

Majmū'ah-ye Falsafī-e Marāghah

A Philosophical Anthology from Maraghah

Containing Works by Abū Ḥāmid Ghazzālī

‘Ayn al-Quḍāt Ḥamadānī, Ibn Sīnā

‘Umar Ibn Sahlān Sāvī,

Majduddīn Jīlī, and others

Facsimile Edition with Introductions in
Persian and English
by

Nasrollah Pourjavady

Iran University Press
Tehran, 2002

Introduction

In his biography of Shihābuddīn Yahyā Suhravardī (d. 587/1191), Shamsuddīn Shahrazūrī writes that the Master of Illumination (Shaykh al-Ishrāq) went, when he was still very young, to Maraghah, a city southwest of Tabriz, where he began his study of philosophy with a teacher named Majduddīn Jīlī.¹ This philosopher was evidently from Gilan, a northern province of Iran, and flourished in the middle of the 6th/12th century—other than this, our information about him is quite meagre. What we do know is that he taught in Ray before he went to Maraghah; his young student in Ray was Fakhruddīn Rāzī (d. 606/1209), later to become the famous theologian-philosopher of his time. Rāzī was studying logic and philosophy with Jīlī, and when Jīlī received an invitation to go to Maraghah, Rāzī accompanied his teacher, probably along with some other students. It was in Maraghah that the young Suhravardī and Rāzī, who were both attending Jīlī's classes, apparently met each other and shared the same philosophical tradition that was represented and passed on by this Gilani professor.

¹ Shamsuddīn al-Shahrazūrī, *Nuzhat al-arwāh*, Vol. II, ed. Khurshid Ahmad, Hyderabad 1976, pp. 122-3.

What was the philosophical tradition that Jīlī represented, and what were the text books he used in his classes in Maraghah? Did he teach any of the works of the famous philosophers such as Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā? Did he also teach logic, and if so what texts did he use? The early biographies of Suhraṣardī and Rāzī mention the name of Jīlī, but unfortunately they say nothing which could help us answer these questions. However, by a stroke of good fortune, one of Jīlī's own treatises has been found in an old codex which was copied, not long after his death, in a school in Maraghah called *Mujāhidīyah*. This is the philosophical anthology that is being published here for the first time in a facsimile edition.

The Madrasah Mujāhidīyah, where our ancient codex was copied in 596-7/1200, is in all likelihood the very school where Jīlī taught, and the scribe, who has not identified himself, may well have been another of Jīlī's students. This being the case, the works he has selected and copied down in the codex may represent more or less the philosophical tradition that was passed down by Jīlī to the younger generation. Besides Jīlī's treatise, which is on logic, the other works included in the Maraghah codex are mostly by famous authors such as Ibn Sīnā, Abū Hāmid Ghazzālī, 'Ayn al-Quḍāt Hamadānī, and 'Umar b. Saḥlān Sāwī, as well as works by unidentified authors.

The favourite author of our scribe appears to be Abū Hāmid Ghazzālī (d. 505/1111). At least five different books and treatises in this collection are by Abū Hāmid. The codex begins with a famous work of Ghazzālī, namely his *Kitāb al-maḍnūn bihī 'alā ghair ahlih*. The authenticity of this work was put in doubt by pre-modern scholars such as Taqūddīn Ibn Ṣalāh

Shahrazūrī (d. 643/1254) and Subkī (d. 756/1355)², on the grounds that the author of this book expressed philosophical doctrines which Ghazzālī claimed to be heretical in his *Maqāṣid*. However, Ibn Taymīyah (d. 728/1328) disagreed with Ibn Ṣalāh and insisted that the work was indeed by Ghazzālī.

Ghazzālīan scholars of our own time, such as W.H.T. Gairdner, M. Asin Palacios, Goldziher, D. B. Macdonald, and finally W. Montgomery Watt, have studied the printed edition of the *Kitāb al-maḍnūn bihī 'alā ghair ahlih* and considered the work to be authentic.³ It is interesting to note, however, that an Egyptian scholar, by the name of Zakī Mubārak, following his professor Dr. 'Alī al-'Anānī, has taken an entirely different position by suggesting that the authentic *Maḍnūn* was actually lost, and what has survived, both in manuscripts and printed editions, under the title of *K. al-maḍnūn bihī 'alā ghair ahlih* is a forgery.⁴ The text of the *K. al-maḍnūn* in the Maraghah Codex proves that Mubārak and his professor were right, for this text is entirely different from the printed edition. Our *K. al-maḍnūn*, which is in fact a philosophical treatise, is basically taken from the section on metaphysics in the *Maqāṣid al-falāsifah* of Ghazzālī.⁵

The second work in our anthology is another treatise with a

² Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt*, Beyrouth 1383a.h.l., Vol. VI, p. 257.

³ Maurice Bouyges, *Essai de chronologie des oeuvres de al-Ghazzālī (Algazal)*, édité et mis à jour par Michel Allard, Beyrouth 1959, p. 52, n. 4.

⁴ Zakī Mubārak, *Al-Akhlāq 'ind al-Ghazzālī*, Beyrouth 1988, p. 117.

⁵ For further discussion of the authenticity of *K. al-Maḍnūn* and the next treatise in this codex, see my "Āthār-e al-Maḍnūn-e Ghazzālī", *Ma'ārif*, Vol. VIII, no. 2 (Nov. 2001), pp. 3-28.

similar title, *Masā'il al maḍnūn bihā 'alā ghair ahlihā*. As its title indicates, this work consists of a number of questions which were put to Ghazzālī, followed by his answers. This is the only extant manuscript of this work, although a text edited and published by Heinrich Malter in Hebrew translation as one of Ghazzālī's treatises,⁶ is in fact a part of this same treatise. Thus, despite the fact that scholars such as D.B. Macdonald and Montgomery Watt have rejected the idea that this is the translation of an authentic work of Ghazzālī,⁷ the existence of the complete *Masā'il* in our anthology supports Malter's claim. As Malter has shown, most of the answers given by Ghazzālī to the questions put to him coincide with what he has said in the physics section of the *Maqāsid*.

The *Risālah fi'l-'ilm al-ladunī* is the third work by Abū Hāmid in our anthology. The authenticity of the treatise has also been questioned, in this case by M. Asin Palacios, and subsequently by Watt. Among the arguments which Watt used in order to demonstrate that this work is spurious was the following statement of Asin Palacios:

I do not believe that this work is by al-Ghazzālī, since the text coincides exactly with a large part of the *Risālah fi'n-nafs wa-r-rūh* of Ibn 'Arabī of Murcia, edited and translated in my study, *La Psicología segun Mohidin Abenarabi* (Congress XIV^e International des Orientalistes, Vol. III). There are in fact two passages literally identical in both *Risālahs*; the second *faṣl* of that of al-Ghazzālī coincides

⁶ *Abhandlung des Abū Hāmid al-Ghazzālī, Antworten auf Fragen die ihn gerichtet wurden*, Frankfurt a.M. 1896.

⁷ Watt, "The Authenticity of the Works Attributed to Al-Ghazzali", *J.R.A.S.* (1952), p. 35.

with part of a *faṣl* of the *Risālah* of Ibn 'Arabī; *faṣl* 4 is identical with *faṣl* 5 in various passages. In my edition and translation of the *Risālah* of Ibn 'Arabī referred to above it can be seen how the terminology and ideology of that are the same which Ibn 'Arabī employs in other works which are indisputably his.⁸

Asin Palacios' argument is obviously based on the assumption that everything that Ibn 'Arabī wrote was original; while we know that the Andalusian Shaykh had no scruples about borrowing from the works of other authors, particularly those of Abū Hāmid,⁹ nor did Ghazzālī himself, for that matter, have such scruples. Besides, other scholars, such as Margareth Smith, who translated the *Risālah fi'l-'ilm al-ladunī* into English, and Abdurrahman Badawi, disagreed with Asin Palacios and Watt. Perhaps the best argument for the authenticity of this work is that put forward by Badawi, that is, that two old manuscripts of this treatise, which were copied before the time of Ibn 'Arabī, have been found, one of which is preserved in Shahid Ali Pasha Library, no. 1712.¹⁰ The existence of a third manuscript of this work in the Maraghah codex, copied less than one hundred years after Abū Hāmid's death, not only adds support to the claim for authenticity of this work, but also shows that this treatise was among the more popular works of Ghazzālī.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 33-4.

⁹ See my "Sayr-e iṣtilāhāt-e ṣūfiān, az *Nahj ul-khaṣṣ-e* Abū Manṣūr Isfahānī tā *Futūhāt-e* Ibn 'Arabī", *Ma'arif*, Vol. XVI, no. 3 (March 2000), pp. 3-55.

¹⁰ Bouyges & Allard, p. 124; Badawi, *Mu'allafat al-Ghazzālī*, 2nd edition, Kuwait 1977, p. 270-71.

After the *Risālah fi 'l- 'ilm al-ladunī*, the series of works by Ghazzālī in our anthology is interrupted by an Arabic work of 'Ayn al-Quḍāt Hamadānī (d. 525/1131), namely the *Zubdat al-ḥaqā'iq* (pp. 121-91). In this book, 'Ayn al-Quḍāt deals with some metaphysical and theological issues from a mystical point of view. The inclusion of such a work in the anthology, alongside the mystical and philosophically oriented works of Ghazzālī, to whom 'Ayn al-Quḍāt shows great respect in the *Zubdah*, should not, I believe, be seen as accidental. The fact that the *Zubdah* is included in the Maraghah codex shows that this philosophical/ mystical work was considered an important text in the tradition of *ḥikmat* that developed in Iran after Abū Hāmid Ghazzālī.

After 'Ayn al-Quḍāt's *Zubdah*, another of Ghazzālī's works is included under the title of *al-Masā'il al-ukhrawīyah* (pp. 191-224). This is in fact the same work that is known as *al-Maḍnūn aṣ-ṣaghīr*. Even though the authenticity of this work was denied by Ibn 'Arabī and in our time by Watt, the existence of this tract in the anthology supports the claim of those who have considered it authentic. The *Masā'il al-ukhrawīyah* is followed by some extracts from an unidentified work of Ghazzālī. In fact, part of this material coincides with some chapters of the above mentioned printed text of the *K. al-maḍnūn bihī 'alā ghair ahlih*. Finally, these extracts are followed by a collection of Ghazzālī's *fatwās*, the same *fatwās* that are quoted by Subkī, in his biography of Abū Hāmid, in the *Ṭabaqāt*.

Ghazzālī's works are once again interrupted by a short treatise of Ibn Sīnā called *Risālah fi 's-sa'ādat wa 'l-ḥujaj* (pp.

226-43). This treatise has already been published.¹¹ Next comes an anonymous treatise on the states of the soul in the grave and at resurrection, with the title of *Aḥwāl an-naḥs ba'd al-mawt* (pp. 245-59).

The last work of Ghazzālī in our codex is the *Mishkāṭ al-anwār* (pp. 260-86). Unfortunately, the last part of the second chapter and the whole of the third chapter of this work is missing.

The second anonymous work in the anthology is a treatise called *Risālah fi 'l-kamāl al-khāṣṣ*. Unfortunately, only the last folio of this treatise is extant. This work seems to have been written during the reign of 'Aḍud-ad-Daulah Shāhanshāh (d. 372/983) and its subject apparently concerns how to train the elite (*al-khāṣṣ*).

Another philosopher and logician whose works are included in our codex is Zaynuddīn 'Umar b. Sahlān as-Sāwī. Sāwī, or more correctly Sāvī, used to teach in his home town Sāveh before he moved to Nishapur. His most famous work on logic is the *Kitāb al-baṣā'ir un-naṣīrīyah fi 'l-mantiq* which was used as a text book, and Suhrawardī is said to have studied it in Isfahan after leaving Maraghah. The existence of two treatises by Sāvī in our anthology shows that the works of this author were studied in the philosophical school of Maraghah. I would not be surprised if one day we were to find some evidence to show that Majduddīn Jīlī had studied with Sāvī. The dates of Sāvī's birth and death are not known, but we know that he flourished in the first half of the 6th/ 12th century. He seems to have been a friend

¹¹ See Hans Daiber, *Bibliography of Islamic Philosophy*, Vol. I, Leiden 1999, p. 477 (4606).

of Tājuddīn Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm Shahrastānī (d. 548/1152), the author of the *Kitāb al-milal wa’n-nihal* and *Kitāb al-muṣāra’ah*. Sāvī corresponded with Shahrastānī over some philosophical problems regarding the *Kitāb al-muṣāra’ah*, to which Shahrastānī replied. In the first treatise by Sāvī in our anthology, entitled *al-Risālat al-musammāt bi’t-tauṭi’ah*, the name of Tājuddīn Mu‘īn al-Islām is mentioned, and it is quite likely that by this Sāvī means Shahrastānī. A part of this treatise has been falsely attributed to Ibn Sīnā and published on the margin of the lithograph edition of Mullā Ṣadrā’s *Commentary on Maibudī’s Hidāyah*.

The other treatise by Sāvī is entitled *Risālah fi taḥqīq naqīd al-wujūd*. This work has been edited and published by M. T. Daneshpazhuh along with Sāvī’s *Tabṣerah va do resālah-ye dīgar dar manṭeq* (Tehran 1337s).

Sāvī’s works are followed by two other treatises on logic. The first is on categorical syllogisms, entitled *Risālah fi’l-ḡiyāsāt al-ḥamlīyah* (pp. 307-44). The name of the author is not mentioned in the codex, but Daneshpazhuh has identified him as Sharafuddīn Muḥammad Mas‘ūdī Ghaznavī. The other treatise on logic is about fourth-figure syllogisms and bears the title of *Kitāb al-lāmi’ fi’ sh-shikl ar-rābi’* (pp. 345-64). The author of this treatise is none other than our Majduddīn Jīlī. After the name of Jīlī, the formula “raḥimahu Allah” is added, which indicates that Jīlī had already died when this treatise was copied.

Ibn Sīnā is obviously another favourite author of the compiler of this codex. Aside from his *Risālah fi’s-sa’ādah*, at least three other works by him are included. The *Risālat ul-adḥawīyah fi’l-ma’ād*, which is positioned after Jīlī’s *Risālah*, is the second work by Ibn Sīnā in the anthology (pp. 365-402). This is followed by another anonymous work on logic. Unfortunately, this treatise also suffers from lacunae (perhaps one or two folios). Then comes the third work of Ibn Sīnā in the codex, which is *Asbāb ḥudūth al-ḥurūf*. P.N. Khānlarī made use of this manuscript in his edition of this text.¹² After this book, a fragment or a chapter from an unidentified book by an unknown author is included with the title of *Faṣl fi lammīyat ikhtisāṣ al-ḥurūf bi-’adad al-ma’rūf* (pp. 443-46), and this is immediately followed by another short treatise on logic which is actually the first part of Fārābī’s “At-tauṭi’ah fi’l manṭiq” published in *Al-Manṭiqīyāt li’l-Fārābī*.¹³

Finally, the last work in the codex is a short treatise, or probably originally a fragment from a longer treatise, by Ibn Sīnā, called “Faṣl fi’ l-ḥuṣn wa asbābih” (p. 450). This fragment has been edited and translated into Turkish by Mehmet Hazmi Tura in 1939.¹⁴

The Maraghah anthology, as we have observed, contains works on both logic and philosophy. The philosophical works deal predominately with spiritual psychology, the nature and the states of the soul (*nafs*) or the spirit (*rūh*), in its pre-natal state

¹² Ibn Sīnā, *Makhārij al-ḥurūf*, Ed. Parviz Nātel Khānlarī, Tehran 1348s.

¹³ Edited by Daneshpazhuh, Vol. I, Qom 1987, pp. 11-7.

¹⁴ Daiber, *Ibid.*, 4617.

and on its post-mortem career. The works of Ghazzālī and the *Zubdah* of ‘Ayn al-Qudāt make up more than half of the whole anthology. The metaphysical works included here generally represent the type of philosophy that was developed by Ghazzālī and other thinkers in the 6th/12th century— a philosophy that was not simply peripatetic, but was on the one hand adapted to accommodate Ash‘arite theology, and on the other inspired by mysticism (*taṣawwuf*). In fact, these two trends can be observed, in different ways, in the philosophical thinking of the two most famous students of the school of Maraghah, namely Fakhruddīn Rāzī and Shihabuddīn Suhrawardī.

Nasrollah Pourjavady