Majmūʻah-ye Falsafī-e Marāghah
A Philosophical Anthology from Maragah

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 Maragah, a city southwest of Tabriz, where he began his study of philosophy with a teacher named Majdūdīn Jīlī.² 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 Maragah, 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 Maragah, Rāzī accompanied his teacher, probably along with some other students. It was in Maragah 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.

What was the philosophical tradition that Jīrī 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 Suhrawardī and Rāzī mention the name of Jīrī, but unfortunately they say nothing which could help us answer these questions. However, by a stroke of good fortune, one of Jīrī's own treatises has been found in an old codex which was copied, not long after his death, in a school in Maraghah called Majährīdīyah. This is the philosophical anthology that is being published here for the first time in a facsimile edition.

The Madrasah Majährīdīyah, where our ancient codex was copied in 596-7/1200, is in all likelihood the very school where Jīrī taught, and the scribe, who has not identified himself, may well have been another of Jīrī'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 Jīrī to the younger generation. Besides Jīrī'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. Sablān 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-maḍānī biht 'alā ghair aḥlih. The authenticity of this work was put in doubt by pre-modern scholars such as Taqūddīn Ibn Sīlāh, Shahrazārī (d. 643/1254) and Subkī (d. 756/1355), on the grounds that the author of this book expressed philosophical doctrines which Ghazzālī claimed to be heretical in his Maqṣūsid. However, Ibn Tāmīyāh (d. 728/1328) disagreed with Ibn Sīlāh 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-maḍānī biht 'alā ghair aḥlih and considered the work to be authentic. It is interesting to note, however, that an Egyptian scholar, by the name of Zakī Muḥārak, following his professor Dr. Aḥī al-'Anānī, has taken an entirely different position by suggesting that the authentic Maḍānī was actually lost, and what has survived, both in manuscripts and printed editions, under the title of K. al-maḍānī biht 'alā ghair aḥlih is a forgery. The text of the K. al-maḍānī in the Maraghah Codex proves that Muḥārak and his professor were right, for this text is entirely different from the printed edition. Our K. al-maḍānī, which is in fact a philosophical treatise, is basically taken from the section or metaphysics in the Maqṣūsid al-falāṣīfah of Ghazzālī.

The second work in our anthology is another treatise with a
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similar title, *Masa'il al madnun bihā 'ala ghair ahlīha*. 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, 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, the existence of the complete *Masa'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 *Maqṣūṣ*.

The *Risālah fi 'l-ilm al-khadān* 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 según Mohidin Abenarabi* (Congress XIV International des Orientalistes, Vol III). There are in fact two passages literally identical in both *Risālahs*, the second *fasl* of that of al-Ghazzālī coincides

with part of a *fasl* of the *Risālah* of Ibn ‘Arabī; *fasl* 4 is identical with *fasl* 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 translation of that are the same which Ibn ‘Arabī employs in other works which are indisputably his.

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, who did Ghazzālī himself, for that matter, have such scruples. Besides, other scholars, such as Margaret Smith, who translated the *Risālah fi 'l-ilm al-khadān* 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. The existence of a third manuscript of this work in the Maragha 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.
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After the Risālah fi 'ilm al-ladunū, the series of works by Ghazzālī in our anthology is interrupted by an Arabic work of 'Ayn al-Qudät Hamadānī (d. 525/1131), namely the Zubdāt al-haqā'iq (pp. 121-91). In this book, 'Ayn al-Qudät 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-Qudät shows great respect in the Zubdah, should not, I believe, be seen as accidental. The fact that the Zubdah is included in the Maragha codex shows that this philosophical/mystical work was considered an important text in the tradition of hikmat that developed in Iran after Aḥū Hāmid Ghazzālī.

After 'Ayn al-Qudät's Zubdah, another of Ghazzālī's works is included under the title of al-Masā'il al-ukhrājīyāh (pp. 191-224). This is in fact the same work that is known as al-Madānin as-saghir. 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-ukhrājīyāh 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-madānin biḥt 'ala ghair asbiḥ. Finally, these extracts are followed by a collection of Ghazzālī's fatwās, the same fatwās that are quoted by Subkī, in his biography of Aḥū Hāmid, in the Tabaqāt.

Ghazzālī's works are once again interrupted by a short treatise of Ibn Sinā called Risālah fi 's-sa'ādat wa'l ḥujaj (pp. 226-43). This treatise has already been published.13 Next comes an anonymous treatise on the states of the soul in the grave and at resurrection, with the title of Ahwāl an-nafs ba'd al-maut (pp. 245-59).

The last work of Ghazzālī in our codex is the Mishkāt al-anwar (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 'Ahdū-Ad-Daulah Shāhānshāh (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 Zaynuḍīn 'Umar b. Sahlān as-Sāwī, or more correctly Sāwī, used to teach in his home town Sāvē before he moved to Nishapur. His most famous work on logic is the Kitāb al-baṣṣir wa-l-nasīrīyāh fi'l-mantiq which was used as a text book, and Suhrawardī is said to have studied it in Isfahan after leaving Maragha. The existence of two treatises by Sāwī in our anthology shows that the works of this author were studied in the philosophical school of Maragha. I would not be surprised if one day we were to find some evidence to show that Majdīn Jīhī had studied with Sāwī. The dates of Sāwī'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

---

of Tājuddīn Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm Shahrastānī (d. 548/1152), the author of the Kitāb al-mīkāl wa'n-nihāl and Kitāb al-mustārā'ah. Sāvī corresponded with Shahrastānī over some philosophical problems regarding the Kitāb al-mustārā'ah, to which Shahrastānī replied. In the first treatise by Sāvī in our anthology, entitled al-Risālah al-musammāt bi't-tauti'ah, the name of Tājuddīn Mu'īn al-Īslām 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 Maḥbudī's Ḥidāyah.

The other treatise by Sāvī is entitled Risālah fi tahqīq naqūd al-wujūd. This work has been edited and published by M. T. Daneshpazuhu along with Sāvī's Taḥṣīrāt wa do resālah-yi digar dar manteq (Tehrān 1337 2).

Sāvī's works are followed by two other treatises on logic. The first is on categorical syllogisms, entitled Risālah fi'l-laqyūsāt al-hamliyyah (pp. 307-44). The name of the author is not mentioned in the codex, but Daneshpazuhu has identified him as Shara'uddīn Muhammad Ma'rūf Ghaznavī. The other treatise on logic is about fourth-figure syllogisms and bears the title of Kitāb al-lāmi' fi'sh-shikl ar-rābī' (pp. 345-64). The author of this treatise is none other than our Majduddīn Ḫāfī. After the name of Ḫāfī, the formula “rahimahu Allah” is added, which indicates that Ḫāfī 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-adhānīyāt fi'l-ma'ād, which is positioned after Ḫāfī'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 Ashbū huṣnāt al-ḥarīf. P. N. Khānlarī made use of this manuscript in his edition of this text. 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 al-kitāb al-ḥarīf bi'aqād al-ma'rīf (pp. 443-46), and this is immediately followed by another short treatise on logic which is actually the first part of Ftrabī's “At-tauti'ah fi'il mantiq” published in Al-Muṣṭaqyāt li'l-Ftrābī. 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-huzn wa ashābiḥ” (p. 450). This fragment has been edited and translated into Turkish by Mehmet Hazmi Tura in 1939. 14

The Maragheh anthology, as we have observed, contains works on both logic and philosophy. The philosophical works deal predominantly with spiritual psychology, the nature and the states of the soul (nafs) or the spirit (rūḥ), in its pre-natal state.
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and on its post-mortem career. The works of Ghazzālī and the Zubdāh 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 (taswīr). 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 Maragha, namely Fakhrūddīn Rāzī and Shihabuddīn Suhravardī.
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