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Abstract:
This paper attempted to discover the authenticity of interpretation work ordained to Abdul Qodir Jailani. This interpretation Sufism was published by two different publishers from two separate countries; Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmıyah located in Beirut, Lebanon and Markaz al-Jailani li al-Buhus al-Ilmıyah in İstanbul, Turkey. This research is conducted from incredulity of ordination validity towards that interpretation work (Tafsır). By reason that the script was similar to another spread-script whose title is Fawatih al-Ilahtiyah authored by Baba Ni’matullah Najwani. By comparison to two versions of Tafsır al-Jailani and one version of al-Fawatih al-Ilahiyah, this research comes to conclusion that this Tafsır (Tafsir al-Jailani) is inscription of Baba Ni’matullah Najwani, not Abdul Qodir al-Jailani. This conclusion goes against to three points; first, the name in book cover is not compatible with the name in introduction as the author had conveyed it in this Tafsir’s introduction; Second, the Author discussed many topics about Wahdat al-Wujud, a Sufism terminology acknowledged by Ibn Arabi who lived after Abdul Kodir al-Jailani. Third; many terms engaged in this Tafsır have not turned out into Tasawwuf Scholars discourse in Abdul Qodir Jailani’s period.
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INTRODUCTION
In Islamic literature, the oversight of work ordained to different author does occur frequently. Time by time, this culpability will be such a propriety to whom live in the next. This mistake point of view is led by three points. Firstly, the lack of inspector (Muhaqqiq) ability on inspected script and republished script. This case occurs frequently because the author in his previous time did not enclose his name to the work he wrote. Meanwhile, the inspector had not or hardly ever conducted some research legitimately as well as the inspector ordained his inspected script to the other author adequately.

Secondly, it is still about the author in his previous time did not write and enclose his name in his work or document, then the inspector ordained that author work to whom had the similar focus tendency. For instance, the inspector identified a script whose content excessively discussed Wabdat al-Wujud then he aligned that work to Ibn Arabi as just he was most-told figure about this theme.

Thirdly, ordination of some work by the inspector to the figure he cherished was to exploit that popular name so the book that was published would be boom-sell. The last of
all might not be something academically. Even it could be closer to public deception. However this kind of phenomenon occurs infrequently.

It possibly needs to acknowledge the example of every chapter as it has been revealed above. The example of ordination mistake in which the factor was to exploit the popularity of some figure is in the book of *Fazaaih al-Mulhidin* written by Alauddin Buhari (841/1438). This book is such a criticism on *Fusus al-Hikam* written by Ibn Arabi (638/1240). However, in order to escalate the popularity of *Fazaaih al-Mulhidin*, this kind of work is ordinated to theology scholar Sa’dudin Taftazani (792/1394) (Ertuğrul, 2008: 117-118).

Meanwhile, there are some works ordinated to Ibn Arabi untitled *Tafsir al-Qur’an al-Karim* (Arabi, 1981), *Tuhfatus Safar* (Arabi, 2010), *Sajarat al-Kunn* (Arabi, 2010), and *Risalah at-Tauhid* (Arabi, 2011). This ordination is just built upon that works have the similar content with the discussions in Ibn Arabi’s works. Other example of work ordination mistake to the figure who is not the true writer is the interpretation book (*Tafsir*) ordinated to Abdul Qodir al-Jailani. This *Tafsir* is published in two different cities, Beirut and Istanbul in the same period, 2009. Publication in Beirut was the output of inspection conducted by Ahmad Farid al-Mazidi and it was published by Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah Publisher in Five Volumes. While other version put in Istanbul was published by Markaz al-Jailani li al-Buhus al-Ilmiyah within six volumes and Muhammad Fadil al-Jailani was its inspector. These two versions of work coincided to be named as *Tafsir al-Jailani* in the cover page. But remarkably, in those two versions a long with the chapter introduction which are the first pages, were mentioned that the name of those commentary work are *al-Fawatih al-Ilahiyah wa al-Mafatih al-Ghaybiyah*. On which the matter is *Tafsir* named *al-Fawatih al-Ilahiyah wa al-Mafatih al-Ghaybiyah* is a *Tafsir* with the Sufism approach that got well-recognized as the work of Baba Ni’matullah Najwani (920/1514) (Najwani, 1907: 2), a Thareqoh Murshid of Naqsabandiyah in Aksehir city, Konya, Turkey. This Paper will attempt to discover the ordination validity of this interpretation work. Is this *Tafsir* truly authored by Abdul Qadir Jailani or Baba Ni’matullah Najwani.

**DISCUSSION**

**An Appellation and Ordination of Tafsir al-Jailani**

Inside the preface of *Tafsir al-Jailani*, it was obviously mentioned as “*this Tafsir – galvanized by God* is named as *al-Fawatih al-Ilahiyah wa al-Mafatih al-Ghaybiyah al-Mudihah li al Kalam al-Quraniyah wa al-Hikam al-Furqoniyah*” (Jailani, 2009: 52). This implies that the definite name of this *Tafsir* is *al-Fawatih al-Ilahiyah wa al-Mafatih al-Ghaybiyah*. Whether the work was written authored by Abdul Qadir Aljailani or Baba Ni’matullah Najwani, appellation of this *Tafsir* as *Tafsir al-Jailani* was from inspector’s initiative both in Dar al-Kutub Publisher and Markaz al-Jailani li al-Buhuts al-Ilmi.

Even if so, interestingly, both two inspectors, Ahmad Farid and Fadhil Jailani do equally name the *Tafsir* which they inspect as *Tafsir al-Jailani* in two distinctive-published versions in two separate publishers. In addition, the name of the author was similarly ordinated to Abdul Qadir Jailani. While all this time, since Abdul Qadir Jailani passed away till his work was published, it had never been there any interpretation work ordinated to Abdul Qadir Jailani amongst the pursuivants of *Thareqah Qadiriyah* or from the students of Abdul Qadir Jailani (Uludag, 1998: 54-62).
Within those two different-published versions, the reason was not revealed why those two inspector prefer to put the title of this interpretation work as Tafsir al-Jailani despite in its preface was apparently written as al-Fawatih al-Habibiya wa al-Mafatih al-Ghaybiya. In Istanbul publishing version, Fadhlil Jailani as the inspector makes this interpretation work be translated into several languages (Jailani, 2009: 30). In Turkey, This translation project is conducted by Dilaver Gurer accompanied by academicians who incorporate with him, and it was published at 2012 in Istanbul. Corresponding to its Arabic version, Turkish version was also named as Geylani Teşir which consists six volumes and was published by Markaz al-Jailani li al-Buhsus al-Ilmiyah.

Along before published with the title “Tafsir al-Jailani”, script with the equal subject matter (bit distinctive diction) was recognized as al-Fawatih al-Habibiya wa al-Mafatih al-Ghaybiya. Tafsir and Sufism experts in Turkey such as Taskopruzdali (968/1560), Katib Celebi (1068/1657), Ismail Pasha (1339/1920), Zirikli (2002: 39), Omer Riza (1993: 37), and Bursali Memed Tahir (1915, 40) unify to say that this Tafsir was the writing of Baba Ni'matullah Najwani. Furthermore, the script untitled al-Fawatih al-Habibiya wa al-Fawatih al-Ghaybiya ordinated to Ni'matullah Najwani had been published in Istanbul within two volumes by Musma Nicam (Usmanice Publisher) in Abdulhamid II period, on date of 18 Rabiiul Awwal 1325/1907.

Closed with the equal script yet a slightly different title, et-Tesiru's-Sufi il-Kamil lil-Kur'ani'l-Kerim: al-Fawatih al-Habibiya wa al-Mafatih al-Ghaybiya al-Mudhib bi li al-Kalam al-Qur'aniyiy wa al-Hikam al-Furqonyiy which was published in Egypt on 1999 by Dar Rikabi Publisher. Dar Rikabi publisher also put out Ni'matullah Najwani as its author (Musakhanov, 2011: 7). From a few data mentioned, either from source in biography shape or publication from that work in previous periods, shows us strongly that they reveal consistently that Fawatih al-Habibiya is the work of Ni'matullah Najwani. More essential than the argument above, in Topkapi Palace on Library side exactly also were there some archives untitled al-Fawatih al-Habibiya. Inside those archives, it was precisely written in the last parts by original author hand-writing “Katabahu al-fakir al-baqir haqir khadim al-faqara wa turab al-akdamiyyin Ni'matullah ibn Mahmud an-Najwani .. fi sanah ihda wa tis'nu miah” (vr. 405).

The incredulity on the work ordination to Abdul Qadir al-Jailani could also be regarded in some version published by Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyih, Ahmad Farid Mazidi within his preface said “his work was also ordinated to the Tafsir expert directed to Hanafi school of thought, Mahmud an-Najwani who passed away on 920 H. out of here, this work could not be determined where the authentic was, Abdul Qadir al-Jailani or Najwani” (Jailani, 2009: 3-4). This statement appoints Ahmad Farid his self who hesitates to whom the original author of the work he inspected. But astonishingly, when he decided to ordinate this work to Abdul Qodir al-Jailani, he did not enclose his reason. Meanwhile Fadhlil Jailani in his preface never noticed Baba Ni'matullah Najwani's name by no means. A postgraduate student in Dokuz Eylul University, Izmir, Turkey, who is not detail enough in doing his research, also wrote a thesis untitled “Interpretation Method of Abdul Qadir Jailani”.

This identical phenomenon also took a place in Indonesia. There a few students in Islamic college like Islamic State University (UIN) and Islamic State Institute (IAIN) conducted equal researches. In 2013, Miftakhul Huda, a student at Walisongo Islamic State Institute, wrote a mini thesis untitled “The Method and Style of interpretation of Syeikh Abdul Qodir Jailani in Tafsir al-Jailani (Study on Surah al-Baqarah)”. This research attempted to illustrate the method used by Abdul Qodir Jailani. A nearly research also was ever conducted by Rahmat Zamzam with the title “The Interpretation of Abdul Qadir al-Jailani about
Examining the Authenticity of Tafsir al-Jailani

Qana’ah: Analysis towards Tafsir al-Jailani”, and there are other equal researches as yet. Indeed, if researches about this interpretation were well-conducted in detail, it would get tracked the fundamental differences between this interpretation work and other works of Abdul Qadir Jailani.

The Manuscript of Tafsir al-Jailani

In this part of research, the writer will distribute the statement of Muhammad Fadhil Jailani about the existence of Manuscript of Tafsir al-Jailani which is there in the first part of Tafsir al-Jailani.

1. According to Muhammad Fadhil Jailani, it was there a handwriting manuscript from Abdul Qodir Jailani in Qadiriyah Library in Baghdad. But, that manuscript was sheer off in centuries before, than it was rediscovered in Syam. While it had been discovered, the manuscript they meant was not found again (Geylânî, 2009: 26). And nowadays it remained undiscovered.

2. Fadhil Jailani stated that there was a manuscript from India, but it was minus one volume. Inside that manuscript was written issued at 622 H, 61 year after Abdul Qadir Jailani passed away (Geylânî, 2009: 26). In addition, Fadhil amplified nothing about the manuscript except its name. As a result, the content of manuscript meant could not be identified.

3. Manuscript (A) is the manuscript which Fadhil Jailani tackled to have it be inspected. Fadhil did not clarify where he got manuscript (A), whether it was from library or individual source, and in what date and year it was published. In the first part pages from volume 1, Fadhil added a few manuscripts that he meant as manuscript (A) and it was written by its previous writer “min tafsir sultan al-Arifin Sayid Abdul Qadir al-Jailani” (Geylânî, 2009: 26).

Meanwhile on which Muhammad Farid Mazidi conducted was a handwriting manuscript from Dar al-Kutub al-Misri. If only relying on this sort of manuscript, it could considerably be detected heaps of handwriting manuscript with the title al-Futuhat al-Ilahtiyah as work result of Ni’matullah Najwani. As a matter of fact, there was a manuscript written by Ni’matullah Najwani himself lied on Topkapi Museum that could topple Muhammad Farid Mazidi’s preference.

Content and Language Diction

Both Tafsir al-Jailani in Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah version or Markaz Jailani version, if it is enclosed with al-Fawatih al-Ilahtiyah, the work of Najwani, it was not there any significantly difference. There was not equal thing such as in the diction, the use of word and abbreviation used in Tafsir al-Jailani which did not reduce its content and showed that the two are different works. Over all was slightly no difference. This would be the first step that both two works are the one work.

Therefore, if there was an original document which had been written by Abdul Qodir Jailani or his student and enclosed with its year of writing, as well as we compared with the genuine document written by Najwani (could be found in Topkapi Museum) at 901 H, we would be able to presume that interpretation work was most likely written by Abdul Qadir Jailani because he absolutely existed before Najwani. The matter was Najwani had the same document with its similar content which written by himself, perhaps he adopted from the Tafsir written by Abdul Qodir Jailani then he elaborated in some of its parts. Unfortunately, the document ordinated to Abdul Qadir Jailani was totally frail. Firstly, it
had no accurate date. Secondly, the date was on 1275 H which was definitely out of the date compared with Najwani’s document with year of writing at 901. As the result, perhaps the work written by Abdul Qadir Jailani has no strong basic argumentation.

In the other hand, there are lots of ambiguities in the content side if this interpretation (Tafsir) would be ordinated to Abdul Qadir Jailani. For instance, in that Tafsir, there are plentiful Sufism terminologies applied by Sufism scholars who lived after Ibn Arabi. Meanwhile, in the other works of Abdul Qadir Jailani such as Fathu ar-Rabani and Ghunya are not found similar language diction. Such a more interesting was inside that Tafsir stated that the writer quoted Ibn Arabi’s work untitled Fusus al-Hikam while Ibn Arabi lived after Abdul Qadir Jailani. In which Abdul Qadir Jailani passed away at 561, in the same time, Ibn Arabi was a one year baby. How could the author site the opinion of Ibn Arabi in his work Fusus al-Hikam if his life was prior to the author of Fusus al-Hikam, it was certainly that the author must have been writer who existed after Ibn Arabi. In this part of context, it should be more appropriate if the work was ordinated to Najwani who passed away at 901 H. To be more perceptible, here are a few excerpts from that Tafsir:

One of chapters from al-Futuhat al-Ihliyah as the work of Ni'matullah Najwani was published at the age of Ottoman, I, p.87:

While in Tafsir al-Jailani, I, p.218:

Two text showed above were the excerpts from al-Futuhat al-Ihliyah and Tafsir al-Jailani. Both two text above are excessively equal, and there just two differences. First distinct in the word (و أيضا) in the script of al-Futuhat al-Ihliyah, while that word was not found within Tafsir al-Jailani. Second distinct inside the script of al-Futuhat al-Ihliyah was stated (حيث قال في فصوص الحكم) while in Tafsir al-Jailani was not enclosed. Unless mentioned above was same both in language diction and content.

Indeed, the similar content also was adopted by Ni'matullah Najwani in his monograph untitled Hidayat al-Ikhwan (Nahçeşvânî, 1907: 135).

"قال سلطان العارفين وبرهان الواليين الواسيتين أبو يزيد البسطامي -قدس الله روحه العزيز- مخبرًا لك منّبهًا عليك عن سعة قلب وفحة صدرك أبيها الطالب للمعرفة واليقين والсалон المقوم لامتنانك لودائع Glück ومحاهج ماتي ألف مرة في زاوية من زوايا قلب العارف ما أحس."

"ثم أطpherd تلك كيف بغل النفي الخبيث مزور أسرار الطريقة محي الملة والدين العربي - قد سره - "لو أن ما لا يتناهي وجوده قد أنتهاه وجوده من زوايا قلب العارف ما أحس."
Other finding that the writer should explain is about use of *Wabdat al-Wujud* terminologies lie on 3 spots in (Geylani, 2009: 33). Inside *Tafsir al-Jailani* published by Markaz Jailani, in its preface, the inspector said “The Syaikh (red: Abdul Qodir Jailani) is a scholar who is excessively far-off from Wabdat al-Wujud thought......... Inside this Tafsir, Wabdat al-Wujud terms are just extension and explication” (Geylani, 2009: 30). This sort of statement is not matching with the content comprehensively because the discussion in context of *Wabdat al-Wujud* is not handful. As a matter of fact, within an inch of writer’s comments is based on this thought (*Wabdat al-Wujud*).

Of course, terminology of *Wabdat al-Wujud* was something not exist yet and never told by Sufism scholars in Abdul Qadir Jailani’s period. Because who firstly addressed *Wabdat al-Wujud* was Ibn Arabi (Thrali: 1987: 48-50). Besides *Wabdat al-Wujud*, Sufism terminologies also engaged in this Interpretation work such as al-A`yan as-Sabtah (al-Hakim, 2005: 90), Maratib al-Wujud, Ibn Hazuri, Insan Kamil, Akil Kul, and Kalam al-A`la.

Here are pieces of content within *Tafsir al-Jailani* that discussed *Wabdat al-Wujud*:

First example;

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 34)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 34)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 219)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 33)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 236)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 6)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 5)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 35)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 537)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 363)}
\]

\[
\text{(Jailani, 2009: 393)}
\]

Examples showed above related to discussions about the existence (*Wujud*) which the motif goes from the concept *Wabdat al-Wujud*. It is Such a Sufism-Philosophy terminology recognized by Ibn Arabi through *Fusus al-Hikam* and *Futuhat al-Makkiyah*. In the other hand, in other works of Abdul Qadir Jailani hardly ever enclose and discuss this sort of terms and do not take place yet in Sufism discourse at that time. This means that this sort of terminology is discussion existing at the time of Abdul Qadir Jailani. Therefore, such impossibility, if Abdul Qadir Jailani quoted or adopted some terminology that had not been there before in his period.

CONCLUSION

Finally, interpretation work (*Tafsir*) called as *Tafsir al-Jailani* is not right to be ordinated to Abdul Qadir Jailani, on the contrary, it is more steady to be ordinated to Baba Ni`matullah Najwani whose his original handwriting document could be found in Topkapi museum, Istanbul. It is led by some arguments such as historical document, content, and language diction used. Firstly, from the side of historical document, it has no hand-writing
archive more aged from the archive of *al-Fawatih al-Iḥāyāyah* in the name of Ni’maullah Najwani. Secondly, from the side of content, the discussion within that interpretation work follows other discussions which are not discourse amongst scholar Sufism at the time of Abdul Qadir Jailani, such as the concept of *Wabdat al-Wujud*. Thirdly, there some terminologies used in that Tafsir are Sufism terminologies which existed after Ibn Arabi’s period.

From the argument presented above, it gets the conclusion that the big trouble will rise if this interpretation work remains ordained to Abdul Qadir Jailani. That trouble lies on side of inconsistent appellation between its cover page and its preface, the content of Tafsir which relates on spirit of *Wabdat al-Wujud*, and used of terminologies in which never be adopted by Abdul Qadir Jaiani. On that account, it is presumably more precise if this Tafsir should have been ordained to Baba Ni’maullah Najwani as stated in document he wrote by himself and still exists at current time. Furthermore, the content of this *Tafsir* is closer to the works of Baba Ni’matu’llah Najwani who was the pursuivant of concept of Ibnu Arabi.
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