2/193.</p>	<p>Supports that the Ayasofya copy has been corrected.</p>

141 After this, al-Jurjānī says:

”واعلم أن الموجود في نسخة الأصل وكثير من النسخ هكذا: «(الرابع: الجسم إذا حفرنا إلى آخره) فقد جعل هذا وجهاً ا رابعاً من الوجوه الدالة على استحالة كون المكان هو السطح، والصواب أنه من تنمة الوجه الثالث كما قررناه»

Jurjānī, *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif* 5, 136

Based on the above table, it can be said that the text of *al-Mawāqif* in al-Jurjānī's commentary does not entirely correspond with al-Ījī's autograph copy in various places. Although he had seen the author's autograph copy of *al-Mawāqif* and stated that it was written by al-Ījī, he did not always refer to this copy and sometimes used other copies. It is understood that al-Jurjānī was not always faithful to the author's autograph copy and that he followed two different methods when he presented the correct text: 1) Either he includes the statement exactly as found in the author's copy of *al-Mawāqif* within his own, and then proceeds to state that it is not correct, or that he does not prefer it presents and the correct one in the commentary, 2) Or he corrects the text directly without mentioning the expression as found in the original autograph copy of *al-Mawāqif*.

Finally, the table below chronologically presents the dates of composition of al-Ījī's theological works and the different versions of *al-Mawāqif*.

	Work	Date of production	Dedication	Manuscripts
1	Version 1 of <i>al-Mawāqif</i>	Around 730/1330	-	No copies have been identified.
2	<i>Jawāhir al-kalām</i>	Before 736/1335	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muhammad b. Rashid al-Dīn (d. 736/1335)	The oldest dated copy identified is 738/1337
3	<i>al-Uyūn</i>	Before 749/1348	-	The oldest dated copy identified is 749/1348
4	2nd version of <i>al-Mawāqif</i>	750-753/1349-1352	Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq (d. 758/1357)	The oldest dated copy identified is 752/1351 Author's copy 753/1352
5	<i>al-Aqā'id al-Aḥudiyya</i>	756/1355	None	
6	<i>Risāla fī kalām Allāh</i>	?	None	

Conclusion

In this article, in which we have discussed the chronology of the five theological works of al-Ījī that we possess, their compositional history, and the relationship between them, we can conclude the following:

According to his student Iftikhār al-Dīn al-Dāmaghānī, al-Ījī wrote *al-ʿAqāʾid al-ʿAḍudiyya* twelve days before his death. Therefore, this work is al-Ījī's last work. The date of composition of his treatise *Risāla fī kalām Allāh* has not been determined.

The theological works of al-Ījī, whose precise chronology has been debated, are *al-Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-kalām* and *al-ʿUyūn*. According to our findings, there is an organic relationship between these three works in the form of base text, abridgment, and epitome. They are also very similar in terms of organisation, titles and views. Based on the relationship between them, the information provided by the author's students, and the manuscripts we examined, we believe that the order of composition of these three works is as follows: (i) First, al-Ījī started to write *al-Mawāqif*, but left it unfinished, (ii) then he prepared a summary of the existing part of *al-Mawāqif* up to the topic of *'khalq al-a'māl'* and added the topic of sam'īyyāt to his new book, *Jawāhir al-kalām*, (iii) subsequently, al-Ījī abridged this work and called it *al-ʿUyūn*, (iv) returning to *al-Mawāqif* after a long break, al-Ījī completed and revised his work and made various changes to it. These points about the nature and chronology of the composition of *al-Mawāqif* and *Jawāhir al-kalām* are based on the statement of al-Kirmānī, who was a student of al-Ījī and commented on his work for the first time under the title *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif* while his teacher was still alive. Moreover, the statements of Shams al-Dīn Tabrizī, another student of al-Ījī, in his commentary *al-Zahāʾir fī sharḥ al-Jawāhir* also support this explanation. These two statements are important in that they are directly expressed by al-Ījī's students and the commentators of his books. Al-Kirmānī's argument also resolves the only argument against the claim that *al-Jawāhir* was written before *al-Mawāqif*. This counter-argument is owing to the apparent contradiction in the dedications of the two books. According to al-Kirmānī's view, al-Ījī dedicated *al-Mawāqif* to the late Amīr Abū Ishāq. This dedication is found in the second, final version of *al-Mawāqif*. However, the first version of *al-Mawāqif* was written much earlier, and thus, the apparent contradiction is resolved.

As for the various versions of *al-Mawāqif*, it is understood that al-Kirmānī had a copy of the first version of the work written in al-Ījī's hand. Unfortunately, this copy is not known to be extant. After an interval of twenty years or more, al-Ījī revised and completed the work and created the second complete version. One example of this version is a copy with the dedication record of Abū Ishāq, dated 753/1352 and written in the author's hand. We believe that this copy was not in al-Kirmānī's possession. Furthermore, the copy dated 752, which contains many errors, is one of the copies representing this version. Because of the differences between these two copies, we believe that at least one other copy representing the second version must have existed.

However, there are also early copies representing the second version that have been meticulously written and corrected. These copies also differ from the author's autograph copy. Therefore, even though al-Ījī created the second version of the work in his own handwriting, he continued to engage with the text. Indeed, he continued to read and discuss *al-Mawāqif* with his students, changing and correcting some parts in the process. His students also transferred these corrections to their copies. Therefore, it would be misleading to consider the author's autograph copy preserved in the Topkapı Palace Library as the final version, and so in order to determine the final version of the text of *al-Mawāqif*, the later corrections made by al-Kirmānī and found in other corrected copies should also be taken into consideration.

As far as we have been able to determine, al-Ījī did not make any cross-references between his theological works. There is no fundamental disagreement between the theological works of the author, especially the three works that are organically related to each other, except for superficial differences in the form of minor explanations. Therefore, we can say that there is a stability of thought among all of al-Ījī's theological works and that there are no serious differences of opinion.

We believe that the literature on al-Ījī's works and the identification of his students deserve more extensive study. In particular, the critical editions of al-Ījī's *al-Uyūn*, al-Kirmānī's *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif* and Shams al-Tabrizī's *al-Zahā'ir*, which are still in manuscript form, will contribute to a better understanding of al-Ījī's theological views. Finally, we are of the opinion that manuscripts constitute an important source in terms of illuminating many unknown issues about authors and works, and therefore, further studies of manuscripts should be encouraged.

Appendix

1. Manuscripts of *al-Mawāqif* that we analysed

	Library and Collection	No	Scribe	Manuscript date	Dedicated	Notes
1	Tehran University, Law	306		h. 752		First <i>Mawqif</i> is missing
2	Topkapi Palace Museum, Koğuşlar	861	Author Line	h. 753	Abū Ishāq	Complete
3	Süleymaniye, Ayasofya	2374		h. 753	Abū Ishāq	Complete
4	Topkapi Palace Museum, Ahmed III	1801	Qutb al-Mu'adhdhinī al-Qazvinī	h. 754		Half a page missing from the <i>dibāja</i>
5	Berlin, National Library	66, 1800		h. 757		First foils missing
6	Süleymaniye, Ayasofya	2375	Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan	h. 757	Abū Ishāq	Complete
7	Süleymaniye, Damad Ibrahim Pasha	805	'Alī b. Muşliḥ al-Sam'ānī	h. 761		The book's introduction is missing
8	Kutahya, Vahid Pasha	1145	'Alī b. Hacı Aḥmad al-Khalidī	h. 763		No <i>dibāja</i>
9	Konya, Yusuf Aga	20		h. 768		Half a page missing from the <i>dibāja</i>
10	Süleymaniye, Yozgat	245	Zayn al-Dīn b. Sharafah al-Ṭalīb al-'Alawī	h. 775	Abū Ishāq	Complete
11	Inebey Library, Hüseyin Çelebi	606		h. 779	Abū Ishāq	Complete
12	National Library of France	2392	Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad, known as Yazici	h. 782	Abū Ishāq	Complete
13	Hacı Selim Aga Library, Hacı Selim Aga	664		h. 793	Abū Ishāq	Complete

14	Süleymaniye, Damad Ibrahim Pasha	806		h. 796	Abū Ishāq	Complete
15	National Library, Nevsehir Damad Ibrahim Pasha	50 - 200	Jamāl al-Dīn b. Ḥasan	h. 796	Abū Ishāq	Complete
16	Corum, Hasan Pasha	4052		h. 801		Missing head
17	National Library	A 10828		h. 802		Most of the <i>dībāja</i> is missing
18	Süleymaniye, Fatih	3162		h. 803	Abū Ishāq	Complete
19	Hacı Selim Aga, Hüdai Efendi	902	Pir Muḥammad	h. 804	Abū Ishāq	Complete
20	Süleymaniye, Fatih	3158	Maḥmūd b. Ḥaydar al- Khwārizmī	h. 810	Abū Ishāq	Complete
21	Süleymaniye, Baghdad Vehbi	815		h. 811	Abū Ishāq	Complete
22	Sarajevo Gâzi Hüsrev Bey	1959	Musliḥ al-Dīn b. Yūsuf	h. 828	Abū Ishāq	Complete
23	Süleymaniye, Laleli	2451	Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al- Manūfī	h. 885		Half a page missing from the <i>dībāja</i>
24	Süleymaniye, Fatih	3163		h. 886	Abū Ishāq	Complete
25	Kastamonu	1573		h. 903	Abū Ishāq	Complete
26	Süleymaniye, Reshid Efendi	339		h. 1020	Abū Ishāq	Complete
27	Süleymaniye, Damad Ibrahim Pasha	803	Muṣṭafā b. al-Ḥāj ‘Abd al-Mu’min al-Jarrāḥ	h. 1108	Abū Ishāq	Complete
28	Corum, Hasan Pasha	1049		h. 1127	Abū Ishāq	Complete
29	Nuruosmaniye Library	2223	Muḥammad b. Muṣṭafā	h. 1139	Abū Ishāq	Complete
30	Al-Mektabat al- Azhariyya	4409	‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Manūfī al-Shāfi‘ī	h. 1162	Abū Ishāq	Complete

31	Süleymaniye, Halet Efendi	410	Luṭf Allāh al-Rūmī	h. 1170	Abū Ishāq	Complete
32	Manisa Akhisar, Zeynelzade	108	Khalil b. Ibrāhīm b. Khalil	h. 1175	Abū Ishāq	Complete
33	Afyon Gedik Ahmet Pasha	03/17861		h. 1195	Abū Ishāq	Complete
34	Süleymaniye, Halet Efendi	448		h. 1204	Abū Ishāq	Complete, <i>dibāja</i> is written on a different line.
35	Topkapi Palace Museum, Ahmed III	1813			Abū Ishāq	Complete
36	Süleymaniye, Carullah	1269			Abū Ishāq	Complete
37	Süleymaniye, Damad Ibrahim Pasha	804			Abū Ishāq	Complete
38	Süleymaniye, Fatih	3159			Abū Ishāq	Complete
39	Süleymaniye, Fatih	3161	Hāj Maḥmūd b. Dāwūd		Abū Ishāq	Complete
40	Nuruosmaniye Library	2224			Abū Ishāq	Complete
41	Konya Yusuf Aga	6629			Abū Ishāq	Complete
42	Topkapi Palace Museum, Treasury of Safety	862			Abū Ishāq	Complete
43	Inebey Library, Haraccioğlu	1263	Dāwūd Anwar		Abū Ishāq	Complete
44	Atf Efendi Library, Atf Efendi	1376			Abū Ishāq	Complete
45	Corum Hasan Pasha	938			Abū Ishāq	Complete
46	Süleymaniye, Çorlulu Ali Pasha	443			Abū Ishāq	Complete, 269 to 402.
47	Süleymaniye, Sehid Ali Pasha	1734				Half a page missing from the <i>dibāja</i> .

48	Inebey Library, Hüseyn Çelebi	607			Abū Ishāq	Incomplete, up to the issue of <i>ru'yat Allāh</i> . 5th <i>Marşad</i> . 5th <i>Mawqif</i>
49	Süleymaniye, Fatih	3157			Abū Ishāq	Missing after the centre of the sixth position
50	Süleymaniye, Fatih	3160			Abū Ishāq	Until the end of the fourth chapter
51	Manisa Akhisar, Zeynelzade	146				The <i>Muqaddim</i> is missing, there is no chapter at the end
52	Ankara, National Library	462				The pages of the copy are mixed. Part of the beginning and end of the chapter is missing.

2. Manuscripts of *Jawāhir al-Kalām* that we analysed

	Library and Collection	No	Title of the book	Scribe	Manuscript date	Dedicated	Notes
1	Topkapi Palace Museum, Ahmed III	1801	<i>Jawāhir al-kalām</i>	Quṭb al-Mu'adhdhin	h. 738	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete. Correspondence with the author's copy
2	Tehran, Malek National Library	1789/1	<i>Kitāb al-Jawāhir</i>		h. 750	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete
3	Beyazit, Veliyuddin Efendi	557	<i>Kitāb Jawāhir al-kalām</i>		h. 768	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete
4	Istanbul University, Rare Books Library	6406	<i>Jawāhir al-kalām, Mukhtaṣar al-Mawāqif</i>	MudarrisZade, Muḥammad Sa'id b. Muṣṭafā	h. 1172	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete
5	Atif Efendi Library	1332	<i>Matn Jawāhir al-kalām Mukhtaṣar al-Mawāqif</i>	Mustaqīm zāde	h. 1175	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Commentary. Written by distinguishing it from Ḥalabī's commentary on <i>Jawāhir al-kalām</i>
6	Süleymaniye, Antalya Tekelioglu	823	<i>Jawāhir al-kalām Mukhtaṣar al-Mawāqif</i>		h. 1184	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete
7	Süleymaniye, Ayasofya	2281	<i>Risala Jawāhir al-kalām</i>			Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete Reciprocated
8	Süleymaniye, Fatih	2924	<i>Jawāhir al-kalām / Mukhtaṣar al-Mawāqif</i>			Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete

9	Süleymaniye, Halet Efendi	443	<i>Jawāhir al-kalām, Mukhtaşar al-Mawāqif</i>			Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete
10	Süleymaniye, Laleli	2171	<i>Jawāhir al- kalām</i>			Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete
11	Izmir National Library	1162				Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete
12	Süleymaniye, Carullah Efendi	1302	<i>Jawāhir al-kalām, Mukhtaşar al-Mawāqif</i>			Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Missing around four leaves from the end
13	Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya ¹⁴²	820	<i>Mukhtaşar al-Mawāqif al-Musammā Jawāhir al- kalām</i>			Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete
14	Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya ¹⁴³	59 Tawḥīd				Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete
15	Dar al-Kutubi al-Misriyya	839 Tawḥīd			h. 1327	Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Rashīd al-Dīn	Complete. The name of the author and the fact that it was compiled as a summary of <i>al-Mawāqif</i> is clearly mentioned ¹⁴⁴

142 The information of this copy is taken from Afifi's edition of *Jawāhir al-kalām* (p. 135).

143 The information of this copy is taken from Afifi's edition of *Jawāhir al-kalām* (p. 135).

144 The information of this copy is taken from Afifi's edition of *Jawāhir al-kalām* (p. 135).

Bibliography

- 'Ala' al-Tanbihī, 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Bukhārī. *Sharḥ Jawāhir al-kalām*. Damascus: Ibn 'Ābidīn Library, n.d: 1b-103b. Maktabah al-Asad.
- Altaş, Eşref. 'Aḍudüddin el-İcī'nin *Risāle Fī Kelāmillah* Adlı Eserinin Tahkik ve Tercümesi'. In *İslām İlim ve Düşünce Geleneğinde 'Aḍudüddin el-İcī*, ed. Eşref Altaş, 391-408. İstanbul: İSAM Publications, 2017.
- Ālūsī, Abū al-Senā Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. 'Abd Allāh b. Maḥmūd al-Husaynī. *Rūhu al-me'ānī fī tafsīr al-Qur'ānī al-'aẓīm wa al-sab'ī al-masānī*. critical ed. 'Alī 'Abd al-Bārī Atiyya. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'ilmiyya, 1415.
- Āmilī, Bahāeddin. *Kashkūl*. ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Karīm al-Namrī. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'ilmiyya, 1418/1998.
- Baçoğlu, Tuncay. 'Müteahhir Dönem Fıkıh Usulünde Adudüddin el-İcī'nin Şerhü'l-Muhtasar'ı', in *İslām İlim ve Düşünce Geleneğinde Aḍudüddin el-İcī*, ed. Eşref Altaş, 429-476. İstanbul: İSAM Publications, 2017.
- Junayd al-Shīrāzī, Abū al-Qāsim Mu'īn al-Dīn Junayd b. Maḥmūd. *Shadd al-izār fī hattī al-awzār 'an zuwwārī al-mezār*. ed. Muḥammad Qazvīnī and Iqbāl al-Āshtiyānī. Tehran: Chaphāne-i Majlis, 1328 AH.
- Jurjānī, Sayyid Sharīf. *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*. critical ed. Muhammad Bedreddin al-N'asānī. Egypt: Matba'ah al-Sa'āde, 1325/1907.
- Jurjānī, Sayyid Sharīf. *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*. İstanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Köprülü Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa, 839, 1b-377a.
- Al-Dāmaghānī, İftihārüddin Muḥammad b. Naşr Allāh b. Muḥammad, *al-Qawā'id al-Shamsiyya fī Sharḥ al-'Aqā'id al-Aḍudiyya*. İstanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 2307, 1b-36b.
- Eroğlu, Muhammed. 'İcī, Mu'īnüddin'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi*. 21: 414-416. Ankara: TDV Publications, 2000.
- Ermihan, Süleyman. *Aḍuddüddin el-İcī'nin 'Cevāhirü'l-Kelām' İsimli Eserin Tahkik ve Tahlili*, Master's Thesis, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, 2020.
- Fasī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd al-Qādir b. 'Alī b. Yūsuf. *Sharḥ Jawāhir al-'ulūm*. İstanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Nuruosmaniye, 2163, 1b-252b.
- Gömbeyaz, Kadir. 'Molla Fenari'ye Nispet Edilen Eserlerde Aidiyet Problemi ve Molla Fenari Bibliyografyası', *International Molla Fanari Symposium (4-6 December 2009, Bursa) - Proceedings*. ed. Tefvik Yücedoğru, Orhan Ş. Koloğlu, U. Murat Kılavuz and Kadir Gömbeyaz. 467-524. Bursa: Bursa Metropolitan Municipality, 2010.
- Görgün, Tahsin. 'İcī, Adudüddin Kadı Ebü'l-Fazl Abdurrahman b. Rükneddin b. Abdurrahman'. In *İslām İlim ve Düşünce Geleneğinde Adudüddin el-İcī*, ed. Eşref Altaş, 21-76. İstanbul: İSAM Publications, 2017.
- Hafız-ı Ebrū, Shihāb al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh b. Luṭf Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥīm Bihdādīnī-yi Hāfī. *Zubdah at-Tawārih*. ed. Seyyed Kamāl Ḥaj Seyyed Javādi. Tehran: 1372 AH.
- Halabī al-Madārī, Ibrahim. *Silku'n-nizām Sharḥ Jawāhir al-kalām*. ed. Ghulam Ḥaydar al-Şiddiqi. Amman: Dār al-Nūr al-Mubīn, 2022.
- Hansārī, Moḥammad Bākir b. Zayn al-'Ābidīn b. Ja'far al-Mūsawī. *Ravzāt al-jannāt fī ahwālī al-'ulamā' wa al-sādāt*. Tehran: Ismā'iliyān Library, 1390 AH.

- Hasan Çelebi, Fanārī. *Hāshiya ‘alā Sharh’i’l-Mawāqif*. Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Carullah Efendi, 1176, 1b-314a; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Murad Molla, 1357 AH., 1b-329b.
- Khojazāda, Muslih al-Din Efendi. *Hāshiya ‘alā Sharh’i’l-Mawāqif*. Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Damad İbrahim Paşa, 784 2a-195a.
- Husayn, ‘Ashiq. ‘Muqaddima.’ In *al-Fawā’id al-Ghiyāsiyya fī ‘ulūm al-balāgha*, ed. ‘Ashiq Husayn, 4-108. Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Miṣrī, 1412/1991.
- Bocnurdī, Kāzım Mūsāwī, *Dāiretu’l-Maārif-i Bozorg-i Islāmī*, critical ed. Kāzım Mūsāwī Bocnurdī, Tehran: Merkez-i Dāiretu’l-Maārif-i Bozorg-i Islāmī, 1993/1372 AH.
- Al-Ījī, ‘Aḡud al-Din ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār. ‘al-‘Aqā’id al-‘Aḡudiyya’, in Jalāl al-Din Dawwānī, *Sharḥ al-‘Aqā’id al-‘Aḡudiyya*, Beirut: Dar al-Iḥyā’ al-Turāthi al-‘Arabi, 1437/2016.
- Al-Ījī, ‘Aḡud al-Din ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār. *Kitāb Jawāhir al-kalām Mukhtaṣar al-Mawāqif*. critical ed. Abu al-‘Alā’ al-Afifi, *Majallah Kullīyah al-Ādāb*, 2/2 (December 1934), 133-243.
- Al-Ījī, ‘Aḡud al-Din ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār. *Jawāhir al-kalām*. Istanbul: Topkapı Palace Museum Library, III. Ahmed, 1801, 1b-49b; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Laleli, 2171, 1b-22a.
- Al-Ījī, ‘Aḡud al-Din ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār. *Sharḥ Mukhtasari al-Muttaḥā al-Usūlī*. Princeton University Library, Garrett, 808H.
- Al-Ījī, ‘Aḡud al-Din ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār. *al-Mawāqif fī ‘ilmī al-kalām*. Beirut: ‘Aleḡ al-kutub.
- Al-Ījī, ‘Aḡud al-Din ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār. *al-Mawāqif fī ‘ilmī al-kalām*. Istanbul: Topkapı Palace Museum Library, III. Ahmed, 1801, 51a-231a; Istanbul: Topkapı Palace Museum Library, Koḡuşlar, 861, 1b-143b; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 2374, 1b-143a; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 2375, 1b-170a; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Damad İbrahim Paşa, 806, 1b-217a; Bursa: Inebey Library, Hüseyin Çelebi, 606, 5b-170b; Tehran: Tehran University Library, Hukuk (Law), 306, 1b-141a.
- Al-Ījī, ‘Aḡud al-Din ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār. *Taḡhiq al-Taḡsūr fī Takthīr al-Tanwīr*. Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Damad İbrahim Paşa, 135, 1b-659a; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Damad İbrahim Paşa, 134, 1b-369b.
- al-Ījī, ‘Aḡud al-Din ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār. *al-‘Uyūn*. Tehran: Malek National Library, 1789, 1-135.
- al-Ījī, Mu‘īn al-Din. *Risāla fī’l-kalām al-naḡsī*. Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Hüseyin Paşa, 752/3, 31a-50b.
- J. van Ess. ‘Azod-al-Din Ījī’. *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Accessed 27 March 2024. <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/azod-al-din-iji>.
- Kātib Çelebi. *Kashf al-Zunūn*. Baghdad: Mektebet al-Muthannā, 1941.
- Kirmānī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Shams al-Din Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. ‘Alī. *al-Kawāshif sharḥ al-Mawāqif*. Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Amcazāde Hüseyin, 317, 1b-499a; Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Şehid Ali Paşa, 1684, 2a-291a.
- Koca, M. Ali, ‘Akaid-Kelām İlişkisi Bağlamında Akaid Literatürünü Okumak: İcī’nin Akaid Risālesi Örneği’ in *İslām İlim ve Düşünce Geleneğinde Adudüddin el-İcī*, ed. Eşref Altaş, 229-298. Istanbul: İSAM Publications, 2017.

- Kurtulus, Riza. 'İncülular'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. 22: 280-281. Ankara: TDV Publications, 2000.
- Mostowfi, Hamdollah. *Tārikh-e gozida*. edited by. Edward G. Browne. Leiden: E.J. Brill: 1910.
- Öğmuş, Harun. 'Aḍudüddin el-İcī'nin Tefsirciliği ve Tahkikü't-Tefsir Adlı'. In *İslām İlim ve Düşünce Geleceğinde Aḍudüddin el-İcī*, ed. Eşref Altaş, 477-522. Istanbul: ISAM Publications, 2017.
- Özaydın, Abdülkerim. 'Tārīh-i Güzide'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. 40: 82-83. Ankara: TDV Publications, 2011.
- Özgüdenli, Osman Gazi. 'Olçaytu Han'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. 33: 345-347. Ankara: TDV Publications, 2007.
- Özgüdenli, Osman Gazi. 'Reşidüddin Fazlullāh-ı Hemedānī'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. 35: 19-21. Ankara: TDV Publications, 2008.
- Pourjavady, Reza. 'The Legacy of 'Aḍud al-Din al-Ījī'. In *Philosophical Theology in Islam Later Ash'arism East and West*, ed. Ayman Shihadeh and Jan Thiele, 337-370. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020.
- Safā, Zebihullah. *Tārīh-i Edebiyāt-i der Iran*. Tehran: Intishārat-i Firdaws, 1366.
- Sahāwī, Abū al-Hayr Shams al-Din Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad. *al-Ḍaw' al-lāmī li-ahlī al-qarn al-tās'*. Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-Hayat, n.d.
- Şiddiqī, Ghulām Ḥayḍar. 'Muqaddima'. In *Silq al-nizām Sharḥ Jawāhir al-kalām*, critical ed. Ghulām Ḥaydar al-Şiddiqī, 5-35. Amman: Dār al-Nūr al-Mubīn, 2022.
- Sinanoglu, Mustafa. 'el-Mevākif'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. 29: 422-424. Ankara: TDV Publications, 2004.
- Shams al-Tabrizī. Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd. *ez-Zahā'ir fi Sharḥ al-Jawāhir*. Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Fatih, 3197, 1b-186a.
- Şeyhhasan, Münzir. 'İbrahim el-Halebī el-Medārī ve el-Lüm'a Adlı Eseri'. *al-Lum'a fi'l-hudūs wa'l-qidam wa'l-kādā wa'l-qadar wa'l-qaḍā wa'l-qadar wa taḥqīq al-taklīf* in, critical ed. Münzir Şeyhhasan, 15-71. Istanbul: İSAM Publications, 2022.
- Taşkın, Bilal and Muhammet Emin Efe. 'Muhaddis Bir Kelāmcı: Şemseddīn el-Kirmānī ve el-Mevākif Şerhi (Bilgi ve Nazar Bahsi Özelinde Bir Değerlendirme)'. *Journal of Islamic Studies* 12/1 (2022): 93-106.
- Tabrizī, Muḥammad 'Alī Mudarrisi. *Rayḥānet al-adab fi terājimi al-ma'rūfīn bi al-kunyah evi al-lakab*. Tehran: 1328-33 AH.
- Taftāzānī, Sa'd al-Din Masoud b. 'Umar b. 'Abd Allāh. *Sharḥ al-Maqāsid fi 'ilmi al-kalām*. Pakistan: Dār al-Ma'ārif al-Nu'māniyya, 1401/1981.
- al-Urmawī, Sirāj al-Din. *Lubāb al-Arba'in*. Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Carullah, 1252, 1b-82b.
- Yavuz, Yusuf Shawki. 'Cevāhirü'l-Kelām '. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. 7: 432-433. Ankara: TDV Publications, 1993.
- Yazdī, Mu'in al-Din Jamāl al-Din 'Alī b. Jalāl al-Din Muḥammad. *Mevāhib-i İlāhī der Tārīh-i Āl-i Muzaffar* ed. Sa'id-i Nefisi, Tehran: 1326.
- Yuvalı, Abdülkadir. 'Ebū Said Bahadır Han'. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. 10: 218-219. Ankara: TDV Publications, 1994.

