Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi/J. Fac. Div. Ank. Univ.; 2026:67(1)

Eser Değerlendirmesi/Book Review

al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī. *Kitāb al-Shubuhāt or Dawāʾ dāʾ al-qulūb*, ed. Bilal Orfali and Ridwan al-Sayyid. Beirut: American University of Beirut Press, 2026. 551 p. ISBN: 978-614-492-025-1

Hasan Aydemir

Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi, Türkiye / Nevsehir Hacı Bektas Veli University, Faculty of Theology, Türkiye

Having discovered a majmūʿah at the Library of the Syrian Society during his travels to Beirut in 1854, Aloys Sprenger announced in a letter to the *JASB* that he had discovered the earliest work in the history of Taṣawwuf.[1] Immediately upon his return, he published an article in this journal under the title "Notice on the دواء داء القلوب of Mohásaby Being the Earliest Work on Sufism as Yet Discovered, and on an Arabic Translation of a Work Ascribed to Enoch." In this article, he claimed that the majmūʿah contained two distinct texts named *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt*, suggesting that they might constitute a single work and that their author was Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/857).[2] Containing English translations of certain passages from the *Dawāʾ* and brief information regarding the content of *al-Shubuhāt*, this article has retained its status as the sole source for researchers concerning these two works until the present day. The reason for this is that after Sprenger, no one was able to access these two works again. This is because the Syrian Society he cited ceased operations, and the manuscripts contained therein were transferred to the library of another institution.[3] Researchers specializing in al-Muḥāsibī, such as Louis Massignon, Margaret Smith, Josef van Ess, and Gavin Picken, were compelled to rely on conjectures regarding the work based on Sprenger's article, as they were unable to locate this majmūʿah.[4]

Aḥmad b. ʿĀṣim al-Anṭākī's (d. between 220/835 and 239/853) work titled *Dawāʾ Dāʾ al-Qulūb*, contained in this majmūʿah long presumed lost, was published by me on November 14, 2025, demonstrating with evidence that the *Dawāʾ* belongs to al-Anṭākī, while *al-Shubuhāt* is the work of al-Muḥāsibī. Several months subsequent to my publication, however, Bilal Orfali and Ridwan al-Sayyid released these texts, positing *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* as a single work authored by al-Muḥāsibī. At this juncture, scholars of Taṣawwuf are confronted with two distinct studies presenting contradictory claims regarding the authorship of these works, thereby creating confusion

1 The letter was sent in 1854 and published in 1855. Aloys Sprenger, "Extract from a letter of Dr. A. Sprenger, dated Damascus, December 24th, 1854.," 24: 44.

2 Aloys Sprenger, "Notice on the Dawâ' dâ' al-qulûb of Mohásaby being the earliest work on Sufism as yet discovered, and on an Arabic translation of a work ascribed to Enoch," 25: 143.

3 For further information on this society, see: A. L. Tibawi, "The Genesis and Early History of the Syrian Protestant College," 21/1: 1-15. Moreover, regarding the historical status of the manuscripts in this collection, see: Boris Liebrenz-Christoph Rauch, "Manuscript Ownership and Readership at the American University of Beirut at the Turn of the Twentieth Century," 248-292.

4 As noted in our study, some scholars were aware of this collection. However, because their primary focus was not on *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt*, these two important works in the field of Sufism remained largely unnoticed in the secondary literature. For a detailed discussion, see: Hasan Aydemir, *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*, 60-82.

Sorumlu yazar: Hasan Aydemir
Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi, Türkiye
E-mail: hasanaydemiir@gmail.com

ROR ID: ror.org/019jds967

Atıf bilgisi:
Aydemir, Hasan. "al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī. *Kitāb al-Shubuhāt or Dawāʾ dāʾ al-Qulūb*, ed. Bilal Orfali and Ridwan al-Sayyid. Beirut: American University of Beirut Press, 2026. 551 s. ISBN: 978-614-492-025-1." *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 67:1 (2026): 477-486.

Dergi ile yayın yapan yazarlar, CC BY-NC 4.0 kapsamında lisanslanan çalışmalarının telif hakkını elinde tutar.
Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright of their work licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0.

within the literature. Consequently, we have penned this book review with the aim of resolving the ensuing confusion and articulating our critiques regarding the new edition by Orfali and al-Sayyid. Where their edition and our study converge is on the attribution of *al-Shubuhāt* to al-Muḥāsibī. In our edition, a separate section was dedicated to this subject, demonstrating with evidence that *al-Shubuhāt* belongs to al-Muḥāsibī.[5] Their work, however, diverges from our study in that it treats *Dawāʾ Dāʾ al-Qulūb* as a part of *Kitāb al-Shubuhāt* and, as a natural consequence of this assumption, attributes the *Dawāʾ* to al-Muḥāsibī. In other words, our study presents evidence regarding the attribution of the *Dawāʾ* to al-Anṭākī and *al-Shubuhāt* to al-Muḥāsibī and includes the edition of the *Dawāʾ* alone. Conversely, Orfali and al-Sayyid treated *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* as a single work, publishing both texts together and attributing them to al-Muḥāsibī.

Before proceeding to our critiques, we must commend Orfali and al-Sayyid for their courage in preparing the edition of *al-Shubuhāt*, a task rendered particularly arduous by the fact that the work survives as a unique manuscript. The authors have made a significant contribution to the field of Ṣūfī studies by placing this work of unique content at the disposal of researchers. We have no doubt that al-Muḥāsibī's *al-Shubuhāt*, possessing rich content regarding the relationship between Taṣawwuf and politics as well as the connection of Taṣawwuf with other religious sciences, will bring new dimensions to the current perception of the history of Taṣawwuf. This study, conducted by the researchers, comprises three main sections. The first section, entitled "al-Muḥāsibī: His Intellectual and Literary Biography," constitutes the "research" component of the work. In this section, the authors outline al-Muḥāsibī's biography and Ṣūfī thought, address the issue of the attribution of *al-Shubuhāt* to al-Muḥāsibī, and describe the contents of the majmūʿah (No. 66) housed in the American University of Beirut Library. The second section, titled "The Text of *Kitāb al-shubuhāt*," constitutes the backbone of the study and comprises the Arabic text of both *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt*. Finally, the "Indices" section, unlike conventional index sections, is devoted to detailed and extensive indices, comprising āyāt, hadith, persons and tribes, places, days and battles, and subject headings, that enhance the scholarly utility of the work. Let us now turn to our critiques regarding the study by Orfali and al-Sayyid.

The expressions within the majmūʿah containing *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* offer significant indications that these constitute two distinct works. First, *Dawāʾ Dāʾ al-Qulūb* is the second of five different works contained in this majmūʿah housed at the American University of Beirut Library. Following the phrase "يتلو دواء داء القلوب" found in the al-farāgh (colophon) of the first work, the text of the *Dawāʾ* begins with an introduction containing the expression "قال أحمد بن عاصم الأنطاكي". However, the final portions of the *Dawāʾ* are missing. Immediately following this lost final section of the *Dawāʾ*, that is, in the third position within the majmūʿah, appears al-Muḥāsibī's work named *Kitāb al-Shubuhāt*, the beginning of which is lost.[6]

In fact, the page immediately following where the text of the *Dawāʾ* ends differs entirely from the preceding sections in terms of structure, content, and style. Furthermore, at the beginning of the sections of *al-Shubuhāt* there appear phrases such as "الجزء العاشر من كتاب الشبهات", and the al-farāgh (colophon) of the manuscript clearly contains the formula "تمت كتاب الشبهات", indicating that the work has been completed.[7] Consequently, due to the fact that the ending of the *Dawāʾ* and the beginning of *al-Shubuhāt* are missing, these two distinct works appear consecutively in their incomplete state, creating the illusion of a single book. This is precisely the point that perplexed Sprenger. Indeed, being aware of the records in the majmūʿah, Orfali and al-Sayyid hesitated in titling their study and opted for the following title reflecting this indecision: "كتاب الشُّبهات أو دواء داء القلوب." It is, of course, possible that the work has been referred to by different names throughout history. However, not only do we lack such data, but as will be seen below, the two works are also distinct from each other in terms of content and style. We shall now turn to our own proofs regarding the fact that these constitute two separate works.

The strongest evidence demonstrating that the texts in question are independent works is that the statements found in the *Dawāʾ* are attributed to al-Anṭākī in later sources, whereas the statements contained in *Kitāb al-Shubuhāt* appear in al-Muḥāsibī's other works. For instance, the fact that sayings cited with attribution to al-Anṭākī in the works of al-Sulamī, Abū Nuʿaym, Abū Khalaf al-Ṭabarī, al-Bayhakī, al-Dhahabī, Ibn al-Jawzī, Ibn ʿAsākir, and Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, as well as many other later Ṣūfī authors, also appear in the *Dawāʾ* is an indication that this work is distinct from *Kitāb al-Shubuhāt*.[8] In texts of the subsequent period, these statements are attributed to

5 For evidence supporting the attribution of *al-Shubuhāt* to al-Muḥāsibī, see: Hasan Aydemir, *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*, 101-108.

6 The *Dawāʾ* appears on folios 15b–29a of the collection, whereas *al-Shubuhāt* occupies folios 30a–123b. For the differences we have mentioned, see the relevant sections of the manuscript. *Majmūʿah*, American University of Beirut, Jafet Library, MS 170:121 saA (Mic-MS-80), fols. 15b-29a and 30a-123b.

7 For these expressions, see: *Majmūʿah*, fols. 65a, 85a, 93a, 123b.

8 We address these citations in the subsequent sections of this study. Furthermore, for detailed information regarding the sayings attributed to al-

al-Anṭākī, appearing sometimes in the form of passages and block quotations, and at other times as individual sentences. Furthermore, the fact that the sayings ascribed to al-Anṭākī are derived from numerous sources rather than a single source indicates that the *Dawāʾ* may have been in circulation as an independent work. The notion that al-Anṭākī was a "questioner," as stated here by Orfali and al-Sayyid, does not align with historical data. The passages ascribed to al-Anṭākī are not attributed to al-Muḥāsibī or anyone else. Had al-Anṭākī been a "questioner" as the authors suggest, later Ṣūfī authors would have ascribed at least some of these expressions to al-Muḥāsibī as well. On the other hand, the fact that a sort of summary of the headings and passages found in *al-Shubuhāt* appears in al-Muḥāsibī's work titled *Kitāb al-Makāsib wa-l-Waraʿ wa-l-Shubuhāt* indicates that it is a work distinct from the *Dawāʾ*. Indeed, upon examining the text of *al-Shubuhāt*, it becomes evident that it is an expanded version of al-Muḥāsibī's *al-Makāsib* in terms of content, style, and network of relations. Consequently, had the text of the *Dawāʾ* been a part of *al-Shubuhāt*, its content would necessarily have corresponded to that of al-Muḥāsibī's *al-Makāsib*.

The themes of the *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* are also distinct from one another. The *Dawāʾ* is a text that addresses a multitude of subjects, ranging from aḥwāl (state) and maqāmāt (stations) to human nature, and from muḥāsabat al-nafs (inward accounting) to the derivatives of niyya (intention), in a brief and concise manner. *Al-Shubuhāt*, in contrast, is a work that substantiates various issues in great detail with evidence from the Qurʻān and the Sunna, covering topics ranging from the conditions of the caliph's just rule to the conditions of accepting gifts from the sultan, from the ruling on earnings derived from the state to the status of property seized via usurpation or oppression, and from doubtful matters in agriculture and trade to the lawful and unlawful aspects of human earnings. *Al-Shubuhāt* sustains this approach for approximately 200 pages without ever changing its theme. The *Dawāʾ*, on the other hand, changes its topic practically every few pages. For instance, while discussing the nature of the intellect, it focuses on muḥāsabat al-nafs a few pages later, and shortly thereafter, it proceeds to the subject of ikhlāṣ in niyya (intention) or to the relationship of friendship between two Ṣūfīs. As can be understood from its introduction, the *Dawāʾ* is a more comprehensive work in terms of its subject matter. Its general purpose is to mention, in outline, the fundamental matters that a murīd (disciple) needs to know. *Al-Shubuhāt*, however, is a text that focuses on the relationship between Ṣūfīs and politics, as well as the relationship between Ṣūfīs and the ulamāʾ, fully detailing these matters. In conclusion, this thematic divergence between the *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* constitutes further evidence that the two texts are distinct works.

The textual structures of the *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* are also distinct from one another. Indeed, in their study, Orfali and al-Sayyid acknowledge that the bābs differ between these two works and even explicitly state that the text abruptly continues with a different style of titling (p. 61). However, they attribute this difference to the fact that the text is "incomplete." The point where the authors state that the text's titling style changes is in fact where the *Dawāʾ* ends and *al-Shubuhāt* begins.[9] The *Dawāʾ* consists of a uniform style of titling; that is, it is composed solely of uniform bābs such as *Bāb al-ʿAql* and *Bāb al-Yaqīn*. *Al-Shubuhāt*, in contrast, is composed of sixteen main headings under the designation of "juzʾ", along with subheadings such as "faṣl" and "bāb" that branch out within these sixteen parts. On the other hand, the "incomplete" matters regarding the headings or the text mentioned by Orfali and al-Sayyid pertain to *al-Shubuhāt*. This situation does not apply to the *Dawāʾ*. Consequently, even the differences in the structures of the texts support our view of "two different works."

Finally, the styles of the *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* are also distinct from one another. The *Dawāʾ* consists of short bābs and responses to questions given in an aphoristic style. There are even bābs in the text composed of merely a single or a few aphoristic expressions.[10] *Al-Shubuhāt*, however, is composed of ajzāʾ devoted to the aforementioned doubtful matters, and of bāb and faṣl headings within these ajzāʾ that run on for pages. Sometimes, there may even be more than one bāb within a single juzʾ. The aim of *al-Shubuhāt* within these extensive parts is to detail the views it advocates with evidence derived from the Qurʾān and the Ḥadīth and to refute contrary situations through specific examples. *The Dawāʾ*, on the other hand, focuses on the domain expanded by Ṣūfī concepts and does not dwell on examples and details in this context. *Al-Anṭākī* offers holistic interpretations regarding the spiritual evolution of the individual based on these concepts. Moreover, the *Dawāʾ* is a text composed predominantly in the question-and-answer (qultu/qāla) format. In *al-Shubuhāt*, however, this format appears very rarely within its approximately 200 pages. On the other hand, the manner in which the subjects are handled in the *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* is also distinct from one another. The *Dawāʾ* contains only a few ḥadīths, cited without isnād (chains of transmission). In this respect, the *Dawāʾ* is a dirāyah-centered

Anṭākī by later Sufi authors that appear in the *Dawāʾ*, see: Hasan Aydemir, *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*, 88-92.

9 *Majmūʿah*, fols. 29b-30a.

10 *Majmūʿah*, fols. 21a, 23b-24a.

work dominated by the author's own views. *Al-Shubuhāt*, in contrast, is a riwāyat-centered text woven with hundreds of hadiths cited along with their isnād. In fact, due to the ḥadīths that run on for pages, it can even be said that this work is among the earliest textual examples to shed light on the relationship between Taṣawwuf and Ḥadīth. Therefore, the fact that the two works differ markedly in style constitutes further evidence that they cannot be the same work.

Having established that *Dawā'* and *al-Shubuhāt* are distinct works, we now examine the arguments Orfali and al-Sayyid advance for attributing *al-Shubuhāt*, treating the two works as a single text, to al-Muḥāsibī. They put forward the following three arguments:

1. The fact that the work proceeds via the question-and-answer method.
2. The fact that the first heading in the text is about the principles of uṣūl al-ʿaql (the principles of the intellect)
3. The presence of expressions from al-Shubuhāt in al-Muḥāsibī's other works (p. 61)

First, the fact that both works feature the question-and-answer format is quite natural within the tradition of early Islamic literature. Indeed, the works of many early Ṣūfīs, not only those of al-Muḥāsibī, are composed in the question-and-answer format.[11] Moreover, as mentioned above, while the question-and-answer format is quite frequent in the *Dawā'*, it is a feature rarely observed in *al-Shubuhāt*. Therefore, the conclusion that the works belong to al-Muḥāsibī cannot be inferred based solely on this aspect. On the other hand, based on this question-and-answer format, Orfali and al-Sayyid conclude that the expression "قال أحمد بن عاصم الأنطاكي" appearing in the compilation refers to the questioner, namely al-Anṭākī (pp. 61–62). As evidence for this, they present the opening passage of *Kitāb al-khalwa*, whose attribution is disputed in modern scholarship. For the opening passage of al-*Khalwa* is identical to a statement attributed to al-Anṭākī in the *Ḥilyat*. Let us now examine the similarity in question between the two texts:

The Beginning of *al-Khalwa* Attributed to al-Muḥāsibī	**The Passage Attributed to al-Anṭākī in the *Ḥilyat***
"قال الإمام أبو عبد الله الحارث بن أسد المحاسبي رضي الله عنه: اعلم رحمك الله إن أهل طاعة الله قدموا بين يدي الأعمال لطيف معرفة الأسباب التي بها يستدعى صالح الأعمال ويسهل عليهم مأخذه توطينا منهم لأنفسهم على استصحابه الي انقضا اجالهم فيصير مالهم في الدنيا يوما واحدا وليلة كلما مضت استأنفوا النية وطلبوا من أنفسهم حسن الصحة ليومهم وليلتهم فكل ما مضى عنهم يوم تحسن منهم الصحبة له أو ليلة راقبوا أنفسهم فيها على جميل الطاعة كان عندهم غنما"[12]	"قال أحمد بن عاصم الأنطاكي: أما بعد، فإن أهل الطاعة قد قدموا بين يدي الأعمال لطيف المعرفة بالأسباب التي يستديمون بها صالح الأعمال ويسهل عليهم مأخذه، وصيروا أعمالهم في الدنيا يوما واحدا وليلة واحدة، كلما مضت استأنفوا النية وطلبوا من أنفسهم حسن الصحبة ليومهم وليلتهم، فكلما مضى عنهم يوم وليلة راقبوا أنفسهم فيها على جميل الطاعة كان عندهم غنما"[13]

As is evident, the first passage in *al-Khalwa*, which begins with the phrase "qāla al-Muḥāsibī," is attributed to al-Anṭākī by Abū Nuʿaym in his work titled the *Ḥilyat* in a much later period. Josef van Ess, the first to make this observation, suggested based on this that *al-Khalwa* might also belong to al-Anṭākī.[14] However, Orfali and al-Sayyid disagree with van Ess on this matter, proposing instead that the author of *al-Khalwa* is al-Muḥāsibī, while al-Anṭākī is its questioner (p. 60). This is because only the first paragraph of *al-Khalwa* appears in the *Ḥilyat* attributed to al-Anṭākī. Indeed, the passages following this initial passage in *al-Khalwa* are not attributed to al-Anṭākī in other sources. Therefore, in their view, al-Anṭākī must be in the position of the "questioner" regarding the text of *al-Khalwa* here as well, while al-Muḥāsibī must be its actual "author." Based on this reasoning, the researchers have claimed that the same situation applies to *Kitāb al-Shubuhāt* (considering the *Dawā'* and *al-Shubuhāt* together). According to them, the expression "قال أحمد بن عاصم الأنطاكي" appearing at the beginning of the *Dawā'* refers to *al-Anṭākī*, who is the transmitter of *al-Shubuhāt*. Let us now examine the opening section of the *Dawā'* in question:

> "قال أحمد بن عاصم الأنطاكي: الحمد لله رب العلمين، كما هو أهله، وكما ينبغي لكرم وجهه، وصلى الله على محمد النبي وعلى آله وسلم كثيرا، رَحِمَ الله عبداً عُنِيَ بنفسه بالنظر لها، فليستمع القول فيتبع أحسنه، لعل الله أن يجعله من أهل اللُبّ والنُهَى ويَمُنَّ عليه بالبشارة عند فراق الدنيا، فإنه يقول تعالى: ﴿ فَبَشِّرْ عِبَادِ الَّذِينَ يَسْتَمِعُونَ الْقَوْلَ فَيَتَّبِعُونَ اَحْسَنَهُ أُولَٰئِكَ الَّذِينَ هَدٰيهُمُ اللّٰهُ وَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمْ أُولُوا الْاَلْبَابِ﴾ [الزمر ٣٩/١٧-١٨] نسأل الله أن يجعلنا وإياكم من أهل هذه الصفة. إن صاحب هذه المسائل ذكر أنه طلب عالما عاملا ناصحا

11 Many works can be cited as examples of texts written in the 'question-and-answer format' in the third century AH, such as al-Kharrāz's *Kitāb al-Ṣidq*, al-Tirmidhī's *Khatm al-Awliyā'*, and al-Junayd's *Kitāb al-Fanā'*.

12 al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī, *Kitāb al-Khalwa*, ed. Ighnāṭiyūs ʿAbdu Khalīfa, 7.

13 Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā'*, 9:284-285.

14 Josef van Ess, *Die Gedankenwelt des Ḥāriṭ al-Muḥāsibī*, 19-21.

مرشدا ليسترشده في أمره ويَدُلُّه على طريق السلامة في أمر دينه فَوَفَّقَه الله له ومَنّ عليه به، فسَأَلَه عن هذه المسايل، فأجابه فيها، فكتبها رَجَاءً أن ينفعَهُ الله بها، وينتفع غيره من أهل الصدق والإرادة ومن يَجْتَهِدُ في علمه طلب الزِّيَادَة."[15]

When we grammatically trace the continuity of pronouns and verb-subjects in this passage, we encounter a result contrary to Orfali and al-Sayyid's assertion: the person "answering" the questions and the one "writing" this text are the same person. Indeed, the flow in the introduction, "he asked him about these questions," "he answered him regarding them," and "he wrote them down" (فسَأَلَه عن هذه المسايل، فأجابه فيها، فكتبها), confirms this point. Here, while the subject of the verb "سألَه" is the inquirer (صاحب المسائل), in the immediately following verb "فأجابه", the pronoun shifts to the position of the respondent, that is, the murshid, who is the nearest antecedent, in accordance with the rule of regular pronominal reference. As for the verb "فكتبها" that follows, its subject also refers to the last-mentioned antecedent, in accordance with the rules of syntax. Furthermore, due to the presence of the particle "ف", the implied meaning here is that the murs̲h̲id penned the work to answer the murīd and provide him with benefit. In this regard, when we consider the expression "قال أحمد بن عاصم الأنطاكي" in the introduction and the flow of the text, it becomes evident that the one writing the text and the one answering are the same person. Consequently, as indicated in this passage and as understood from the purpose of its composition, the *Dawāʾ* is a work penned by al-Anṭākī himself to address several issues.[16]

On the other hand, in the classical period, citing the author's name at the very beginning along with the phrase "qāla fulān" was a common custom. By providing the author's name at the outset, authors or copyists prevented the work from being lost or stolen.[17] Indeed, the custom of citing the author's name at the beginning is a feature observed in the manuscripts of many extant Ṣūfī works. The fact that we know the authors of the works of many Ṣūfīs today, such as al-Muḥāsibī, al-Kharrāz, al-Junayd, and al-Tirmidhī, is due to the expression "qāla fulān" found at the beginning of their manuscripts. While there may be other indicators for some, the attribution of others to them relies solely on this phrase. In this respect, the phrase "qāla Aḥmad b. ʿĀṣim al-Anṭākī" appearing at the beginning of the manuscript indicates, in its most fundamental and natural sense, the author of the *Dawāʾ*.

Orfali and al-Sayyid state that this work belongs to al-Muḥāsibī on the grounds that the first heading of *al-Shubuhāt* (considering the *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* together) concerns the intellect. This is because, according to the authors, al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī is the originator of the "nature of the intellect" and the idea of "al-ʿaql ʿan Allāh" in the history of early Taṣawwuf (p. 61). It is certainly true that al-Muḥāsibī stands out among early Ṣūfīs regarding the nature of the intellect, and that he even has an independent work on this subject, titled *K. māʾiyyat al-ʿaql*. However, the first passage of the *Dawāʾ* is related not to the nature of the intellect but to its qualities and characteristics. The *Dawāʾ* discusses, rather, the quality of the intellect, its role in the human-God relationship, its utility, and its soundness.[18] Al-Muḥāsibī, on the other hand, in *K. māʾiyyat al-ʿaql*, focuses directly on what the *al-ʿaql* means and in what manner it is a gharīza.[19] Conversely, in later Ṣūfī texts, al-Anṭākī stands out with frequent citations when the "quality/characteristics of the intellect" are concerned.[20] Furthermore, since the expressions found in the "uṣūl al-ʿaql" of the *Dawāʾ* are already attributed to al-Anṭākī in later sources, one should conclude, based on this chapter heading that the work belongs to al-Anṭākī.[21] Another point concerns the concept of "al-ʿaql ʿan Allāh." There is, in fact, no such discussion in the *Dawāʾ*. Furthermore, the *Dawāʾ* contains no similar expressions regarding the idea of "al-ʿaql ʿan Allāh" as emphasized by al-Muḥāsibī in his works.[22] Therefore, the claim that the *Dawāʾ* belongs to al-Muḥāsibī based on this reasoning remains unfounded.

15 *Majmūʿah*, fol. 15b.

16 Another point worth mentioning here is that the phrase qāla Abū ʿAbd Allāh appears seven times in the *Dawāʾ*, and following this phrase, direct answers are provided without any preceding questions. In other words, whoever Abū ʿAbd Allāh is, he is the author of the work. However, the kunya of both al-Anṭākī and al-Muḥāsibī is "Abū ʿAbd Allāh." Indeed, since 'Abū ʿAbd Allāh' was the kunya of many Sufis in the early period, this cannot be considered a definitive indicator. Moreover, al-Sulamī states that al-Anṭākī had two kunyas, "Abū ʿAbd Allāh" and "Abū ʿAlī," but that "Abū ʿAbd Allāh" was the most famous among them, see: al-Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfīya*. ed. Muṣṭafā ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAṭā, 118.

17 For instance, Hujwīrī himself states that due to the plagiarism of his works, he inserted the phrase qāla Hujwīrī not only at the beginning of his book but also in many places throughout it. Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-Maḥjūb*, trans. Isʿād ʿAbd al-Hādī Qandīl, 1:191-192.

18 *Majmūʿah*, fols. 15b-17a.

19 In *al-ʿAql*, al-Muḥāsibī devotes considerable space to the nature of the intellect, the views of the scholars of his time regarding this subject, and his own preference in this matter. For the relevant sections, see: al-Muḥāsibī, *al-ʿAql wa-fahm al-Qurʾān*, ed. Ḥusayn al-Quwwatlī, 201-212.

20 al-Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfīya*, 118; al-Bayhakī, *al-Jāmiʿ li-shuʿab al-īmān*, ed. Mukhtār Aḥmad al-Nadwī (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2003), 6:368; al-Iṣfahānī, Abū Nuʿaym, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*. 9:287-291; Abū Khalaf al-Ṭabarī, *Salwat al-ʿĀrifīn wa-Uns al-Mushtāqīn*. ed. Gerhard Böwering, Bilal Orfali, 485.

21 For relevant sources and citations, see: Hasan Aydemir, *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*, 88.

22 Moreover, considering that al-Anṭākī has a statement supporting the concept of al-ʿaql ʿan Allāh, the idea that he influenced al-Muḥāsibī might even

Finally, the third argument presented by Orfali and al-Sayyid, namely, the claim that the expressions found in *al-Shubuhāt* (considering the *Dawā'* and *al-Shubuhāt* together) appear in al-Muḥāsibī's other works, is both accurate and misleading. It is an undeniable fact that the expressions in *al-Shubuhāt* show significant similarities to al-Muḥāsibī's other works. However, the authors are mistaken on this point because by using the title *al-Shubuhāt*, they imply that the *Dawā'* and *al-Shubuhāt* constitute a single work. The point on which they are correct is that passages quoted for pages in al-Muḥāsibī's work *Ādāb al-nufūs* also appear in the *Dawā'* text. However, even this fact serves as evidence that the *Dawā'* belongs to al-Anṭākī, not to al-Muḥāsibī. This is because an expression in the form of "One of the ḥukamā' said" appears at the beginning of these passages in *Ādāb al-nufūs*.[23] In the *Dawā'*, however, these passages appear directly without such an expression at the beginning. It is implausible for al-Muḥāsibī to recount his own thoughts in *Ādāb al-nufūs* after having cited this expression. Furthermore, the fact that these sayings, which follow the phrase "One of the ḥukamā' said" in *Ādāb al-nufūs* and appear in the *Dawā'*, are attributed to al-Anṭākī in some later sources confirms the idea that the text belongs to al-Anṭākī.[24] Moreover, al-Anṭākī's famous epithet is "Ḥākim."[25]

Orfali and al-Sayyid state, based on Hujwīrī's statement, that al-Muḥāsibī was al-Anṭākī's teacher (p. 59). This claim is incorrect. In fact, most Ṣūfī biographical works state that these two Ṣūfīs were peers.[26] In our opinion as well, there was a friendship between them rather than a teacher-student relationship. On the other hand, al-Anṭākī was the elder.[27] Al-Muḥāsibī may have met al-Anṭākī at a time when he fled from Baghdād and went to Dimashq. Moreover, if we consider the appearance of al-Anṭākī's expressions in the text of *Ādāb al-nufūs* together with the fact that al-Anṭākī was the elder, we can suggest that al-Anṭākī influenced al-Muḥāsibī. As a matter of fact, the entirety of al-Muḥāsibī's *Ādāb al-nufūs*, from beginning to end, is a text formed around the elaboration and interpretation of the sayings that follow the expression "One of the ḥukamā' said." Furthermore, if it is revealed in the future that the other passages following the other expressions of "One of the ḥukamā' said" in *Ādāb al-nufūs* also belong to al-Anṭākī, it might even be considered that al-Anṭākī had a significant influence on al-Muḥāsibī. In truth, specifically regarding *Ādāb al-nufūs*, al-Muḥāsibī might be a "transmitter" of al-Anṭākī's thoughts. Significantly, van Ess questions the attribution of this work to al-Muḥāsibī since the passages following the expression "One of the ḥukamā' said" in *Ādāb al-nufūs* are attributed to al-Anṭākī in classical sources and suggests that al-Anṭākī might be the actual originator of the thoughts in the text.[28] In our study, we also stated that when we compared these two passages found in *Ādāb al-nufūs* and the *Dawā'*, al-Muḥāsibī gave the impression of a sort of commentary, interpreting al-Anṭākī's words by expanding upon them.[29] However, further detailed studies are needed to support the claim that *Ādāb al-nufūs* is a commentary on al-Anṭākī's thoughts. In summary, the point made by Orfali and al-Sayyid regarding the presence of expressions from *al-Shubuhāt* in al-Muḥāsibī's other works relates to al-Shubuhāt, not to the *Dawā'*. After all, since *al-Shubuhāt* is al-Muḥāsibī's work, it is quite natural for similar ideas from his other works to appear in *al-Shubuhāt*. It is incorrect for the researchers to assume that the *Dawā'* and *al-Shubuhāt* are the same work and to conclude that both belong to al-Muḥāsibī without considering other possibilities at all. Having addressed our objections to the researchers' arguments, let us now mention some other proofs indicating that the *Dawā'* is the work of al-Anṭākī:

As mentioned above, some expressions found in *Dawā'* appear in later period Ṣūfī texts attributed to al-Anṭākī. The fact that a significant portion of the *Dawā'* appears in the works of authors such as al-Sulamī, Abū Khalaf al-Ṭabarī, al-Bayhaqī, al-Dhahabī, Ibn al-Jawzī, Ibn ʿAsākir, and Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, as attributed to al-Anṭākī, is the strongest proof that the work belongs to al-Anṭākī. Because we have cited these proofs at length in the work we published, we will mention only some of them here. The first passage of "Usūl al-ʿaql," the first chapter of the *Dawā'*, is as follows:

be raised. See: al-Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfiya*, 120.

23 al-Muḥāsibī, *Ādāb al-Nufūs*, ed. ʿAbd al-Qādir Aḥmad ʿAṭā, 45.

24 al-Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfiya*, p. 119; Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār. Taḏkirat al-Awliyā'. ed. Muḥammad Adīb al-Jādir, 426,

25 Abū Zurʿa al-Dimashqī refers to his teacher al-Anṭākī, from whom he received hadith, as "Aḥmad b. ʿĀṣim al-Ḥakīm." See: Ibn ʿAsākir, *Ta'rīkh Madīnat Dimashq*, ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn Abū Saʿīd ʿUmar b. Gharāma al-ʿAmrawī, 71:224; Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, *Siyar Aʿlām an-Nubalā'*, ed. Kāmil al-Kharrāṭ, 9:336. Ibn al-ʿAdīm (d. 660/1262) describes him as *ḥakīm* and states that he belongs to the people of wisdom. See: Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Bughyat al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār, 2:848. Moreover, the concept of ḥikma frequently appears in the sayings attributed to him in the sources. Similarly, it is observed that the concept of ḥikma is frequently used in the text of the *Dawā'*. See: *Majmūʿah*, fols. 18a, 18b, 21a, 21b, 23a, 24b, 28a.

26 For relevant sources, see: Hasan Aydemir, *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*, 41-42.

27 Indeed, when their dates of birth are examined, it is evident that al-Anṭākī was older than al-Muḥāsibī. For the birth dates of both, see: Hasan Aydemir, *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*, 23-25, 41-42. Knysh also disagrees with Hujwīrī on this matter, stating that al-Anṭākī was older and even suggesting that he may have been al-Muḥāsibī's teacher. Alexander Knysh, "Aḥmad b. ʿĀṣim al-Anṭākī," 47-48.

28 van Ess, *Die Gedankenwelt des Ḥāriṯ al-Muḥāsibī*, 18.

29 Hasan Aydemir, *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*, 97.

"قلت: أخبرني أفضل ما أعطي العبد؟ قال: العقل، قلت: ما أنفع العقل؟ قال: ما عرّفك نعمة الله تعالى عليك، وأعانك على شكرها، وقاد بك إلى الخلاف الهوى."[30]

This passage is likewise transmitted in the works of al-Sulamī, Abū Khalaf al-Ṭabarī, al-Bayhakī, Ibn ʿAsākir, and Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār as attributed to Aḥmad b. ʿĀṣim al-Anṭākī.[30] Even though they do not mention the *Dawāʾ* by name, the habit of including al-Anṭākī when transmitting Ṣūfī sayings regarding *al-ʿaql* gives rise to the opinion that the work was seen or in circulation. Furthermore, in the Usūl al-ʿaql chapter, it is observed that the answers al-Anṭākī gives to questions in the form of "what is the most beneficial…?" using the superlative form appear in the sources as attributed to al-Anṭākī, and even their sequence remains unchanged as block quotations. Now, let us examine another passage found in the later part of the Usūl al-ʿaql chapter of the *Dawāʾ*:

"فما أنفع اليقين؟ قال: ما عظّم في عينك ما به قد أيقنتَ، وصغّر في عينك غيره، وأثبتَ فيك الخوفَ من الوعيد والرجا من الوعد. قلت: فما أنفع الخوف؟ قال: ما حجزك عن المعاصي الله، وأطال منك الحزن على ما فاتك، وألزمك الفكرة في بقية عمرك، وما يَصيرُ إليه عاقبةُ أمرك. قلت: فما أنفع الرجاء؟ قال: ما سهّل عليك العملَ لإدراكِ ما ترجوا. قلت: فما أنفع الحق؟ قال: إنصافُك الناسَ من نفسك، وقبولك الحق ممن هو دونك. قلت: فما أنفع الصدق؟ قال: أن تقرّ لله بعُيُوب نفسك، وَمَسَاوئ عملك. قلت: فما أنفع الإخلاص؟ قال: ما نفى عنك التزين والرياء. قلت: فما أنفع الحياء؟ قال: أن تستحي أن تسأل اللهَ ما تُحِبُّ وتأتي ما يَكْرَهُ."[31]

This passage from the chapter on the Usūl al-ʿaql in the *Dawāʾ* appears in the *Ḥilyat* in almost the same form, attributed to al-Anṭākī, as follows:

قال أحمد بن عاصم الأنطاكي: "أنفع اليقين ما عظم في عينك ما به قد أيقنت، وصغر في عينك ما دون ذلك، وأثبت الخوف ما حجزك عن المعاصي، وأطال منك الحزن على ما قد فات وألزمك الفكر في بقية عمرك وخاتمة أمرك، وأنفع الرجاء ما سهل عليك العمل لإدراك ما ترجو، وألزم الحق إنصافك الناس من نفسك، وقبولك الحق ممن هو دونك، وأنفع الصدق أن تقر لله بعيوب نفسك، وأنفع الإخلاص ما نفى عنك الرياء والتزين، وأنفع الحياء أن تستحي أن تسأله ما تحب وتأتي ما يكره، وأنفع الشكر أن تعرف منه ما ستر عليك من مساويك فلم يطلع أحدا من المخلوقين عليك."[32]

Moreover, some sentences from this block quotation appear in *Ṣifat al-Ṣafwa* with a partially altered sequence.[33] Further on in the Usūl al-ʿaql chapter, the following statement regarding *faqr* appears:

"قلت: فما أنفع الفقر؟ قال: ما كنت له مجتملا وبه راضيا."[34]

This expression found in the *Dawāʾ* appears in al-Sulamī's *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfīya* and the *Ḥilyat* as attributed to al-Anṭākī, with a minor variation, as follows:

"وقال أحمد: "أنفع الفقر ما كنت به متجملا، وبه راضياً."[35]

Following this statement in the *Dawāʾ*, a saying related to the concept of al-ḥazm is again attributed to al-Anṭākī in the *Ḥilyat*.[36] Likewise, the saying concerning the purification of deeds from afflictions, which follows immediately after, is attributed to al-Anṭākī in both the *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfīya* and the *Ḥilyat*.[37] It is also noteworthy that most of the sayings in this first chapter of the *Dawāʾ* appear in the *Ḥilyat* with attribution to al-Anṭākī. Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣfahānī includes almost all the answers al-Anṭākī gave in the *Dawāʾ* to questions in the form of "what is the most beneficial…?" in the *Ḥilyat*.[38] In addition to this, let us look at the very first sentence of the chapter titled "Maʿrifat al-nafs" in the *Dawāʾ*:

"اعلم أن من لم يعرف بنفسه فهو من دينه على غرور، ومن عرف بنفسه وعرف عيوبه، زاد ذلك في خوفه. ومن علامة قلة معرفة العبد

30 *Majmūʿah*, fol. 15b.
31 *Majmūʿah*, fol. 15b.
32 al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*, 9:282.
33 Ibn al-Jawzī, *Ṣifat al-Ṣafwa*, ed. Khālid Muṣṭafā Ṭarṭūsī, 846.
34 *Majmūʿah*, fol. 16a.
35 al-Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfīya*, 119; al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*, 9:283.
36 al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*, 1996, 9/283.
37 al-Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfīya*, 119; al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*, 9:283.
38 For the remaining parts of the passages in question, see al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*, 9:282-284.

بنفسه قلة الخوف والحياء، وعلامة قلة الخوف قلة الحزن في القلب، وإذا قلّ الحزن في القلب خرب كما أن البيت إذا لم يُسكن خرب."[39]

al-Sulamī attributes the first part of this saying to al-Anṭākī:

"وقال أحمد: من علامة قلة معرفة العبد بنفسه قلة الحياء وقلة الخوف."[40]

It is noteworthy that one part of this saying does not appear in al-Sulamī. However, its continuation appears in the works of al-Bayhaqī, al-Dhahabī, and al-Munāwī, attributed to al-Anṭākī with minor differences, as follows:

"قِلّةُ الخوف من قلّة الحزن في القلب وإذا قَلّ الحُزْنُ في القلب خرِبَ كما يَخْربُ البيتُ، إذا لم يسكن خرب."[41]

Let us look at the following passage found in the chapter named "Hidāyat al-aʿmāl" in the Dawāʾ:

"استكْثِرْ من الله لنفسك قليلَ الرزق لتَخْلُصَ إلى الشكر، واستقلّ من نفسك كثيرَ الطاعة أَزْرًا منك على نفسك وتعرضًا للعفو، وادفع الجهل بحاضر العلم، واستعمل حاضر العلم بخالص العمل، وأحرز خالص العمل من عظيم الغفلة، وانْفِ عظيمَ الغفلة بشدة التيقظ، واستجلب شدَّة التيقظ بصدق الخوف، واحذر خَفِيَّ التزيُّن بحاضر الحيا،"[42]

This passage appears in Abū Nuʿaym's *Ḥilyat* with a slight difference, and similarly in Ibn al-Jawzī's *Ṣifat al-Ṣafwa*, as attributed to al-Anṭākī.[43] Now, let us examine the following long passage in the Dawāʾ that appears after a few sentences following this paragraph:

"وإياك والتسويف فإنه بحر عميق يغرق فيه الهلكى، وإيّاك والغفلة فمنها يكون سواد القلب. وإياك والتواني فيما لا عذر لك فيه فإليه يلجأ الغافلون، واسترجع سالف الذنوب بشدة الندم وكثرة الاستغفار. وتعرض لعفو الله بحسن المراجعة، واستعن على حسن المراجعة بخالص الدعاء والمناجاة، وتخلص إلى عظيم الشكر باستكثار قليل الرزق واستقلال كثير الطاعة، واستجلب زيادة النعم بعظيم الشكر، واستجلب عظيم الشكر بخوف زوال النعم، واطلب بهاء العز بإماتة الطمع، وادفع ذل الطمع بعز الإياس، واستجلب عز الإياس ببُعْد الهمة، واستعن على بُعْد الهمة بقصر الأمل، وبادر بانتهاز النعمة عند إمكان الفرصة، ولا إمكان كالأيام الخالية مع صحة الأبدان، وإياك والثقة بغير المأمون. فاعلم أنه لا معرفة كمعرفة نفسك، ولا نعمة كالعافية، ولا عافية كمساعدة التوفيق، ولا حلاوة كالزهد، ولا زهد كقصر الأمل، ولا حرص كالمنافسة في الدرجات، ولا ظفر كغلبة الشيطان، ولا عدل كالإنصاف، ولا طاعة كأداء الفرائض، ولا مصيبة كعدم العقل، ولا عدم كقلة اليقين، ولا قلة يقين كفقد الخوف، ولا مصيبة كاستهانته بذنوب ورضى بالحالة التي أنت عليها، ولا ذل كذل الطمع."[44]

This passage, transmitted at such length in the *Dawāʾ*, is likewise attributed to al-Anṭākī in the *Ḥilyat* with a slight difference.[45] Immediately following this chapter in the *Dawāʾ*, a chapter heading titled "Ṣifat al-tazyīn" appears, consisting of a single sentence.[46] This statement is also attributed to al-Anṭākī in the *Ḥilyat*, *Kawākib al-Durrīya*, and *ʿIlm al-qulūb*, a work attributed to Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī but whose author is unknown.[47] To avoid prolonging the discussion, we suffice with these proofs. Now, finally, let us examine the relationship networks of the individuals appearing in the *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt.*

Yūsuf b. Asbāṭ (d. 185/801), Abū Isḥāq al-Fazārī (d. 188/804 [?]), and Haytham b. Jamīl al-Anṭākī (d. 213/823) are three figures whose sayings are transmitted in the *Dawāʾ*. The fact that these three are from Antioch and that there exists a "direct relationship" between them and Aḥmad b. ʿĀṣim al-Anṭākī serves as further proof that the work belongs to al-Anṭākī himself. We observe a close connection between al-Anṭākī and these individuals, both in terms of hadith transmission and personal companionship. Conversely, the fact that we are unable to establish an organic link between al-Muḥāsibī and Haytham b. Jamīl or Abū Isḥāq al-Fazārī further supports this view.[48] On the other hand, the fact that almost all of the initial narrators of the hadiths in *al-Shubuhāt* had

39 *Majmūʿah*, fol. 17b.
40 al-Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfīya*, 119.
41 al-Bayhakī, *al-Jāmiʿ li-shuʿab al-īmān*, 2:270; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ*, 9:336; ʿAbd al-Raʾūf al-Munāwī, *Kawākib al-Durrīya*, 1:531.
42 *Majmūʿah*, fol. 29b
43 We have not included the text here for the sake of brevity. For comparison, see: al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*, 9:287; Ibn al-Jawzī, *Ṣifat al-Ṣafwa*, 847.
44 Due to the disorder of the folios in the majmūʿah, a portion of this passage appears on folio 29b, while the remainder is found on folio 21a. See: *Majmūʿah*, fols. 21a, 29b.
45 al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*, 9:288-289.
46 For the expression in question, see: *Majmūʿah*, fol. 21a.
47 Anonymous, (attrib. Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī), *ʿIlm al-Qulūb* ed. ʿAbd al-Qādir Aḥmad ʿAṭā, 165; al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*, 9:289; ʿAbd al-Raʾūf al-Munāwī, *Kawākib al-Durrīya*, 1:531.
48 For the places where these names appear in the *Dawāʾ*, see: *Majmūʿah*, fols. 18a, 23b-24a; Furthermore, for the relationship between al-Anṭākī and the individuals in question, see: Hasan Aydemir, *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*, 29-36.

a direct relationship with al-Muḥāsibī, while having no connection to al-Anṭākī, is also a significant indicator that the works and their authors are distinct. We have cited these proofs in detail in our published study.[49]

In conclusion, when we consider all the indicators together, there remains no doubt that the *Dawāʾ* belongs to al-Anṭākī. As can be understood, Orfali and al-Sayyid reached the conclusion that it belongs to al-Muḥāsibī because they proceeded from a flawed premise. In other words, had they not disregarded the strong indicators from the very beginning that the *Dawāʾ* and *al-Shubuhāt* are distinct works, the researchers would likely not have made this error. Due to the short interval between the publication dates of the two studies, it is probable that Orfali and al-Sayyid were unaware of our work and the evidence we presented. Alternatively, even if they were aware, they may not have had the opportunity to revise their views as their work was already in press. However, we must express our hope that as time progresses, they will revise their work in new editions, and that the researchers will publish the two works as separate entities, attributing the *Dawāʾ* to al-Anṭākī alone. On the other hand, should they persist in their current view, Orfali and al-Sayyid are required to strengthen the 'research' section of their work and respond to our critiques, at least in the next edition.

Setting aside all these critiques, Orfali and al-Sayyid deserve great commendation simply for bringing to light and publishing a work as difficult to edit as al-Muḥāsibī's *al-Shubuhāt* for the first time. The *al-Shubuhāt* manuscript is an extremely arduous text to prepare for publication. Indeed, merely deciphering the isnāds of a work composed predominantly of such chains is the product of immense effort. We are grateful to them for making such a work available to the scholars of Taṣawwuf.

References

Anonymous. (attrib. Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī), *ʿIlm al-Qulūb*. ed. ʿAbd al-Qādir Aḥmad ʿAṭā. Cairo: Maktabat al-Qāhira, 1964.

ʿAṭṭār, Farīd al-Dīn. *Taḏkirat al-Awliyāʾ*. ed. Muḥammad Adīb al-Jādir. Damascus: n.p., 2009.

Aydemir, Hasan. *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*. Ankara: İlâhiyât, 2025.

al-Bayhakī. *al-Jāmiʿ li-Shuʿab al-Īmān*. ed. Mukhtār Aḥmad al-Nadwī. Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2003.

al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn. *Siyar Aʿlām an-Nubalāʾ*. ed. Kāmil al-Kharrāṭ, Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 2006.

Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-Maḥjūb*. tr. Isʿād ʿAbd al-Hādī Qandīl. 2 vols. Cairo: al-Majlis al-Aʿlā li-l-Thaqāfa, 2007.

al-Iṣfahānī, Abū Nuʿaym. *Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ*. 10 vols. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Saʿāda, 1974.

Ibn ʿAsākir. *Taʾrīkh Madīnat Dimashq*. ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn Abū Saʿīd ʿUmar b. Gharāma al-ʿAmrawī. 74 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 2001.

Ibn al-Jawzī. *Ṣifat al-Ṣafwa*. ed. Khālid Muṣṭafā Ṭarṭūsī. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya, 2012.

Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Kamāl al-Dīn. *Bughyat al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 2001.

Knysh, Alexander. "Aḥmad b. ʿĀṣim al-Anṭākī." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam Three*, 47–48. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Liebrenz, Boris, and Christoph Rauch. "Manuscript Ownership and Readership at the American University of Beirut at the Turn of the Twentieth Century." In *Manuscripts, Politics and Oriental Studies*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2019.

Majmūʿah. American University of Beirut, Jafet Library, MS 170:121 saA (Mic-MS-80), fols. 15b-29b.

al-Muḥāsibī, al-Ḥārith. *Ādāb al-Nufūs*. ed. ʿAbd al-Qādir Aḥmad ʿAṭā, Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Kutub al-Thiqāfiyya, 1991.

al-Muḥāsibī, al-Ḥārith. *Kitāb al-Khalwa*. ed. Ighnāṭiyūs ʿAbdu Khalīfa, Beirut: Meshrīq, 1955.

al-Muḥāsibī, al-Ḥārith. *al-ʿAql wa-Fahm al-Qurʾān*. ed. Ḥusayn al-Quwwatlī Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1971.

al-Munāwī, 'Abd al-Ra'ūf. *al-Kawākib al-Durriyya fī Tarājim al-Sāda al-Ṣūfiyya*. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1999.

al-Sulamī. *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣūfiyya*. ed. Muṣṭafā ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAṭā. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1998.

Sprenger, Aloys. "Extract from a Letter of Dr. A. Sprenger, Dated Damascus, December 24th, 1854." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 24 (1855): 44–52.

Sprenger, Aloys. "Notice on the Dawā' dā' al-qulūb of Mohásaby Being the Earliest Work on Sufism as Yet Discovered, and on an Arabic Translation of a Work Ascribed to Enoch." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of*

49 For a table showing the direct relationship between the names in *al-Shubuhāt* and al-Muḥāsibī, see: Hasan Aydemir, *Ahmed b. Âsım el-Antâkî ve Devâu dâi'l-kulûb Adlı Eseri*, 106-108.

Bengal 25 (1856): 133–150.

al-Ṭabarī, Abū Khalaf. *Salwat al-ʿārifīn wa-Uns al-Mushtāqīn*. ed. Gerhard Böwering, Bilal Orfali. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013.

Tibawi, A. L. "The Genesis and Early History of the Syrian Protestant College." *Middle East Journal* 21:1 (Winter 1967): 1–15.

van Ess, Josef. *Die Gedankenwelt des Ḥāriṯ al-Muḥāsibī*. Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität Bonn, 1961.