

Traditions, Transmissions, Translations: An Overview of the Commentaries on Ibn Sīnā's *Kitāb al-Šifā'* Preserved in India

Ivana Panzeca

The purpose of this paper is to offer an overview of the manuscripts that preserve the commentaries on the most important Peripatetic *summa* of Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna, 980–1037), i.e. *Kitāb al-Šifā'* (Book of the healing/cure), preserved in India and compiled to a large extent during the Safavid reign (16th–18th). The amount of *testimonia* exemplifies the extraordinary influence of the Avicennian text and its intense circulation. The *Šifā'* was a milestone of the philosophical tradition and for centuries it has been commented, glossed, paraphrased and summarised by leading exponents of the learned milieu, occupying a pivotal role in the intellectual genealogy and transmission chain of philosophy in the Islamic East.

Keywords: Ibn Sīnā, *Kitāb al-Šifā'*, Commentaries, India

1. Introduction

The Safavid epoch was one of the greatest periods of intellectual vitality and spiritual splendour in the history of Islamic Iran, as is testified by the large number of works, and the remarkable circulation

* Published with the support of the Policy Planning Unit of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation (under Article 23-bis of DPR 18/1967): the opinions expressed are those of the authors, and do not reflect the opinions or views of the Fondazione per le scienze religiose or the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation. A feeling of great esteem and due gratitude goes to Prof. Alberto Melloni for the indispensable support and his important suggestions and comments; I am also very grateful to Prof. Amos Bertolacci for allowing me to access precious materials and for his constant and valuable advice given over the past few years in the framework of the ERC project PhiBor, "Philosophy on the Border of Civilizations

of manuscripts in Iran, and in the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent. To analyse this varied panorama, it is necessary to examine the socio-political and religious reasons for this grandeur: the ideologies of the time, steeped in history and centuries of tradition, and the rise of the new dynasty with the official proclamation of the Šīʿī creed. These processes influenced the transmission of texts and therefore the various facets of philosophical-theological thought. The manuscript witnesses partly clarify the meaning and modalities of these fluctuating, and apparently inextricable, intellectual circuits.

After a preliminary presentation of the historical background, there will be a consideration of the scientific activity of the period, rich in original works, commentaries and *marginalia* on, and translations of the texts of the great classical thinkers. In the second part of the article, there will be a census of the “Indian” *testimonia* so far identified, with the most notable information regarding every *codex*, taken from the archives and existing bibliography. The list will be preceded by a brief introduction on some of the most influential Avicennian commentators, the copies of which are currently preserved in India, and followed by a directory with the main bibliographic sources examined and a provisional table containing all the commentators of *al-Šifāʾ*.¹

and Intellectual Endeavours: Towards a Critical Edition of the Metaphysics (*Ilābiyyāt of Kitāb al-Šifāʾ*) of Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā)”, available at <https://www.avicennaproject.eu/#/> (20 February 2021), based at the Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa.

¹ Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Ilābiyyāt min al-Šifāʾ li-Šayḥ al-Raʾīs Abū ʿAlī Ḥusayn Ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Sīnā maʾa Taʿliqat*, ed. by ʿA.K. Šarīf Širāzī, vol. I, Tehran, Madrasa Dār al-Funūn, 1303/1885, pp. 266–567 (vol. I contains the Physics and Metaphysics of the *Šifāʾ* together with some interlinear or marginal glosses by Mullā Awliyāʾ, Sayyid Aḥmad ʿAlawī and Mullā Sulaymān; vol. II contains Mullā Šadrā’s commentary on the Metaphysics I–VI of the *Šifāʾ*); Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Ilābiyyāt min Kitāb al-Šifāʾ*, ed. by Ḥ. al-ʿAmulī, Qom, Maktab al-ʿIlm al-Islāmī, Markaz al-Našr, 1376Hš/1997 or 1998; Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Šifāʾ, al-Ilābiyyāt (1)*, ed. by Ğ.Š. Qanawatī and S. Zāyid, Cairo, al-Hayʾa al-ʿamma li-šūʿn al-maṭābīʿ al-amīriyya, 1960; Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Šifāʾ, al-Ilābiyyāt (2)*, ed. by M.Y. Mūsā, S. Duniyā and S. Zāyid, Cairo, al-Hayʾa al-ʿamma li-šūʿn al-maṭābīʿ al-amīriyya, 1960 (repr. Tehran, Intiṣārāt-i Našir-i Ḥusraw, 1363Hš/1984 or 1985); Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Šifāʾ, al-Ilābiyyāt wa-Taʿliqat Šadr al-mutaʿallibīm ʿalayhā Kitāb al-Šifāʾ (Metaphysics), with Marginal Notes by Mullā Šadrā, Mīr Dāmād, Ḥwānsārī, Sabzavārī and others*, ed. with introd. and notes by Ḥ. Nāġi Iṣfahānī, Tehran, Anġuman-i āṭār va mafāḥīr-i farhangī (Society for the Appreciation of Cultural Works and Dignitaries, Institute of Islamic Studies of Tehran), 1383Hš/2004.



FIG. 1. H. Moll, Persia, Caspian Sea, and Part of Independent Tartary (1736).

2. Historical Background

Three great Islamic Empires dominated the scene during the first centuries of the modern age: the Mughals, the Safavids, and the Ottomans.² The rise to power of the Safavids can be considered one of the most fascinating periods in Muslim history. The domination started at the beginning of the 16th century (907/1501) and lasted for over two centuries, when the Afghans conquered Persia, ransacked Isfahan and killed Šāh Sultān Ḥusayn I, the last governor.³ Duodeciman Šī‘ism was declared the official religion of the empire,⁴ after a long period in which the positions of the main religious currents of Islām were less delineated. The role of sufism in the preparation of the terrain for the institution of a Šī‘i Persia with the Safavids was decisive, for both its active political role and its religious and spiritual one. From the 13th century Šī‘ism was spreading through some sufi orders that were apparently Sunnī, but they were devoted to ‘Alī and some also accepted the *wilāya* (in Persian *valāya*), the power of direction and spiritual initiation that the Šī‘ites believe was conferred on ‘Alī by the prophet of Islām.⁵

² Cf. S.F. Dale, *The Muslim Empires of the Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010; D.E. Streusand, *Islamic Gunpowder Empires: Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals*, Boulder, Westview Press, 2011; S.P. Blake, *Time in Early Modern Islam: Calendar, Ceremony, and Chronology in the Safavid, Mughal, and Ottoman Empires*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 21–23: “Safavid Iran was shaped like a bowl, a flat bottom encircled by two mountain ranges. The Elburz Mountains ran along the southern shore of the Caspian Sea and met the smaller ranges of Khurasan in the east. The Zagros Mountains stretched from Azerbaijan in the northwest to the Persian Gulf and the east toward Baluchistan. The Eastern Highlands bordered the country on the southeast. A high arid plateau, with an average elevation of 3,000 feet, formed the base of the bowl. Two deserts – the Kavir and the Lut – sprawled across this expanse. Only three rivers interrupted the dry plateau: The Karun River (the only navigable one) originated in the Zagros Mountains and flowed to the Shatt al-Arab and the Persian Gulf; the Safid River rose in the Elburz Mountains and emptied into the Caspian Sea; and the Zayanda River, the only one of the three that watered the plateau, began in the Zagros Mountains and flowed through Isfahan dying in a salty swamp nearby”.

³ See R. Matthee, *Persia in Crisis: Safavid Decline and the Fall of Isfahan*, London-New York, I.B. Tauris, 2012.

⁴ Cf. R. Abisaab, *Converting Persia: Religion and Power in the Safavid Empire*, London-New York, I.B. Tauris, 2004.

⁵ See H. Nasr, “Spiritual Movements, Philosophy and Theology in the Safavid Period”, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. VI, *The Timurid and Safavid Periods*, ed. by P.

The Safavid people took their name from a figure of the Mongol period called Šafī al-Dīn (d. 1334), head of a sufi order. Just a few decades after the death of Šafī, this people began to affirm Duodeciman Šī'ism and the crowning in Tabriz of Šāh Ismā'īl I (r. 907–930/1501–1524) marked the beginning of the kingdom.⁶ Like all his progenitors, Ismā'īl directed the Šafawiyya sufi order.⁷

The dynasty very soon turned into a well-organised political and military strength conquering the whole of Persia and unifying it for the first time since the fall of the Sassanids.⁸ The Safavid Empire reached its apex under Šāh 'Abbās I (r. 996–1038/1588–1629), the fifth king, better known as the Great. 'Abbās ascended to the throne at just sixteen, supervised by a tutor, and became both a military leader and a skilled administrator. Iranian society enjoyed a state of peace and prosperity, the border disputes with the Ottoman Empire and other neighbouring states were resolved. In 1000/1590 or 1591 'Abbās moved the capital from Qazvin, in the north of Iran, to the famous city of Isfahan: the new capital of the kingdom, already a recognised learning centre, became even at that time a sacred place for all scholars.

Jackson and L. Lockhart, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 656–697, part. 656–657. Cf. A. Anzali, *Mysticism in Iran: The Safavid Roots of a Modern Concept*, Columbia, The University of South Carolina Press, 2017.

⁶ Safavid rulers: Ismā'īl I (907–930/1501–1524); Ṭahmāsp I (930–984/1524–1576); Ismā'īl II (984–985/1576–1577); Muḥammad Ḥudābanda (985–995/1578–1587); 'Abbās I (996–1038/1588–1629); Šafī I (1038–1052/1629–1642); 'Abbās II (1052–1077/1642–1666); Šafī II (Sulaymān I) (1077–1105/1666–1694); Sulṭān Ḥusayn I (1105–1135/1694–1722); Ṭahmāsp II (1135–1144/1722–1732); 'Abbās III (1144–1148/1732–1736).

⁷ Blake, *Time in Early Modern Islam*, cit., p. 23: "As Twelver or Imami Shiites, this mystical order rejected the first three caliphs and honored the Twelve Imams as the direct descendants of Muhammad. An invented genealogy claimed that Sheikh Safi (the founder of the order and Ismail's ancestor) was a lineal descendant of the Seventh Imam, Musa al-Kasim. Ismail also proclaimed himself the Mahdi (Guided One) and a reincarnation of Ali (the first Imam)".

⁸ Cf. *Safavid Persia: The History and Politics of an Islamic Society*, ed. by C. Melville, London-New York, I.B. Tauris, 1996; C.P. Mitchell, *The Practice of Politics in Safavid Iran: Power, Religion and Rhetoric*, London-New York, I.B. Tauris, 2009; A.J. Newman, *Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire*, London-New York, I.B. Tauris, 2009.



FIG. 2. Šayḫ Šaḡī al-Dīn Interpreting for his Disciples Various Verses by Distinguished Poets, Shiraz, Iran, 990/1582. © The Agha Khan Museum.

3. Convergences and Divergences of Philosophy and Theology

During the so-called cultural Renaissance, the propensity of the great encyclopaedists and commentators was oriented towards philosophy, theology and sufism, but

far from being a period characterized by the total domination of a monolithic concept of learning (limited, as some think, to the religious sciences), the Safavid reign was marked by the interaction between religious and secular branches of science, and between a popular approach to science, on the one hand and a technical, more professional one on the other hand.⁹

Philosophy certainly had a leading role within this refined scenario and the Safavid hegemony created a new context for its development. The debate that took place in Iran during much of the 16th century can be considered a prolongation of the teachings of the School of Shiraz,¹⁰ particularly of those of Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad Daštakī (d. 903/1498)¹¹ and Ġalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aṣ'ad Kāzarūnī Šiddiqī

⁹ H.M. Hamedanee, "History of Science in Iran in the Last Four Centuries", in *Science and Technology in Islam*, vol. II, *Technology and Applied Sciences*, ed. by A.Y. Al-Hassan, M. Ahmed and A.Z. Iskandar, Beirut, Unesco Publishing, 2001, pp. 615–643, here 618.

¹⁰ Thus defined by H. Corbin, *Histoire de la philosophie islamique*, Paris, Gallimard, 1986, pp. 459–461. The label School of Shiraz has not always been shared by contemporary scholarship. We can speak more exactly of two schools of thought referring to the intellectual authorities of the epoch, Šadr al-Dīn Daštakī e Ġalāl al-Dīn Dawānī, who did not share the same position on various issues. See R. Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Period: Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Nayrīzī and His Writings*, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2011, pp. 74–105, here 75: "This conflict is reflected particularly in the following writings of these two philosophers: i) their glosses on 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī al-Qūshchī's commentary on Našīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's *Tajrid al-i'tiqād*; ii) their superglosses on Mīr Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī's glosses (*hawāshī*) on Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī's commentary on Sirāj al-Dīn al-Urmawī's *Maṭālī' al-anwār*, entitled *Lawāmi' al-asrār fī sharḥ Maṭālī' al-anwār*; iii) their superglosses on Mīr Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī's glosses on 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī's commentary on Ibn Ḥājib's *Mukhtaṣar al-muntabā*; iv) their superglosses on Jurjānī's glosses on Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī's commentary on Najm al-Dīn al-Kātibī's *al-Shamsiyya*; v) their treatise on the proof of existence of the Necessary Existent and His attributes (*fī ithbāt al-wājib wa-ṣiḥātibī*)".

¹¹ He dedicated his most significant writings to the Ottoman Sulṭān Bāyazīd II. According to his son, Ġiyāṭ al-Dīn Maṣṣūr, his main teacher in logic and philosophy was Sayyid Muslim al-Fārsī, with whom he read *al-Isārāt wa-al-tanbīhāt* of Ibn Sīnā. He wrote some philosophical treatises and superglosses on commentaries by Quṭb al-Dīn Rāzī, Šaraf al-Dīn ibn al-Bārīzī Ḥamawī and 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī Qūšchī. *Ibidem*, pp. 16–24

Dawānī (a.k.a. ‘Allāma Dawānī, d. 908/1502).¹² This attitude changed around the end of the 16th century, when the purely Šīrī configuration of the kingdom became stronger and stronger. Many Safavid scholars, particularly theologians and jurists, identified *‘ilm* as knowledge of the religious and Qur’ānic sciences and considered the *imāms* the only people to have deep knowledge of the revealed truth.¹³ *De facto*, thanks to the blending and mixing of different schools of thought, philosophy played a central part in theological writings, so much so that often it was identified with theology;¹⁴ philosophical discussions were also oriented towards religion and many intellectual figures assumed religious roles.¹⁵

and *passim*; A. Bdaīwi, “Some Remarks on the Confessional Identity of the Philosophers of Shiraz: Šadr al-Dīn Dashtakī (d. 903/1498) and his Students Mullā Shams al-Dīn Khafrī (942/1535) and Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd Nayrīzī (948/1541)”, *Isbraq* 5 (2014), pp. 61–85; E. Niewöhner-Eberhard, *Die Dastakis: Die Familiengeschichte des Autors Ḥasan Fasā’ī im Fārsnāma-yi Nāsirī*, Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2009, part. pp. 22–31 and 31–38; Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Period*, cit., pp. 16–32.

¹² He was appointed *sadr* (religious supervisor) and taught at the Madrasa-yi Dār al-Aytām of Shiraz. He accepted the post of chief judge of Fārs from Sulṭān Ya’qūb (883–896/1478–1490) and he was later on good terms with Sulṭān Rustam (898–902/1493–1497). In addition to his association with the Turkmen rulers of Shiraz, he also enjoyed the respect of the Timurid Sulṭān Abū Sa’īd, to whom he dedicated his illuminationist commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr* by Šihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī (d. 1191). See A.J. Newman, “Davānī, Jalāl-al-Dīn Moḥammad” s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/davani> (20 February 2021); Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Period*, cit., pp. 4–16; See M.M. Āqā (or Āḡā) Buzurg Tīhrānī, *Al-Darī‘a ilā taṣānīf al-šī‘a*, 25 vols., Beirut, Dār al-Adwā’, 1403–1406/1983–1986 (a supplement ed. by A. Al-Ḥusaynī was published as vol. XXVI in Mashhad 1364Hs/1985): see vol. I, pp. 106–107, vol. II, pp. 103–104; vol. IV, pp. 227–228; vol. VI, pp. 67, 116, 132, 134; vol. XII, pp. 63–64; vol. XIII, pp. 138–139, 352; vol. XIV, pp. 240–241; vol. XVIII, pp. 359–360; vol. XXIV, p. 385; R.P. Ansari, “Ibn Kemal, Dawānī and the Avicennan Lineage”, *Mélanges de l’Université Saint-Joseph* 67 (2017–2018), pp. 237–264.

¹³ M. Moazzen, *Formation of a Religious Landscape: Shi‘i Higher Learning in Safavid Iran*, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2018, p. 126 ff.

¹⁴ See A.J. Newman, *Society and Culture in the Early Modern Middle East: Studies on Iran in the Safavid Period*, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2003; R. Pourjavady and S. Schmidtke, “Twelver Shīrī Theology”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Theology*, ed. by S. Schmidtke, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 456–472, part. 462–469; Nasr, “Spiritual Movements, Philosophy and Theology”, cit., pp. 656–697; S.H. Rizvi, “The Many Faces of Philosophy in the Safavid Age”, in *The Empires of the Near East and India: Source Studies of the Safavid, Ottoman, and Mughal Literate Communities*, ed. by H. Khafipour, New York, Columbia University Press, 2019, pp. 305–318.

¹⁵ Nasr, “Spiritual Movements, Philosophy and Theology”, cit., p. 658: “There are four major intellectual perspectives and schools of thought, all clearly defined in traditional

The rational sciences and philosophical investigations increasingly gained ground in Iran during the early years and middle of the 17th century. The *madrasas* of Isfahan were impregnated with Qur'anic studies and Imāmī tradition, and the polymath scholars possessed a profound knowledge of jurisprudence (*fiqh*), religious and philosophical sciences, literature and grammar.¹⁶ In the course of time philosophical notions mixed with mysticism circulated more and more in the new generation of 'ulamā' and the *kalām* lost vigour in the new classification of the sciences, making way for other disciplines. In addition to the curricular traditions, the scholars returned to the texts of the gnostic and Neoplatonic *ḥikma* dating back to the first period of the reception and translation of the Greek sources,¹⁷ and to the founders of the *falsafa* in the Arabic Islamic milieu.¹⁸ The request for a better-defined Greek and Neoplatonic identity,¹⁹ distinguished from that of the *kalām* in the Sunnī tradition, became characteristic of Iranian thinkers starting from the 17th century.²⁰ Avicenna had represented a turning point in the reading and interpretation of the Greek phil-

Islamic learning, which gradually approach each other during the period leading to the Safavid revival: Peripatetic (*maṣṣabā'ī*) philosophy, illuminationist (*ishrāqī*) theosophy, gnosis (*irfān*) and theology (*kalām*). It is due to the gradual intermingling and synthesis of these schools that during the Safavid period the major intellectual figures are not only philosophers but also theologians or gnostics".

¹⁶ Moazzen, *Formation of a Religious Landscape*, cit., pp. 139-147, here pp. 139-140.

¹⁷ See R. Pourjavady and S. Schmidtke, "An Eastern Renaissance? Greek Philosophy under the Safavids (16th–18th Centuries AD)", *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 3 (2015), pp. 248–290, here 255: "It is therefore not surprising that it was the 'Greek', pre-Avicennan tradition that was favoured in one way or another by most Safavid philosophers, who identified its philosophical notions with the religious tenets of Twelver Šī'ism. This religious preference for the pre-Avicennan tradition is indicated by a renewed interest in the classical earlier Imāmī *ḥadīṯ* collections and creeds and, more specifically, renewed interest among Safavid thinkers in early authoritative texts of Twelver Šī'ism".

¹⁸ See G. Endress, "Reading Avicenna in the *Madrasa*: Intellectual Genealogies and Chains of Transmission of Philosophy and the Sciences in the Islamic East", in *Arabic Theology, Arabic Philosophy: From the Many to the One: Essays in Celebration of Richard M. Frank*, ed. by J.E. Montgomery, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA, Uitgeverij Peeters en Department Oosterse Studies, 2006, pp. 371–422, here 421.

¹⁹ See M. Di Branco, "The 'Perfect King' and the Philosophers: Politics, Religion and Graeco-Arabic Philosophy in Safavid Iran: the Case of the *Uṭūlūḡiyyā*", *Studia graeco-arabica* 4 (2014), pp. 191–218; M. Terrier, "La représentation de la sagesse grecque comme discours et mode de vie chez les philosophes šī'ites de l'Iran safavide (XI^e/XVII^e siècle)", *ibidem* 5 (2015), pp. 299–320.

²⁰ See Pourjavady and Schmidtke, "An Eastern Renaissance?", cit., p. 255.

osophical texts and the variety of works that circulated during his time was partly eclipsed by his *summae*,²¹ as well as by those of his disciples and followers.²²

Among the threads of this tangled mesh, there stood out the esoteric teachings of the *imāms* and the *iṣrāqī* thought of Šihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī containing aspects of the doctrines of ancient Persia and sufi and gnostic teachings.²³ As Reza Pourjavady stresses,

Suhrawardī's writings, as well as the classical philosophical texts, particularly the Graeco-Arabica and the early Muslim (and Christian) philosophers, were increasingly venerated as an alternative to the later Avicennian tradition, which was more and more identified with Sunnism.²⁴

The main intellectuals of the time, some of whom were Avicennian Peripatetics, were undoubtedly influenced by the philosophy

²¹ On Avicenna and his works, see D. Gutas, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition: Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works. Second Revised and Enlarged Edition, Including an Inventory of Avicenna's Authentic Works*, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2014; A. Bertolacci, "Ibn Sīnā (d. 428/1037): Metaphysics of the *Shifā'*", in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, ed. by K. El-Rouayheb and S. Schmidtke, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 143–168.

²² A.H. al-Rahim, *The Creation of Philosophical Tradition: Biography and the Reception of Avicenna's Philosophy from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century A.D.*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2018; R. Wisnovsky, "Avicenna and the Avicennian Tradition", in *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, ed. by P. Adamson and R.C. Taylor, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 92–136; Id., "The Nature and Scope of Arabic Philosophical Commentary in Post-Classical (ca. 1100–1900 AD) Islamic Intellectual History: Some Preliminary Observations", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, Suppl. 83 (2004), pp. 149–191; A.H. al-Rahim, "Avicenna's Immediate Disciples: Their Lives and Works", in *Avicenna and his Legacy: A Golden Age of Science and Philosophy*, ed. by Y.T. Langermann, Turnhout, Brepols, 2010, pp. 1–25; J. Janssens, "Al-Lawkarī's Reception of Ibn Sīnā's *Ilāhiyyāt*", in *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics*, ed. by D.N. Hasse and A. Bertolacci, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2012, pp. 7–26.

²³ P. Adamson, *Philosophy in the Islamic World: A History of Philosophy without any Gaps*, vol. III, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 379–385, here 382: "Ibn 'Arabī and Suhrawardī too were long dead by the time of Safavid Iran, but their ideas remained alive and well".

²⁴ Pourjavady and Schmidtke, "An Eastern Renaissance?", cit., p. 255; cf. J. Wallbridge, "Suhrawardī's (d. 1191) *Intimations of the Tablet and the Throne*: The Relationship of Illuminationism and the Peripatetic Philosophy", in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, cit., pp. 255–277.

of *isrāq*:²⁵ Šayḥ Bahā' al-Dīn 'Āmilī (d. 1030/1621),²⁶ Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Dāmād Ḥusaynī Astarābādī (a.k.a. Mīr Dāmād d. 1041/1631),²⁷ Mīr Abū al-Qāsim Astarābādī Findiriskī (d. 1050/1640),²⁸ Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Širāzī (known as Mullā Šadrā, d. ca. 1050/1640), Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-'Ābidīn Ḥusaynī 'Alawī 'Āmilī Isfahānī (or Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad, Mīr Dāmād's son-in-law, d. between 1054/1644 and 1060/1650), Mullā Šamsā Gilānī (d.

²⁵ H. Nasr, "The Spread of the Illuminationist School of Suhrawardī", *Islamic Quarterly* 14 (1970), pp. 111–121; Id., *The Islamic Intellectual Tradition in Persia*, ed. by M. Amin Razavi, Richmond, UK, Curzon Press, 1996, pp. 160–171.

²⁶ Imāmī scholar and *šayḥ al-Islām* of Isfahan. He gained admiration and support from the Šāh 'Abbās I for his enormous erudition, and during the years in Isfahan he befriended Mīr Dāmād and counted among his students Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Maḡlisī, Sayyid Aḥmad 'Alawī, Šadr al-Dīn Širāzī and Mullā Muḥsin Faiḍ Kāšānī. See E. Kohlberg, "Bahā'-al-Dīn 'Āmelī" s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/baha-al-din-ameli-shaikh-mohammad-b> (20 February 2021); A. Newman, "Towards a Reconsideration of the Isfahān School of Philosophy: Shaykh Bahā' and the Role of the Safawid 'ulamā'", *Studia Iranica* 15 (1986), pp. 165–199.

²⁷ See A.J. Newman, "Dāmād, Mīr(-e), Sayyid Moḥammad Bāqer" s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/damad-mir-e-sayyed-mohammad-baqer-b> (20 February 2021). In Isfahan he studied with Mīr Faḥr al-Dīn Muḥammad Sammākī Astarābādī, an alumnus of Ġyāt al-Dīn Maṣṣūr Daštakī. He was intimate at the courts of 'Abbās I and Šāh Šafī and was given the title *šayḥ al-Islām*. Among his disciples there was the best-known of the thinkers of the day, Mullā Šadrā Širāzī, as well as his son-in-law, Sayyid Aḥmad 'Alawī. He was a versatile thinker who mainly wrote of philosophy, blending Duodeciman Šrīsm with Avicennian philosophy and with the illuminationism of Suhrawardī, and he commented on Avicenna's *Šifā'*. His school was known as *al-ḥikma al-yamānīyya*, based on the Prophet's famous saying "Faith is Yemeni and wisdom is Yemeni", or coming from the East, a source of light and revelation. See Āqā Buzurg Ṭīhrānī, *Al-Darī'a ilā tašānīf al-šī'a*, cit., vol. VIII, pp. 67–70; for Mīr Dāmād's works see C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, 2 vols., Weimar, E. Felber, 1898–1902; Leiden, Brill, 1943–1949, suppl. vols. I–III, Leiden, Brill, 1937–1942, part. suppl. vol. II (1938), pp. 579–580; S.H. Rizvi, "Mīr Dāmād's (d. 1631) al-Qabasāt: The Problem of the Eternity of the Cosmos", in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, cit., pp. 438–464; Id., "Mīr Dāmād in India: Islamic Philosophical Traditions and the Problem of Creation", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 131 (2011), pp. 9–23.

²⁸ A key figure of the Isfahan School, he travelled extensively in India and became passionate about Indian philosophy, so much so that he moved to the Mughal court and translated several texts from Sanskrit to Persian. S.H. Rizvi, "Mīr Fendereski" s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/mir-fendereski-sayyed-amir-abul-qasem> (20 February 2021).

ca. 1064/1654),²⁹ ‘Abd al-Razzāq ibn ‘Alī Lāhīgī (d. ca. 1072/1661 or 1662),³⁰ the author of some of the most important *ḥikma* texts in Persian, and also of the commentary ascribed to him on Suhrawardī’s *Ḥikmat al-iṣrāq* (Illuminative wisdom) and glosses on Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī’s commentary on Avicenna’s *Kitāb al-Iṣārāt wa-al-tanbihāt*

²⁹ A distinguished student of Mīr Dāmād and a close friend of Mullā Ṣadrā, he studied at the Madrasa-yi Ṣayḥ Luṭf Allāh al-Maysī in Isfahan and perhaps taught there. He studied with Mīr Dāmād, Bahā’ al-Dīn al-‘Āmilī, Aqā Ḥusayn Ḥwānsārī, and lived in Hyderabad under the patronage of the Mughal general, Ṣāh Mahābat Ḥān (d. 1044/1634) and the governor, ‘Abd Allāh Quṭb Ṣāh (r. 1625–1672). He was writer of treatises and glossator, he opposed Mullā Ṣadrā’s philosophy and inclined more toward Mīr Dāmād’s illuminative perspective. See S. Rizvi, “Mullā Shamsā Gilānī and his Treatise on the Incipience of the Cosmos (*ḥudūth al-‘ālam*)”, *Isbraq* 6 (2015), pp. 40–70; M.Š. Gilānī, *The Incipience of the Cosmos: Ḥudūth al-‘ālam*, Critical Edition, with Annotation and Introduction in Persian by A. Asghari and G. Dadkhah, English Introduction by S. Rizvi, Costa Mesa, Mazda Publishers, 2015.

³⁰ ‘Abd al-Razzāq ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn Lāhīgī was a student and also a son-in-law of the master Mullā Ṣadrā. The philosophical positions of Lāhīgī were almost exclusively those of Avicenna, sometimes rejecting the doctrine of his master Mullā Ṣadrā, when he considered it incompatible with Avicenna’s interpretation. Lāhīgī wrote a commentary on Avicenna’s *Kitāb al-Iṣārāt* as well as a large commentary on a major work of Avicennian philosophical theology, *Ṭaḡrīd al-‘itiqād* (Sublimation of belief) by Ṭūsī. W. Madelung, “‘Abd-al-Razzāq Lāhījī” s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abd-al-razzaq-lahiji-11th-17th-century-theologian-and-philosopher> (20 February 2021): “His teacher in philosophy was Mollā Ṣadrā Ṣīrāzī (d. 1050/1641). In his works Lāhījī frequently refers to him in laudatory terms as our teacher (*ostādonā*), and his *divān* contains several eulogies of him. He does not mention any other teacher [...] Lāhījī married one of the daughters of his teacher. There seems to have been some rivalry between him and the other son-in-law student of Ṣadrā, Mollā Moḥsen Fayz, whose philosophical outlook greatly differed from his own. Both are said to have been given their pen names, Fayyāz and Fayz, by their father-in-law. In Qom Lāhījī taught at the Madrasa-yi Ma’sūma. Among his students were Qāzī Sa’īd Qomī and his own son Mīrzā Ḥasan (d. 1121/1709), the author of several religious books. A second son, Ebrāhīm, is known to have written a work entitled *al-Qawā‘ed al-beḥmiya wa’l-kalāmīya*. Other data about Lāhījī’s life can be gleaned from his *divān*”. See H. Corbin, *La philosophie iranienne islamique aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles*, Paris, Buchet/Chastel, 1981, pp. 96–115; M. Horten, “Die philosophischen und theologischen Ansichten von Lahigi”, *Der Islam* 3 (1912), pp. 91–131; L. Lewisohn, “Sufism and the School of Isfahān: *Ṭaṣawwuf* and *Ṭrḥān* in Late Safavid Iran (‘Abd al-Razzāq Lāhījī and Fayḍ-i Kāshānī on the Relation of *Ṭaṣawwuf*, *Ḥikmat* and *Ṭrḥān*)”, in *The Heritage of Sufism*, vol. III, *Late Classical Persianate Sufism (1501–1750)*, ed. by L. Lewisohn and D. Morgan, London, Oneworld, 1999, pp. 63–134; S.H. Rizvi, “A Sufi Theology Fit for a Shī‘ī King: The Gawhar-i Murād of ‘Abd al-Razzāq Lāhījī (d. 1072/1661–1662)”, in *Sufism and Theology*, ed. by A. Shihadeh, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2007, pp. 83–100.

(Book of pointers and reminders),³¹ Fayḏ Kāšānī (d. 1090/1679 or 1680),³² and Qāḏī Sa'īd Qummī (d. after 1107/1696),³³ a philosopher,

³¹ Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Išārāt wa-al-tanbihāt ma'a Šarḥ Našīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī*, ed. by S. Dunyā, 4 vols., Cairo, Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1957–1960, repr. 1968–1971; J. McGinnis, “Našīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, *Šarḥ al-Ishārāt*”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, cit., pp. 326–347.

³² See R. Ġafarīyān, *Dīn wa-siyāsāt dar dawra-yi šafawī*, Qom, Anšarīyān, 1370Hš/1991, pp. 148–292; H. Ālgar, “Fayḏ-e Kāšānī, Mollā Moḥsen-Moḥammad” s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/fayz-e-kasani> (20 February 2021): “He returned to Isfahan where he joined the circle of the great scholar Bahā'-al-Dīn 'Āmelī (q.v.) as well as, perhaps, attending the lectures of Mīr Dāmād on philosophy [...] in 1029/1620 he departed for Mecca [...] On his return to Persia Fayḏ set about seeking a new master with whom to study and before long encountered one in Qom Mollā Šadrā (d. 1050/1641), who was destined to be his principal teacher in a wide variety of disciplines. Fayḏ recounts that as a result of the eight years he spent studying and engaged in ascetic exercises under the supervision of Mollā Šadrā, he attained the innermost meaning of all the sciences (*al-Maḥajja al-bayḏā* IV, p. 9). The influence of Šadrā's philosophy, together with its three principal components – illuminationist (*esrāqī*) thought, the Sufism of Ebn al-'Arabī (q.v.), and the teachings of the Ahl al-Bayt [...] – is indeed to be seen in most of Fayḏ's works, although the Sufi dimension is more noticeable in his writings than in those of his master. It was also Šadrā who gave him the *maḳlaṣ*, Fayḏ, by which he came to be known, as well as one of his daughters in marriage”. Kāšānī refused an invitation to settle in Isfahan from Šāh Šafī, but subsequently accepted one from his successor Šāh 'Abbās II. He taught at the Mullā 'Abd-Allāh *madrasa* and was Friday prayer leader in Isfahan. Despite the monarch's support, Kāšānī met with hostility from the exoterist scholars, probably because of his sufi inclinations, whose terminology he disguises in his texts using it philosophically in the manner of Mullā Šadrā. The *takya* that was founded in Isfahan for Kāšānī in the days of 'Abbās II was then razed to the ground during the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusayn.

³³ He probably began his studies in philosophy at the Madrasa-yi Ma'šūma with the theologian and poet 'Abd al-Razzāq Lāhīġī, the son-in-law of Mullā Šadrā, and a prominent illuminationist Avicennian. It was with Lāhīġī that Qummī began his study of Avicenna. In 1658, he migrated to Isfahan to seek patronage at the court of Šāh 'Abbās II and became a close confidant to Šāh 'Abbās II and his personal physician. There he continued his studies in philosophy with the idiosyncratic dervish-philosopher Raġab 'Alī Tabrīzī, who taught at the Madrasa-yi Šayḥ Luṭf Allāh, and the rational and religious disciplines with the Safavid polymath Mullā Muḥsin Muḥammad Fayḏ Kāšānī, another son-in-law of Mullā Šadrā. In Isfahan, he was ordered to construct a *dervīš* lodge for his teacher and the Šāh's favourite, Kāšānī. The Šāh ordered that a plot of land be set aside for these Sufis, where they could practice their meditation, self-reflection, retreats, and ecstatic experiences. The Šāh was a regular visitor to Qummī's house in Qom and appointed him a *qāḏī*. On the accession of Šāh Sulaymān, he lost favour and was imprisoned in Alamut, probably being close to and inclined towards sufiism. However, he was soon restored to his position and was even appointed *šayḥ-al-Islām* of Qom in 1099/1690, where he spent the rest of his life. See S.H. Rizvi, “Qāzi Sa'īd Qomi” s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/qazi-said>

jurist, and mystic, and a student of Kāšānī. The following table, simplified and reduced in comparison to Robert Wisnovsky's,³⁴ additionally includes a third column with some authors that have also commented on both Avicenna's and Suhrawardī's works.

Ibn Sīnā: <i>al-Išārāt wa-al-tanbihāt</i>	Ibn Sīnā: <i>al-Šifā'</i>	Suhrawardī's works
Ibn Kammūna (d. 676/1277)	-	Ibn Kammūna: <i>Kitāb al-Talwihāt</i>
Q. Širāzī (d. 710/1310)	-	Q. Širāzī: <i>Ḥikmat al-išrāq</i>
'A. Ḥillī (d. 726/1326)	'A. Ḥillī	'A. Ḥillī: <i>Kitāb al-Talwihāt</i>
Ĝ. Dawānī (d. 908/1502)	-	Ĝ. Dawānī: <i>Hayākil al-nūr</i>
Ġ. Daštakī (d. 949/1542)	Ġ. Daštakī	Ġ. Daštakī: <i>Hayākil al-nūr</i>
-	Mullā Šadrā (d. ca. 1050/1640)	Mullā Šadrā: <i>Ḥikmat al-išrāq</i>

qomi (20 February 2021). See Pourjavady and Schmidtke, "An Eastern Renaissance?", cit., p. 267: "The most significant impact of the *Theologia* can be traced in the works of Raġab 'Alī Tabrīzī (d. 1080/1669) and his circle. Raġab 'Alī and his students took issue with the philosophy of Mullā Šadrā, and yet they shared the latter's extensive use of the *Theologia* and other Neoplatonic works. His student Qāḍī Sa'īd Qumī (d. 1107/1696) wrote glosses (*ta'liqāt*) on the *Theologia*. Here Qumī defends Neoplatonism against Avicennian philosophy, and one of his primary concerns in this work and in his other writings is to reinterpret the sayings of Šīrī *imāms* in the light of *Plotiniana*. Another student of Raġab 'Alī, 'Alī Qulī b. Qaraġġāy Ḥān (d. after 1091/1680), wrote a Persian commentary (*šarḥ*) on the *Theologia*". Cf. Q.S. Qummī, *Ta'liqāt 'alā Utūluġiyyā*, in *Muntahabāti az ātār-i bukamā'-yi Īrān*, ed. by S.J. Āštīyānī, vol. III, Tehran, Intišārāt-i Anġuman-i Šāhanšāhī-yi Falsafa-i Īrān, 1356Hš/1977, pp. 149–286; S.H. Rizvi, "(Neo) Platonism Revived in the Light of the Imams: Qāḍī Sa'īd Qummī (d. AH 1107/AD 1696) and his Reception of the *Theologia Aristotelis*", in *Classical Arabic Philosophy: Sources and Reception*, ed. by P. Adamson, London, Warburg Institute, 2007, pp. 177–207; Id., "Seeking the Face of God: The Safawid *Ḥikmat* Tradition's Conceptualisation of *Walāya Takwīnīya*", in *The Study of Shi'i Islam: History, Theology and Law*, ed. by F. Daftary and G. Miskinzoda, London, I.B. Tauris, 2014, pp. 391–410, part. 402–403.

³⁴ Cf. R. Wisnovsky, "Avicenna's Islamic reception", in *Interpreting Avicenna: Critical Essays*, ed. by P. Adamson, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 190–213, here 194.

During the 11th and 12th centuries of the Muslim era two copies of *Ḥikmat al-išrāq*, Suhrawardī's masterpiece, was translated into Persian, the common cultural language of Persia and India. The first copy was attributed to an Indian sufi, Muḥammad Šarīf ibn al-Ḥarawī, and is dated 1008/1599 or 1600, and the second to Bahrām ibn Faršād, a disciple of a Zoroastrian priest, Āzar Kaywān (alive in 1048/1638).³⁵ In the same period, *Ḥikmat al-išrāq* was commented on³⁶ and Mullā Šadrā wrote his masterly glosses on the same text.

However, renewed interest in Greek philosophy and gnostic thought did not coincide with abandonment of the Avicennian tradition and the intersection of manifold creeds and doctrines also helps us to understand better a remarkable phenomenon that originated at that time and which concerns the path taken within a few centuries by two of Avicenna's *summae*, namely *Kitāb al-Šifā'* and *Kitāb al-Išārāt*. The text of *Išārāt* was widely commented on³⁷ between the 12th and 16th centuries through a convergence of elements: compiled in a compact style and as a text belonging to the final phase of Avicennian speculation, *Išārāt* could be presented as a conclusive expression of his positions.³⁸

³⁵ Nasr, *The Islamic Intellectual Tradition in Persia*, cit., p. 163.

³⁶ The author of the glosses on *Ḥikmat al-išrāq* and the commentary on *al-Alwāḥ al-Imādiyya* was identified by Hellmut Ritter with Nağm al-Dīn Ḥağī Maḥmūd Tibrīzī (H. Ritter, "Philologika IX. Die vier Suhrawardī, Ihre Werke in Stambuler Handschriften", *Der Islam* 24 [1937], p. 271). This was refuted by Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Period*, cit., pp. 46–47, who identifies the author with Nayrīzī, a student of the two Daštakīs, a commentator on *Ḥikmat al-išrāq* and *al-Alwāḥ al-Imādiyya* by Suhrawardī.

³⁷ Among others we can mention Šaraf al-Dīn Mas'ūdī (d. shortly after 582/1186), Faḥr al-Dīn Rāzī (d. 606/1210), Nağm al-Dīn Nağūwānī (fl. 626/1229), Sayf al-Dīn Āmidī (d. 641/1243) and Našīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī (d. 672/1274). See R. Wisnovsky, "On the Emergence of Maragha Avicennism", *Oriens* 46 (2018), pp. 263–331; Id., "Towards a Genealogy of Avicennism", *ibidem* 42 (2014), pp. 323–363; Id., "Avicennism and Exegetical Practice in the Early Commentaries on the *Išārāt*", *ibidem* 41 (2013), pp. 349–378.

³⁸ Wisnovsky, "Avicenna's Islamic reception", pp. 193–194: "This reason is that the *Išārāt* represents the final stage of development of Avicenna's ideas about the interrelationship between two of his most important distinctions: first, between essence (*mābiyya*) and existence (*wujūd*), and second, between the necessary of existence in itself (*wājib al-wujūd bi-dbātibi*) and the necessary of existence through another (*wājib al-wujūd bi-ghayrihi*), which Avicenna took to be convertible with the possible of existence in itself (*mumkin al-wujūd bi-dbātibi*). According to this hypothesis, post-Avicennian *mutakallimūn* were interested in the *Išārāt* precisely because it is in the *Išārāt* that Avicenna linked the two distinctions most closely together. What I mean is that in the *Išārāt*, Avicenna's discussion of essence and existence is followed immediately by his

“Terse, dense, and cryptic”,³⁹ for a long time it caught the attention of scholars, who almost entirely neglected the longer and more detailed *Šifā’*. The latter was used as the reference text by annotators of *Išārāt*, but never extensively commented on. Beginning from the 16th century there started a vast exegetic activity and intense debates, which continued until the 19th century, focusing on the book of Metaphysics (*Ilāhiyyāt*). Safavid scholars not only read Avicenna, but continued to write works on his writings and went over the chain of authors relating to their spiritual and philosophical origins. Commentaries and glosses on *Šifā’* overlapped or at any rate came into play parallel to those related to *Išārāt*, the predominant orientation in the previous centuries. Among the *ḥukamā’* who commented on Avicenna’s *Šifā’*, the following stood out: Mīr Dāmād, Mullā Šadrā, Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad, Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Mu’min Sabzawāri Iṣfahānī (d. 1090/1679), and Āqā Ḥusayn Ibn Muḥammad Ḥwānsārī (d. 1099/1687).

4. *Iğāzas and Waqf-Nāmas*

The *iğāzas* (certificates of transmission or permission to teach) issued by the Isfahan scholars constitute an important testimony for reconstruction of the curriculum of the *madrasas* in the Safavid era. These documents however reveal that philosophical works coexisted alongside “*uṣūlī*-oriented” works and collections of *abādīt*.⁴⁰ For example, Mīr Dāmād granted an *iğāza* to his disciple and son-in-law, Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad, giving him permission to transmit a certain number of texts regarding rational sciences, including some parts of Avicenna’s *Kitāb*

discussion of causality, which is then followed immediately by his discussion of intrinsically and extrinsically necessary existence. In the *Ilāhiyyāt* of the *Šifā’*, by contrast, there are extensive discussions of other metaphysical topics – substance, matter and form, perfection, and so on – that come between the discussion of essence and existence in Book I, Chapter 5, and the discussion of causality in Book VI; and also further extensive discussions of other metaphysical topics that come between the discussion of causality in Book VI and the discussion of the Necessary of Existence in itself in Book VIII. (It is true that *Ilāhiyyāt* 1.6 is devoted to the necessary/possible distinction, and that it follows immediately upon the discussion of essence and existence in I.5. But I.6 does not use the essence/existence distinction for a theological purpose; that is, I.6 does not argue that God is the only *wājib al-wujūd bi-dhātibi* because His essence and His existence are identical. For this, we have to wait until Book VIII).³⁹

³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 193.

⁴⁰ Moazzen, *Formation of a Religious Landscape*, cit., p. 142.

al-Šifā' (*Burbān*) and *Kitāb al-Isārāt*, as well as the commentaries on them.⁴¹

During the 17th century, the intellectuals enjoyed the support of 'Abbās I and Šafī I, but also of their vizier, Sayyid Ḥusayn Ḥalifa Sultān (*Sultān al-'ulamā'*, d. 1654, son-in-law of 'Abbās I). They promoted the activity both of philosophers and of "mystically-inclined" traditionalists, and also supported the cultured elite through various appointments, commissioning works and offering them real contracts, as well as the opportunity to make use of a specialised *madrasa* in the teaching of the rational sciences.⁴² The circle of scholars that enjoyed the patronage of *Sultān al-'ulamā'* and, after his death, that of 'Abbās II, was made up of illustrious names of the epoch, including Muḥammad Taqī Maḡlisī (d. 1070/1659 or 1660),⁴³ 'Abd al-Razzāq Lāhīḡī, and Qāḏī Sa'īd Qummī. Many other *ḥukamā'* played important roles in the Islamic community: Mullā Raḡab 'Alī Tabrīzī (d. 1080/1669)⁴⁴ was invited to the court of Šāh 'Abbās II, while Muḥaqqiq Sabzawārī was appointed *šayḥ al-Islām* of Isfahan and also had a decisive role in the ascent to the throne of Šāh Sulaymān; Muḥammad Tunikābunī, a disciple of Tabrīzī, was also active during the reign of Sulaymān, who appointed him for several positions, including that of *mutawallī*

⁴¹ *Ibidem*.

⁴² *Ibidem*, p. 140.

⁴³ Among his later teachers, two stand out as particularly important: 'Abd Allāh Tus-tarī/Šuštārī and Bahā' al-Dīn Āmilī. See R. Brunner, "Majlesi, Moḥammad-Taqī" s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/majlesi-molla-mohammad-taqi-b-maqsud-ali-esfahani> (20 February 2021).

⁴⁴ Known as the "dervish-philosopher", among his best-known students we can mention Mullā Muḥammad Tunikābunī, Qāḏī Sa'īd Qummī, Amīr Qawwām al-Dīn Muḥammad Iṣfahānī, Mullā Muḥammad Šafī'ī Iṣfahānī and Muḥammad Rafī'ī Pīrzā-da. 'Alī Tabrīzī seems to have translated from Arabic into Persian both *Ilāhiyyāt* and *Isārāt*. Quoted in *From the School of Shiraz to the Twentieth Century*, ed. by S.H. Nasr and M. Aminrazavi, London-New York, I.B. Tauris, in association with the Institute of Isma'ili Studies, 2015, p. 283 and 285–304; Tabrīzī's *Itbāt-i waḡīb* and *al-Aṣl al-aṣil* have been translated by M. Rustom as "On the Necessary Being" and "The Fundamental Principle" in *Anthologie des philosophes iraniens depuis le XVII^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours*, Textes persans et arabes choisis et présentés par S.J. Āštiyāni, Introduction analytique par H. Corbin, vol. I, Tehran-Paris, Department d'Iranologie de l'Institut franco-iranien de recherche/Librarie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971, pp. 220–243 and 244–271; M.U. Faruque and M. Rustom, "Rajab 'Alī Tabrīzī's Refutation of Šadrian Metaphysics", in *Philosophy and the Intellectual Life in Shī'ah Islam*, ed. by S.N. Ahmad and S.H. Rizvi, London, Bloomsbury/The Shī'ah Institute Press, 2017, pp. 184–207.

(the custodian of *waqf*, a charitable endowment) of the Madrasa-yi Gadda.⁴⁵

Around the middle of the 17th century in Isfahan there was a conflict among philosophers, Aḥbārīs, Sufis and *muḡtabids*. Although in some *madrāsas* the rationalist sciences regularly continued to be part of the curriculum studiorum, the ‘*ulamā*’ and the jurists, who supported strictly religious dogmatism, discredited and opposed both mystical positions and philosophical investigations, considered heretical due to the ambiguity of their ideas and the erroneous reinterpretation of Šīrī precepts.⁴⁶ Muḡammad Ṭāhīr Qummī, *šayḡ al-Islām* of Qom (d. 1100/1689) and one of the toughest opponents of the philosophical party within the hierarchy, wrote a fiery polemical essay confuting sufism, accusing its followers of being Sunnis and believing, among other things, in the doctrine of divine love.⁴⁷ Another significant example is constituted by the *iğāza* of Qummī, granted to the son of Muḡammad Taqī Mağlisī, Muḡammad Bāqir Mağlisī (the second Mağlisī, d. 1110/1699 or 1670)⁴⁸ – who had asked him for permission to transmit the four canonical collections of Šīrī *ḡadīṡs*. Qummī granted permission but at the same time rejected philosophical investigation:

The doctrine of the philosophers (*falāsifa*) is contrary to the religion of Islam and the content of the verses of the Quran. Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā, who cultivated this form of irreligiousness, were afflicted with melancholia. Ibn Sīnā was a wine drinker, and Fārābī played musical instruments. The Šī‘a, by contrast, are said to have opposed the infidel philosophers, and are commended for having killed the mystic Suhrawardī in Aleppo, because of his concentration on philosophy.⁴⁹

Muḡammad Taqī Mağlisī suffered repercussions from many *fuqāḡā* because of the ambiguity of his doctrinal opinions; Muḡsin Fayḡ

⁴⁵ Moazzen, *Formation of a Religious Landscape*, cit., pp. 141–142.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 144.

⁴⁷ M.M. Ṭāhīr Qummī, *Opposition to Philosophy in Safavid Iran: Mulla Muḡammad-Ṭāhīr Qummī’s ḡikmat al-‘Arifīn*, ed. by A. Anzali and S.M. Hadi Gerami, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2018, p. 144; see Āqā Buzurg Ṭīhrānī, *Al-ḡarī‘a ilā taṡānīf al-šī‘a*, cit., vol. IV, pp. 495–498; R. Ġāfarīyān, *Šafawīyya dar ‘arṡa-yi dīn, farḡang wa-siyāsāt*, vol. II, Qom, Pažūhiškada-yi Ḥawza va Dānišgāh, 1379Hš/2000 or 2001, pp. 605–659.

⁴⁸ See Brunner, “Majlesi, Moḡammad-Bāqer” s.v., cit.

⁴⁹ Moazzen, *Formation of a Religious Landscape*, cit., p. 147.

Kāšānī and Muḥammad Bāqir Sabzawārī were condemned by Šayḥ 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Āmilī for their mystical and philosophical inclinations.⁵⁰ Probably – as Maryam Moazzen stresses – the most exemplary anecdote of that time is constituted by the testimony of a Portuguese Augustinian monk named Antonio who converted to Islām in Isfahan in 1108/1696 with the name 'Alī Qulī Ġadīd al-Islām (d. after 1134/1722). He attests to the popularity of Avicenna's philosophical works as follows:

Too often I found myself in the company of a group of [religious students] who, having spent years in the madrasas in pursuit of knowledge, believed they knew something and numbered themselves amongst the knowledgeable. Even as a recent convert at the time with no thorough knowledge of the *ḥadīths*, when I asked them about a tradition that dealt with the most fundamental matters of religion, they knew nothing about it, and I was the one who taught them on the matter. They said, 'We study philosophy; we have busied ourselves for years with books like *Sharḥ al-hidāya*, *al-Shifā'*, and *al-Ishārāt*, and thus we found no spare time to study hadith,' an excuse worse than the offense itself!⁵¹

Ġadīd al-Islām maintained that his students did not have a deep knowledge of Islamic law, Qur'ānic exegesis and the *aḥādīth*:

I have had many conversions with people who claim to be knowledgeable and had spent years of their lives in madrasas learning, and who consider themselves as one of people of knowledge, yet when as a novice who has not yet acquired a comprehensive knowledge of *ḥadīth*, I asked them a *ḥadīth* concerning one of the necessities of religion, they did not know it and I had to teach them! Their reason was that they had spent all tho-

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 146. Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Ḥwānsārī (d. 1313/1895 or 1896), a Šī'ī biographer, in his *Rawḍāt al-ġannāt*, wrote: "Shaykh 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Āmilī in one of his books (i.e., *Prohibition of music and the like*) attributed some improper discourses to Muḥsin Fayḍ such as accusing him of believing in the unity of existence (*waḥdat-i wujud*) and holding that infidels will not be punished eternally in Hell. *Muḥtabids*, however, even those who reach a high rank are not guaranteed salvation" (M.B. Ḥwānsārī, *Rawḍāt al-ġannāt fi ahwāl al-'ulamā wa-al-sādāt*, 8 vols., vol. VII, Tehran, Čāp-i Islāmiyya, 1976–1981, see pp. 10–31).

⁵¹ Tāhir Qummī, *Opposition to Philosophy in Safavid Iran*, cit., pp. 8–9. See 'A.-Q. Ġadīd al-Islām, "Risāla dar radd-i ḡamā'at-i Šūfiyān", *Mirāt-i islāmī Iran* 7 (1377Hš/1998), pp. 17–54.

se years studying philosophical books including *Šarḥ-i Hidāya*, commentaries and glosses on *Šifā'* and *Ishārāt* and didn't have enough time to study *ḥadīth*! [...] These philosophers who now consider themselves *ḥakīms* thanks to their limited knowledge of *al-Šifā'* and so forth, which as a result have become heretics, say we want to have nothing to do with *ḥadīth*; we are the people of intellect and thus [would not be intellectually satisfied by] transmitted sciences including *ḥadīth*. We accept whatever is confirmed by intellect and reason.⁵²

In the last decades of the Safavid dynasty, the anti-philosophical discourse can also be considered in the light of the *waqf-nāmas* (certificates of pious endowment) of the time of 'Abbās II compared to those issued during the reign of Šāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn: unlike what happened in the former period, in which no textual sources exist on the abolition of philosophy or sufism from the curriculum of the *madrasa*, the last period condemned, in some cases explicitly, the study and teaching of the so-called deceptive sciences, meaning pure philosophy, *ḥikma*, sufism. The rejected books included *al-Šifā'*, *al-Išārāt*, *Ḥikmat al-ayn* and *Šarḥ al-hidāya* and the punishment for failure to exclude them was expulsion from the *madrasa*.⁵³ Although many intellectuals were convinced that the rational sciences could be valid sources of learning and understanding of the sacred texts, and therefore be considered the most effective means to persuade infidels of the truthfulness of the Islamic religion, the *waqf-nāmas* of the *madrasas* insisted on the idea that truth had to be found exclusively in the texts of the Šī'ī tradition.⁵⁴ However, this attitude only referred to a part of society: the curriculum effectively taught in schools was ampler than what appears in the *waqfs*. The rational sciences remained principal disciplines of teaching, so much so that many students preferred them to the study of jurisprudence and the *aḥādīth*.

The *waqf-nāmas* undoubtedly constitute significant testimonies, but cannot be taken into consideration in general since they do not give identical indications as to the curriculum. Two *waqfs* of the two most important *madrasas* of the reign of 'Abbās II, namely Ğadda Kūčak and Ğadda Buzurg, do not give specific instructions concern-

⁵² Moazzen, *Formation of a Religious Landscape*, cit., pp. 157–158; cf. Ğa'farīyān, *Šafawīyya dar 'arša-yi dīn, farhang wa siyāsāt*, vol. II, cit., pp. 677–678.

⁵³ Ṭāhīr Qummī, *Opposition to Philosophy in Safavid Iran*, cit., pp. 11–15.

⁵⁴ Moazzen, *Formation of a Religious Landscape*, cit., p. 156.

ing the disciplines to be studied, but rather a list of the books owned, mainly texts of *fiqh*, *kalām*, and *mantiq*, but no other classics of philosophy or sufism.⁵⁵ By contrast, a *waqf* of the Sulṭān Ḥusayniyya *madrasa* (built by Āqā Kamāl, d. after 1133/1720) includes in the brief list of the texts belonging to the *madrasa* some important classics of the history of Islamic thought, among them Ibn Sīnā's *al-Šifā'*.⁵⁶



FIG. 3. R. 'Abbāsī, *Youth Reading* (1625–1626). © The British Museum.

⁵⁵ Ṭāhir Qummī, *Opposition to Philosophy in Safavid Iran*, cit., pp. 12-13.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*.

5. From Iran towards India

As regards the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent – although true interest in this discipline peaked centuries earlier – the institution of a school of Islamic philosophy can be dated from the Safavid epoch. Premodern Muslim thinkers inserted theology into the rationalist sciences, a classification that was perfectly suited to the Indian context, where most of the scholars that dealt with theological matters also possessed a solid philosophical background. Precisely in that specific context it is difficult to trace a clear-cut line between theology and philosophy, so much so that the definition “rationalist theology” has been adopted in reference to the theological corpus of the Indian scholars.⁵⁷

Theology in India seems to have depended greatly on some fundamental aspects of the thought and synthesis of Avicenna, and the influence of the *falsafa* even succeeded in smoothing over the lines of sectarian division among Sunnis and Šīrites, both having the same pedagogic and scholastic background, commenting on and glossing the same texts and showing an eclecticism that could not be confined to any extreme classification. The main centres of “rationalist theology” were found above all in the northern area of the country and the principal cities were the following: Delhi, Lucknow, Sandīla, Sihala and Rampur. There was also an important presence of scholars in Allahabad, Jaunpur, Khairabad and Varanasi, and later also in Aligarh, Hyderabad, Madras and Tonk.⁵⁸

An effect of the new Safavid politics was the migration of Sunnī scholars to the neighbouring areas. The hostility towards Sunnis began with the rise to power of the Safavids and was intensified during the reign of Šah Ṭahmāsp I (r. 1524–1576). Hence many Persian humanists and scientists travelled to India, and among them we can mention Mušliḥ al-Dīn Lārī (d. 979/1572)⁵⁹ – who in his *Mir’āt al-adwār wa-mirqāt al-ahbār* attributes the hostility of Ṭahmāsp to the Sunnis as the main reason for the migration from Iran towards other

⁵⁷ See A.Q. Ahmed and R. Pourjavady, “Theology in the Indian Subcontinent”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Theology*, cit., pp. 606–624, here 615.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 616.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 608. Lārī studied religious and rational sciences in Shiraz with various prominent personalities of the intellectual life of the time: Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Lārī (d. after 918/1512), Šams al-Dīn Ḥafīrī (d. 942/1535 or 1536), and the best-known Ġyāṭ al-Dīn Maṣūfī ibn Muḥammad Ḥusaynī Daštakī Šīrāzī. See R. Pourjavady, “Mušliḥ al-Dīn al-Lārī and His *Samples of the Sciences*”, *Oriens* 42 (2014), pp. 292–322.

lands, mainly India⁶⁰ – the well-known Mīr Findiriskī, and Bahā' al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan Iṣfahānī (or Fāḍil Hindī, d. 1137/1725), who summed up the Metaphysics section of *Šifā'*.

In this connection, the third Timurid sovereign of the Mughal Empire, Akbar the Great (r. 1556–1605), favoured a valuable cultural and spiritual exchange, and many Zoroastrians emigrated from Shiraz toward India. A constant migration of men of letters determined a revival of Persian language and poetry in that country, and the most important Indian spiritual texts were translated from Sanskrit into Persian.⁶¹

As far as philosophy was concerned, the lineage of the texts disseminated in the Indian subcontinent dates back to the School of Shiraz. Some Indian witnesses of the *Šifā'* derive from copies owned and studied by the philosophers in those intellectual circles, but most of the *testimonia* preserved in India were copied during the Safavid and Mughal period, a tangible sign of the great and editorial renaissance of the time.⁶² A key figure in the diffusion of Islamic philosophy in the subcontinent was Sayyid Mīr Faṭḥ Allāh Širāzī (d. 997/1589), who knew and promoted the *išrāqī* principles.⁶³ The chain of transmission in India goes back to him: a disciple of Giyaṭ al-Dīn Daštakī (d. 949/1542)⁶⁴, he was invited to India by Mīrzā Ġānī, the ruler of Thatta, and spent many years in the service of 'Alī 'Ādil Šāh (r. 1558–1580) in Bijapur

⁶⁰ See A.Q. Ahmed and R. Pourjavady, "Theology in the Indian Subcontinent", in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Theology*, cit., p. 608.

⁶¹ *The Empires of the Near East and India*, cit. See also *Perso-Indica: An Analytical Survey of Persian Works on Indian Learned Traditions*, available at <http://perso-indica.net/> (20 February 2021).

⁶² See PhiBor: <http://project.avicennaproject.eu/index.php?id=61#c117> (20 February 2021).

⁶³ One of the most learned men of his time, a famous sufi and an official in Mughal India. See S.H. Qasemi, "Faṭḥ-Allāh Širāzī, Sayyed Mīr" s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/fath-allah-sirazi> (20 February 2021); M.A. Alvi and A. Rahman, *Fatullah Shirazi: A Sixteenth Century Indian Scientist*, New Delhi, National Institute of Sciences of India, 1968; Ahmed and Pourjavady, "Theology in the Indian Subcontinent", cit., part. pp. 608–609.

⁶⁴ Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad Daštakī's son, philosopher, and *mutakallim* of the late Timurid and early Safavid period, a commentator of *Šifā'* and Suhrawardī's *Hayākil al-nūr*, and also a glossator of Ṭūsī's commentary on *Iṣārāt*. See Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Period*, cit., pp. 24–32; A.J. Newman, "Daštakī, Ġiāt-al-Dīn" s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/dastaki-amir-sayyed> (20 February 2021).

as a *wakīl* (administrator) and subsequently a period in Ahmadnagar, where he met Sulṭān Murtaḍā Nizām Šāh II (r. 1565–1588). In answer to the theological questions asked by the Sulṭān, he wrote *al-As'ila al-sulṭāniyya* in Persian. In 990/1582, he was summoned to the imperial court of Akbar, where he was given the title *ʿAḍud al-dawla*, and remained there until his death in Kashmir.⁶⁵

The figure of Faṭḥ-Allāh is linked to some witnesses of the *Šifā'* and in particular to an insightful 14th-century manuscript, Rampur Raza Library, 3476 ʿ (*ḥikma* 112, dated 718/1318 or 1319; copyist Maḥmūd ibn ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī Wandkilī [from Qasan/Kashan]).⁶⁶ It is a valuable witness for the intellectual genealogy and represents an example of the interchanges between the Safavid and Mughal Empires. This precious *testimonium* played a fundamental role in the transmission of the work in India:

It was owned by Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Daštakī, then passed to his son Ġiyāṭ al-Dīn Maṣṣūr (d. 949H/1542) – active in the Madrasa Maṣṣūriyya that his father dedicated to his name – then to this latter's son Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ṭānī (d. 962H/1555), then to the student of Ġiyāṭ al-Dīn Maṣṣūr, Faṭḥ Allāh al-Šīrāzī (d. 997H/1589), who is the author of the indexes of contents in the manuscript.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ See A.Q. Ahmed and R. Pourjavady, “Theology in the Indian Subcontinent”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Theology*, cit., p. 608.

⁶⁶ M.A. Ḥān, *Fibrīst-i kutub-i ʿArabī-yi mauḡūda-yi Kitābḥānah-i riyyāsati Rāmpūr*, vol. I, Rampur, Maṭbaʿ Aḥmadī, 1902, p. 397; I.A. ʿAršī, *Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in Raza Library Rampur*, vol. IV, *Sufism, Holy Scriptures, Logic & Philosophy*, Rampur, Raza Library Trust, 1971, pp. 440–443. This copy deals with Logic, Physics, Mathematics & Metaphysics. Begins with a note by Abū ʿUбайд al-Jawzjānī. His another note is found at the end of *al-ṭabīʿiyyāt*. According to a 3rd note (dated 1100/1689) by Mīr M. Hādī (d. 1114/1703), the three tables of contents (foll. 1b–4b, 244b–7a & 387b–8a) are in the hand of Faṭḥu'llāh Šīrāzī (d. 997/1589), & foll. 247a & 389a bear the autographs of Ġiyātu'd-Dīn Maṣṣūr Šīrāzī (d. 949/1542) and Ṣadru'd-Dīn aṭ-Ṭānī (d. 962/1555). It was studied by Mīr Ṣadru'd-Dīn al-Awwal (d. 903/1498) & collated and corrected by some other scholar in 845/1441 (fol. 243b and 386a). Copied by Maḥmūd b. ʿA. b. M. b. ʿA. al-Qāsānī”.

⁶⁷ A. Bertolacci and S. Di Vincenzo, “The Manuscript Tradition of Avicenna's *Ilābiyyāt* of the *Šifā'*: An Overview”, available at <https://www.avicennaproject.eu/#/manuscripts/intro> (20 February 2021).

The manuscript was acquired by the royal library of the Mughal ruler Akbar probably after being brought to India by Faṭḥ Allāh; it was then moved to Rampur Raza Library, where it is still preserved.

Another witness of the *Šifā'* seems to be connected to Faṭḥ Allāh: Khoj, Kitābhāna-yi Madrasa-yi Namāzī, MS 247:

It was copied in Ramaḍān 986H/November-December 1578 for an 'Abd al-Ḥālīq Ibn Muḥammad Maḥmūd from Gīlān, who was, according to historical sources of the time, a student of Faṭḥ Allāh Šīrāzī and Mīrzā Ğān. He reportedly studied MS [247] with Faṭḥ Allāh Šīrāzī, collated it and corrected it; the process of correction of the manuscript ended the month of Ša'bān 988H/September–October 1580: it can be supposed that he worked with Faṭḥ Allāh Šīrāzī before the latter moved to the court of Akbar I in about 991H.⁶⁸

Among Faṭḥ Allāh Šīrāzī's theological writings, we can mention the gloss on Dawānī's earlier gloss on 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Qūšġī's (d. 879/1474) commentary⁶⁹ on Ṭūsī's *Taġrīd al-i'tiqād* (Sublimation of belief).⁷⁰ Šams al-Dīn Iṣfahānī (d. 749/1348) and Naġm al-Dīn Maḥmūd Nayrīzī (d. after 933/1526)⁷¹ also commented on *Taġrīd*, and other scholars wrote glosses on Qūšġī's commentary, such as Ğiyāt al-Dīn Daštakī, Šams al-Dīn Ḥafrī (d. 942/1535 or 1536),⁷² Ḥusayn al-Ilāhī

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*. See note 89: "Interestingly, an 'Abd al-Ḥālīq Ğīlānī is also recorded as the copyist of another witness of the *Šifā'* which does not preserve the Ilāhiyyāt, namely MS Qom, Maraz-i Iḥyā'-i Mīrāt-i Islāmī 314, which might, therefore, be an additional manuscript connected to the same intellectual milieu".

⁶⁹ Qūšġī, Šarḥ *Taġrīd al-i'tiqād*, Tabriz, Lithograph Edition by Mullā 'Abbās 'Alī, 1301/1883.

⁷⁰ It is a Twelver Šī'ī creed written by Ṭūsī in or shortly before 667/1268 and contains six chapters (*maqṣad*): on metaphysics (three sections or *fuṣūl*), on substance and accidents (five sections), on theology (*ilāhiyyāt*, three sections), on prophecy, on the imamate, and on the resurrection. Našīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, *Taġrīd al-i'tiqād*, ed. by M.Ġ. Ğalālī, Tehran, Markaz al-Našr, Maktab al-I'lām al-Islāmī, 1986; Cf. Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Period*, cit., pp. 66–67; Id., "Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawānī (d. 908/1502), Glosses on 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Qūshjī's Commentary on Našīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's *Tajrīd al-I'tiqād*", in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, cit., pp. 415–437.

⁷¹ See Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Period*, cit., pp. 45f.

⁷² F. Saatchian, *Gottes Wesen-Gottes Wirken: Ontologie und Kosmologie im Denken von Sams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ḥafri*, Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2011; Id., "Bio-bibliographische Daten und Gedankengut des Šams-al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ḥafri's, Philo-

Ardabīlī (d. 950/1543),⁷³ Ğamāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd Šīrāzī (d. 962/1554 or 1555), and Faḥr al-Dīn al-Sammākī Astarābādī (d. 984/1576 or 1577). Ḥafarī, Sammākī, and Ardabīlī also wrote works on the third chapter concerning Metaphysics. Apparently, none of the authors listed above commented on the chapter on the imamate, an issue that would have forced them to affirm or to deny their affiliation to the Šīʿī faith. This general attitude changed during the 17th century, when the work was commented on in its entirety, from an exclusively Šīʿī perspective, by Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad, ‘Abd al-Razzāq Lāhīġī, and Sayyid Muḥammad Ašraf al-‘Alawī ‘Āmilī (d. 1145/1732), who wrote a Persian commentary on it. Their glosses concerned above all the first two chapters of the text which dealt with preliminary philosophical matters like substances and accidents.⁷⁴

Malik reports that, after Faṭḥ Allāh, the commentary by Tūsi on *Kitāb al-Isārāt* and the *Ilāhīyyāt al-Šifā’* were both being read in India, but it is likely that their influence was limited.⁷⁵ Towards the end of the 17th century in India there emerged an interest in the Physics⁷⁶ and Logic of the *Šifā’*. These texts were explored as a supplement for a deeper study of themes already covered in other works. The attention towards the Avicennian *summae* developed further in India around the end of the 18th century, and this also involved an increase in commentaries. As far as the *Šarḥ al-Isārāt* is concerned, Ğiyāṭ al-Dīn Daštakī, Mīrẓā Ğān Ḥabīb Allāh Bāġnawī (d. between 994 or

soph und Astronom der schirasischen Schule des 10./16. Jahrhunderts”, *Iranistik* 6/2 (2009–2010), pp. 113–158.

⁷³ See Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Period*, cit., pp. 41–44.

⁷⁴ See R. Pourjavady and S. Schmidtke, “Twelver Shīʿī Theology”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Theology*, cit., p. 463.

⁷⁵ Cf. J. Malik, *Islamische Gelehrtenkultur in Nordindien: Entwicklungsgeschichte und Tendenzen am Beispiel von Lucknow*, Leiden-New York-Köln, Brill, 1997, p. 93; A.Q. Ahmed, “Logic in the Khayrābādī School in India: A Preliminary Exploration”, in *Law and Tradition in Classical Islamic Thought: Studies in Honor of Professor Hossein Modarressi*, ed. by M. Cook et al., New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp. 227–244, here 242: “Manuscript evidence suggests that in the context of India and before the Khayrābādīs, this work was of concentrated interest mainly in the late eleventh/seventeenth century”.

⁷⁶ J. McGinnis, “Pointers, Guides, Founts and Gifts: The Reception of Avicennan Physics in the East”, *Oriens* 41 (2013), pp. 433–456.

995/1585 or 1587),⁷⁷ and Āqā Ḥusayn Ḥwānsārī wrote some glosses on the text, focusing on the sections on Physics and Metaphysics.

Among other eminent Šī'ite scholars, who lived during the 17th century and moved to India, we can mention Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad Ġilānī (d. after 1066/1656),⁷⁸ disciple of Mīr Dāmād, and Mīrẓā 'Alī Ridā Tağallī Ardakānī Šīrāzī (d. 1098/1686), who had studied with Ḥusayn Ḥwānsārī. Tağallī spent some years under the patronage of the Mughal Emperor, Aurangzīb (r. 1658–1707) and during his stay in India he wrote a treatise in Persian on Šī'ī doctrine and on the imamate, entitled *Safīnat al-nağāt*.⁷⁹

In Indian Islamic world, the fame of *Ḥikmat al-išrāq* and of Suhrawardī's *Ḥayākil al-nūr* was only slightly inferior in comparison to that which it attained in the Persian world. Almost all the Muslim intellectuals in the region – associated with the School of Isfahan – were closely connected to the universe of *išrāqī* thought and the teachings of Mīr Dāmād and those of Mullā Ṣadrā spread throughout the whole Indian continent. In that variegated context, in which manifold creeds and doctrines intersected, one must also include translations of philosophical texts from Arabic into Persian. Avicenna's Metaphysics of the *Šifā'* was also translated into Persian, and to date two distinct translations have been identified.⁸⁰ Most of these witnesses are preserved in Iran, but two copies are found in the Indian continent, testifying to the intense intellectual activity of that period and the notable circulation of authoritative works towards India.

⁷⁷ AŠarite theologian from Shiraz, among whose texts we can mention his gloss on Ġalāl al-Dīn Dawānī's commentary on 'Aḍud al-Dīn Īğī's *Risāla fī l-'Aqā'id*, his gloss on Sayyid Šarīf Ġurğānī's commentary on Īğī's *al-Mawāqif*, and his glosses on, or reworking of, *Šifā'*. See R. Pourjavady, "Bāghnawī, Ḥabiballāh" s.v., in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*, ed. by K. Fleet et al., Leiden, Brill, 2015, available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_24272 (20 February 2021), 2012, pp. 28–30.

⁷⁸ Among Ġilānī's theological works: *Risāla fī al-ğabr wa-al-tafwīd*; *Risāla fī itbāt al-wağīb*; *Risāla fī bayān al-qadā' wa-al-qadar*; and *Risāla fī kayfiyyat al-i'tiqād fī maḍhab al-ḥaqq*. Cf. Ahmed and Pourjavady, "Theology in the Indian Subcontinent", cit., p. 611; Ġ. Subḥānī et al., *Muğam ṭabaqāt al-mutakallimīn*, vol. IV, Qom, Mu'asasa-yi Imām Šadiq, 1383Hš/2004, pp. 390–391.

⁷⁹ See A.Q. Ahmed and R. Pourjavady, "Theology in the Indian Subcontinent", in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Theology*, cit., p. 611.

⁸⁰ I. Panzeca, "On the Persian Translations of Avicenna's *Ilāhiyyāt*", *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 28 (2017), pp. 553–567.

6. *Šifāʾ* 's Commentators and Glossators

The definition “School of Isfahan” was coined by Henry Corbin⁸¹ and Seyyed Hossein Nasr to identify a philosophical and mystical movement patronised by Šāh ‘Abbās I. Isfahan became the symbolic place, both as the capital of the kingdom and as a cultural centre. The school represented the apogee of the Safavid Renaissance and Mīr Dāmād was symbolically considered its founder. The intellectual activity of those thinkers and their ideologies spread to the whole of Persia, Iraq, Syria and India.

This section will briefly take into account four of the most important and representative authors of commentaries and *compendia* on *Šifāʾ*, whose manuscript copies are currently preserved in India.⁸²

6.1. *Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Yaḥyā Qawāmi Šīrāzī* (a.k.a. *Mullā Šadrā*, 979–ca. 1050/1571 or 1572–ca. 1640)

Mullā Šadrā (*Šadr al-mutaʿallihīn*, Master of those who would be divine)⁸³ was probably the most influential philosopher after Avicenna. A writer and prolific commentator, an ingenious and acute thinker, he played a central role in the so-called School of Isfahan. He was born in Šīrāz and died in Basra, during the reigns of Šāh ‘Abbās I and Šāh Šafī. After Shiraz, he lived in Qazvin and finally in Isfahan. His two most influential and best-known teachers were Šayḥ Bahāʾ and Mīr Dāmād: with the former he studied jurisprudence, Qurʾānic exegesis and *aḥādīṭ*; with the latter he approached the speculative sciences, phi-

⁸¹ H. Corbin, “Confessions extatiques de Mīr Damad: maître de théologie à Ispahan”, in *Mélanges Louis Massignon*, ed. by H. Massé, vol. I, Damascus, Institut Français de Damas, 1956, pp. 331–378; Nasr, *The Islamic Intellectual Tradition in Persia*, cit., p. 239; see S.H. Rizvi, “Isfahan School of Philosophy” s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/isfahan-school-of-philosophy> (20 February 2021).

⁸² For preliminary comments on the career of the *Šifāʾ* in India, see A.Q. Ahmed, “The *Šifāʾ* in India I: Reflections on the Evidence of the Manuscripts”, *Oriens* 40 (2012), pp. 199–222; Ahmed and Pourjavady, “Theology in the Indian Subcontinent”, cit., p. 611; Subḥānī *et al.*, *Muḡam ṭabaqāt al-mutakallimīn*, vol. IV, cit., pp. 144f.

⁸³ S.H. Rizvi, “Mollā Šadrā Šīrāzī” s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/molla-sadra-sirazi> (20 February 2021).

losophy and theology. Subsequently he returned to Shiraz and then moved for a period of meditation to the holy city of Qom. He presumably married in Shiraz and had a large family. However, the manuscript witnesses attest to the itinerant life of Mullā Ṣadrā and the continual exchange of letters with his spiritual guide, Mīr Dāmād. During the years spent in Qom he educated numerous students, including Fayḍ Kāšānī, 'Abd al-Razzāq Lāhīgī and Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad Nayrizī, who became his sons-in-law, marrying three of his daughters. When in 1040/1630 or 1631 he moved definitively to Shiraz, he was the most important teacher in the Madrasa-yi Ḥan.

Mullā Ṣadrā investigated in particular the Peripatetic works of Avicenna and his students, the so-called *Theology of Aristotle*, and the illuminationist works of Suhrawardī. He was considered a revolutionary in the metaphysical sphere thanks to the primacy of the doctrine of existence within the debate on Avicenna's distinction between existence and essence in contingent beings.⁸⁴ Ṣadrā maintained the necessity of the "method of understanding reality through a mixture of logical reasoning, spiritual inspiration, and a deep meditation" founded on the principal scriptural sources of the Šī'ī tradition.⁸⁵

Mollā Ṣadrā has become the dominant philosopher of the Islamic East and his approach to the nature of philosophy has been exceptionally influential. His real achievement apart from his doctrinal propositions was to effect a culmination of a tendency within the philosophical schools of the post-Avicennan period, namely to synthesize and reconcile reason and intuition, philosophy and mysticism within a largely late Neoplatonic paradigm of doing philosophy. Philosophy is thus a practice and a way of life in which reflection, reading, and learning are always complemented by spiritual practices and exercises. One cannot become a sage purely on the basis on one's own intellectual efforts, nor can one truly understand the nature of reality as an illiterate ascetic reliant solely on mystical intuition. In this way, Mollā Ṣadrā, in a manner representative of a number of

⁸⁴ Cf. Benevich, "The Essence-Existence Distinction: Four Elements of the Post-Avicennian Metaphysical Dispute (11–13th Centuries)", *Oriens* 45 (2017), pp. 203–258; A. Bertolacci, "The Distinction of Essence and Existence in Avicenna's Metaphysics: The Text and Its Context", in *Islamic Philosophy, Science, Culture, and Religion: Studies in Honor of Dimitri Gutas*, ed. by F. Opwis and D. Reisman, Leiden, Brill, 2012, pp. 257–288.

⁸⁵ S.H. Rizvi, "Mollā Ṣadrā Šīrāzi" s.v., cit.

Muslim thinkers insistent upon the median way of their faith, represents a mean between excessive rationalism and the unfettered claims of Sufis.⁸⁶

An eclectic scholar who wrote on philosophy, theology, mysticism and scriptural exegesis, Mullā Ṣadrā produced over forty-five works, many of them late in life. Among his main works on metaphysics and commentaries on philosophical *summae* we can mention the following: 1) *Al-Hikma al-muta‘aliya fi al-asfār al-‘aqliyya al-ārba‘a* (The transcendent wisdom of the four journeys of the intellect); 2) *Al-Šawāhid al-rubūbiyya fi al-manābiḡ al-sulūkiyya* (Proofs of divine along the path of the wayfarers); 3) *Al-Hikma al-‘Aršiyya* (The wisdom of the throne); 4) *Al-Mabda’ wa-al-ma‘ād* (The provenance and destination); 5) *Kitāb al-Mašā‘ir* (The book of ontological inspirations); *Šarḥ al-Hidāya* (Commentary on *Guidance in Wisdom*); *Ta’liqat ‘alā Šarḥ Hikmat al-Isrāq of Quṭb al-Dīn Širāzī* (Notes upon the commentary on the *Wisdom of illumination*); *Ta’liqat ‘alā al-Ilāhiyyāt min Kitāb al-Šifā’* (Notes on the Metaphysics of *Kitāb al-Šifā’*).⁸⁷

6.2. Aḥmad Ibn Zayn al-‘Ābidīn Ḥusaynī ‘Alawī ‘Āmilī Isfahānī (a.k.a. Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad, d. between 1054–1060/1644–1650)

Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad⁸⁸ belonged to one of the big Šī‘ī families of the Jabal Amel region in Syria, from which many Šī‘ites emigrated to Iran during the Safavid Empire. A native of Isfahan and an illustrious member of that school, he was the intellectual teacher of several generations of students. The *iğāzas* that were conferred on him by Mīr Dāmād

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁷ For Mullā Ṣadrā’s works see Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, cit., suppl. vol. II, 1938, pp. 588–589; I. Kalin, “An Annotated Bibliography of the Works of Mullā Ṣadrā with a Brief Account of His Life”, *Islamic Studies* 42/1 (2003), pp. 21–62; S.H. Rizvi, *Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī: His Life and Works and the Sources for Safavid Philosophy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press on behalf of the University of Manchester, 2007; Id., “Reconsidering the life of Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī (d. 1641): Notes Towards an Intellectual Biography”, *Iran* 40 (2002), pp. 181–201. Furthermore, C. Bonmariage, “Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Šīrāzī’s (d. 1635) *Divine Witnesses*”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, cit., pp. 465–487; Nasr, *The Islamic Intellectual Tradition in Persia*, cit., pp. 271–303. See Appendix II.

⁸⁸ H. Corbin, “Aḥmad ‘Alawī” s.v., in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ahmad-b-15> (20 February 2021).

and Šayḥ Bahā' are precious sources for his intellectual and spiritual biography, because they show that his education included the complete curriculum of traditional studies, *ḥikma*, *kalām*, *fiqh* and *tafsīr*.⁸⁹

'Alawī has been listed among Peripatetic philosophers and defined an *išrāqī* Avicennian. He wrote a commentary on Avicenna's *Ilāhiyyāt I–X* entitled *Miftāḥ al-Šifā' wa-al-'urwa al-wuṭqā fī šarḥ Ilāhiyyāt al-Šifā'* (The key of the *Šifā'* and the firm handhold in the commentary of *Šifā'*'s Metaphysics), or *Minḥāğ al-Šifā' fī al-Ilāhiyyāt* (The Methodology of *Šifā'* in Metaphysics).⁹⁰ This is a vast and original *summa* that expounds the characteristics of Šīrī Avicennian thought in the School of Isfahan, where Mīr Sayyid continues the dialogue with Avicenna begun by Mīr Dāmād in his *Qabasāt* (Firebrands). The first lines of the text explain the title of Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad's work and its reference to the Oriental philosophy (*al-Ḥikmat al-mašriqiyya*) of Avicenna, which he considers the key to interpreting the *Šifā'*. Still more significant is the theoretical support that Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad derives from the oriental theosophy of Suhrawardī, where the orient indicates the spiritual world.

A final point of special interest is connected to the fact that the metaphysics of Avicenna's *Šifā'* concludes with an outline of a prophetic philosophy that opens the way to the prologue of the "Book of oriental theosophy" of Sohrawardī.⁹¹

Among the other works of Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad, we can mention the following: 1) a commentary on *al-Qabasāt* by Mīr Dāmād; 2) a commentary on Mīr Dāmād's unfinished *Taqwīm al-īmān* (Rectification of faith), written in Arabic and dated 1023/1614, it is called *Kašf al-ḥaqā'iq fī šarḥ taqwīm al-īmān*; 3) an Arabic treatise known as *Riyād al-quds* (The gardens of holiness), *al-Ta'liqāt al-qudsiyya* (Sacred notes), or *Mašābiḥ al-quds wa-qanādīl al-uns* (The lamps of holiness and the torches of intimacy). Dated 1011/1602 and dedicated to Šāh 'Abbās I, it is a supercommentary on the commentaries of Qūšğī and Ḥafri on the Metaphysics section of the *Tağrīd al-i'tiqād* by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī. Sayyid Aḥmad composed a summary of this work dated 1037/1627.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁹⁰ See Appendix II.

⁹¹ H. Corbin, "Aḥmad 'Alawī" s.v., cit.

6.3. *Āqā Husayn ibn Muḥammad Ḥwānsārī (1016–1099/1607–1687)*

Ḥwānsārī⁹² was one of the most distinguished intellectual figures in Isfahan. His depth of knowledge in philosophy and religious sciences, mathematics and astronomy, led him to be called the “master of all and everything”, the “master of humanity”, and the “eleventh intellect”. He moved to Isfahan and studied at the Madrasa-yi Ḥwāga Malik; his teachers were among others Mīr Findiriskī, *Sultān al-‘ulamā’*, Muḥammad Taqī Maḡlisī, and Muḥammad Bāqir Sabzawārī.

Ḥwānsārī was critical of the most important ideas of Mīr Dāmād and Mullā Ṣadrā and had intellectual controversies with his contemporary Muḥammad Bāqir Sabzawārī, although he was very close to the latter since he had married his sister.

He accused his rival of “fanatical partisanship” (*ta’aṣṣub*) to Avicenna and of mistaking the task of a commentator and glossator on Avicenna’s works with simply establishing Avicenna’s intended meaning.⁹³

His students include: his son, Ğamāl Ḥwānsārī, who commented on the first two books of the Natural philosophy section (*Ṭabī‘iyyāt*) of the *Šifā’* (both father and son wrote glosses on the *Šarḥ al-Īsārāt*)⁹⁴; Mullā Širwānī (d. 1098/1687), another glossator of the Physics of the *Šifā’*; Mullā Awliyā’ (fl. XI/XVII c.), who wrote glosses on the Metaphysics of the *Šifā’*; Ḥātūnābādī (d. 1116/1704), who glossed on the *Īsārāt* and *Šifā’*; Afandī Tabrīzī Iṣfahānī (d. 1130/1718), who wrote incomplete glosses on the *Ilāhiyyāt*.

Among his main works are the following: 1) glosses on the Metaphysics of *Šifā’*;⁹⁵ 2) glosses on the sections on Natural philosophy and Metaphysics from the *Muḥākamāt* by Quṭb al-Dīn Taḥṭānī Rāzī (d. 766/1364) on Ṭūsī’s commentary on Avicenna’s *Īsārāt* and in response to Mīrzā Ğān’s gloss on Quṭb al-Dīn’s *al-Ilāhiyyāt min*

⁹² K. El-Rouayheb, *The Development of Arabic Logic (1200–1800)*, Basel, Schwabe Verlag, 2019, pp. 155–158.

⁹³ *Ibidem*, p. 155.

⁹⁴ Āqā Husayn and Āqā Ğamāl Ḥwānsārī, *al-Ḥāšiya ‘alā Šurūḥ al-Īsārāt*, ed. by A. ‘Ābidī, 2 vols., Qom, Būstān-i Kitāb, 1388Hš/2009.

⁹⁵ See Appendix II.

al-muḥākamāt;⁹⁶ 3) a gloss on Dawānī's first gloss on the sections on Metaphysics from Qūšǧī's commentary on Ṭūsī's *Ṭaǧrīd al-kalām*; 4) supergloss on Ġurǧānī's gloss on Quṭb al-Dīn Rāzī's commentary on Urmawī's *Maṭāli*.⁹⁷ Ḥwānsārī wrote two commentaries on the Metaphysics of *Šifā'*: the first contains a long introduction, extant in many Iranian manuscripts; the second one is a severe attack on the criticisms produced by Sabzawārī.⁹⁸ He probably also translated into Persian the Metaphysics section of *Šifā'*.⁹⁹

6.4. *Faḍl-i Imām ibn Muḥammad Aršad Ḥayrābādī (d. 1243/1827 or 1828)*

In the mid-18th century, alongside the Isfahan intellectuals, another circle of scholars started to emerge, that of the Ḥayrābādiyya. Some glosses and commentaries of theirs concentrated on the issue of the definition of God, and their contribution to the study of logic was a major one. Over the years, the Ḥayrābādīs began to emerge as the most important and prolific authors in the field of theology. Avicenna's works and the commentaries on his texts were part of standard Ḥayrābādiyya training and found extensive commitment and criticism on the part of these thinkers.¹⁰⁰ Hence, about a century after the end of the Safavid Empire, the Mīr Dāmād school was associated in India with Ḥayrābādī philosophers, who settled in Delhi in the 19th century.¹⁰¹

⁹⁶ Q.D.R. al-Taḥṭānī, *Al-Muḥākamāt 'alā šarḥay al-Išārāt*, Cairo, al-Maṭba'a al-Āmīra, 1290/1873 or 1874; Id., *Al-Muḥākamāt bayn šarḥay al-Išārāt, al-Ilābiyyāt* [published together M.Ġ. Bāǧnawī, *Hāšiya 'alā al-Muḥākamāt bayn šarḥay al-Išārāt*], ed. by M. Hādizāda, Tehran, Mīrāt-i maktūb, 1381HŠ/2002.

⁹⁷ El-Rouayheb, *The Development of Arabic Logic (1200–1800)*, cit., p. 158.

⁹⁸ Āqā Buzurg Ṭīhrānī, *Al-Darī'a ilā tašānīf al-šī'a*, cit., vol. VI, p. 142; *Anthologie des philosophes iraniens*, vol. I, cit., pp. 145–150 (French part), pp. 362–407 (Arabic text). See Appendix II.

⁹⁹ See D. Šafā, *Tārīḫ-i adabiyyāt dar Irān*, Tehran, Ferdowsi Publication, 1378HŠ/1999 or 2000, vol. V, pp. 314–315.

¹⁰⁰ A.Q. Ahmed and R. Pourjavady, "Theology in the Indian Subcontinent", in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Theology*, cit., pp. 614–617; Rizvi, "Mīr Dāmād in India: Islamic Philosophical Traditions and the Problem of Creation", cit., pp. 9–23.

¹⁰¹ Id., "Mīr Dāmād and the debate on *Ḥudūt-i Dabrī* in India", in *Muslim Cultures in the Indo-Iranian World during the Early-Modern and Modern Periods*, ed. by D. Hermann and F. Speziale, Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2010, pp. 449–473, esp. p. 464 ff.;

Faḍl-i Imām¹⁰² was born in Khairabad, near Lucknow, and also acquired renown thanks to the teaching of ‘Abd al-Wāḡid Ḥayrābādī (d. 1216/1802), the grandson of Muḥammad A‘lam Sandilāwī (d. 1197/1783), seen as the founder of the intellectual lineage of the Ḥayrābādiyya. ‘Abd al-Wāḡid Ḥayrābādī in turn had studied with students of Kamāl al-Dīn Fatihpūrī, the teacher of Baḥr al-‘Ulūm al-Laknawī. Faḍl-i Imām was employed in the British East India Company as a *mufti* and *ṣadr al-ṣudūr* (head of religious endowments) in Delhi and acquired an excellent reputation as a logic. He epitomised *Šifā’ (Talḥīṣ al-Šifā’)*, and his son Faḍl-i Ḥaqq ibn Faḍl-i Imām Ḥayrābādī (d. 1278/1861)¹⁰³ wrote important works, including *Ḥāšīya ‘alā Talḥīṣ al-Šifā’*, a gloss on his father’s *compendium*. Among the texts by Faḍl-i Imām on logic, mention must be made of the following: 1) a commentary on *al-Mīzān* (The balance), an introductory handbook of uncertain authorship; 2) a gloss on Mīr Zāhid’s gloss on Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s treatise on conception and assent; 3) an introductory handbook on logic entitled *al-Mirqāt* (The staircase).

Khayrābādī’s epitome of the *Shifā’* (Cure), the philosophical masterpiece of Ibn Sīnā, is even more intriguing. It clearly follows the order of the latter’s shorter philosophical compendium, the *Ishārāt* (Pointers), for the first part (*Fann*) and, as a consequence, of Athīr al-Dīn al-Abharī’s (d. 663/1264) *Hidāyat al-ḥikma* (Correct Guide to Wisdom), a philosophical compendium that was central in *madrassa* education in South Asia. In other words, Khayrābādī rearranges this part of the *Shifā’* in view of another textual tradition; the significance of this decision, if any, should be explored in future scholarship. The epitome, which reverts to the traditional order of the *Shifā’* starting from the second part, treats the

Ahmed, “Logic in the Khayrābādī School in India”, cit., p. 242: “One finds in the works of the Khayrābādīs extended engagement and criticism of Avicenna. See, for example, Faḍl-i Ḥaqq Ḥayrābādī’s *Ḥāshīyat sharḥ Sullam Qāḍī Mubārak* (Lahore, Evergreen Press, n.d.), 107”.

¹⁰² A.Q. Ahmed, “Faḍl-i Imām Khayrābādī” s.v., in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*, cit., available at https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-3/fadl-i-haqq-khayrabadi-COM_27825 (8 July 2021); El-Rouayheb, *The Development of Arabic Logic*, cit., pp. 195–198.

¹⁰³ J. Malik, “Faḍl-i Ḥaqq Khayrābādī” s.v., in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*, cit., available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_26908 (8 July 2021); A.Q. Ahmed and J. McGinnis, “Faḍl-i Ḥaqq Khayrābādī’s (d. 1861), *Al-Ḥadiyya al-Sa‘īdiyya*”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, cit., pp. 535–559.

entirety of Physics of Ibn Sīnā's text (with a few lacunae). A close study of its contents and arguments (and of the commentary on this work by the author's son, Faḍl-i Ḥaqq Khayrābādī (d. 1277/1861) will determine if it makes any meaningful contribution to the tradition of the *Physics* (Ahmed and McGinnis, "Hadīyya").¹⁰⁴

7. Inventory of the Commentaries on Ibn Sīnā's al-Šifā' Preserved in India

In this chapter, I provide a general description of the manuscript witnesses of the commentaries on Avicenna's *Šifā'* currently preserved in India, and the provisional results of an ongoing research on the subject.



FIG. 4. Aligarh, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University, MS 'Ulūm 3 'A, Ibn Sīnā, *Kitāb al-Šifā'* (with *marginalia*).

¹⁰⁴ Ahmed, "Faḍl-i Imām Khayrābādī" s.v., cit.; Id., "Post-Classical Philosophical Commentaries/Glosses: Innovation in the Margins", *Oriens* 41 (2013), pp. 317–348.

The following list contains all the *testimonia* identified so far (as of June 2020), pointing out their chronology (dating mainly from the Safavid and Qajar periods), their copyists, places of copying and their formats. The information on the witnesses is mainly based on the data drawn from the archives and the bibliographic sources.¹⁰⁵

1) Aligarh, Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University
<https://www.amu.ac.in/libraries/maulana-azad-library/manuscripts>

MS 564 (*Habīb Ganġ* Collection)

Author: Ibn Sīnā

Content: note on *Šifā'*

Copyist: 'Alī Naqī ibn Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad

Date of copying: 1266/1849

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta'liq*; the text is transcribed in black and *ta'liq* in red

Foliation/pagination: ff. 113; lines 17; size 23 x 19, 15 x 10 cm.

Seals: the first fly-leaf bears a seal of Zafar Maḥdī dated 1265

References: https://api.amu.ac.in/storage/file/pdf/amulib/HG_V2.pdf
(p. 248)

MS 566 (*Habīb Ganġ* Collection)

Author: Ḥusayn ibn Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥwānsārī

Content: glosses on *Ilābiyyāt* (completed in 1064/1653)

Copyist: Ibn Muḥammad Yūsuf al-Rāzī

Date of copying: 1107/1695

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta'liq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 262; lines 24; size 26 x 18, 16 x 10 cm.

References: https://api.amu.ac.in/storage/file/pdf/amulib/HG_V2.pdf
(p. 249)

Incipit:

بسم الله - الحمد لله رب العالمين - لا يبعد أن يقال في ترك الموصوف إيماء لطيفة في آخر الحاشية [...]

¹⁰⁵ For the acronyms of the bibliographic references mentioned, see Appendix I. It is to be noted that the transcriptions shown are almost all extracted from the reference catalogues of each manuscript and reported *verbatim*. We shall inform the reader that the original transcriptions have been normalized with diacritical dots where needed and according to my interpretation.

Colophon:

صورة خط المصنف رحمه الله تعالى وقع الفراغ بحمد الله وتوفيقه [...]

MS 567 (*Habīb Ganğ* Collection)

Author: Ḥusayn ibn Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥwānsārī

Content: glosses on *Ilābiyyāt* (completed in 1064/1653)

Date of copying: 1103/1691

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nash*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 81; lines 27; size 23 x 19, 14 x 8 cm.

Description: folios laminated. The first fly-leaf bear three illegible seals along with a round seal which is partly effaced

References: https://api.amu.ac.in/storage/file/pdf/amulib/HG_V2.pdf (p. 249)

Incipit:

بسم الله - الحمد لله رب العالمين - قوله في ابتداء طلب موضوع الفلسفة [...]

MS 110/31 (*Subḥān Allāh* Collection)

Author: 'Allāma Faḍl Imām Ḥayrābādī

Content: summary of *Šifā'*

Date of copying: 1227/1812

Language: Arabic

Foliation/pagination: pp. 219

References: https://api.amu.ac.in/storage/file/pdf/amulib/Subhanullah_Collection.pdf (p. 80)

MS University 'Ulūm 3 'A

Author: Ibn Sīnā (with marginal notes by Mullā Ṣadrā and Āqā Ḥusayn Ḥwānsārī)

Content: *Ilābiyyāt al-Šifā'*

Copyist: not mentioned, from an exemplar copied by Ḥakīm 'Alī Ṣāhib Kalām

Date of copying: probably before 1263/1856 or 1857

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta'liq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 124

Seals: three seals at the last page (one being dated 1263/1846 or 1847)

References: <https://www.avicennaproject.eu/#/manuscripts/list/227>

Explicit and Colophon:

تمت الكتاب الشفاء بحمد الله وحسن // توفيقه تمت المقالة العاشرة من الفلسفة // الأولى وهو الكتاب
الأخير من الشفاء //
نقل از خط مبارک حکیم علی صاحب کلام نوشته شد.

2) Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh Government Oriental Manuscripts Library and Research Institute (form.: Āṣafiyya Library)

MS 236

Author: Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (Mullā Ṣadrā)

Content: glosses on *Šifā'*

Language: Arabic

References: O, II: 83; K, II: 1198–1199

MS 431

Author: 'Alī Riḍā Ṭarzī ibn Mawlānā Šams al-Dīn Ḥalḥālī

Content: Persian translation of *Ilāhiyyāt* plus commentary

Place and date of composition: Kabul, 6 Rabi' 1048/17 August 1638

Language: Arabic, Persian

Script: *Šikasta*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 348, lines 21

References: Da₂: 95; Es: 8; Iş: 100; K, III: 492–493; O, II: 85

Colophon:

تمام شد ترجمه فن ثالث عشر کتاب شفاء بعون افاضات الهیه و بمددکاری ایزد بیچون در بلده کابل در وقت چاشتگاه در تاریخ ششم ربیع الثانی در سنه هزار و چهل و هشت هجری و مؤلف // این ترجمه مشوش النظام علی رضا طرزی ابن مولانا شمس الدین خلخالی از صاحب انصاف متوقع اصلاح این تالیف است // چه حقیر را فرصت نظر ثانی درین واقع نشد. امید که اصلاح نظر صاحب این فن این نسخه را برایش آورد بحق محمد و آله // تمت بالخیر.

MS 607

Author: Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (Mullā Ṣadrā)

Content: glosses on *Šifā'*

Language: Arabic

References: O, II: 86

MS 600

Author: Ibn Sīnā (with glosses by Mullā Ṣadrā)

Content: *Ilāhiyyāt al-Šifā'*

Date of copying: 1303/1885 or 1886

Language: Arabic

References: R: 444 (19)

MS 853

Author: Qāḍī Baġdād Qiwām al-Dīn ibn Ḥasan al-Ma'rūf

Content: glosses on *Ilāhiyyāt*

Language: Arabic

References: O, II: 88

MS No number

Author: Maḥmūd 'Alī (?)

Content: glosses on *Ilāhiyyāt*

Language: Arabic

References: O, III: 126

3) Hyderabad, Salar Jung Museum and Library
<http://www.salarjungmuseum.in/Library.html>

MS Phil. no. 12

Author: Āqā Ḥusayn ibn Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥwānsārī

Content: glosses on *Ilāhiyyāt* (completed in 1064/1653)

Copyist: Nūr al-Dīn ibn 'Alī Riḍā al-Daylamī

Date of copying: 1078/1667

Language: Arabic

Script: small *Nash* cursive

Foliation/pagination: ff. 277, lines 22, size 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ x 5

Seals: library of Farruḥ Siyar

Remarks: written in the life-time of the annotator

References: N: 8

Incipit:

الحمد لله رب العالمين الصلوة على محمد وآله الطاهرين، فصل، قوله في ابتداء طلب موضوع الفلسفه
الأولى والحام لفظ الابتداء بناء على أنه الفصل الثاني أيضاً في ذلك الطلب وتتمه له [...]

Explicit:

ذلك ويكون كلامه لمن الإيجاد الذي يكون هذا العدم المطلق أولى بأن يكون إيجادا وهو أيضا كما ترى،
فتدبر، تمت بالخير.

4) Kolkata, The Asiatic Society Library
<https://www.asiaticsocietykolkata.org/>

MS Q 25 (old no. 956)
Author: Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (Mullā Ṣadrā)
Content: glosses on *Ilāhīyyāt*
Language: Arabic
Script: *Nash*
References: U: 106

5) Mysore, Oriental Library of Late Tippoo Sultan of Mysore

MS V (Arabic Books, Philosophy)
Author: Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (Mullā Ṣadrā)
Content: glosses on *Ilāhīyyāt*
Language: Arabic
Script: *Nash*
References: Sw: 118

6) Patna, Khudā Bakhsh Oriental Public Library (Bankipur)
<http://kblibrary.bih.nic.in/>

MS 2226 (HL no. 2822)
Author: Ibn Sīnā (with marginal notes by Mullā Ṣadrā)
Content: *Ilāhīyyāt al-Šifā'* (I.1–III.5; X.5)
Copyist: 'Aṭā' Allāh
Date of copying: 1082/1671 or 1672
Language: Arabic
Script: *Nasta'liq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 163, lines 19, size 8 x 5, 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 3 cm.

References: <https://www.avicennaproject.eu/#/manuscripts/list/229>; A: 70; B (1937): 815; E₂: 32; M: 170; Ma₂, XXI: 5

Incipit:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم // الحمد لله رب العالمين والصلوة على سيدنا محمد وآله الأكرمين أجمعين [...]

Colophon:

تمام شد بوقت چاشت روز شنبه بتاریخ بیست و سیوم شهر شوال سنه ۱۰۸۲ کتاب العبد عطاء الله.

MS 2227

Author: Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (Mullā Šadrā)

Content: glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*

Copyist: Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-‘Aqīlī

Date of copying: not dated, apparently XII/XVIII; the copyist at the end says that he transcribed the copy from an autograph manuscript dated 1044/1634 or 1635

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta‘līq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 146, lines 31, size 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 5, 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ cm.

References: Ma₂: 5; B (1937): 815

Incipit:

قال قدس سره إن العلوم الفلسفية كما قد أشير إليه إلخ ذكر الشيخ في الفصل الثاني من الفن الأول [...]
وهي في المنطق إن الغرض من الفلسفة أن يوقف على حقائق الأشياء كلها إلخ [...]

Colophon:

قد نقلت هذه النسخة الشريفة [...] من خط مؤلفها المولى العلامة المحقق مولانا صدر الدين الشيرازي في سنة أربع وأربعين بعد ألف [...] وأنا العبد المذنب [...] محمد بن حسين العقيلي الأسترابادي -

MS 2228

Author: Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (Mullā Šadrā)

Content: glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*

Date of copying: not dated; three seals of ‘Awaḍ kings of the XII/XVIII at the beginning

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nash*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 274, lines 25, size $9\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, $6\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$ cm.

Description: the copy contains a beautiful frontispiece; gold-ruled borders

References: Ma₂: 5–6; B (1937): 815

MS 2229

Author: Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Ābidīn ‘Alawī

Content: a detailed gloss on *Ilābiyyāt*; the copy is incomplete and ends abruptly (وكما يجوز ان يدل لفظه)

Date of composition: 1065/1654 or 1655 during the Safavid reign of Šāh ‘Abbās II

Date of copying: not dated (apparently XII/XVIII)

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta‘liq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 349, lines 25, size $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6$, $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ cm.

References: Ma₂: 6; B (1937): 815

Incipit:

الحمد لمن رفع سرادقات اللاهوت [...] وسمينا شرحنا هذا بمفتاح الشفاء [...] في شرح إلهيات كتاب الشفاء [...] اتفق تصنيف هذا الشرح في زمان الدولة القاهرة [...] شاه عباس خلد الله ملكه إلخ [...]

Note (f. 143v):

مفتاح الشفاء [...] لأحمد بن زين العابدين العلوي [...] وهي حاشية لإلهيات الشفاء

MS 3466 (HL no. 3032)

Author: Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (Mullā Šadrā)

Content: glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*

Date of copying: 1113/1701

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta‘liq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 278, lines 24, size $18\frac{1}{2} \times 16$; $16 \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ cm.

Description: slightly worm eaten; repaired and bound

References: Ma₂, XL: 2

MS 3468 (HL no. 3561) (part I)

Author: Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (Mullā Šadrā). His name is not traceable in the manuscript, but he refers to his work entitled

Al-Asfār al-arba‘a

Content: glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*

Date of copying: 1268/1851

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta'liq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 111, lines 21, size 28 x 22^{1/2}, 23 x 12 cm.

Description: slightly worm eaten; fully laminated and bound in two parts

References: Ma2, XL: 3

Incipit:

الحمد لله رب العالمين والصلوة على محمد وآله الطاهرين. في ابتداء طلب موضوع الفلسفة الأولى إتمام لفظ
الابتداء بناء على أنّ الفصل الثاني أيضاً في ذلك الطلب [...] وإتمّ جعلها فصلين لا فصلاً واحداً إلخ [...]

Explicit:

وصدر غير متناهية وهو الهيولى انتهى ولا يخفى ما في لعل هذا ذكره الشيخ

MS 3469 (HL no. 3561) (part II)

Author: Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (Mullā Ṣadrā)

Content: glosses on *Ilābiyyāt* (the second part of the previous work)

Date of copying: 1268/1851

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta'liq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 111 (112–223), lines 21, size 28 x 22^{1/2}, 23 x 12 cm.

Description: slightly worm eaten; fully laminated and bound in two parts

References: Ma2, XL: 4

Incipit:

لا ربط بينها [...] ثم قيل بعد ذلك [...] الأول أنّ قولكم الجسم أو الاتصال من حيث هو جسم واتصال
ليس قوّة على ما مر علم [...] إلخ

Explicit:

بالزمان إلى الوجود [...] ويكون محصل كلامه أنّ الاتحاد الذي يكون بعد العدم المطلق أولى بأن يكون
اتحاداً وهو أيضاً كما ترى -

7) Rampur, Raza Library
<http://razalibrary.gov.in/>

MS 1138

Author: 'Alī Riḍā Ṭarzī ibn Mawlānā Šams al-Dīn Ḥalḥālī

Content: Persian translation of *Ilāhiyyāt* plus commentary
Place and date of composition: Kabul, 6 Rabi^r 1048/17 August 1638
Language: Arabic, Persian
Script: Šikasta
Foliation/pagination: ff. 498, lines 21
Description: Some pages are slightly worm-eaten
References: S: 313
Colophon:

ترجمه فن ثالث عشر کتاب شفاء بعون // افاضات الهیه وممددکاری ایزد بیچون در کابل در وقت چاشتگاه در تاریخ ششم ربیع الثانی // در سنه هزار و چهل و هشت هجریه. و مؤلف این ترجمه مشوش النظام علی رضا طرزی ابن // مولانا شمس الدین خلخالی [ز] صاحب انصاف متوقع اصلاح این تالیف است، // چه حقیر را فرصت نظر ثانی درین واقع نشد. امید که اصلاح نظر صاحب این فن // این نسخه را برآیش آورد // بحق محمد. // تمت بالخیر.

MS 3489
Author: Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Širāzī (Mullā Šadrā)
Content: glosses on *Ilāhiyyāt*
Date of copying: 1077/1666
Language: Arabic
Script: *Nasta'liq* and *Nash*
Foliation/pagination: ff. 305, lines 23, size 20,4 x 14,3 cm.
Description: badly worm-eaten, but laminated
References: As: 446–447
Incipit:

بسم - قوله قدس سره إن العلوم الفلسفية كما قد أشير إليه - ذكر الشيخ في الفصل الثاني من الفن الأول من الجملة الأولى وهي في المنطق -

MS 3490
Author: Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Širāzī (Mullā Šadrā)
Content: glosses on *Ilāhiyyāt*
Date of copying: 1273/1855 or 1856
Language: Arabic
Script: *Nasta'liq*
Foliation/pagination: ff. 318, lines 18, size 24 x 18 cm.
Description: good, worm-eaten
References: Kh, I: 386 (MS 60); As: 446–447

MS 3491

Author: Āqā Ḥusayn ibn Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥwānsārī

Content: glosses on *Ilābīyyāt* (completed in 1064/1653)

Copyist: Muḥammad al-Tunikābunī (d. 1124/1712)

Date of copying: 1086/1676

Seals: two seal-impressions at the end of Muḥammad al-Tunikābunī (dated 1084/1673); f. 1r autograph and seal of Muḥammad Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥāġī Muḥammad 'Alī al-Iṣfahānī (dated 1230/1815); another seal of Sa'īd al-Dawla Bahādur.

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta'liq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 134, lines 27, size 24,3 x 15 cm.

Description: good, slightly worm-eaten and water-stained

References: Kh, I: 386 (MS 62, dated 1084/1673, is it the same copy?);

As: 448–449

Incipit:

الحمد لله رب العالمين - في ابتداء طلب موضوع الفلسفة الأولى - إتمام لفظ الابتداء بناء على أن الفصل الثاني أيضاً في ذلك الطلب -

MS 3492

Author: Āqā Ḥusayn ibn Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥwānsārī

Content: glosses on *Ilābīyyāt*

Copyist: Raġab 'Alī ibn 'Abd al- 'Alī al-Ḥalḥālī al-Iṣfahānī

Date of copying: 1125/1713

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasḥ*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 390, lines 21, size 24 x 13,5 cm.

Seals: f. 1v autograph of Muḥammad Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad 'Alī al-Iṣfahānī (dated 1243/1827 or 1828)

Description: good, slightly worm-eaten

References: Kh, I: 386 (MS 61); As: 448–449

MS 3493

Author: Muḥammad Faḍl Imām Ḥayrābādī

Content: incomplete abridgement of *Ṭabī'īyyāt* (the unique copy attested)

Copyist: Tafaḍḍul 'Alī, known as Ḥāġī 'Alī al-Dihlawī

Date of copying: 1248/1833

Language: Arabic

Script: *Nasta'liq*

Foliation/pagination: ff. 126, lines 27, size 30 x 17 cm.

Description: good, worm-eaten, but repaired

References: Kh, I: 381 (MS 23, dated 1242/1826 or 1827, is it the same copy?); As: 448–449

Incipit (abruptly):

فإنها نفسها جوهر موجود وهي أيضاً مستعد لقبول أشياء كثيرة -

8. Concluding Remarks

The survey exemplifies the extraordinary influence of the Avicennian tradition during the Safavid and Mughal dynasties and the spread of texts and doctrines throughout the whole Iranian world and the Indian subcontinent. This inquiry constitutes a preliminary step towards a more exhaustive overview of a significant phenomenon concerning commentaries on Avicenna's masterpiece and therefore towards a more faithful and adequate reconstruction of the processes of reception and assimilation of the work, which flourished once again between the 16th and 18th centuries. The intersection of different factors determined a precise chain of transmission of the *opus* in question, and its legacy involved different epochs, cities, intellectual milieus and major personalities. It has been ascertained that from 17th century the study of Avicenna's *summae* also intensified in India, and the interest in them reappeared in about the 19th century with the ḤJayrābādī School.

The witnesses considered testify to the intense exegetical activity of the epoch and the circulation of authoritative philosophical texts, although a systematic research is still in progress. More in-depth work will be carried out on the supercommentaries and superglosses on the *Šifā'*, as well as on the manuscript copies preserved in the Middle East, always bearing in mind that the largest concentration of codices is preserved in Iran.

panzeca@fscire.it
Fondazione per le scienze religiose
via U. Maddalena, 112 – 90137 Palermo
Italia

APPENDIX I

Acronyms of the bibliographic sources

A = G.C. Anawati, *Mu'allafāt Ibn Sīnā, Essai de bibliographie avicennienne*, Cairo, Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1950, pp. 78–79.

Am = Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Ilābiyyāt min Kitāb Al-Šifā'*, cit.

As = 'Aršī, *Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in Raza Library Rampur*, vol. IV, cit., pp. 446–449.

B = Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, cit.

C = Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Šifā'*, *al-Ilābiyyāt*, cit.

D = M. Dirāyatī, *Fibrīst-vārah-i Dastnivištāhā-yi Īrān (Dinā), The Abridged Catalogue of Iran Manuscripts*, Tehran, Al-Javad Cultural & Research Institute, 1389Hš/2010, vol. I, p. 105; vol. II, pp. 133, 214; vol. IV, pp. 308–312, 804–805; vol. VI, pp. 308–312, 804, 1202–1203, 1207; vol. VII, p. 674; vol. IX, pp. 1037–1038; vol. X, p. 841, vol. XI, p. 409.

Da₁ = M.T. Dānišpažūh, *Fibrīst-i Kitābhāna-yi Ihdā'i-yi Āqā-yi Sayyid Muḥammad-i Miškāt, Kitābhāna-yi Dānišgāh-i Tibrān, Catalogue méthodique, descriptif et raisonné des manuscrits philosophiques, mystiques et apologetiques persans et arabes de la Bibliothèque de l'Université de Tébérān* (Don de M. le Professeur Meshkāt), Tehran, Imprimerie de l'Université, 1332Hš/1953, vol. III/1, pp. 199–200.

Da₂ = Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Nağāt min al-ğarq fī baḥr al-dalālāt*, ed. by M.T. Dānišpažūh, Tehran, Intišārāt-i Dānišgāh-i Tihṛān, 1364Hš/1985, part. p. 95.

Da₃ = M.T. Dānišpažūh, *Fibrīst-i nuṣṣahā-yi ḥaṭṭī-i Kitābhāna-yi Markazī-yi Dānišgāh-i Tibrān*, Tehran, Intišārāt-i Dānišgāh-i Tihṛān, 1362Hš/1983, vol. XVII, p. 288.

E₁ = O. Ergin, "İbni Sina Bibliografyası", in *Büyük Türk Filozof ve Tib Üstadı İbni Sina Şahsiyeti ve Eserleri Hakkında Tetkikler*, Istanbul, Muallim Ahmet Halit Kitap Evi, 1937, pp. 3-80.

E₂ = O. Ergin, *İbni Sina Bibliografyası*, Istanbul, Osman Yalçın Matbaası, 1956.

Es = M.J. Esmaili, "The Commentary Tradition on the *Ilābiyyāt* of the *Shifā'*: An Historical and Bibliographical Survey", *Sophia Perennis* 10/2 (2013-2014), pp. 5–26.

F = M. Dirāyatī, *Fibrīstgān nuṣṣahā-yi ḥaṭṭī-yi Īrān (Fanḥā), Union Catalogue of Iran Manuscripts*, Tehran, Sāzmān-i Asnād va Kitābhāna-yi Millī-yi

Ġumhūrī-yi Islāmī-yi Īrān, 1391–1393Hš/2012–2015, vol. I, p. 328; vol. IV, pp. 785–786; vol. VIII, pp. 394–395; vol. XII, pp. 92–106; vol. XIII, p. 477; vol. XIX, pp. 975–976; vol. XXI, pp. 79–80, 94–95; vol. XXVI, p. 283; vol. XXX, pp. 565, 820–821; vol. XXXIII, pp. 817–818.

H = ‘A. H. Hā’irī, *Fibrīst-i Kitābhāna-yi Maḡlis-i Šūrā-yi Millī, A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Parliament Library (Persian & Arabic)*, vol. V, Tehran, Intiṣārāt-i Maḡlis, 1345Hš/1965, pp. 297–299, 402–404.

Iṣ = Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Šifā’, al-Ilābiyyāt wa-Ta’līqāt*, cit., pp. 58–59, 83–84, 100–101, 128.

K = S.T.H. Kantūrī, *Fibrīst-i kutub-i ‘Arabī va Fārsī va Urdū mahzūna-yi Kutubhāna-yi Aṣafīyya-yi Sarkār-i ‘Alī*, 4 vols., Hyderabad, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library and Research Institute, 1332–1355/1914–1936, vol. II, pp. 1198–1199; vol. III, pp. 492–493.

Kh = Ḥān, *Fibrīst-i kutub-i ‘Arabī-yi mauḡūda-yi Kitābhāna-yi riyāsāt-i Rāmpūr*, vol. I, cit., p. 397.

M = Y. Mahdawī, *Fibrīst-i nuṣṣahā-yi muṣannaḡāt-i Ibn-i Sīnā, Bibliographie d’Ibn Sīnā*, Tehran, Intiṣārāt-i Dānišgāh-i Tīhrān, 1333Hš/1954, pp. 172–173.

Ma₁ = ‘A.H. Mawlawī, *Miftāḡ al-kunūz al-ḡafīyya, Arabic Manuscripts Bankipore*, 3 vols., Patna, Government Printing, 1918–1922 [Urdu text].

Ma₂ = Id., *Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore*, vol. XXI (Arabic MSS), *Encyclopaedias, Logic, Philosophy and Dialectics*, pp. 4–6, vol. XL (Arabic MSS), *Physics/Metaphysics*, pp. 2–4, Calcutta-Patna, Baptist Mission Press/Superintendent, Government Printing, 1994, 2008.

Mz₁ = A. Munzawī, *Fibrīst-i nuṣṣahā-yi ḡaṭṭī-yi Fārsī, A Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts*, vol. II/1, Tehran, Regional Cultural Institute, 1970, pp. 755–756.

Mz₂ = Id., *Fibrīstvarāh-i kitābhā-yi Fārsī, An Annotated Bibliography of Persian Works Including Manuscript’s Descriptions*, vol. VI, Tehran, The Centre of Great Islamic Encyclopaedia Library Publications Series, 1381Hš/2002, pp. 104–105, 132.

N = M. Niẓām al-Dīn, *A Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Salar Jang Collection*, Hyderabad, Osmania Oriental Publications Bureau, 1957, p. 8.

O = *Andhra Pradesh Government Oriental Manuscripts Library and Research Institute (Persian, Urdu, Arabic Books)*, Hyderabad, Osmania University Campus, vol. II, pp. 83, 85–86, 88; vol. III, p. 126.

Pb = PhiBor, “Philosophy on the Border of Civilizations: Towards a Critical Edition of the Metaphysics of Avicenna” (ERC project), available at: <http://project.avicennaproject.eu/index.php?id=65> (20 February 2021).

R = R. Massani, “Āṭār Abū ‘Alī Sīnā dar Kitābhānahā-yi ḡuṣūṣī va-‘umūmī

Hind”, in *Le livre du millénaire d'Avicenne*, vol. II, Tehran, Société iranienne pour la conservation des monuments nationaux, 1384Hš/1953, pp. 438–449.

S = W.H. Šiddīqī, *Fihrist-i nuṣṣahā-yi Fārsī-yi Kitābhāna-yi Radā, Rampur, Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts*, vol. I, Delhi, Diamond Printers, 1375Hš/1996, p. 313.

Š = Ibn Sīnā, *Al-Ilābiyyāt min al-Šifā'*, cit.

St = C.A. Storey, *Persian Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*, vol. II/3, published with the aid of the Iranian Culture Foundation by The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, Leiden, Brill, 1977, p. 348.

Sw = C. Stewart, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oriental Library of the Late Tippoo Sultan of Mysore*. To which are prefixed, Memoirs of Hyder Aly Khan, and his son Tippoo Sultan, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1809, p. 118.

Ṭ = Āqā Buzurg Ṭīhrānī, *Al-Darī'a ilā taṣānīf al-šī'a*, cit.

U = 'A. Mīrzā Ašraf, *A Catalogue of the Arabic Books and Manuscripts in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, under the supervision of the Honorary Philological Secretary, Calcutta, Baptist Mission Press, 1904, p. 106.

W = Wisnovsky, “Avicenna’s Islamic reception”, cit.

APPENDIX II

Ibn Sīnā's *Kitāb al-Šifā'*: Abridgements, Commentaries, Glosses and Translations

Abū Maṣṣūr al-Ḥusayn ibn Ṭāhir ibn Zayla (d. 440/1048 or 1049): compendium of *Šifā'*¹

Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210): attested commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*²
'Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn 'Īsā Ḥusrawšāhī (Šams al-Dīn?) (580–652/1184 or 1185–1254 or 1255): abridgement of *Manṭiq*³

Ġamāl al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn 'Alī ibn al-Muṭaḥhar al-Šīrī al-'Allāma Āyat Allāh (a.k.a. 'Allāma Ḥillī) (648 or 649–726/1251–1326): commentary on *Manṭiq*⁴

Qāḍī Baġdād Qiwām al-Dīn ibn Ḥasan al-Ma'rūf: commentary on *Ilābiyyāt* (d. 922/1516)⁵

Ġiyāṭ al-Dīn Maṣṣūr ibn Muḥammad Ḥusaynī Daštakī Šīrāzī (d. 949/1542): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*⁶

*It is a provisional list in chronological order.

¹ M, p. 173; W, p. 194.

² See Pb: "The first known attestation of a commentary (*šarḥ*) on the *Ilābiyyāt*, possibly ascribed to Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210), occurs in Šalāḥ al-Dīn Ḥalīl Ibn Aybak al-Šafadī (d. 764/1363), *Al-Wāfi bi-al-wafayāt*, ed. by A. Al-Arnā'ūt and T. Muṣṭafā, Dār iḥyā' al-tūrāt al-'arabī, Beirut 2000, IV, p. 180".

³ D, vol. VI, 1202; F, vol. XXI, p. 79; M, p. 173; Wisnovsky, "On the Emergence of Maragha Avicennism", cit., p. 264; Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a, *Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*, ed. by A. Müller, vol. II, Cairo, al-Maṭba'a al-Wahbiyya, 1299/1882, p. 174, 4–5.

⁴ *Kašf al-Ḥifā' min Kitāb al-Šifā'* (on *Maqūlāt* I.1–IV.5). See F, vol. XXVI, p. 283; M, p. 172; T, vol. XVIII, p. 34.

⁵ O, vol. II, p. 88.

⁶ On I.1–6. *Šifā' al-qulūb*, ed. by A. Ahari, in *Ganġina-yi Babārestān (A Collection of 18 Treatises in Logic, Philosophy, Theology, and Mysticism)*, ed. by 'A. Awġābī, vol. I, Tehran, Intiṣārāt-i Kitābhānah, Mūza va Markaz-i Asnād-i Maġlis-i Šūrā-yi Islāmī, 1379Hš/2000, pp. 184–276; *Šifā' al-qulūb*, in *Musannaṣāt-i Ġiyāṭ al-Dīn Maṣṣūr-i Ḥusaynī-yi Daštakī-yi Šīrāzī*, ed. by 'A. Nūrānī, vol. II, Tehran, Anġuman-i mafāḥir va āṭār-i farhangī, 1386Hš/2007, pp. 375–487 (cf. vol. I, p. 110); *Šifā' al-qulūb wa-Taġāwbur al-aġsām*, ed. by 'A. Awġābī, Tehran, Intiṣārāt-i Kitābhānah, Mūza va Markaz-i Asnād-i Maġlis-i Šūrā-yi Islāmī, 1390Hš/2012, pp. 1–132. Excerpts in Iṣ. See A, p. 79; B (1937), p. 815; D, vol. VI, 1207; F, vol. VIII, pp. 394–395, F, vol. XXI, pp. 94–95, F, vol. XXX, p. 565; M, p. 173; Pb.

Sayyid Mullā Šāh Ṭāhīr Ibn Raḍī al-Dīn Ismā'īlī Ḥusaynī Kāšānī (a.k.a. Šāh Ṭāhīr Dakkanī Anḡadānī) (d. 952/1545 or 1546): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*⁷

Ḥabīb Allāh al-Bāḡnawī al-Šīrāzī (Mīrzā Ġān) (d. between 994 or 995/1585 or 1587): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*?⁸

Bahman Aškī (alive before XI/XVII c.): abridgement of *Šifā'*⁹

Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥusayn Ḥasanī: glosses on *Ilābiyyāt* (written before 1020/1611 or 1612)¹⁰

Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Dāmād Ḥusaynī Astarābādī (a.k.a. Mīr Dāmād) (950–1041/1542–1631): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*¹¹

'Alī Riḍā Ṭarzī (or Ṭarazī) ibn Mawlānā Šams al-Dīn Ḥalḥālī (alive before 1048/1638): Persian translation and commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*¹²

Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Šīrāzī (a.k.a. Mullā Šadrā) (979–ca. 1050/1571 or 1572–ca. 1640): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*¹³

Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Ābidīn Ḥusaynī 'Alawī 'Āmilī Isfahānī (a.k.a. Mīr Sayyid Aḥmad) (d. between 1054–1060/1644–1650): commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*¹⁴

Mullā Raḡab 'Alī Tabrīzī (d. 1080/1669): attested Persian translation¹⁵

Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Mu'min Sabzawārī Işfahānī (1018–1090/1609–1679): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*¹⁶

⁷ Mz₂, p. 132; Ṭ, vol. VI, p. 142. Student of Ḥafri (d. after 1525).

⁸ D, vol. IV, p. 308; F, vol. XII, pp. 92–93; M, p. 173 (glosses on Aristotelian categories, treatises 2 and 3 of *Ilābiyyāt*).

⁹ D, vol. VI, 1202; F, vol. XXI, p. 79.

¹⁰ *Ummūdaḡa 'i Ibrābīmīyya, Ta'liqāt 'alā Ilābiyyāt al-Šifā' wa-al-Naḡāt*. See A, p. 79; D, vol. II, p. 214; M, p. 173.

¹¹ *Ta'liqāt 'alā Kitāb al-Šifā'*, in Š and excerpts in Iş. See F, vol. XII, p. 93; M, p. 173.

¹² Da. . d. 95: Es. d. 8: Is. d. 100: K. vol. III. bb. 492–493: O. vol. II. d. 85: S. d. 313.

¹³ On *Ilābiyyāt* I–VI. *Al-Ta'liqāt li-Šadr al-muta'allibīna Muḥammad Ibn Ibrāhīm Šadr al-Dīn al-Šīrāzī 'alā l-Šifā'*, in Š, pp. 2–264; *Šarḥ wa-Ta'liqāt Šadr al-muta'allibīna bar Ilābiyyāt-i Šifā'-yi šayḥ al-ra'īs Abū 'Alī ibn Sīnā*, 2 vols., ed. and annot. by N. Ḥabībī, under the direction of M. Ḥamane'ī, Tehran, Intiṣarāt-i Bunyād Ḥikmat Islāmī Šadrā, 1382Hs/2003 or 2004; commentary on *Ilābiyyāt* I–II in Iş, pp. 1–248. See A, p. 78; B (1937), p. 815; D, vol. IV, pp. 308–309; F, vol. XII, pp. 93–96; M, p. 173; Pb. Cf. Š.

¹⁴ *Miftāḥ al-Šifā' wa-al-urwa al-wuṭqa' fi šarḥ Ilābiyyāt al-Šifā'*, or *Mīnbāḡ al-Šifā' fi al-Ilābiyyāt* (commentary on *Ilābiyyāt* I–X). Excerpts in Š, and excerpts on *Ilābiyyāt* I–II in Iş; two excerpts in *Anthologie des philosophes iraniens*, cit., vol. II, pp. 12–29, 87–117 (on *Ilābiyyāt* VIII.6, p. 358.1–2, 10–11, 14–15, on VIII.7, p. 362.18, and on IX.7, p. 423.4–12). Eng. transl. by M. Fakhry in Nasr and Aminrazavi, *From the School of Shiraz*, cit., pp. 264–282. See A, p. 78; B (1937), p. 815; B (1943), p. 592; D, vol. IX, pp. 1037–1038; M, p. 173; Pb. Cf. Š.

¹⁵ Nasr and Aminrazavi, *From the School of Shiraz*, cit., p. 283.

¹⁶ Excerpts in Iş; see D, vol. IV, p. 309; F, vol. XII, p. 98; F, vol. XXX, pp. 820–821; M, p. 173; Pb. Partial ed. in *Anthologie des philosophes iraniens*, vol. II, cit., pp. 546–615.

Mir Muḥammad Maʿsūm ibn Faṣīḥ al-Ḥaqq Ḥusaynī Qazwīnī (d. 1091/1680 or 1681): glosses on *Šifā*¹⁷

Āqā Ḥusayn ibn Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥwānsārī (1016–1099/1607–1687): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*, superglosses on Sabzawārī’s glosses, and attested Persian translation¹⁸

Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn Širwānī (1033–1098/1624–n): glosses on *Ṭabīʿiyyāt*¹⁹

Mullā ʿAbd al-Ġafār ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥya Ġilānī (fl. XI/XVII c.): commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*²⁰

Šāh Qiwām al-Dīn Ḥamza ibn ʿAlī Nassāba Širāzī/Ḥamza ibn Muḥammad Ḥasanī Ḥusaynī (fl. XI/XVII c.): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*²¹

ʿAlī ibn Faḍl Allāh Ġilānī (fl. XI/XVII c.): commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*²²

Muḥammad Yūsuf Rāzī (Mullā Awliyaʿ) (fl. XI/XVII c.): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*²³

Muḥammad Raḍawī (fl. XI/XVII c.): glosses on *Šifā*²⁴

Sayyid Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Raḍawī (fl. XI/XVII c. ?): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*²⁵

Ismāʿīl ibn Muḥammad Bāqir Ḥātūnābādī (1031–1116/1621 or 1622–1704): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*²⁶

Sayyid ʿAlī Ḥusaynī ʿUrayḍī Imāmī (d. 1117/1705 or 1706): Persian translation and commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*²⁷

¹⁷ D, vol. IV, p. 309; F, vol. XII, p. 98.

¹⁸ First commentary on *Ilābiyyāt* I–VIII. Ā.H. Ḥwānsārī, *Ḥāšiyat ʿalā al-Šifāʿ (al-Ilābiyyāt)*, ed. by Ḥ. Nāġī Iṣfahānī, Qom, Kungira-yi Buzurgdāšt-i Muḥaqqiqān-i Ḥwānsārī, 1378HŠ/1999; excerpts in Iṣ and in *Anthologie des philosophes iraniens*, cit., vol. I, pp. 362–409. See B (1937), p. 815; D, vol. IV, p. 310; F, vol. XII, pp. 98–102; M, p. 173; Pb.

¹⁹ D, vol. IV, p. 310; F, vol. XII, p. 98.

²⁰ T, vol. VI, p. 142. Student of Mir Dāmād.

²¹ On *Ilābiyyāt* I.1–II.2. See D, vol. IV, pp. 309–310; F, vol. XII, pp. 102–103; excerpts in Š and Iṣ (Iṣfahānī, p. 126, identifies the author with Muḥammad Qawwām al-Dīn al-Sayfī al-Qazwīnī, d. 1150/1737 or 1738). See Pb.

²² *Tawfiq al-ṭabīq* (commentary on *Ilābiyyāt* X). ʿAlī ibn Faḍl Allāh Ġilānī, *Tawfiq al-ṭabīq fi ṭibāʾat anna al-sayb al-raʾīs min al-Imāmiyya al-Itnā ʿAshariyya*, ed. by M.M. Ḥilmī, Cairo, Dār iḥyāʾ al-kutub al-ʿarabiyya, 1953.

²³ D, vol. IV, pp. 310–311; F, vol. XII, p. 102; M, p. 173; glosses in Š and excerpts in Iṣ.

²⁴ D, vol. IV, p. 311; F, vol. XII, p. 103.

²⁵ On *Ilābiyyāt* I–II. See D, vol. IV, p. 311; F, vol. XII, pp. 104–105.

²⁶ D, vol. IV, p. 311; F, vol. XII, p. 103.

²⁷ Cf. Panzeca, “On the Persian Translations of Avicenna’s *Ilābiyyāt*”, cit.; D, vol. II, p. 133; D, vol. VI, 1202–1203; Da₁, pp. 199–200; Da₂, p. 95; Da₃, p. 288; Es, p. 8; F, vol. IV, pp. 785–786; H, pp. 297–299, 402–404; M, p. 174; Mz₁, pp. 755–756; Mz₂, pp. 104–105; St, p. 348.

Allāma Sulaymān Māhwazī Baḥrānī (Mullā Sulaymān) (1065–1121/1654–1710): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*²⁸

Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Tunikābunī (1040–1124/1631–1712): glosses on *Ṭabī‘iyyāt*²⁹

Āqā Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn Ḥwānsārī (d. 1125/1713): glosses on *Ṭabī‘iyyāt*³⁰

Mīrzā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mīrzā ‘Īsā Afandī Tabrīzī Iṣfahānī (1066–1130/1656–1718): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*³¹

Mullā Ḥamza Ġilānī (d. 1134/1722): glosses on *Šifā*³²

Bahā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan Iṣfahānī (a.k.a. Fāḍil Hindī) (d. 1137/1725): abridgement of *Šifā*³³

As‘ad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Uṭmān al-Yānyawī (d. 1143/1730): glosses on *Manṭiq* and *Ṭabī‘iyyāt*³⁴

Sayḥ ‘Alī Ḥazīn Zāhdī Ġilānī Iṣfahānī (d. 1181/1767 or 1768): commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*³⁵

Āqā Muḥammad Bīdābādī (d. 1198/1783 or 1784): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*³⁶

Mullā Muḥammad Mahdī ibn Abī Ḍarr Narāqī Kāšānī (1128–1209/1715 or 1716–1794 or 1795): commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*³⁷

²⁸ M, p. 173; glosses in Š and excerpts in Iṣ.

²⁹ *Ibtāl kawān al-ḥaraka fard-an sayyāl-an (al-ḥaraka fī al-maqūla)*. D, vol. I, p. 105; F, vol. I, p. 328.

³⁰ On *Ṭabī‘iyyāt* I–II. See A, p. 78; D, vol. IV, p. 311; F, vol. XII, pp. 103–104; M, p. 173. Ā.Ġ. Ḥwānsārī, *al-Ḥāšiya ‘alā l-Šifā*, ed. by R. Ustādī, Qom, Kungira-yi Buzurgdašt-i Āqā Ḥusayn-i Ḥwānsārī, 1378Hš/1999.

³¹ Ṭ, vol. VI, pp. 68, 142–143.

³² Cf. R. Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Qajar Iran*, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2019, p. 9.

³³ *‘Awn Iḥwān al-Šafa’ ‘alā fahm Kitāb al-Šifā*. Cf. M, p. 173; on *Ilābiyyāt* I–II see Iṣ, pp. 261–296, 471–485 (partial Metaphysics). ‘A. Awḡabī has edited the first part of this commentary on Logic, Tehran, Mu‘assasa-yi Pažūhišī-yi Ḥikmat va Falsafa-yi Īrān, 1393Hš/2014.

³⁴ Cf. R. Wisnovsky, “Indirect Evidence for Establishing the Text of the *Shifā*”, *Oriens* 40 (2012), pp. 257–273, here 267; S. Di Vincenzo, “Reading Avicenna’s *Kitāb al-Šifā*’ in the Ottoman World. The Circulation of the Work Within the School of As‘ad al-Yānyawī”, *Mélanges de l’Université Saint-Joseph* 67 (2017-2018), pp. 327-350.

³⁵ Ṭ, vol. VII, p. 108.

³⁶ Glosses in Iṣ.

³⁷ On *Ilābiyyāt* I–II.2. See Narāqī, *Šarḥ al-Ilābiyyāt min Kitāb al-Šifā*, ed. by M. Mohaghegh, vol. I, Tehran, Institute of Islamic Studies of McGill University – Tehran Branch, 1365Hš/1986 (partial commentary); Id., *Šarḥ Ilābiyyāt al-Šifā’ 1–2*, ed. by Ḥ. Nāḡī Iṣfahānī, 2 vols., Qom, Kungira-yi Buzurgdašt-i Muḥaqqiqān-i Narāqī, 1380Hš/2001 (full commentary); excerpts in Iṣ. See D, vol. VI, p. 804; F, vol. XIX, pp. 975–976; Pb; Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Qajar Iran*, cit., pp. 36–65; S. Rizvi, “An

- Anonymous Author (fl. XII/XVIII c.): commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*³⁸
- Sayyid ‘Abd al-‘Azīm ibn ‘Alī Riḍā Lingġānī Ḥusaynī Iṣfahānī (d. after 1231/1816): commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*³⁹
- Muḥammad Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd al-Bāqī Ḥātūnābādī Iṣfahānī (d. 1233/1817 or 1818): commentary on *Ilābiyyāt*⁴⁰
- Faḍl-i Imām ibn Muḥammad Aršad ‘Umarī Ḥayrābādī (d. 1243/1827 or 1828): abridgement of *Ṭabī‘iyyāt*⁴¹
- ‘Alī ibn Ğamšīd Nūrī (a.k.a. Mullā ‘Alī Nūrī) (d. 1246/1831): commentary on *Šifā*⁴²
- Faḍl-i Ḥaqq ibn Faḍl-i Imām Ḥayrābādī (d. 1861): gloss on Faḍl-i Imām Ḥayrābādī’s commentary
- Ḥaġġ Mullā Ḥādī Sabzawārī (1212–1289/1797–1873): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*⁴³
- Āqā ‘Alī Mudarris Ṭihrānī (ibn Zunūzī Ṭabrīzī) (1234–1307/1819–1889): supercommentary on Mullā Ṣadrā’s commentary⁴⁴
- Mīrzā Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Sayyid Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāī (a.k.a. Ğilwa) (1238–1314/1822 or 1823–1896): glosses on *Mantiq*, *Ṭabī‘iyyāt* and *Ilābiyyāt*⁴⁵

Avicennian Engagement with and Appropriation of Mullā Ṣadrā Šīrāzī (d. 1045/1636): the Case of Mahdī Narāqī (d. 1209/1795)”, *Oriens* 48 (2020), pp. 219–249.

³⁸ S.M. Mar’asī Naġafī and M.H. Amīnī, *Fihrist-i nuṣṣahā-yi ḥaṭṭī-yi Kitābhāna-yi ‘Umūmī-yi Ḥaḍrat-i Āyat Allāh al-‘Uzmā Mar’asī Naġafī*, vol. XLVII, Qom, Kitābhāna-yi Buzurg-i Āyat Allāh Mar’asī Naġafī – Ganġina-yi Ğahānī-yi Maḥṭūṭāt-i Islāmī, 1395Hš/2017, p. 774, MS 18860/19.

³⁹ On *Ilābiyyāt* I and up to *fasl* 4. *Nūr al-‘urafā’ fi šarḥ Ilābiyyāt al-Šifā’*. See D, vol. X, p. 841; F, vol. XXXIII, pp. 817–818.

⁴⁰ Commentary on *Ilābiyyāt* IX–X. See D, vol. IV, p. 311; F, vol. XII, p. 105, Pb.

⁴¹ A, p. 79.

⁴² W, p. 194; Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Qajar Iran*, cit., pp. 125–178.

⁴³ *Fihrist-i nuṣṣahā-yi ḥaṭṭī-yi*, ed. by S.Ā.H. Aškevarī, vol. XI, Qom, Markaz-i Ihyā’-i Mīrāt-i Islāmī, 1390Hš/2011 or 2012, p. 66, MS 4549; Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Qajar Iran*, cit., pp. 179–230.

⁴⁴ See Nasr and Aminrazavi, *From the School of Shiraz*, cit., p. 473; Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Qajar Iran*, cit., pp. 231–258.

⁴⁵ D, vol. IV, p. 311; F, vol. XII, p. 105; see Pb: “Two annotations in the guard leaves at the beginning of this manuscript state that this codex was corrected by Ğilwa, who used it for his teaching of philosophy in 1314H, and that the glosses that do not bear indication of their authors (the names of al-‘Alawī, Mullā Awliyā’, and others, are visible) are by Ğilwa himself”. The glosses on four chapters of the first section of Natural Philosophy (Chapters I.2, I.6, I.8, and II.8) have been edited in *Maġmū‘at Āṭār Ḥakīm Ğilwa*, ed. by Ḥ. Rezazadeh, Tehran, Mu‘assasa-yi Intiṣārāt-i Ḥikma, 1385Hš/2006, pp. 309–342; Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Qajar Iran*, cit., pp. 283–312.

- Mudarris Ḥasan (1249–1316/1870–1937): glosses on *Šifā*⁴⁶
Mīrzā Muḥammad Ṭāhir ibn Farāğ Allāh Tunikābunī (1280–1360/1863
or 1864/1941 or 1942): glosses on *Mantiq* and *Ilābiyyāt*⁴⁷
‘Abd Allāh Anwār (b. 1343/1924 or 1925): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt* to the
text of the Cairo edition (unpublished, in Farsi)⁴⁸
Muḥammad Taqī Mišbāḥ Yazdī (b. 1353/1934 or 1935): commentary on
*Ilābiyyāt*⁴⁹

Other Authors (unknown dates)

- Anonymous: glosses on *Mantiq*⁵⁰
Anonymous: Persian translation and summary of *Mantiq*⁵¹
Anonymous: supercommentary on *Ṭabī‘iyyāt*⁵²
Maḥmūd ‘Alī (?): glosses on *Ilābiyyāt*⁵³
Muḥammad Taqī ibn Muḥammad Astarābādī: commentary on *Šifā*⁵⁴

⁴⁶ D, vol. IV, p. 311; F, vol. XII, p. 105.

⁴⁷ D, vol. IV, p. 311.

⁴⁸ Pb.

⁴⁹ *Šarḥ Ilābiyyāt Šifā*, ed. by ‘A.Ĝ. Ibrāhīmī-Far, 3 vols., Qom, Intiṣārāt Mu‘assasa-yi Amūzišī va Pağūhišī Imām Ḥomeynī, 1386 or 1387Hs/2007 or 2008 (in Persian). See Pb, further items in Am, pp. 5–6; Is, pp. 54–58, 96–100; Mullā Ṣadrā, *Šarḥ wa-Ta‘liqāt*, cit., pp. 9–15.

⁵⁰ D, vol. VI, pp. 311–312.

⁵¹ F, vol. XII, p. 106; F, vol. XXI, p. 80.

⁵² M.A. Ṭalass, *Al-Kachchāf*, *Catalogue générale des manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque Générale des Wakfs de Bagdad*, Baghdad, Imprimerie Al-‘Ani, 1953, p. 109, MS 5269.

⁵³ O, vol. III, p. 126.

⁵⁴ D, vol. VI, p. 805; F, vol. XIX, p. 976.