

INTRODUCTION

1. *The Problem of Pain and Suffering*

Many questions may arise for a person who reflects on the phenomenon of pain. If he directs his attention to what happens in his body at the moment that he feels pain, he may wonder how it is that he has this kind of experience. Why does it hurt when he is hit and why does one injury hurt more than another? And how is it that some sorts of pain, such as headaches, occur without any visible injury? How does the pain stop?

The above questions relate to the suffering of pain, but how does one account for the infliction of pain? As pain in general is considered to be a disagreeable sensation that should be avoided, it seems obvious that it is morally bad to inflict pain on someone else, but does this apply to every infliction of pain? Are there circumstances in which it is good to inflict pain? For instance, is it good to inflict pain on someone else in order to obtain a profit for him or to avert a harm to him? Should he give his consent first?

A religious person may wonder why pain exists at all in our world. If he considers this world as created by God, who is good and omnipotent, he may suppose that God could have created a world in which nobody suffers. But our world is not like that. People suffer pain as a result of illness and disaster. Are these imposed by God? If so, for what reason does He subject His creatures to them? Are they meant as a punishment for sin? Why, then, are children and animals also made to suffer? Can they have sinned so that they deserve to be punished?

Religion has always tried to find an answer to the problem of pain and suffering in this world¹. In Islamic theology the problem of suffering is usually discussed as part of the larger problem of God's omnipotence and human free will. Adherents of the view that God has absolute omnipotence hold that God is the only true agent in

¹ Of the works on this subject, I mention only Hebblethwaite (1976), who gives a short introduction to views about evil and suffering in the world's religions, and Hick (1985ⁿ) who describes the development of Christian thought on this problem. A good treatment comparing Islamic and Western theodicy is Ormsby (1984).

this world. This implies that not only God's own acts but also all human acts are created by God. However, this theory raises a problem: how are we to interpret the evil done by humans? If God creates the human acts, does this imply that He also creates the evil they do? Does this mean that God creates bad actions?

The Mu'tazilite thinkers strongly objected to the idea that God creates human acts. They emphasized that God does no evil at all. In their opinion, all evil in the world is caused by human agency. In support of this view, they defended the notion of human freedom of choice. They maintained that the evil done by humans is not God's will, but is chosen by these humans by their own will because God has given them freedom of choice, which implies that they can choose between doing an evil act and not doing it.

The Mu'tazilites referred to the principle that God only performs good actions as the principle of Justice (*'adl*). However, the principle that God does no evil at all raises the question of how to account for illness and disaster which are thought to have been created by God. Because of their adherence to the principle of Justice, the Mu'tazilites defended the opinion that illnesses and disasters created by God are good, although at first sight they seem to be bad as they involve pain and suffering². As the problem of the existence of pain and suffering in this world is closely related to the question of the Justice of God, the subject of pain is given considerable attention in the three Mu'tazilite texts *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawhīd wa-'l-'adl*, [*Tā'liq*] *sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-Majmū' fī 'l-muḥīṭ bi-'l-taklīf*.

2. Three Mu'tazilite texts

At the end of 1951 an Egyptian scientific expedition was sent to Yemen to explore libraries there in order to find unknown manu-

² For the opinions of Muslim thinkers on questions of pain and suffering see Watt (1979), who discusses the Sunni opinions about suffering and the place of suffering in Ṣūfism, and Pessagno (1984), who describes al-Māturīdī's opinion. For specifically Mu'tazilite opinions on this subject see Nader (1956, 83-86), Watt (1973, 238-242), Gimaret (1974, 1975 and 1980, 341-360), Daiber (1975, 253-281) (on Mu'ammār b. 'Abbād al-Sulamī), Hourani (1971, 97-102) (on 'Abd al-Jabbār) and Peters (1976, 269-271) (on 'Abd al-Jabbār). Vajda (1985, 333-386) describes the opinions held by the Karaite Yūsuf al-Baṣīr and 'Abd al-Jabbār. On the related question of the best of all possible worlds (*al-aṣlah*) see Brunschvig (1974a, 5-23), who describes the Mu'tazilite view, and Ormsby (1984), who discusses al-Ghazālī's view.

scripts written by Mu'tazilite authors. A number of manuscripts were found and photographed on the spot. The photographs were taken to Cairo, where they are now kept in the National Library (Dār al-kutub). Among the manuscripts that were photographed in Yemen was a large manuscript that contained volumes IV-VIII, part of volume IX, volumes XI-XIV, XVI and XX of a work that was called *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawhīd wa-'l-'adl*, or *al-Mughnī*³ for short. It appeared to be a systematically built-up explanation of the Mu'tazilite doctrine by the Mu'tazilite theologian 'Abd al-Jabbār⁴ (d. about 415/1024). From what 'Abd al-Jabbār says at the end of volume XX it becomes clear that with this volume the work is complete (*Mughnī* XX/2, 257: 18-19). It is to be regretted that the large Yemen manuscript does not contain the whole work, but fortunately volume XV and a part of volume XVII, which are missing in this manuscript, have been found in two smaller manuscripts⁵. The text of all the volumes that were available was published by several editors in Cairo in the years 1380-1389/1960-1969.

Another Mu'tazilite work that was photographed by the expedition in Yemen is [*Tā'liq*] *sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*. The work was already known, as some collections of Arabic manuscripts contain copies of it⁶. However, the text of this work had not yet been edited. It was only edited in 1965 in Cairo by 'Abd al-Karīm 'Uthmān, after the Yemen expedition. He used two manuscripts for his edition: the Istanbul manuscript⁷ and the Yemen manuscript, the photocopy of which is kept in the National Library in Cairo⁸. 'Uthmān attributed

³ See Anawati (1957, 281-284). The titles *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawhīd wa-'l-'adl* and *al-Mughnī* were used both as can be concluded from the fact that both titles are written in the manuscripts. See also el-Khodeiri (1958, 417).

⁴ For the biography of 'Abd al-Jabbār, see below, 36-53. For more details on the *Mughnī*, see below, 8-10 and 44-45.

⁵ See el-Khodeiri (1958, 417-418). Until now, no manuscripts of volumes I, II, III, X, XVIII and XIX and the missing parts of volumes IX and XVII of the *Mughnī* have been found. Ben-Shammai (1974, 302-303) believes that a missing part of the volumes IX and X exists in the Firkovich collection in Leningrad. Monnot (1974, 25-27) mentions a fourth manuscript of the *Mughnī* that is an original manuscript belonging to the collection of Dār al-kutub in Cairo. However, he found that it does not contain any volumes besides some of those already found in the other three manuscripts.

⁶ Gimaret (1979, 48-49) mentions seventeen manuscripts that are found in collections in Ankara, Berlin, Istanbul, Milan, Munich, Şan'ā', Rome and Vienna.

⁷ Collection of Ahmet III 1872 (*Tā'liq*, 28-29).

⁸ Collection of Maktabat al-Jāmi' al-kabīr, kalām 190 (undated); Dār al-kutub photocopy B 277799 (*Tā'liq*, 29-30). See also Gimaret (1979, 49).

the work to ‘Abd al-Jabbār. He thought that ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s disciple Mānkḏīm, whose name is also mentioned on the title page, wrote it down from ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s dictation (*Tā’līq*, 27: 16-28: 3). However, when studying the text, some scholars became aware that Mānkḏīm’s contribution to the work must have been more than only writing it down. They therefore started to refer to *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* as a commentary or paraphrase made by Mānkḏīm, although they did not give arguments for this⁹.

It was Gimaret¹⁰ who convincingly argued that the text edited by ‘Uthmān was not a work by ‘Abd al-Jabbār himself but rather a critical paraphrase of a work by him. Gimaret pointed out that a first indication for this is to be found on the title page of the Istanbul manuscript that ‘Uthmān used as the basis of his edition. It reads: *Kūṭāb Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa li-Qāḏī ‘l-quḏāt ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad al-Hamadhānī al-Asad‘abādī al-mutawaffā sanat 415 hijriyya ‘ullīqa ‘an al-sayyid al-imām Qawām al-ḏīn Mānkḏīm* etc. (*Tā’līq*, 37). Gimaret concluded that “‘ullīqa ‘an ... Mānkḏīm” means that the work was “received” from Mānkḏīm, in the sense that it contains the reports of lectures¹¹ given by Mānkḏīm on a work by ‘Abd al-Jabbār entitled *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*¹². This means that the title of the text edited by ‘Uthmān should be: *Tā’līq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*¹³.

⁹ Madelung (1965, 182-183 and 256) referred to the work as Mānkḏīm’s “Kommentar (*Tā’līq*) zu Qāḏī ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s Erläuterung der fünf Grundlehren” and Vajda (1985, 303) pointed out that the text that was known as ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* did not reproduce ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s teachings literally.

¹⁰ Gimaret (1979, 47-57).

¹¹ See Gimaret (1979, 51-52). This implies that Mānkḏīm is to be considered as the author of the work. His authorship is confirmed by another manuscript that says “*ta’līf*” instead of “‘ullīqa ‘an”. (See note 13). That the verb ‘*allaqa* ‘an means “he wrote down what is taught”, is confirmed by Makdisi (1981, 114), who says about this term in relation to the study of law: “The verb ‘*allaqa*, with the prepositions ‘*alā* or ‘*an*, was said of a student who took notes of the lecture of his master-jurisconsult.”

¹² ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* has not been preserved. On this work, see below, 45-46.

¹³ Application of this title is debatable because it is found on the title page of another manuscript of the work, manuscript no. 194 of the list of manuscripts that were filmed during the 1974 expedition to Ṣan‘ā’ (*Makhtūṭāt*, 1976, 31). This list also contains two other manuscripts of this work: nos 94 and 237. They are entitled: *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa, li-‘l-Qāḏī ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad*, but instead of the formula “‘ullīqa ‘an”, they say: “*ta’līf Qawām al-ḏīn Mānkḏīm Aḥmad b. Husayn al-mā’rūf bi-Shashḏūw*.” As for manuscript no. 95, which is mentioned as another manuscript of Mānkḏīm’s paraphrase, Gimaret (1979, 49, note 1) has found that it is not *Tā’līq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, but a different work.

In ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s time, and probably in Mānkdīm’s time as well, professors used to dictate their works to their students, so that these students wrote down complete books from dictation. But, in addition to this, a professor could give lectures for which he made lecture notes, or he could teach with the help of one of his own works or the work of another master. The students took notes of these lectures. This is what the verb *‘allaqa* ‘an refers to. The record of the notes made by a student was called *ta’līq* or *ta’līqa*¹⁴. A student could use a *ta’līq* as a book. The difference between a commentary and a *ta’līq* was probably that a commentary was dictated word by word, whereas a *ta’līq* contains notes of a lecture that was given at the normal rate of speech. It is likely that Mānkdīm gave lectures about ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, explaining it and commenting on it. A student made notes of Mānkdīm’s words and the result was *Ta’līq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*.

Among the manuscripts photographed in Yemen by the expedition is another work that was also attributed to ‘Abd al-Jabbār at first, but which later also turned out to be a critical paraphrase of one of his works. The name of this critical paraphrase is *al-Majmū‘ fi ‘l-muḥīt bi-‘l-taklīf*¹⁵ and it consists of four volumes. The text of

¹⁴ The term *ta’līqa* was also used to designate the professor’s own lecture notes, his own syllabus for the course he taught. According to Makdisi (1981, 118-127), works of the *ta’līqa* type were used as textbooks for the study of law from the second half of the third/ninth century. The *ta’līqa* was first developed by Shāfi‘ī and Ḥanafī jurists, and was adopted at a later date by the Ḥanbalīs and Mālikīs and in other disciplines such as grammar, *kalām*, and medicine. Makdisi (1981, 125-126) deems it likely that in ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s time Mu‘tazilites made use of such *ta’līqāt* for their study of the Mu‘tazilite system.

¹⁵ The manuscript of the *Majmū‘* that was photographed by the Yemen expedition, the photocopies of which are kept in the Dār al-kutub in Cairo, is the only complete text that is known to exist. Manuscripts of only the first volume exist in the collection of Depot der ehemaligen Preussischen Staatsbibliothek in der Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, in the collection of the Fondation “Caetani” in the library of the Academy of Lincei in Rome and in the collection of Taymūr Bāshā in the Dār al-kutub in Cairo (*Majmū‘* I, 8). The Yemen manuscript and the manuscripts belonging to the collections in Tübingen and Cairo were used by Houben for his edition of volume I that he mistook for *al-Muḥīt bi-‘l-taklīf* by ‘Abd al-Jabbār. It was published in Beirut in 1965. Volume I was also edited that year in Cairo by ‘Azmī, who likewise mistook it for ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *al-Muḥīt bi-‘l-taklīf*. For the edition of volume II Houben made use of two manuscripts: the Yemen manuscript and a manuscript found in the National Library in Vienna (*Majmū‘* II, 17). Houben died before the text could be published. After his death, the first draft of the text was revised and corrected by Gimaret. It was published in Beirut in 1981. Volume III, edited by Peters, was published in Beirut in 1999. Daiber (1975, 509-510, note 2) has pointed out

volume I was edited by Houben and, separately, by ‘Azmī in Cairo, both in 1965. Both editors attributed the work to ‘Abd al-Jabbār¹⁶. Later, Gimaret¹⁷ produced evidence that *al-Majmū‘ fī ‘l-muḥīṭ bi-‘l-taklīf* is a paraphrase written by Ibn Mattawayh, another disciple of ‘Abd al-Jabbār of a work by ‘Abd al-Jabbār entitled *al-Muḥīṭ bi-‘l-taklīf*. The following words appear on the title-page of the manuscript that is the basis of the Houben edition: *al-Majmū‘ fī ‘l-muḥīṭ bi-‘l-taklīf li-Qāḍī ‘l-quḍāt Abī ‘l-Ḥasan ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad wa-huwa min jam‘ al-shaykh al-inām Abī Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. Mattawayh*. Gimaret has made it clear that the expression *min jam‘* does not mean “written down from dictation by...”, as Houben assumed, but rather “composed by...”¹⁸. Another argument put forward by Gimaret to defend

that in Ṣan‘ā two other manuscripts of parts of *al-Majmū‘ fī ‘l-muḥīṭ bi-‘l-taklīf* exist which were not photographed by the Egyptian expedition to Yemen in 1952 and are not mentioned in the list of the manuscripts photographed by this expedition. I found that these two manuscripts are neither mentioned in the list of manuscripts that were photographed by the Egyptian expedition to Yemen in 1974 (*Makhtūṭāt*, 1976).

¹⁶ When Houben edited the first volume of *al-Majmū‘ fī ‘l-muḥīṭ bi-‘l-taklīf* he assumed that it was a version of ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *Kitāb al-Muḥīṭ* made by one of his students (*Majmū‘* I, 8). However, he noticed the difference in style between the *Mughnī* and *al-Majmū‘ fī ‘l-muḥīṭ bi-‘l-taklīf*. He found that the latter was less complete than the former and that it showed a greater freedom and independence. However, he did not draw the conclusion that it was a commentary made by Ibn Mattawayh. He thought that Ibn Mattawayh had merely written down ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s dictation and he therefore presented the work as ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s work. On the French title-page of the printed text Ibn Mattawayh’s name is not even mentioned. Nevertheless, as early as 1902, Biram (1902, 6-7) had referred to the *Majmū‘* as the work of Ibn Mattawayh and to the *Muḥīṭ* as the work of ‘Abd al-Jabbār, although without explaining the relation between them. It was Gimaret (1977, 20-31) who presented arguments that *al-Majmū‘ fī ‘l-muḥīṭ bi-‘l-taklīf* is not the original *al-Muḥīṭ bi-‘l-taklīf* by ‘Abd al-Jabbār but a critical paraphrase by Ibn Mattawayh.

¹⁷ Gimaret (1977, 20-31).

¹⁸ The main meaning of the verb *jama‘a*, of which *jam‘* is the verbal noun, is “he collected; brought, or gathered together”, but it can also mean “he composed, arranged, or settled a thing, or an affair” (Lane, 1868/93, 455). That *min jam‘* in the title of *al-Majmū‘ fī ‘l-muḥīṭ bi-‘l-taklīf* means “composed by” had been understood by Luṭf and ‘Awn, the editors of Ibn Mattawayh’s *al-Tadhkira fī aḥkām al-jawāhir wa-‘l-‘rād* (*Tadhkira*, 14-15). There are other examples to be found in which *jama‘a* is used in the sense of writing or dictating a book. In his *al-Tadhkira fī aḥkām al-jawāhir wa-‘l-‘rād*, Ibn Mattawayh says: “I saw in what Qāḍī ‘l-quḍāt wrote [or dictated] (*jama‘ahū*) in *Ta‘līq al-Baghdādiyyāt ...*” (*Tadhkira*, 86: 17-18). Another example of *jama‘a* in the sense of “he wrote [or dictated]” is to be found in ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *Faḍl al-‘tizāl wa-ṭabaqāt al-Mu‘tazila*, where ‘Abd al-Jabbār says about Abū ‘l-Faḍl al-Kashshī that he wrote a good book in which he “brought together” (*jama‘a*) what is not to be seen in other works (*Faḍl* 319: 1-3; see also *Ṭabaqāt*, 101: 8-10).

his opinion that *al-Majmūʿ fī ʿl-muḥūṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf* is a paraphrase is that in the text ‘Abd al-Jabbār is referred to in the third person¹⁹. On the basis of these and other indications in the text, Gimaret²⁰ concluded that *al-Majmūʿ fī ʿl-muḥūṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf* is a paraphrase of ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *al-Muḥūṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf*.

Gimaret referred to *Tāʿlīq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-Majmūʿ fī ʿl-muḥūṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf* as paraphrases because in them Mānkdīm and Ibn Mattawayh describe in their own words what ‘Abd al-Jabbār said in *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-Muḥūṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf*, respectively. However, *Tāʿlīq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-Majmūʿ fī ʿl-muḥūṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf* are not mere paraphrases. Gimaret has made this clear by mentioning several passages that show evidence that Mānkdīm and Ibn Mattawayh added their own opinions and critical comments to what ‘Abd al-Jabbār said or left out what they deemed to be superfluous²¹.

Mānkdīm’s and Ibn Mattawayh’s critical approaches to ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s teaching should not be seen as a lack of respect for their master. Criticism from disciples was stimulated by the Muʿtazilite masters. This may be a corollary of the great importance the Muʿtazilites attached to independent thinking and reflection (*nazar*) as a way to finding the truth about God and the world. ‘Abd al-Jabbār strongly disapproved of uncritical adherence (*taqlīd*) to the opinion of another person or to the doctrine of a school (*Mukhtaṣar*, 199: 11-200: 3). He certainly also applied this to his own disciples and his fellow Muʿtazilites. He shows this attitude at the end of the *Mughnī*, where he invites his fellow Muʿtazilites to correct the mistakes they may find in it (*Mughnī* XX/2, 257: 12-14). It shows that ‘Abd al-Jabbār was open to correction by his fellow Muʿtazilites. So, when Mānkdīm and Ibn Mattawayh criticize ‘Abd al-Jabbār and correct what they deem to be a wrong opinion, they are only doing what they are expected to do as good Muʿtazilites.

Because of his findings that *Tāʿlīq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-*

¹⁹ Gimaret (1977, 22) gives some examples from volume II. Other examples, to be found in the volumes II and III, are: “And in other [books] than this book [*al-Muḥūṭ*], Qāḍī ʿl-quḍāt chose ...” (*Wa-qad ikhtāra Qāḍī ʿl-quḍāti fī ghayri hādihā ʿl-kitābi*) (*Majmūʿ* III, 91:20). “But what Qāḍī ʿl-quḍāt says is different: ... what he says in the *Mughnī* is that ..., then he withdrew that and said: ...” (*Wa-innamā khtalafa kalāmu Qāḍī ʿl-quḍāti ... fa-ʿlladhī qālahū fī ʿl-Mughnī annahū ..., thumma rajāʿa ʿan dhālika wa-qāla ...*) (*Majmūʿ* II, 305: 12-13).

²⁰ Gimaret (1977, 29-31).

²¹ Gimaret (1979, 53-57 and 1977, 24-26).

Majmūʿ fi ʿl-muḥīṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf are critical paraphrases, Gimaret²² advises that these paraphrastic texts should be used with caution and that not all the opinions that are found in them should automatically be attributed to ʿAbd al-Jabbār. In line with Mānkḏīm’s and Ibn Mattawayh’s critical approach to ʿAbd al-Jabbār’s texts, it is to be expected that *Taʿlīq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-Majmūʿ fi ʿl-muḥīṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf* contain opinions that are their own rather than those of ʿAbd al-Jabbār²³. The conclusion of my dissertation confirms this. The comparison of the subject of pain in the three texts has made clear that in some cases Mānkḏīm and Ibn Mattawayh introduced in their paraphrases opinions that differ from ʿAbd al-Jabbār’s opinions.

The possibility that the *Mughnī* as it is found in the manuscripts is a paraphrase can be eliminated. Firstly, that the text was dictated by ʿAbd al-Jabbār is indicated by the words *imlāʿ al-qāḏī Abī ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Jabbār* that follow the main title on the title page of each volume. Unlike the paraphrases, no one apart from ʿAbd al-Jabbār himself is mentioned on the title pages as being involved in any way in the production of the work. The person(s) who wrote down the *Mughnī* from dictation is (are) not even mentioned. That this text was dictated by ʿAbd al-Jabbār is confirmed by ʿAbd al-Jabbār himself at the end of the *Mughnī*, where he uses the word dictation (*imlāʿ*), several times in reference to his work on it (*Mughnī* XX/2, 258: 1-

²² Gimaret (1979, 57).

²³ This had already been observed by Vajda. Working on an annotated translation of *al-Kitāb al-muḥṭawī*, written by the Muʿtazila influenced Karaite *mutakallim* Yūsuf al-Baṣīr (first half of the eleventh century), he compared the contents of this work with those of works by ʿAbd al-Jabbār in order to get a better understanding of Yūsuf al-Baṣīr’s thinking. Doing so, Vajda knew that [*Taʿlīq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-Majmūʿ fi ʿl-muḥīṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf*] were not works by ʿAbd al-Jabbār but rather critical paraphrases, made later, of these works. He pointed out that because [*Taʿlīq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-Majmūʿ fi ʿl-muḥīṭ bi-ʿl-taklīf*] were made later, they could not have been known to Yūsuf al-Baṣīr when he wrote *al-Kitāb al-muḥṭawī*, which was finished in 411/1021 (see Vajda, 1985, 592), shortly before the death of ʿAbd al-Jabbār in 415/1024. Vajda said: “Notre documentation concernant ʿAbd al-Jabbār comprend, on le sait, des oeuvres qui sont certes issues de son enseignement, mais ne reproduisent pas littéralement celui-ci, et prennent même assez souvent une attitude critique sur des points de détail: il s’agit du *Šarḥ* et du *Maǧmūʿ* au demeurant postérieurs l’un et l’autre à Yūsuf al-Baṣīr. Par conséquent, s’il est indispensable de se référer à ces textes, voire d’y recourir constamment, il importe de ne jamais oublier qu’ils ne peuvent avoir servi, sous la forme où nous les lisons aujourd’hui, de sources au Maître karaïte. A ce point de vue, seul le *Mughnī* peut être actuellement considéré comme renfermant des textes qui nous vent parvenus dans la rédaction que Yūsuf peut avoir eu sous les yeux” (Vajda, 1985, 303).

259: 2). A second indication is the fact that in it, the voice of ‘Abd al-Jabbār is always given in the first person²⁴. Taking these indications into account, it can safely be assumed that the text of the *Mughnī* as it was found in the Ṣan‘ā’ manuscript is not a paraphrase like *Tā’līq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-Majmū‘ fī ‘l-muḥūṭ bi-‘l-taklīf*.

3. The Place of the Subject of Pain in the Three Texts

The edited text of the *Mughnī* consists of the fourteen volumes that have been discovered²⁵. The sequence of subjects in these volumes shows that the *Mughnī* was dictated according to a carefully thought out design, so that the twenty-volume work forms a coherent whole²⁶. The *Mughnī* consists of two main parts: *al-Tawḥīd* (Unity) and *al-‘Adl* (Justice). The names of these parts correspond to the two main Mu‘tazilite principles. The second main part, *al-‘Adl*, starts with volume VI and ends with volume XX. The subject of pain is mainly discussed by ‘Abd al-Jabbār in the second part of volume XIII of the *Mughnī* (*Mughnī* XIII, 226-568), which is named *al-Luṭf* (Divine Assistance)²⁷ because this is the subject that is discussed in this volume²⁸. According to ‘Abd al-Jabbār pain imposed by God is an important *luṭf*²⁹. In addition, particular aspects of pain are consid-

²⁴ To the examples of sentences in the first person that Gimaret has included, many more can be added such as: “we have explained in another place that ...” (*wa-qad bayyannā fī ghayri mawḍi‘in anna ...*) (*Mughnī* XIII, 242: 14); “we have spoken at length on it ... and now we raise the question of ...” (*wa-qad ashbā‘nā ‘l-qawla fīhi ... wa-nahnu ‘l-āna nūridu ...*) (*Mughnī* XIII, 262: 3); “we have explained in the beginning of the section on justice that ...” (*wa-qad bayyannā fī awwālī bābi ‘l-‘adli annahū ...*) (*Mughnī* XIII, 298: 14).

²⁵ These volumes were edited by several editors and published in Cairo in the years 1960-1969. Volume XX was published in two separate parts. For a survey of the titles of the volumes and the names of their editors, see References, Primary sources, *Mughnī*.

²⁶ For an outline of the structure of the *Mughnī*, see Peters (1976, 34-35).

²⁷ For an explanation of the meaning of the term *luṭf*, see below, 148-151.

²⁸ Volume XIII (*al-Luṭf*) was edited by Abū ‘l-‘Alā’ ‘Afīfī and published in Cairo in 1962. Several scholars have studied parts of this volume dealing with pain. Brunschvig (1974 a) partly based his study of ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s analysis of pain on it. Vajda (1985, 333-386) studied it, comparing ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s theory on the compensation of pain as it is expressed in this volume with the corresponding chapter in Yūsuf al-Baṣīr’s *al-Kitāb al-muḥṭawī*. McDermott (1978, 181-186 and 382-384) studied the discussions on pain in this volume in order to compare ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s theory on this subject with the theories of al-Shaykh al-Mufīd and al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā.

²⁹ See below, 151-153, 155-156.

ered briefly in other volumes of the *Mughnī* in the discussion of other subjects. ‘Abd al-Jabbār mostly does this in order to clarify the subject under discussion or to strengthen an argument. For instance, in his discussion of the way in which humans act ‘Abd al-Jabbār also discusses how they bring pain into existence³⁰.

As opposed to the printed text of the *Mughnī* that consists of fourteen volumes, the printed text of *Tā’līq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* consists of only one volume. There are some indications that Mānkdīm not only paraphrased but also summarized ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s work³¹. He may have done so because the work was meant to be used as a studybook and therefore should not be too extensive. It is likely that the structure of Mānkdīm’s *Tā’līq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* in general conforms to the structure of ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*. It consists of an introduction and five parts that are named after the five Mu‘tazilite principles (*uṣūl*). Although Mānkdīm declares that he prefers the system of two principles as it is followed in the *Mughnī*, he maintains the structure of ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, which is based on the five principles. As for the order of subjects within each part, it seems that Mānkdīm mostly keeps the order as it was in ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s *Sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*. This is indicated by remarks like: “However, he presented it in this way, so we follow him” (*Tā’līq*, 81: 13). Sometimes Mānkdīm disapproved of the order chosen by ‘Abd al-Jabbār. For instance, he says: “The right sequence would be to begin with..., but we follow his [‘Abd al-Jabbār’s] way, so we start with what he started with” (*Tā’līq*, 666: 4-7). However, Mānkdīm sometimes changed the order: “We will answer the second question first, because that suits better...” (*Tā’līq*, 409: 5) and, “After he, may God have mercy upon him, had explained that God cannot be a body, he explained that He cannot be an accident (*araḍ*), but we will first explain what an accident is” (*Tā’līq*, 230: 10-11). The subject of pain is discussed in the second part, that deals with the principle of Justice (*‘adl*) (*Tā’līq*, 299-608). The discussion of pain and its compensation takes twenty-two printed pages (*Tā’līq*, 483-505). Because of the rather limited scope, some aspects of pain,

³⁰ *Mughnī* IX, 52-59. In this section ‘Abd al-Jabbār confines himself to the way in which pain is brought into existence by human beings, leaving out any discussion of other aspects of pain.

³¹ Studying the pages of *Tā’līq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* that deal with the subject of the appointed time (*ajal*), Abrahamov (1993a, 14, note 38) noticed that they seem to summarize ‘Abd al-Jabbār’s views.

such as how it comes into existence, are not explicitly discussed in *Tā'liq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*.

Al-Majmū' fī 'l-muḥīṭ bi-'l-taklīf is longer than *Tā'liq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa*, but shorter than the *Mughnī*. At present three volumes of the text have been published, but as the manuscript consists of four volumes, it is likely that the edited text will also consist of four volumes. *Al-Majmū' fī 'l-muḥīṭ bi-'l-taklīf*, like the *Mughnī*, is divided in two main parts: Unity and Justice. As a sort of introduction, an explanation is first given of God's imposing obligations (*taklīf*) on humans and what one must know with respect to this subject (*Majmū' I*, 1-25). This is followed by the first main part, *al-Tawḥīd* (Unity), which deals with attributes in general and the attributes of God in particular (*Majmū' I*, 26-226). The second main part, *al-'Adl* (Justice), which is much longer than the first main part, *al-Tawḥīd*, starts at the end of volume I (*Majmū' I*, 227). The main discussion of the subject of pain is to be found in the second main part, in the first section of volume III (*Majmū' III*, 11-129). Although the discussion of pain in the *Majmū'* is not as extensive as that in the *Mughnī*, it deals with all the aspects of pain that are discussed in the *Mughnī*.

The authors of the three texts, 'Abd al-Jabbār, Mānkḏīm and Ibn Mattawayh, belonged to three successive generations who adhered to the same Mu'tazilite school, the Bahshamiyya. The subject of my dissertation was the adoption of the teaching of 'Abd al-Jabbār by his disciples Mānkḏīm and Ibn Mattawayh. In this dissertation I made a comparison of the sections on pain in *al-Mughnī*, *Tā'liq sharḥ al-uṣūl al-khamsa* and *al-Majmū' fī 'l-muḥīṭ bi-'l-taklīf*. The conclusion was that Mānkḏīm and Ibn Mattawayh agreed with 'Abd al-Jabbār on most points. Those parts in their discussion in which they do not add anything to the topic at hand, have been left out here. Only some additional remarks made by Mānkḏīm and Ibn Mattawayh which show their disagreement with 'Abd al-Jabbār have been included.

In the original dissertation attention was paid to schools within the Mu'tazila, in particular in a historical survey of the Bahshamiyya. As this survey contains useful information on 'Abd al-Jabbār, Mānkḏīm, Ibn Mattawayh and other Mu'tazilites, I have kept it, although it is not essential for the subject of the present study.