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Introduction¹

Suhrawardī (d. 1191) has been hailed as a crucial thinker in the history of philosophy in the Islamic world, as first suggested by Henry Corbin. However, the actual influence of Suhrawardī on thinkers after him has mostly been assumed rather than established. In the centuries after Suhrawardī, the late-medieval and early-modern period of Islamic intellectual history, the writing of commentaries was a popular phenomenon. It did not automatically mean the commentator was in favor of the ideas of the original author. Therefore, tracing a commentary tradition is a measurement that gives us a fairly good insight into the reception of a certain intellectual, both positive and negative. In this article I contribute to a more precise understanding of Suhrawardī’s legacy, by putting together a list of all known commentaries, of which I found 58 in total, of which at least 31 are extant.

Suhrawardī’s perceived impact

A good portion of the surge of modern interest in Suhrawardī is due to Henry Corbin’s efforts, who saw Suhrawardī as the continuator of philosophical activity in the Islamic world in the late medieval period. Corbin did not necessarily aim to correct the older view that philosophical activity had waned after Ibn Rushd,² but he
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²
merely wanted to qualify this and add to it. As Corbin saw it, after Ibn Sīnā the great tradition of philosophy split in two, one faction headed by Ibn Rushd (d. 1198), the other by Suhrawardī (d. 1191). The philosophy that had more or less died out in the Islamic world, in Corbin’s eyes, was the ‘Peripatetic’ (Mashshāʿī) philosophy. Original philosophical activity had continued due to efforts by Suhrawardī, who had revived a wholly different kind of philosophy, one connected with “the spiritual vision of Ancient Persia,” and also with ancient thinkers such as Plato, Hermes, and Pythagoras. According to Corbin, this different kind of philosophy should be called Ishrāqī philosophy, which formed, according to him, a proper school of thought which constitutes the lion’s part of philosophical activity of late medieval Islam.

This narrative has a significant following. Perhaps most striking is that the narrative was generally accepted, to the extent that it found its way in introductory works on Islamic philosophy. A particularly good example is the widely read *A History of Islamic Philosophy* by Majid Fakhry, whose chapter ‘Post-Avicennian Developments’ only deals with Suhrawardī and what Fakhry calls ‘Illuminationism’ or the ‘Ishraqī Tradition’.

Yet the very influence of Suhrawardī has been called into question. Says Morris:

By Sadra’s time, the philosophical writings of Suhrawardī […] do not seem to have attracted the same sort of following and complex social connections as the three disciplines we have just discussed [kalām, falsafa, and taṣawwuf, LWCvL]. Rather than forming the basis of an independent school, they were apparently another of the intellectual options facing the small elite of educated philosophers.
This is quite the contrary to how the aforementioned scholars put it, and Morris is not alone. Fazlur Rahman remarks that “there is little evidence of the existence of any important Ishrāqī school of thought at the time of the appearance of Mullā Ṣadrā.” Rüdiger Arnzen too, remarks that, specifically on the issue of Platonic Forms, philosophers from 16th-17th century Safavid Iran were not enthusiastic about Suhrawardī’s ideas. At first Ulrich Rudolph adopts Corbin’s narrative in his introductory book on Islamic philosophy. Yet when he comes to describe the later centuries, he cannot help but note that “Compared to this long tradition [of continuing Ibn Sīnā’s philosophy], the number of scholars who continue [the philosophy of] Suhrawardī is rather modest.”

The contrast could hardly be any greater. Some scholars imply that almost everyone in the late-medieval to early-modern period was continuing the work of Suhrawardī, other scholars imply that virtually no one was doing so. Who is right, and, by implication, who is wrong? This question is not easily answered, but does invite us to take seriously this gap in our understanding of Islamic philosophy. Some efforts have been made before to understand the impact of Suhrawardī. Hellmut Ritter provides us the first tentative list of commentaries. Corbin tried to compile a list of intellectuals that may have been influenced by Suhrawardī, to provide a measure for the influence of Suhrawardī. Others filled in some details and corrections to this, though treating the list of possible influence more and more as conventional wisdom rather than open questions. For example, Corbin says “As for the works of the great Shi`ite philosopher Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, it would be interesting to find out the amount of Ishrāqī influence in it.” Nasr states that “Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī […] was not only acquainted with Suhrawardī but also influenced by him.” Ziai, in turn, warns about
Ṭūsī that “his Illuminationist attitude should not be overlooked,”¹⁶ from which Aminrazavi infers that Ṭūsī was “highly influenced by Suhrawardī.”¹⁷ All the while, actual evidence for this supposed influence is not given, let alone analyzed. Recently there have been efforts to collect evidence from the Qajar period,¹⁸ and the Indian subcontinent.¹⁹ Additionally, other scholars have sorted out certain ambiguities through their study of large amounts of manuscripts of specific intellectuals.²⁰ Yet, the question of Suhrawardī’s influence remains largely an open one.

In this article I wish to focus on a particular kind of influence, namely that which manifests itself through commentaries. I found mentions of 58 commentaries, of which I have ascertained the existence of 31. This is an impressive number, as writing a commentary is no small feat. It betrays a serious commitment of time and resources on behalf of the commentator. As such it is a proxy indicator for interest in the commented upon text at that particular time and place of the commentator. As the writing of commentaries was one of the standard practices of intellectuals in the premodern Islamic world, focussing on it should give us an impression of the average engagement with the original author. This need not be strictly positive: as I discovered in the case of Suhrawardī, only few of his commentators are committed to his philosophy. The majority seems to disagree on basic tenets. They had other reasons to write a commentary. Hunting down all commentaries therefore allows for a reasonable picture of the overall reception of a certain thinker. Listing and briefly discussing all known commentaries is therefore a good place to start investigating the influence of a certain thinker, in premodern Islamic intellectual discourse.

The remainder of this article follows a simple structure. I first provide a list of all the commentaries I could find mention of. I then go over all the authors of which I
am certain they wrote a commentary, providing some basic biographical information and providing brief evaluations of their commentaries.

**Schematic overview of reported commentaries**

I shall now present a list of commentaries on Suhrawardī’s corpus. I define a commentary as a text with “structural textual correspondence,” meaning that a target text not only evidently relies in structure on a source text, but shows intentional textual correspondence exactly in those places of the source text that define the structure and composition of the text. These ‘commentaries’ can be of different nature; commentaries (in the true sense of the word, sing. *sharḥ*), glosses (sing. ḥāshiya/ta ‘īqa), comparisons (sing. muḥākama), summaries (sing. mukhtaṣar/mulakhkhas), versifications (sing. naẓm), even translations (sing. tarjama) all have this relationship with a source text.

The following list is arranged by source text, and subsequently by date, in so far as it could be ascertained. Here, I attempt to provide an over-complete list of commentators. This means that it may be that not all persons listed here actually wrote a commentary on Suhrawardī, but at least we limit the possibility of overlooking a commentary. These false positives are a trade-off I think we should be willing to make, which we later may try to remedy with manuscript research. When we do not have manuscript evidence to confirm the existence of a commentary, this may mean one of two things. On the one hand, it may be that it was mistakenly reported as an existing commentary. This means it never existed and should have no place in the list below. On the other hand, it may have existed at some point, but that over time all the
manuscript copies were lost or destroyed, or perhaps it is still extant somewhere, but unidentified. In this case it has every right to be in the list.

I have found it to be sufficient to compare Ḥajjī Khalīfa’s (d. 1657) *Kashf al-Zunūn*, Brockelmann’s *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, Ḥibshī’s *Jāmiʿ al-shurūḥ wa-al-hawāshī*, and Corbin’s introductions to his editions in *Oeuvres Philosophiques et Mystiques*, supplemented by some scholarly studies, notably Karimi’s introduction (in Persian) to the edition of *Nūr al-fuʿād* and Pourjavady’s study on Nayrīzī, entitled *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*. For names in *italics* I could not verify the commentary’s existence. I give dates only in Hijrī notation.

1. Ḥikmat al-ishrāq - Suhrawardī, d. 587

- Shams al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī, d. ≥ 687
- Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī, d. 710
- *al-Sayyid al-Sharīf Jurjānī*, d. 816
- ‘ʿAbd al-Karīm, fl. 906
- Dāwānī, d. 908
- *Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥusayn Ḥusaynī Hamdānī*, d. 1025
- Ahmad Dada al-Mawlawī al-Rūmī, d. 1113
- *Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī (“ʿAlī ibn Abū Ṭālib al-Ḥazīn”)*, d. 1181
- *al-ʿAllāmah al-Ḥillī*, d. 726
- Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn Hindūshāh, d. ≥ 743
• Kamāl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ʿAtāʾiḥī Ḥillī, d. 781

• Najm al-Dīn al-Nayrīzī, d. ≥943

• Muḥammad Sharīf ibn Harawī, ≥1008

• ʿAbd al-Nabbī al-Shāṭīrī ʿImād al-Dīn Muḥammad ʿĀrif al-ʿUthmānī d. >1020

• Mīr Dāmād, d. 1041

• Baharām ibn Farshād Shāgīrād Ādharkīwān, d. 1044

• Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī (Mullā Ṣadrā), d. 1045

• Farzānah Baharām ibn Farshād, fl. 1048

• Jamāl al-Dīn Marʿashī, d. 1081

• Asʿad Muḥammad al-Bāniyyah, d. 1142

• Muḥammad Bāqir al-Jīlānī, fl. 12th c.

• Ḥādī Sabzawārī, d. 1289

• Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥādī, d. 1350

• ʿAbbās-qlī ibn Qanbar ʿAlī Sharīf Rāzī, d. 1374

• Anonymous, Turkish translation

2. Hayākil al-nūr - Suhrawardī, d. 587

• Anonymous

• Dawānī, d. 908
• Najm al-Dīn al-Nayrīzī, d. ≥ 943

• Khālīl ibn Abī Turāb, fl. 957

• Yahyā bin Bīr ʿAlī Nuṣūḥ al-Qusṭānīnī ("Nawī"), d. 1007

• Abū al-Faḍl ibn Mūbārak Nāgawrī ʿAllāmī, d. 1011

• ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Lāḥījī ("Fayyāḍ"), d. 1051

• Mawlā Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad Jān Qarabāghī, d. 1054

• Muḥammad Zāhid bin Muḥammad Aslām al-Haravī al-Kāhili, d. 1101

• Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ("ʿAlī ibn Abū Ṭalib al-Ḥazīn"), d. 1181

• Maḥmūd Khwajah Jahān

• ʿAbd al-Ḥayy Anšārī Farangī Mahallī, d. 1304

• Ghiyāth al-Dīn al-Dashtakī, d. 948

• Ḥasan bin Muḥammad al-Kurādī al-Zabīrī, d. ≥ 1019

• Ismāʿīl Anqaravī, d. 1041

• Anonymous, Arabic commentary, fl. 12th c.

• ʿUbayd Allāh Khān al-Tarkhānī

• Qāsim ʿAlī Akhgar Ḥaydarābādī, d. ≥ 1365

3. al-Talwīḥāt al-lawḥiyya wa-al-ʿarshiyya - Suhrawardī, d. 587

• Auto-commentary

• Ibn Kammūnā, d. 676
• Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Kāshī al-Ḥillī, d. 755\textsuperscript{71}

• Shams al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī, d. \geq 687\textsuperscript{72}

• Ḫusām al-Dīn ibn Yahyā al-Lāhījī, d. 11th c.\textsuperscript{73}

• Anonymous, *Hebrew translation*\textsuperscript{74}

4. *al-Alwāḥ al- Imādiyya* - Suhrawardī, d. 587

• Najm al-Dīn al-Nayrizī, d. \geq 943\textsuperscript{75}

5. *al-Lamaḥāt fī al-ḥaqāʾiq*

• Niẓām al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Faḍl Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Tūdhī al-Hamadhānī, d. \geq 650\textsuperscript{76}

6. *Qiṣṣat al-ghurbat al-gharbiyya* - Suhrawardī, d. 587

• Anonymous, *Persian paraphrase and explanation*\textsuperscript{77}

7. *Muʾnis al-ʿushshāq* - Suhrawardī, d. 587

• ʿImād al-Dīn ʿArabshāh Yazdī, fl. 8th c.\textsuperscript{78}

• Anonymous, *Arabic commentary*\textsuperscript{79}

• Anonymous, *Persian commentary*\textsuperscript{80}

• Anonymous, *Turkish revision*\textsuperscript{81}
8. *Awāz-i Parr-i Jibrāʾīl* - *Suhrawardī*, d. 587

- Anonymous, Arabic commentary\(^8^2\)


- Muṣannifak, d. 875\(^8^3\)

The thirty-one extant commentaries can be reduced to twenty authors. Together with *Suhrawardī*, they form what I call the restricted commentary tradition, that is, all the authors of the set of all independently circulating commentaries, represented in the list on the next page. Note that Mīr Dāmād is included, even though he only wrote one gloss. On the other hand, some authors penned multiple commentaries. Additionally, some commentaries that have survived are anonymous or could not be dated and are therefore not represented in the following list.
A chronological sketch of the eighteen intellectuals together forming the restricted commentary tradition on Suhrawardī - L.W.C. van Lit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentator</th>
<th>Death Year Hijrī</th>
<th>Death Year C.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Suhrawardī</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niẓām al-Dīn al-Tūdhī al-Hamadhānī</td>
<td>≥ 650</td>
<td>≥ 1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Kammūna</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Shahrazūrī</td>
<td>≥ 687</td>
<td>≥ 1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qūṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn Hindūshāh</td>
<td>≥ 743</td>
<td>≥ 1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Kāshī al-Ḥillī</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muṣannīfak</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Dawānī</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najm al-Dīn al-Nayrizī</td>
<td>≥ 943</td>
<td>≥ 1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghiyāth al-Dīn al-Dashtakī</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harawī</td>
<td>≥ 1008</td>
<td>≥ 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Kurdi al-Zabūrī</td>
<td>≥ 1019</td>
<td>≥ 1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīr Dāmād</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anqaravī</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullā Šadrā</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḥmad Dada al-Mawlawī al-Rūmī</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāsim ʿAlī Akhgar al-Ḥaydarābādī</td>
<td>≥ 1365</td>
<td>≥ 1945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Well known commentators

Ibn Kammūna

As far as we know, the little-known Tūdhī, to be discussed later, was the very first to write a commentary on a text by Suhrawardī, in his case on *al-Lamaḥāt*, which he finished in 650/1252. Some fifteen years later, the first well-known commentary was penned by Ibn Kammūna, who wrote on Suhrawardī’s *al-Talwīḥāt*. Ibn Kammūna was born into a Jewish family and lived in Baghdad. He died in 683/1284, perhaps in Ḥilla. It seems he earned a living as part of the administration of the Juwaynī family and not by lecturing. He was, however, in contact with the intellectual elite of his time, as is evident in his correspondence with people such as Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī and Kātibī. At a later point in his life, he started to receive patronage for his scholarly activities. It may be that his commentary on *al-Talwīḥāt* played an important role in this shift, as Pourjavady and Schmidtke point out that before the completion of this commentary in 667/1268, Ibn Kammūna was not patronized for his work, while afterwards he was.

The commentary on *al-Talwīḥāt* seems to have been produced on request by some scholars who are referred to in the introduction. It is a lemmatized commentary, covering the entirety of Suhrawardī’s *al-Talwīḥāt*. Two characteristics stand out, both attesting to Ibn Kammūna’s philosophical acumen. On the one hand, Ibn Kammūna does his best to precisely indicate what Suhrawardī is trying to say. He habitually tries to collect Suhrawardī’s argumentation in lists of arguments for or against a certain thesis. On the other hand he is not reluctant to criticize Suhrawardī, sometimes concluding with an outright dismissal of certain ideas. In the commentary,
there are references to other writings of Suhrawardī, among them Ḥikmat al-ishrāq, al-Mashā’ī, al-Alwāḥ, al-Muqawamāt, and Kalimat al-taṣawwuf. The edition of Habibi is useful, though with some caveats.⁸⁹

**Shahrazūrī**

The very little we know about the life of Shams al-Dīn Shahrazūrī is summarized by Emily Cottrell.⁹⁰ We know he was old enough to finish a text in the year 665/1267. The latest date at which we have an indication of him being alive is Jumādā al-Ūlā 687/June 1288.⁹¹ He had definitely passed away by 14 Shawwāl 704/May 9, 1305.⁹² As for his whereabouts, it may be inferred from his name that he or a close ancestor lived at least part of his life in Shahrazur. This place is in the border-region of present-day Iraq and Iran, approximately halfway between Baghdad and Tabriz.⁹³

Shahrazūrī wrote two commentaries, on al-Talwīḥāt and on Ḥikmat al-ishrāq. Pourjavady and Schmidtke found manuscript evidence that suggests Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-ishrāq was finished on 20 Rajab 685/September 11, 1286. Ziai’s edition suffers from some typos but is usable. Of the other commentary, on al-Talwīḥāt, we know only little. It has so far not been edited, and is left undiscovered in modern scholarship. My limited investigations of it show that there is textual overlap with his own Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-ishrāq and his own Rasā’il al-shajara al-ilāhīyya. evidencing parallel writing process of his corpus. Besides that, as Corbin already knew,⁹⁴ there is some textual overlap between Ibn Kammūna’s and Shahrazūrī’s commentary on al-Talwīḥāt. Given Shahrazūrī’s active writing period from 1267 to 1286, it seems
reasonable to think Ibn Kammūna’s commentary influenced Shahrazūrī, not the other way around.

Based on my experience, I would argue that Shahrazūrī is the most original author among the earliest commentators, one who appreciated Suhrwardī’s philosophical innovations and tried to develop them further. In studying the last chapter of Ḫikmat al-ishrāq, on eschatology, it became clear to me that the next author to be discussed, Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī, based his commentary nearly entirely on Shahrazūrī’s, and so did others.

**Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī**

Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī played a pivotal role in the dissemination of Suhrwardī’s thought, mainly through his *Sharḥ Ḫikmat al-ishrāq*, which was widely read for many centuries afterwards. Born in the year 634/1236, in Shiraz, he stayed there until his twenty-fourth year, studying and working as a physician. He then moved to the recently founded astronomical observatory in Maragha, to study with the famous Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī. There he also studied with others, such as Kātibī (d. 1276) and Ḥūrūdī (d. 1265). Before 676/1277, he became qāḍī of Malatya and Sivas (Anatolia), which may have been the time when he encountered the writings of Suhrwardī and Shahrazūrī. He probably stayed there until 680/1281. Around 690/1290, he ended up in Tabriz and remained there for the remainder of his life. He died there probably on 17 Ramaḍān 710/February 7, 1311.

As an author, it seems he was primarily a collector and compiler, which has especially become clear in the case of his encyclopedic work *Durrat al-tāj*. As Pourjavady and Schmidtke write, “the fact that, with the exception of portions of the
section on logic, no part of the philosophical sections of *Durrat al-tāj* was originally written by Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī, suggests that his significance as a philosopher should be reconsidered." The same goes for his *Sharḥ Hikmat al-īshrāq*, which was completed in 694/1295. It has long been suspected that it is essentially a reworking of Shahrazūrī’s commentary on *Hikmat al-īshrāq*, and my own investigations support this thesis. Comparing the two commentaries, it is nonetheless impressive to see how he reworked it, from a lemmatizing commentary into a running commentary, occasionally dropping or adding something. There is a true proliferation of different editions of Quṭb al-Dīn’s commentary, either with or without Mullā Șadrā’s glosses, and it seems too early to tell which edition will become the standard.

**Jalāl al-Dīn Dawānī and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī**

We can only speculate whether Tūdhī, Ibn Kammūna, Shahrazūrī, and Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī met each other. Others involved in the commentary tradition on Suhrawardī are separated from each other by decades, sometimes centuries. Two members of the commentary tradition, however, were not only living around the same time, but in fact in the very same city. They are Jalāl al-Dīn Dawānī and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī, both living in late 9th/15th century Shiraz. Dawānī was born around 830/1426. From 853/1449 he started producing texts, mainly in the sciences. It seems he visited Najaf and Baghdad, then went to Shiraz to work as a religious scholar. With the army of the Qaraquyunlu, he ended up in Tabriz in 872/1467. On 11 Shawwāl 872/May 4, 1468, he finished there his commentary on Suhrawardī’s *Hayākil al-nūr*. Afterwards he went back to Shiraz and stayed there for most of his life, passing away
in 908/1502. Receiving gifts from different rulers, some as far away as the Ottomans, it is clear that he had acquired fame already during his life.

Ṣadr al-Dīn Dashtakī, the father of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, was living in Shiraz as well, and Dawānī and Ṣadr al-Dīn engaged in numerous intellectual debates, writing back and forth. After Ṣadr al-Dīn had passed away, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī took over his father’s teaching position, and also continued the quarrels with Dawānī. Ghiyāth al-Dīn was born in 966/1462, in Shiraz. He stayed for most of his life in Shiraz and died there on 6 Jumādā al-ūlā 949/August 18, 1542. He was notably well-versed in mathematics. He not only wrote dedicated treatises on mathematics, but also uses mathematics in unrelated writings. He wrote his commentary on Hayākil al-nūr at an early age, before 895/1490.

Dawānī’s commentary on Hayākil al-nūr was widely circulated, also in the Ottoman and Mughal empires. This explains why it was first edited in Madras, in 1953 (reprinted in 2010). Tuysirkani’s edition of 1991 is however a major improvement upon the text. Pourjavady has suggested that “in this commentary Dawānī demonstrates his comprehensive knowledge of Suhrawardī’s works, as well as those of Suhrawardī’s earliest commentators, namely Ibn Kammūna (d. 683/1284), Shams al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī (d. after 687/1288) and Qūṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī,” but Pourjavady does not provide evidence for this. Such evidence would be important, as this suggestion would seem to imply that Dawānī was an outspoken follower of Suhrawardī, a suggestion Corbin eagerly made. Without a specific inquiry into Dawānī’s intentions in his commentary, this commitment should not be taken for granted.
Even though Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī himself calls his text a commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr*, it engages with Dawānī’s text so extensively that we may also see it as a super-commentary. His reason to start a super-commentary was perhaps fueled by resentment towards him because Dawānī won most intellectual debates with the father of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Ṣadr al-Dīn. The many sarcastic and mocking remarks support such an interpretation. An example of this is Dashtakī’s sarcastic praise for Dawānī’s comment on Suhrawardī’s spelling of melancholia (*mālīkhūliyā*), correcting it into *mālīnhūliyā*, with an *n* in the middle. Dashtakī retorts: “May God reward him well for [his] search for knowledge, for even though he does many people [lit.: them] harm by [proposing] wrong ideas […] he sometimes also leads them to beautiful, precious pearls and significant, beneficial points like this.” Clearly, then, he thinks little of Dawānī’s efforts. Aside from this, there may have been another reason for Dashtakī to write a commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr*. He had a mystical experience in his late twenties which he made sense of by using the concept of a world of image (*ʿālam al-mithāl*), which he took from the commentary tradition on Suhrawardī. In his commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr*, he includes a discussion of the world of image.

Awjabi’s edition is usable if one keeps the appendices of that edition in mind, which contain passages that may belong to the actual text of Dashtakī’s commentary. As pointed out by Pourjavady, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī lectured on Suhrawardī’s writings and from one *ijāzah* (‘license’) it seems as though he himself prepared a commentary on *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*. Unfortunately, we do not have manuscript evidence for this.
Mīr Dāmād and Mullā Ṣadrā

The next two names, those of Mīr Dāmād and Mullā Ṣadrā, are not names of adversaries but rather those of master and student. Mīr Dāmād (d. 1041/1631) was born in Astarābād in the second half of the 10th/16th century. He studied in Mashhad, and later in life worked at the courts of Isfahan. At Isfahan, he apparently studied with Sammākī, himself a student of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī. Though this could be a line of transmission for Suhrawardī’s philosophy, it need not be so. There is only little evidence of any interest in Suhrawardī. We do have a gloss on §268 of Ḥikmat al-ishrāq, of about 2.5 pages in length in a mix of Persian and Arabic, written in 1029/1619. Since it is properly introduced and concluded in its manuscript evidence, and since it has been edited, it is a good example of how small a text can be while still attaining the status of an independently circulating treatise and therefore a proper part of the commentary tradition. Suhrawardī’s passage in question is a flowery description of the justice of God towards mankind, to which Mīr Dāmād notes that this passage does not mean that Suhrawardī believes in metempsychosis. The text testifies to the continuing unease and uncertainty about Suhrawardī’s position on metempsychosis.

The most famous student of his, is known as Mullā Ṣadrā or Ṣadr al-muta‘allihīn. Given his fame, it is odd that we do not know for sure when he died. Rizvi suggests 1045/1636 as the most likely date, however, most biographical sources give 1050/1641. Rizvi infers from self-referential evidence in Mullā Ṣadrā’s corpus, that he was born in 979/1572, in Shiraz. Mullā Ṣadrā had apparently a number of writings of Dawānī and the two Dashtakīs in his possession. Rizvi interprets Mullā Ṣadrā’s ownership of these writings as meaning that he was self-taught at a young age.
Around age forty, Mullā Ṣadrā went for a few years into seclusion near the village of Kahak. Afterwards, he returned to teaching and writing in various places, mostly in Qom and Shiraz, in the meantime completing seven pilgrimages to Mecca.

Most of Mullā Ṣadrā’s textual output may be dated after this retreat, among them the huge *Ta’līqa ‘alā Sharḥ Hikmat al-ıshrāq*. It was probably finished after 1015/1606 and before 1041/1631. Although most modern sources agree on understanding the title as a commentary on Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī’s commentary, it is in fact a collection of glosses directly on Suhrawardī’s text, with only occasional references to Quṭb al-Dīn’s commentary._ The confusion is understandable as his glosses seem to have always been copied together with *Sharḥ Hikmat al-ıshrāq*, never simply *Hikmat al-ıshrāq*. This could be an indication that neither Suhrawardī’s text, nor Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī’s commentary were wide-spread at the time, for otherwise Mullā Ṣadrā’s glosses could have been simply distributed separately, significantly reducing the amount of paper needed (and thereby resources and time) to complete a copy._ An edition has long been a desideratum, which has now been fulfilled by more than one editor. It remains to be seen which edition holds up best. I have had a good experience with Musavi’s edition.

**Lesser known commentators**

**TÜDHĪ**

His name is Niẓām al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Faḍl Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Tūdhī al-Hamadhānī. Tūdhī is either in the vicinity of Samarqand or Merv._ The commentary, on *al-Lamaḥāt*, is dedicated to Nāṣir al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn Shujāʿ al-Dīn Qilij al-Ḥāṣiri._ Since Tūdhī himself states he finished the commentary on 27 Ṣafar 650/May
we may consider this text to be the earliest known commentary on any text from Suhrawardī’s corpus. The text is therefore evidence that Suhrawardī’s writings enjoyed some popularity starting at most half a century after his death. If we are to assume Tūdhī did not travel far away, his commentary is evidence of a rather swift transmission of Suhrawardī’s writings from the Mediterranean to Transoxiana. According to Maalouf there are some lacunae in the source text. The limited time I spent studying this text did not reveal a particularly positive or negative attitude towards Suhrawardī’s thinking.

**Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn Hindūshāh**

A one-page note by either this person or his son is preserved in Esad Efendi 1932. Perhaps this person is to be identified as al-Nakhjavānī, which is plausible considering that the date contained the manuscript is close to a finishing date of a writing of this al-Nakhjavānī. This would place this commentary in the 14th century. The note relates a dream in which the prophet Muḥammad collects Suhrawardī’s bones for a proper burial.

**Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Kāshī al-Ḥillī**

ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Kāshānī, also known as al-Qāshī al-Ḥillī, was born in Kāshān and grew up in Ḩilla. He spent most of his time in Ḩilla and Baghdad, but died in 755/1354, in Najaf. He wrote several treatises on philosophy, most of them being commentaries or glosses. He wrote a partial gloss on Ibn Kammūna’s *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt*, abruptly stopping in the middle of the part on metaphysics.
Muşannifak

Corbin drew attention to a commentary, entitled Ḥall al-rumūz wa-kashf mafāṭiḥ al-kunūz on Risālat al-ābrāj, written by ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Bistāmī, known simply as Muşannifak (“the little writer”). This author was born in 803/1400 at Shāhrūd near Bistām. If our sources are correct, he first travelled 800 kilometers East to Herat, and studied there. In 848/1444 he undertook an even longer journey, but this time Westward, ending up in Anatolia, under the newly established Ottoman dynasty. After the conquest of Constantinople, he settled there and lived off a stipend provided by Sultan Mehmed II. He finished his commentary in 866/1462, in Edirne, which shows that Suhrawardī’s writings entered the Ottoman intellectual domain early on.

Najm al-Dīn al-Nayrizī

Pourjavady showed that several commentaries were written by Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd al-Nayrizī. His birth date is unknown, and the earliest trace we have of him is a copy of Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī’s Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-īshrāq in his hand, finished in 897/1491. He studied in Shiraz with Ṣadr al-Dīn Dashtakī and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī, probably mostly busying himself with theology and philosophy. Pourjavady shows that Ghiyāth al-Dīn read with him Hayākil al-nūr and Ḥikmat al-īshrāq, with Ghiyāth al-Dīn’s own commentary alongside. We do not know exactly when he died, but Pourjavady proposed he was still alive in 943/1536 while he apparently did not outlive Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī, who died in 948/1541.
Around 913/1505, he finished his glosses on *Hikmat al-ishrāq*, and he completed his commentary on *al-Alwāḥ*, on 5 Rabi` II 930/11 February 1524, in Yazd. He called it *Miṣbāḥ al-arwāḥ fī sharḥ haqāʾiq al-Alwāḥ*. He slightly revised it two years later, when he found an additional section of *al-Alwāḥ* that he had previously not seen. Also in 930/1524, but after *Miṣbāḥ*, he finished his glosses on Dawānī’s *Shawākil al-ḥūr*, of which, Nayrizī says himself, he had draft versions from the time of his youth. Especially the commentary on *al-Alwāḥ* is an impressive piece of writing. It is huge and Nayrizī cites from virtually the entire commentary tradition on Suhrawardī. Clearly, Nayrizī was deeply interested in these writings, but as with previous intellectuals, this in itself does not mean he was a faithful adherent of Suhrawardī’s philosophy and occasionally raises criticism. Hopefully it will come out in an edition at some point.

**Harawī**

Of the author of *Anwāriyya*, a commentary on *Hikmat al-ishrāq*, we know his name to be Muḥammad Sharīf Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn al-Harawī, and that he composed the commentary in 1008/1600. Ziai, editor of *Anwāriyya*, further asserts that he was part of the Chisthi Sufi order and may have lived in India. Harawī makes many comparative references to Indian philosophy, but for the majority relies on Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī’s *Sharḥ Hikmat al-ishrāq*. Sometimes, he makes this explicit by introducing a citation with qāla al-shārīḥ (‘the commentator says’). Sometimes, he paraphrases in Persian Quṭb al-Dīn’s Arabic commentary. Sometimes it is not exactly a paraphrase, but is still using key terminology from Quṭb al-Dīn’s text.
Generally speaking, Harawī’s text covers Suhrawardī’s introduction and part two of *Hikmat al-ishrāq*. Noticeably, he leaves out significant parts of the earlier chapters of the second part. In the first chapter, he only picks up sentences here and there for the first few pages and leaves out the rest. Of the second chapter, he leaves out the first ten subparts (*fūsūl*), beginning his commentary with the last paragraph of the tenth subpart. In the parts that he covers, he leaves out a few sentences of Suhrawardī’s text here and there, but in general follows it faithfully. Some of the sentences he does not give in citation, in Arabic, but rather paraphrases them in Persian. He adopted the lemmatized commentary style, but his lemmas are usually only one sentence long. In fact, when one compares the way Harawī’s text compartmentalizes Suhrawardī’s text with the way Ziai and Walbridge split up Suhrawardī’s text into English sentences, the result is almost complete similarity.

**Ḥasan al-Kurdī and Muḥammad Bāqir al-Jīlānī**

Another commentator goes by the name of Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Kurdī al-Zībārī. He wrote a versification of *Hayākil al-nūr*, in which he also included fragments of some of the commentaries on Suhrawardī’s texts. Ritter suggests that MS Laleli 2486, finished in 1019/1610, could be an autograph. If he is the same author as the glosses on Samarqandī’s *Risālat al-istiʿārāt* (a text on rhetoric), he presumably died in 1040/1630. Laleli 2486 is in a most legible naskh, nearly fully vocalized and with each hemistich clearly marked with dots in red ink. The title page reads, loosely translated:
The *alfiya* on Metaphysics according to the teaching of the Ishrāqīs as it is contained in the *Hayākil al-nūr*, with extracts from its commentary and something from *Hikmat al-ishedrāq*.

The poem indeed runs to about a thousand (*alf*) verses (estimated, ±20), structured according to the seven chapters of *Hayākil al-nūr*. Since *Hayākil al-nūr* does not have a discussion on metempsychosis, Ḥasan al-Kurdī added a section at the end of his poem specifically on this, under the heading “Epilogue to the Seven Temples, on metempsychosis” (*khātima al-hayākil al-sab’ āfī bayān al-tanāsukh*), in which he draws mostly from *Hikmat al-ishedrāq*. This part alone accounts for more than a quarter of the poem and merits further investigation.

Similar evidence for the continued interest in Suhrawardi’s ideas on metempsychosis is a commentary on the last chapter of *Hikmat al-ishedrāq* by a certain Muḥammad Bāqir al-Jilānī. The text is extant in two manuscripts, one dating to 1707.

**Ismāʿīl Anqaravī and Aḥmad Dada al-Mawlawī al-Rūmī**

Ismāʿīl Anqaravī (d. 1041/1631) wrote a commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr*, called *Īḍāḥ al-hikam*, in which he draws extensively from Dawānī’s commentary. From Kuşpinar’s study, we learn that Anqaravī studied a wide variety of topics in Ankara, and became acquainted with different Sufi orders at a young age. He went to Konya and came in contact with the Mawlawī order. This eventually allowed him to fulfill an important position in Istanbul, being Shaykhlik from 1019/1610 onwards, until his death in 1041/1631. His commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr* is characterized by Kuşpinar as a way “to remove the stigma of the heretical scent of ittiḥād (unification) and ḥulūl
(incarnation) from the notorious utterances of certain renowned mystics, and thus to justify the coincidence of their doctrine with ‘Islamic orthodoxy’.” This makes sense when one considers the content of Anqaravī’s commentary, and also makes sense when we remember that he was living at a time when a new group, the Kadizadeli, was advocating a vigilant adherence to orthodoxy, its members actively attacking Sufi practices.

A few generations later we find in the Ottoman Empire Aḥmad Dada. He was astronomer and historian who died in Mecca in 1701. His glosses are contained in Ragip Pasa 854, along with Nayrīzī’s glosses. They can be separated by the signs with which they are accompanied, which are explained on a page before the first folio. It seems there are only very few glosses belonging to him.

Muḥammad ʿAlī Ḥazīn and ʿUbayd Allāh Khān al-Tarkhānī

Although my intention was to only expand on those commentators whose identity we know and whose text is extant, I wish to make a few exceptions here. ʿUbayd Allāh Khān al-Tarkhānī wrote a commentary on Hayākīl al-nūr, which seems to be making some use of Dawānī’s commentary. His commentary cannot be dated exactly, but the sole surviving manuscript, preserved in Lahore, is dated to 1209/1794, and perhaps this commentary comes from that time or a century earlier. This would go well with two other pieces of evidence of the continued interest in Suhrawardī in the 18th century.

The first piece of evidence are the writings of Muḥammad ʿAlī Ḥazīn. Ḥazīn was a prolific intellectual best known for his poetry. He was born at Isfahān in 1103/1692 and travelled a lot, eventually going to India. He died in 1180/1766, at
Benares which is also known as Varanasi, located even further East than Lucknow. In his autobiography he writes about the texts that he studied, which include many well-known philosophical and scientific titles. For our purpose, it is of note that he studied *Sharḥ Hayākil al-nūr* in Isfahan with Amīr Sayyid Ḵasan of Ṭāliqān, and also studied *al-Talwīḥāt*, in Shiraz with Molla Muḥammad Bāqir. He must have studied these texts between 1117/1705 and 1127/1715. More importantly, he claims to have written a gloss on *Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*, a gloss on *Sharḥ Hayākil al-nūr*, and a commentary on *Kalimat al-taṣawwuf*, in Isfahan around the year 1034/1721. Next to an autobiography he also compiled a list of his own works in which there are even more references to Suhrawardī. A gloss on *al-Talwīḥāt* and a gloss on *al-Mashārī* are mentioned. Additionally, two treatises seem to engage substantially with Suhrawardī’s philosophy: *Risāla fī bayān al-quwwa al-qudsiyya* and *Risāla al-baḥth maʾa al-shaykh al-Suhrwardī fī al-ruʿyā*. None of these writings have survived. Perhaps they were all written at an early age, and were part of the writings that were plundered in 1135/1722 (age 30), when he had to flee in disguise during the Siege of Isfahan.

The second piece of evidence is the Manuscript 124 held at the University of Michigan. The repeated mention of Mīr Zāhid is presumably a reference to Mīr Muḥammad Zāhid b. Muḥammad Aslam al-Harawī (d. 1101/1689), dating this writing for the 18th century or later. It consists mainly of rewordings of Dawānī’s and Dashtakī’s commentaries, and in fact the document reads as study notes on those text. On folios 4-13 the author includes seven excursuses (sing. *maṭla*) on specific notions pertinent to Suhrwardī’s *Hayākil al-nūr* and on folios 51-60 the author intersperses his own comments between his usage of Dawānī and Dashtakī. The manuscript is
therefore valuable evidence for the continued interest and detailed study of 
Suhrawardī’s works in the 18th century.

**Qāsim ʿAlī Akhgar Ḥaydarābādī**

An outlier in this commentary tradition is Ḥaydarābādī, who lived in 20th 
century India and wrote a commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr*. It has been partly edited,147 based on the autograph.148 Karimi suggests that Ḥaydarābādī was alive at least 
between 1894 and 1945, the latter being the date of completion of the commentary on 
*Hayākil al-nūr*. Ḥaydarābādī wrote mostly on religious subjects, though also on 
various other subjects, ranging from poetry to astronomy. The commentary is in 
Persian and is entitled *Nihāyat al-ẓuhūr*. It starts with a long introduction, in which 
various subjects are discussed, mostly to bring out the difference between the 
Peripatetic point of view (*minhaj-i mashshāʿīn*) and Suhrawardī’s point of view 
(ṣarīq-i ʿishrāqiyyīn).149 After this introduction, he comments on each chapters of 
Suhrawardī’s *Hayākil al-nūr*, loosely citing Suhrawardī’s text in Arabic.150

**Conclusion**

I have given here a list of commentaries on Suhrawardī’s corpus by bringing 
together bibliographical information and the accumulated wisdom of almost a century 
of scholarship. In total I was able to include fifty-eight commentaries, of which at 
least thirty-one have survived, for which I could find twenty different authors. Six of 
them lived not much more than a century after Suhrawardī, of which three had close 
ties to Baghdad. Three lived in Shiraz around the year 1500, and five lived around 
1600. Of these five, two had a connection to the three intellectuals from Shiraz.
Though this is evidence for Suhrawardī’s importance for late medieval and early modern Islamic philosophy, we noticed at the same time that among the commentators there are dissident voices and divergent reasons for writing. Commenting on Suhrawardī does not in the least mean that we should call the commentator an adherent of Suhrawardī, or part of an ‘ishrāqī school of philosophy.’ It merely indicates that Suhrawardī was read at that time and place, and captivated an intellectual so much he spent time and resources on writing a commentary. In fact, if one thing has become clear, it is the diversity of the authors’ background, time, and place. The time frame spans from the early 13th century to the 20th century, and the geographical spread extends from Edirne to Hyderabad. I hope this overview may serve as a new springboard for future research on Suhrawardī and his commentators.
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