



PROJECT MUSE®

---

## The Commentary Tradition on Suhrawardī

L.W.C. (Eric) van Lit

Philosophy East and West, Early Release, (Article)

Published by University of Hawai'i Press



This is a preprint article. When the final version of this article launches, this URL will be automatically redirected.

- ➔ For additional information about this preprint article  
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/633829/summary>

# **The Commentary Tradition on Suhrawardī**

L.W.C. (Eric) van Lit

Institut dominicain d'études orientales

eric@digitalorientalist.com

## **Introduction<sup>1</sup>**

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,<sup>2</sup> but he

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).<sup>3</sup> The philosophy that had more or less died out in the Islamic world, in Corbin's eyes, was the 'Peripatetic' (*Mashshā'ī*) 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,"<sup>4</sup> and also with ancient thinkers such as Plato, Hermes, and Pythagoras. According to Corbin, this different kind of philosophy should be called *Ishraqī* 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.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps most striking is that the narrative was generally accepted, to the extent that it found its way in introductory works on Islamic philosophy.<sup>6</sup> 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 'Ishraqi Tradition'.<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup>

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.”<sup>9</sup> Rüdiger Arnzen too, remarks that, specifically on the issue of Platonic Forms, philosophers from 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> century Safavid Iran were not enthusiastic about Suhrawardī’s ideas.<sup>10</sup> 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] Suhrawardi is rather modest.”<sup>11</sup>

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.<sup>12</sup> Corbin tried to compile a list of intellectuals that may have been influenced by Suhrawardī, to provide a measure for the influence of Suhrawardī.<sup>13</sup> 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 Shī‘ite philosopher Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, it would be interesting to find out the amount of *Ishrāqī* influence in it.”<sup>14</sup> Nasr states that “Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī [...] was not only acquainted with Suhrawardī but also influenced by him.”<sup>15</sup> Ziai, in turn, warns about

Ṭūsī that “his Illuminist attitude should not be overlooked,”<sup>16</sup> from which Aminrazavi infers that Ṭūsī was “highly influenced by Suhrawardī.”<sup>17</sup> 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,<sup>18</sup> and the Indian subcontinent.<sup>19</sup> Additionally, other scholars have sorted out certain ambiguities through their study of large amounts of manuscripts of specific intellectuals.<sup>20</sup> 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*),<sup>21</sup> glosses (sing. *ḥāshiya/ta'liqa*), comparisons (sing. *muḥākama*), summaries (sing. *mukhtaṣar/mulakḥḥaṣ*), versifications (sing. *naẓm*), even translations (sing. *tarjama*) all have this relationship with a source text.<sup>22</sup>

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 *Jāmi' al-shurūḥ wa-al-ḥawāshī*, 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-fu'ād* 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<sup>23</sup>

- Shams al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī, d. ≥ 687<sup>24</sup>
- Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī, d. 710<sup>25</sup>
  - *al-Sayyid al-Sharīf Jurjānī*, d. 816<sup>26</sup>
  - *'Abd al-Karīm*, fl. 900<sup>27</sup>
  - Dawānī, d. 908<sup>28</sup>
  - *Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥusayn Ḥusaynī Hamdānī*, d. 1025<sup>29</sup>
  - Aḥmad Dada al-Mawlawī al-Rūmī, d. 1113<sup>30</sup>
  - *Muḥammad ibn 'Alī* (“*'Alī ibn Abū Ṭālib al-Ḥazīn*”), d. 1181<sup>31</sup>
- *al-'Allāmah al-Ḥillī*, d. 726<sup>32</sup>
- Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn Hindūshāh, d. ≥ 743<sup>33</sup>

- *Kamāl al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ‘Atā’iqī Ḥillī, d. 781*<sup>34</sup>
- Najm al-Dīn al-Nayrīzī, d. ≥ 943<sup>35</sup>
- Moḥammad Sharīf ibn Harawī, ≥1008<sup>36</sup>
- *‘Abd al-Nabbī al-Shaṭṭārī ‘Imād al-Dīn Muḥammad ‘Ārif al-‘Uthmānī d. >1020*<sup>37</sup>
- Mīr Dāmād, d. 1041<sup>38</sup>
- *Bahrām ibn Farshād Shāgirad Ādharkīwān, d. 1044*<sup>39</sup>
- Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī (Mullā Ṣadrā), d. 1045<sup>40</sup>
- *Farzānah Bahrām ibn Farshād, fl. 1048*<sup>41</sup>
- *Jamāl al-Dīn Mar‘ashī, d. 1081*<sup>42</sup>
- *As‘ad Muḥammad al-Bāniyyah, d. 1142*<sup>43</sup>
- Muḥammad Bāqir al-Jīlānī, fl. 12th c.<sup>44</sup>
- *Hādī Sabzawārī, d. 1289*<sup>45</sup>
- *Mīrzā Muḥammad Hādī, d. 1350*<sup>46</sup>
- *‘Abbās-qulī ibn Qanbar ‘Alī Sharīf Rāzī, d. 1374*<sup>47</sup>
- *Anonymous, Turkish translation*<sup>48</sup>

## **2. Hayākil al-nūr - Suhrawardī, d. 587**<sup>49</sup>

- Anonymous<sup>50</sup>
- Dawānī, d. 908<sup>51</sup>

- Najm al-Dīn al-Nayrīzī, d. ≥ 943<sup>52</sup>
- *Khalīl ibn Abī Turāb*, fl. 957<sup>53</sup>
- *Yahyá bin Bīr ‘Alī Nuṣūḥ al-Qusṭanīnī* (“*Naw ‘ī*”), d. 1007<sup>54</sup>
- *Abū al-Faḍl ibn Mubāarak Nāgawrī ‘Allāmī*, d. 1011<sup>55</sup>
- ‘*Abd al-Razzāq al-Lāhījī* (“*Fayyāḍ*”), d. 1051<sup>56</sup>
- *Mawlā Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad Jān Qarabāghī*, d. 1054?<sup>57</sup>
- *Muḥammad Zāhid bin Muḥammad Aslam al-Harawī al-Kābilī*, d. 1101<sup>58</sup>
- *Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī* (“*‘Alī ibn Abū Ṭālib al-Ḥazīn*”), d. 1181<sup>59</sup>
- *Maḥmūd Kh<sup>w</sup>ajah Jahān*<sup>60</sup>
- ‘*Abd al-Ḥayy Anṣārī Farangī Maḥallī*, d. 1304<sup>61</sup>
- Ghiyāth al-Dīn al-Dashtakī, d. 948<sup>62</sup>
- Ḥasan bin Muḥammad al-Kurdī al-Zabīrī, d. ≥ 1019<sup>63</sup>
- Ismā‘īl Anqaravī, d. 1041<sup>64</sup>
- Anonymous, Arabic commentary, fl. 12th c.<sup>65</sup>
- ‘Ubayd Allāh Khān al-Tarkhānī<sup>66</sup>
- Qāsim ‘Alī Akhgar Ḥaydarābādī, d. ≥ 1365<sup>67</sup>

### **3. *al-Talwīḥāt al-lawḥiyya wa-al-‘arshiyya* - Suhrawardī, d. 587<sup>68</sup>**

- *Auto-commentary*<sup>69</sup>
- Ibn Kammūnā, d. 676<sup>70</sup>

- Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Kāshī al-Ḥillī, d. 755<sup>71</sup>
- Shams al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī, d. ≥ 687<sup>72</sup>
- *Ḥusām al-Dīn ibn Yaḥyā al-Lāhījī*, d. 11th c.<sup>73</sup>
- *Anonymous, Hebrew translation*<sup>74</sup>

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

- Najm al-Dīn al-Nayrīzī, d. ≥ 943<sup>75</sup>

#### **5. *al-Lamaḥāt fī al-ḥaqā’iq***

- Nizām al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Faḍl Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Tūdhī al-Hamadhānī, d. ≥ 650<sup>76</sup>

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

- Anonymous, Persian paraphrase and explanation<sup>77</sup>

#### **7. *Mu’nis al-‘ushshāq* - Suhrawardī, d. 587**

- ‘Imād al-Dīn ‘Arabshāh Yazdī, fl. 8th c.<sup>78</sup>
- Anonymous, Arabic commentary<sup>79</sup>
- Anonymous, Persian commentary<sup>80</sup>
- Anonymous, Turkish revision<sup>81</sup>

**8. *Awāz-i Parr-i Jibrā'īl* - Suhrawardī, d. 587**

- Anonymous, Arabic commentary<sup>82</sup>

**9. *Risālat al-abrāj* - Suhrawardī, d. 587**

- Muṣannifak, d. 875<sup>83</sup>

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.*

<i>Commentator</i>	<i>Death Year Hijrī</i>	<i>Death Year C.E.</i>
<i>Al-Suhrawardī</i>	587	1191
Niẓām al-Dīn al-Tūdhī al-Hamadhānī	≥ 650	≥ 1252
Ibn Kammūna	676	1277
Al-Shahrazūrī	≥ 687	≥ 1288
Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī	710	1310
Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn Hindūshāh	≥ 743	≥ 1342
Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Kāshī al-Ḥillī	755	1354
Muṣannifak	875	1470
Al-Dawānī	908	1502
Najm al-Dīn al-Nayrīzī	≥ 943	≥ 1536
Ghiyāth al-Dīn al-Dashtakī	948	1541
Harawī	≥ 1008	≥ 1599
Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Kurdī al-Zabīrī	≥ 1019	≥ 1610
Mīr Dāmād	1041	1631
Anqaravī	1041	1631
Mullā Ṣadrā	1045	1635
Aḥmad Dada al-Mawlawī al-Rūmī	1113	1701
Qāsim ‘Alī Akhgar al-Ḥaydarābādī	≥ 1365	≥ 1945

## 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.<sup>84</sup> It seems he earned a living as part of the administration of the Juwaynī family and not by lecturing.<sup>85</sup> 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.<sup>86</sup> 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.<sup>87</sup>

The commentary on *al-Talwīḥāt* seems to have been produced on request by some scholars who are referred to in the introduction.<sup>88</sup> 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-Mashāriʿ*, *al-Alwāḥ*, *al-Muqāwamāt*, and *Kalimat al-taṣawwuf*. The edition of Habibi is useful, though with some caveats.<sup>89</sup>

## Shahrazūrī

The very little we know about the life of Shams al-Dīn Shahrazūrī is summarized by Emily Cottrell.<sup>90</sup> 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.<sup>91</sup> He had definitely passed away by 14 Shawwāl 704/May 9, 1305.<sup>92</sup> 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.<sup>93</sup>

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 undiscussed 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-ilāhiyya*, evidencing parallel writing process of his corpus. Besides that, as Corbin already knew,<sup>94</sup> 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 Suhrawardī's philosophical innovations and tried to develop them further. In studying the last chapter of *Hikmat 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 Suhrawardī's thought, mainly through his *Sharḥ Hikmat 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.<sup>95</sup> 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 'Urḏī (d. 1265). Before 676/1277, he became *qāḏī* of Malatya and Sivas (Anatolia), which may have been the time when he encountered the writings of Suhrawardī and Shahrazūrī.<sup>96</sup> 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 Ramaḏān 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.”<sup>97</sup> The same goes for his *Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*, which was completed in 694/1295.<sup>98</sup> It has long been suspected that it is essentially a reworking of Shahrāzūrī’s commentary on *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*,<sup>99</sup> 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 Ṣadrā’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, Shahrāzūrī, 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 9<sup>th</sup>/15<sup>th</sup> century Shiraz.<sup>100</sup> 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 Qaraqyunlu, 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.

Şadr al-Dīn Dashtakī, the father of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, was living in Shiraz as well, and Dawānī and Şadr al-Dīn engaged in numerous intellectual debates, writing back and forth. After Şadr 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.<sup>101</sup> He wrote his commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr* at an early age, before 895/1490.<sup>102</sup>

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.<sup>103</sup> 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 Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī,"<sup>104</sup> 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.<sup>105</sup> 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*,<sup>106</sup> 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 *mālīnkhūliyā*, with an *n* in the middle.<sup>107</sup> 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.”<sup>108</sup> 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 (*‘ālam 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.<sup>109</sup>

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.<sup>110</sup>

## 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 10<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>111</sup> 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.<sup>112</sup> 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.<sup>113</sup> 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.<sup>114</sup> 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'liqat alā Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*. It was probably finished after 1015/1606 and before 1041/1631.<sup>115</sup> 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.<sup>116</sup> The confusion is understandable as his glosses seem to have always been copied together with *Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*, never simply *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*. 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.<sup>117</sup> 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**

### **Tūdhī**

His name is Nizām al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Faḍl Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Tūdhī al-Hamadhānī. Tūdh is either in the vicinity of Samarqand or Merv.<sup>118</sup> The commentary, on *al-Lamaḥāt*, is dedicated to Nāṣir al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn Shujā' al-Dīn Qilij al-Ḥāṣirī.<sup>119</sup> Since Tūdhī himself states he finished the commentary on 27 Ṣafar 650/May

9, 1252,<sup>120</sup> 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.<sup>121</sup> 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-Nakhjawānī, which is plausible considering that the date contained the manuscript is close to a finishing date of a writing of this al-Nakhjawānī.<sup>122</sup> This would place this commentary in the 14<sup>th</sup> 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**

‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Kāshānī, also known as al-Qāshī al-Ḥillī, was born in Kāshān and grew up in Ḥilla. He spent most of his time in Ḥilla and Baghdad, but died in 755/1354, in Najaf. He wrote several treatises on philosophy, most of them being commentaries or glosses.<sup>123</sup> He wrote a partial gloss on Ibn Kammūna's *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt*, abruptly stopping in the middle of the part on metaphysics.<sup>124</sup>

## **Muṣannifak**

Corbin drew attention to a commentary, entitled *Ḥall al-rumūz wa-kashf mafātih al-kunūz* on *Risālat al-abrāj*, written by ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Biṣṭāmī, known simply as Muṣannifak (“the little writer”).<sup>125</sup> This author was born in 803/1400 at Shāhrūd near Biṣṭām.<sup>126</sup> 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-Nayrīzī**

Pourjavady showed that several commentaries were written by Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd al-Nayrīzī.<sup>127</sup> 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-ishrāq* 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-ishrāq*, 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 *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*, and he completed his commentary on *al-Alwāḥ*, on 5 Rabīʿ II 930/11 February 1524, in Yazd.<sup>128</sup> He called it *Miṣbāḥ al-arwāḥ fī sharḥ ḥaqāʾiq 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, Nayrīzī 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 Nayrīzī cites from virtually the entire commentary tradition on Suhrawardī. Clearly, Nayrīzī 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 *Ḥikmat 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.<sup>129</sup> 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 Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*. Sometimes, he makes this explicit by introducing a citation with *qāla al-shāriḥ* ('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.<sup>130</sup>

Generally speaking, Harawī's text covers Suhrawardī's introduction and part two of *Ḥikmat 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.<sup>131</sup> Of the second chapter, he leaves out the first ten subparts (*fuṣūl*), beginning his commentary with the last paragraph of the tenth subpart.<sup>132</sup> 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.<sup>133</sup> If he is the same author as the glosses on Samarqandī's *Risālat al-isti'ārāt* (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 *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*.<sup>134</sup>

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‘a fī bayān al-tanāsukh*), in which he draws mostly from *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*. This part alone accounts for more than a quarter of the poem and merits further investigation.

Similar evidence for the continued interest in Suhrawardī’s ideas on metempsychosis is a commentary on the last chapter of *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq* by a certain Muḥammad Bāqir al-Jīlānī. The text is extant in two manuscripts, one dating to 1707.<sup>135</sup>

### **Ismā‘īl Anqaravī and Aḥmad Dada al-Mawlawī al-Rūmī**

Ismā‘īl Anqaravī (d. 1041/1631) wrote a commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr*, called *Īdāḥ al-ḥikam*, in which he draws extensively from Dawānī’s commentary. From Kuşpınar’s study,<sup>136</sup> 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 Kuşpınar as a way “to remove the stigma of the heretical scent of *ittihād* (unification) and *ḥulūl*

(incarnation) from the notorious utterances of certain renowned mystics, and thus to justify the coincidence of their doctrine with ‘Islamic orthodoxy’.”<sup>137</sup> 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 ‘Alī Ḥazīn and ‘Ubayd 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. ‘Ubayd Allāh Khān al-Tarkhānī wrote a commentary on *Hayākil 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 18<sup>th</sup> century.

The first piece of evidence are the writings of Muḥammad ‘Alī Ḥazīn. Ḥazīn was a prolific intellectual best known for his poetry. He was born at Isfahan 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 Ḥasan of Ṭāliqān,<sup>138</sup> and also studied *al-Talwīḥāt*, in Shiraz with Molla Muḥammad Bāqir.<sup>139</sup> He must have studied these texts between 1117/1705 and 1127/1715.<sup>140</sup> 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.<sup>141</sup> Next to an autobiography he also compiled a list of his own works in which there are even more references to Suhrawardī.<sup>142</sup> A gloss on *al-Talwīḥāt* and a gloss on *al-Mashāriḥ* are mentioned.<sup>143</sup> Additionally, two treatises seem to engage substantially with Suhrawardī's philosophy: *Risāla fī bayān al-quwwa al-qudsiyya* and *Risāla al-baḥth ma'ā al-shaykh al-Suhrawardī fī al-ru'yā*.<sup>144</sup> 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),<sup>145</sup> when he had to flee in disguise during the Siege of Isfahan.<sup>146</sup>

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 18<sup>th</sup> 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. *maṭlab*) on specific notions pertinent to Suhrawardī'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 18<sup>th</sup> century.

### **Qāsim 'Alī Akhgar Ḥaydarābādī**

An outlier in this commentary tradition is Ḥaydarābādī, who lived in 20<sup>th</sup> century India and wrote a commentary on *Hayākil al-nūr*. It has been partly edited,<sup>147</sup> based on the autograph.<sup>148</sup> 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-zuhūr*. 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 mashshā'īn*) and Suhrawardī's point of view (*ṭarīq-i ishrāqiyīn*).<sup>149</sup> After this introduction, he comments on each chapters of Suhrawardī's *Hayākil al-nūr*, loosely citing Suhrawardī's text in Arabic.<sup>150</sup>

### **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 13<sup>th</sup> century to the 20<sup>th</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>. The research for this article was supported by the European Research Council Starting Grant 'The Here and the Hereafter in Islamic Traditions' (no. 263308) and by the MacMillan Center at Yale University. I thank John Walbridge and Mohammad Javad Esmaeili for sharing valuable information regarding some of the more obscure commentators.

<sup>2</sup>. The dominant narrative of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, see e.g. Boer, Tj. de, *Geschichte der Philosophie im Islam* (Stuttgart: Fr. Frommanns Verlag, 1901).

<sup>3</sup>. E.g. Corbin, H., *En Islam Iranien: Aspects spirituels et philosophiques: II Sohrawardī et les Platoniciens de Perse*, Paris: Gallimard, 1971, p. 10; Corbin, H., *History of Islamic Philosophy*, transl. by L. Sherrard, New York: Kegan Paul International, 1993, p. 205.

<sup>4</sup>. Corbin, *En Islam Iranien*, vol. 2, p. 10.

<sup>5</sup>. Notable examples include Nasr, S.H., *Three Muslim Sages*, Delmar: Caravan Books, 1976, p. 55; Landolt, H., "Two Types of Mystical Thought in Iran: An essay on Suhrawardī Shaykh al-Ishrāq and 'Aynulquzat-i Hamadānī," *Muslim World* 68, no. 3 (1978): 187–204; Aminrazavi, M., *Suhrawardi and the School of Illumination*, Richmond: Curzon Press, 1997, pp. 121-122; Sinai, N., "Kommentar", in:

---

Suhrawardī, *Philosophie der Erleuchtung*, transl. N. Sinai, Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen im Insel Verlag, 2011, pp. 227-228.

<sup>6</sup>. E.g. Watt, W. Montgomery, *Islamic Philosophy and Theology*, 2nd ed., Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1985, p. 91; Leaman, O., *An Introduction to Classical Islamic Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 199ff; Adamson, Peter, and Richard C. Taylor, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 201ff.

<sup>7</sup>. Fakhry, M., *A History of Islamic Philosophy*, 3rd ed. (Columbia University Press, 2004).

<sup>8</sup>. Shīrāzī, Ṣadr al-Dīn, *The Wisdom of the Throne* [= Al-Ḥikmah al-‘Arshiyyah], transl. J. W. Morris, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981, p. 29.

<sup>9</sup>. Rahman, F., *The Philosophy of Mullā Ṣadrā*, Albany: SUNY Press, 1975, p. 1.

<sup>10</sup>. Arnzen, R., *Platonische Ideen in der arabischen Philosophie*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011, p. 185-186.

<sup>11</sup>. Rudolph, U., *Islamische Philosophie Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 2004, p. 93.

<sup>12</sup>. Ritter, H., “Philologika IX: Die vier Suhrawardī, Ihre Werke im Stambuler Handschriften,” *Der Islam* 24 (1937): 270–286.

<sup>13</sup>. Corbin, *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 1, pp. XLIII-LXII; *En Islam iranien*, vol. 2, pp. 346-361.

<sup>14</sup>. Corbin, *En Islam iranien*, vol. 2, p. 352.

<sup>15</sup>. Nasr, S.H., “The Spread of the Illuminationist School of Suhrawardi,” *Islamic Quarterly* 14, no. 1 (1970): 111–121, p. 112.

<sup>16</sup>. Ziai, H., “The Illuminationist tradition,” In *History of Islamic Philosophy*, ed. by S.H. Nasr and O. Leaman, 465–495, London: Routledge, 1996, p. 471.

<sup>17</sup>. Aminrazavi, M., *Suhrawardi and the School of Illumination*, Richmond: Curzon Press, 1997, p. 123.

<sup>18</sup>. Karimi Zanjani Asl, M., “Pīshguftār”, in Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Mūsā Buzshallū’ī Kumijānī, *Inner Light* [= Nūr al-fu’ād], ed. by H. Ziai and M. Karimi Zanjani Asl (Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers, 2012), pp. 51-62.

<sup>19</sup>. Karimi Zanjani Asl, M., *Ḥikmat-i ishrāqī dar hind*, Tehran: Intishārāt iṭṭalā’āt, 1387.

<sup>20</sup>. Pourjavady, R., and S. Schmidtke, *A Jewish philosopher of Baghdad: ‘Izz al-Dawla Ibn Kammūna (d. 683 1284) and his writings*, Leiden: Brill, 2006; Pourjavady, R., *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, Leiden: Brill, 2011.

<sup>21</sup>. My double use of commentary, in the general sense and in the more specific, true sense of the word, is mirrored in actors’ categories. As Gutas proposes, when sources speak of *tafsīr*, they mean a commentary in the general sense of the word, which could be a commentary, but also a translation, summary, and so forth. *Sharḥ*,

---

on the other hand, is the word used for a commentary in the true sense of the word. Cf. Gutas, D., “Aspects of Literary Form and Genre in Arabic Logical Works,” In *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical Texts: The Syriac, Arabic and Latin Medieval Tradition*, ed. by Ch. Burnett, London: Warburg Institute, 1993, pp. 29–76. For more on this, see my article Lit, L.W.C. van, “Commentary and commentary tradition: The basic terms for understanding Islamic intellectual history,” *MIDEO* 32 (2017).

<sup>22</sup>. Cf. Gacek, A., *Arabic Manuscripts: A Vademecum for Readers*, Leiden: Brill, 2009, pp. 78-80.

<sup>23</sup>. All works of Suhrawardī mentioned here are attested in manuscripts and have been edited by Corbin et al.

<sup>24</sup>. Cf. Shahrazūrī, *Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-Ishrāq*, ed. by H. Ziai, Tehran: Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies, 2001.

<sup>25</sup>. Cf. Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī, *Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-Ishrāq*, ed. by A. Nourani and M. Mohaghegh, Tehran: Mu’assasah-i muṭāla‘āt al-islāmī, 2001. Also available in various other editions, such as by Habibi and Musavi.

<sup>26</sup>. Even Ḥajjī Khalīfa is unsure of its existence, Ḥajjī Khalīfa, *Kashf al-ẓunūn*, 2 vols., Istanbul: Wikālat al-ma‘ārif, 1943, vol. 1, pp. 684-685.

<sup>27</sup>. Ḥajjī Khalīfa, *Kashf al-ẓunūn*, vol. 1, pp. 684-685.

<sup>28</sup>. A number of glosses seem to exist in at least one manuscript, cf. Corbin, “Prolégomènes II”, in: *Oeuvres Philosophiques...* vol. 2, p. 62. It seems to be kept at Tehran University, #1047. Perhaps this is also what Ḥibshī refers to when he lists Dawānī as a commentator on *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*, cf. Ḥibshī, A.M., *Jāmi‘ al-shurūḥ wa-al-ḥawāshī*, 2 vols. (Abu Dhabi: al-Majma‘ al-thaqāfī, 2004), p. 844.

<sup>29</sup>. Karimi, “Pīshguftār”, p. 40.

<sup>30</sup>. An “Aḥmed Mawlawī” is mentioned in the preface of MS Ragip Paşa 854, Istanbul, 1115. I am assuming this is the same person as mentioned in Kaḥḥāla, U.R., *Mu‘jam Al-Mu‘allifīn*. 15 vols. Damascus: al-Maktaba al-‘arabiyya, 1960, vol. 1, p. 137.

<sup>31</sup>. Āghā Buzurg, *al-Dharī‘a ilā taṣānīf al-Shī‘a*, 26 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-aḍwā’, 1983), vol. 6, p. 121; Ḥibshī, A.M., *Jāmi‘ al-shurūḥ wa-al-ḥawāshī*, p. 845.

<sup>32</sup>. Āghā Buzurg, *al-Dharī‘a*, vol. 6, p. 121; vol. 13, p. 211. As Karimi notes, we do not have any manuscripts of this text, and the epithet *al-‘Allāma* is also used for Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī making it possible that the two were mixed up. It is therefore unlikely he actually wrote a commentary. Karimi, “Pīshguftār”, pp. 36-38.

<sup>33</sup>. Esad Efendi 1932, Istanbul, 743, f. 140a (I thank John Walbridge for this).

<sup>34</sup>. Āghā Buzurg, *al-Dharī‘a*, vol. 13, p. 211, who states he has seen a copy in Najaf. He suggests it was finished in 756/1355, being a summary (*mukhtaṣar*), relying on Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī’s commentary.

- 
- <sup>35</sup>. Only glosses. For extant manuscript evidence and a description see Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, pp. 179-187.
- <sup>36</sup>. Harawī, *Anwāriyya*, ed. by H. Ziai, Tehran: Mu'assasah-i intishārāt amīr kabīr, 1358.
- <sup>37</sup>. Entitled *Rūḥ al-arwāḥ sharḥ Ḥikmat ishrāqiyya*; Rahman Ali Sahib, *Tadhkira-yi 'ulamā'-i Hind*, Lucknow: 1914, p. 135.
- <sup>38</sup>. Only one small gloss: Mīr Dāmād, "Ta' līqa 'alā Ḥikmat al-ishrāq," In *Muṣannafāt-i Mīr Dāmād*, ed. by A. Nourani, Tehran: Anjuman-i āthār wa mufākhir-i farhangī, 2003, pp. 523–527. Cf. Corbin, Prolégomènes II, in: *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 2, p. 63.
- <sup>39</sup>. Karimi mentions this name as a translator into Persian, but notes there is no manuscript evidence, "Pīshguftār", p. 43.
- <sup>40</sup>. Cf. Mullā Ṣadrā, *Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-ishrāq bah inḍimām ta' līqāt Ṣadr al-muta'allihīn*, ed. by S. M. Musavi, 2 vols., Tehran: Mu'assasah-i intishārāt-i ḥikmat, 2010.
- <sup>41</sup>. Corbin claims that he translated *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq* into Persian, but he does not know of a manuscript copy, cf. Corbin, "Prolégomènes II", in: *Oeuvres Philosophiques...* vol. 2, p. 61.
- <sup>42</sup>. Karimi, "Pīshguftār", p. 40.
- <sup>43</sup>. Ismā'īl Pāshā, *Ḥadiyyat al-'ārifīn*, vol. 1, p. 205-206.
- <sup>44</sup>. Dirayati, M., *Fankhā*, Tehran: Sāzmān-i asnād wa-kitābkhāna-i millī-i jumhūrī-i islāmī-i Īrān, 1390, vol. 19, p. 542.
- <sup>45</sup>. Rizvi mentions a commentary but does not give evidence for its existence. Rizvi, S., "Hikma muta'aliya in Qajar Iran: Locating the Life and Work of Mulla Hadi Sabzawari (d. 1289/1873)," *Iranian Studies* 44, no. 4 (2011): 473–496, p. 484.
- <sup>46</sup>. Karimi mentions this as a translation into Urdu. Kirmani, "Pīshguftār", p. 44. Kirmani points out there is no manuscript evidence for a translation into Sanskrit.
- <sup>47</sup>. Dirayati, *Fankhā*, vol. 10, pp. 316-7.
- <sup>48</sup>. Karimi notes a reference to this in Mīrzā Āqājān Kirmānī's *Risālah mā shā'a Allāh*. Kirmani, "Pīshguftār", p. 44.
- <sup>49</sup>. Corbin only edited the Persian version (Suhrawardī wrote it himself in both languages). Arabic version is available in multiple places. Perhaps the most convenient place to find it is Dawānī, *Thalāth rasā'il*, ed. by S.A. Tuysirkānī (Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 1991), pp. 77-97.
- <sup>50</sup>. A Persian commentary has partially survived and is edited in Suhrawardī, and Anonymous commentator, *Hayākil al-nūr*, ed. by M. Karimi Zanjani Asl (Tehran: Nashr-i nuqtah, 1379), pp. 169-194. Some believe that the commentator was Mubāriz al-Dīn Muḥammad Muẓaffār (d. 759) which would make this the earliest commentary, hence I listed it as the first item.

---

<sup>51</sup>. First edited by Haq and Kokan, but for a better edition see Dawānī, “Shawākīl al-Ḥūr Sharḥ Hayākīl al-Nūr,” In *Thalāth rasā’il*, ed. by S.A. Tuysirkānī, 100–261, Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 1993.

<sup>52</sup>. Only glosses. For extant manuscript evidence and a description see Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, pp. 188-189.

<sup>53</sup>. Āghā Buzurg, *al-Dharī’a*, vol. 14, p. 177.

<sup>54</sup>. Ismā’īl Pāshā, *Ḥadiyyat al-‘ārifīn*, vol. 2, p. 531.

<sup>55</sup>. Karimi writes that ‘Allāmī was studying Suhrawardī together with his father and his brother (Abū al-Fayḍ Fayḍī). Karimi, *Ḥikmat-i ishrāqī dar hind*, pp. 27-28.

<sup>56</sup>. Ismā’īl Pāshā, *Ḥadiyyat al-‘ārifīn*, vol. 1, p. 567. Tuysirkani states he does not know of any manuscripts. Tuysirkani, “Muqaddimah”, in Dawānī, *Thalāth Rasā’il* (Tehran, Mīrās-i maktūb: 1991), p. 10.

<sup>57</sup>. Dirayati, *Fankhā*, vol. 12, p. 110.

<sup>58</sup>. Ismā’īl Pāshā, *Ḥadiyyat al-‘ārifīn*, vol. 2, p. 301.

<sup>59</sup>. Āghā Buzurg, *al-Dharī’a*, vol. 6, p. 140; Ḥibshī, A.M., *Jāmi‘ al-shurūḥ wa-al-ḥawāshī*, p. 2108. In connection to this person, Karimi also gives the names of Ḥasan Ṭāliqānī and Muḥammad Ḥusayn Quṭayfī as commentators, but without any details, Karimi, “Pīshguftār”, p. 52. In another publication, Karimi speaks of “Muḥammad ‘Alī Ḥazīn Lāhījī” for which he assigns a death year of 1180/1766. This is clearly the same Ḥazīn as listed here. Karimi says this Ḥazīn also wrote glosses on Suhrawardī’s *Kalimat al-taṣawwuf*, *al-Mashāri‘*, and *al-Talwīḥāt*. Again, without manuscript evidence I refrain at this moment from listing Ḥazīn under these other texts as a commentator. Karimi, *Ḥikmat-i ishrāqī dar hind*, pp. 74-75.

<sup>60</sup>. *GAL*, S1, p. 782.

<sup>61</sup>. Karimi, *Ḥikmat-i ishrāq dar hind*, p. 75.

<sup>62</sup>. Cf. Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī, *Ishrāq Hayākīl al-nūr li-kashf zulamāt Shawākīl al-ghurūr*, ed. by A. Owjābi, Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 2003.

<sup>63</sup>. Cf. Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Kurdī al-Zībārī, “Naẓm Hayākīl al-nūr,” MS Laleli 2486, Istanbul, 1019; Ritter, H., “Philologica IX”, p. 284.

<sup>64</sup>. Cf. Kuşpınar, B., *Ismā’īl Ankaravī on The Illuminative Philosophy: His İzāhu’l-Ḥikem Its edition and analysis in comparison with Dawwānī’s Shawākīl al-Ḥūr, together with the translation of Suhrawardī’s Hayākīl al-Nūr*, Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization, 1996.

<sup>65</sup>. University of Michigan: MS 124, Ann Arbor.

<sup>66</sup>. Punjab University Ar h II 183A/1911, Lahore, 1209.

<sup>67</sup>. Cf. Qāsim ‘Alī Akhgar Ḥaydarābādī, *Nihāyat al-zuhūr*, ed. by M. Karimi Zanjani Asl, Tehran: Anjuman-i asār va mufākhīr-i farhangī, 2006.

---

<sup>68</sup>. Corbin only edited the part on Metaphysics (*Ilāhiyyāt*). The full text is now available within Ibn Kammūna, *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt al-lawḥiyyah wa-al-‘arshiyyah*, ed. by N. Habībī, 3 vols., Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 2008.

<sup>69</sup>. Brockelmann asserts as such, *GAL*, G1, p. 437. Perhaps what is meant is Suhrawardī’s *al-Muqāwamāt*.

<sup>70</sup>. First partly edited by Ziai, now fully available by Habibi.

<sup>71</sup>. Cf. Ḥillī, Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Kāshī, “Ta‘līqāt ‘alā Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt,” MS Ragip Paşa 852, Istanbul, 752.. Perhaps Agha Bozorgh wrongly attributed the work of this Ḥillī to the more famous ‘Allāmah Ḥillī (d. 1325), cf. Āghā Buzurg, *al-Dharī‘a*, vol. 7, p. 74-75.

<sup>72</sup>. Extant in various manuscripts, the oldest dated being Shahrazūrī, “Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt,” MS Or. 578, Leiden, 704.

<sup>73</sup>. Dirayati, *Fankhā*, vol. 9, p. 200.

<sup>74</sup>. Corbin asserts as such, but I have seen no evidence, cf. Corbin, “Prolégomènes II”, in *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 2, p. 61.

<sup>75</sup>. Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, pp. 172-178.

<sup>76</sup>. Cf. Tūdhī, Nizām al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Faḍl Allāh ibn Aḥmad, “Sharḥ al-Lamahāt,” MS Topkapı A 3251, Istanbul, n.d.

<sup>77</sup>. Edited by Corbin. *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 2, pp. 274-297.

<sup>78</sup>. ‘Imād al-Dīn ‘Arabshāh Yazdī, *Mu’nis al-‘ushshāq*, ed. M. Haravi, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Mawlā, 1366.

<sup>79</sup>. Qasimi, M. “Sharḥ-i mu’nis al-‘ushshāq-i Suhrawardī,” *Ma‘ārif* 4, no. 1 (1366): pp. 149–64.

<sup>80</sup>. Corbin, “Prolégomènes II”, in *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 2, p. 90, fn. 170; “Prolégomènes III”, in *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 3, p. 93.

<sup>81</sup>. Anonymous, “Firdaws ṭawīl,” MS Hacı Reşit Bey 108, Istanbul, 1089.

<sup>82</sup>. Corbin, “Prolégomènes II”, in *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 2, p. 90, fn. 170; “Prolégomènes III”, in *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 3, p. 76.

<sup>83</sup>. Extracts edited by Corbin in *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 3, pp. 462-471.

<sup>84</sup>. Pourjavady, Schmidtke, *A Jewish philosopher*, pp. 8ff.

<sup>85</sup>. Pourjavady, Schmidtke, *A Jewish Philosopher*, p. 14-15.

<sup>86</sup>. Pourjavady, Schmidtke, *A Jewish Philosopher*, p. 12-13.

<sup>87</sup>. Pourjavady, Schmidtke, *A Jewish Philosopher*, p. 10.

<sup>88</sup>. Ibn Kammūna, *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt al-lawḥiyyah wa-al-‘arshiyyah*, ed. by N. Habībī, (Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 2008), vol. 1, p. 1-2.

<sup>89</sup>. Lameer, J., “Ibn Kammūna’s Commentary on Suhrawardī’s Talwīḥāt. Three Editions,” *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* 3 (2012): pp. 154–184.

---

<sup>90</sup>. Cottrell, E., “Šams al-Dīn al-Šahrazūrī et les Manuscrits de «La Promenade des Âmes et le Jardin des Réjouissances: Histoire des Philosophes»,” *Bulletin d’Études Orientales*, IFPO Damas, LVI (2004-2005): pp. 225–260.

<sup>91</sup>. This is inferred from the expression *matta ‘a Allāh al-kāfah bi-ṭūl baqā’ihi* (“may God grant him enjoyment for the rest of his life”), found in a copy of *al-Shajarah* that was completed in that year. Cf. Habibi, N., “muqaddimah”, in: Shahrazūrī, *al-Shajarah*, vol. 1, p. *bīst-u shish* [xxvi]. Given this date, Mascitelli’s identification with a Shāfi’ī scholar from Damascus, who died in 674-5/1276-7, should be discarded. Cf. Mascitelli, D., “L’identità di Šams al-Dīn Šahrazūrī filosofo isrāqī: un caso aperto,” *Rivista degli studi orientali* 69 (1995): pp. 219–227.

<sup>92</sup>. The date when a copyist finished a manuscript, in which it is indicated that Shahrazūrī is not alive anymore. Cottrell, p. 228.

<sup>93</sup>. Minorsky, V., Bosworth, C.E., “Shahrazūr”, in *EF<sup>2</sup>*, vol. 9, pp. 218-219.

<sup>94</sup>. Corbin, “Prolégomènes I”, in Suhrawardī, *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 1, pp. 64-65, 70-73.

<sup>95</sup>. Biographical information is mainly drawn from Niazi, K., “Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī as Depicted in Early Historical Sources”, *Tarikh-e Elm* 11 (2013), pp. 23-39, supplemented by Walbridge, *The Science of Mystic Lights*, p. 7-26.

<sup>96</sup>. Since around that time (687/1288) a copy from an autograph copy of Shahrazūrī’s *al-Shajarah* was completed in Siwas, see above, footnote 79. He may already have encountered Suhrawardī’s thought in Baghdad, perhaps through the commentary of Ibn Kammūna, which he was aware of as he gave away a copy of Ibn Kammūna’s *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt* in 692/1293, see Ritter, H., “Philologika IX”, p. 274. Cf. Pourjavady, R., and S. Schmidtke, “Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī’s (634/1236 - 710/1311) Durrat al-Taj and its Sources,” *Journal Asiatique* 292, no. 1–2 (2004): pp. 311–330.

<sup>97</sup>. Pourjavady, Schmidtke, “Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī’s (634/1236 - 710/1311) Durrat al-Taj and its Sources,” p. 320.

<sup>98</sup>. Ritter, “Philologika IX”, p. 276.

<sup>99</sup>. Pourjavady, Schmidtke, “Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī’s (634/1236 - 710/1311) Durrat al-Taj and its Sources,” p. 312; Walbridge, J., and Ziai, H., “Introduction”, in Suhrawardī, *The Philosophy of Illumination*, p. xxii; Corbin, H., “Prolégomènes II”, in Suhrawardī, *Oeuvres Philosophiques*, vol. 2, p. 69-71. Pourjavady and Schmidtke also point out that Ibn Kammūna had an influence on Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī, Pourjavady, Schmidtke, *A Jewish philosopher*, p. 29.

<sup>100</sup>. Biographical information is drawn from Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, pp. 4-32.

<sup>101</sup>. For example, Dashtakī, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Manṣūr, *Ishrāq Hayākil al-nūr li-kashf zulamāt Shawākil al-ghurūr*, ed. by Ali Owjabi (Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 2003), p. 130.

---

<sup>102</sup>. Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, p. 25.

<sup>103</sup>. First edition: Dawānī, *Shawākil al-Ḥūr Sharḥ Hayākil al-Nūr*, ed. by M.A. Haq and M.Y. Kokan (Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, 1953), Reprinted Baghdad: Bayt al-warrāq, 2010. New edition: Dawānī, “Shawākil al-Ḥūr Sharḥ Hayākil al-Nūr,” In *Thalāth rasā’il*, ed. by S.A. Tuysirkānī (Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 1993), pp. 100–261.

<sup>104</sup>. Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, p. 9.

<sup>105</sup>. Corbin, H., “Présentation”, in Suhrawardī, *L’archange empourpré*, p. 33.

<sup>106</sup>. And it is as such referred to by others, such as Lāhījī, ‘Abd al-Razzāq, *Risālah-i nūrīyah dar ‘ālam-i mithāl* (Mashhad: Dānishgāhī mashhad, 1972), p. 149.

<sup>107</sup>. Dawānī, *Shawākil al-ḥūr*, p. 235-236.

<sup>108</sup>. Dashtakī, *Isḥrāq Hayākil al-nūr*, p. 361.

<sup>109</sup>. Lit, L.W.C. van, “Ghiyāth al-Dīn Dashtakī on the world of image (‘ālam al-mithāl): The place of his Isḥrāq Hayākil al-nūr in the commentary tradition on Suhrawardī,” In *Isḥrāq: Islamic philosophy yearbook*, vol. 5 (Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura Publishers, 2014), pp. 116–136.

<sup>110</sup>. Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, p. 55, fn. 52. The *ijāzah* is printed on pp. 196-197.

<sup>111</sup>. Details about his life are taken from Andrew Newman, “Dāmād, Mīr(-e), Sayyed Moḥammad Bāqer,” *Encyclopædia Iranica*, Vol. VI, Fasc. 6, pp. 623-626; an updated version is available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/damad-mir-e-sayyed-mohammad-baqer-b> (accessed 13 May 2015); Dabashi, H., “Mīr Dāmād and the founding of the ‘School of Isfahan,’” In *History of Islamic Philosophy*, ed. by O. Leaman and S.H. Nasr, London: Routledge, 1996, vol. 1, pp. 597–634.

<sup>112</sup>. Netton, I.R., “Suhrawardī’s Heir? The Isḥrāqī Philosophy of Mīr Dāmād,” In *The Heritage of Sufism: Late Classical Persianate Sufism (1501-1750) The Safavid & Mughal Period*, ed. by L. Lewisohn and D. Morgan, Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 1999, vol. 3, pp. 225–246.

<sup>113</sup>. I draw the biographical information from Rizvi, S., *Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī: His life and works and the sources for Safavid philosophy*, Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement 18 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 1-30.

<sup>114</sup>. Rizvi, *Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī*, pp. 117-135.

<sup>115</sup>. The former is the date of completion for *Kitāb al-Mabda’ wa-al-ma’ād* (Rizvi, *Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī*, p. 64), to which he refers. The latter is the death date of Mīr Dāmād, which he mentions with an invocation used for someone who is alive ; Rizvi, *Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī*, p. 76.

<sup>116</sup>. Corbin already warned about this (“Prolégomènes II”, in Suhrawardī, *Oeuvres Philosophiques*, vol. 2, p. 62), which is also why his translation of *Ḥikmat al-isḥrāq* and parts of Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī’s and Mullā Ṣadrā’s commentaries refers on

---

the title page to the two additional texts as “Commentaires de Qoṭbaddīn Shīrāzī et Mōlla Ṣadrā Shīrāzī”. Suhrawardī, *Le livre de la sagesse orientale* [= Ḥikmat al-ishrāq], transl. by H. Corbin, ed. and intr. by Ch. Jambet (Lagrasse: Verdier, 1986).

<sup>117</sup>. As is the case with many glosses, for example Khayālī’s (d. 1465) glosses on Taftāzānī’s *Sharḥ al-‘aqā’id* were distributed independently, as were Siyālkūtī’s (d. 1656) glosses on Khayālī’s glosses.

<sup>118</sup>. Maalouf, “The Manuscripts”, in Suhrawardī, *Kitāb al-lamahāt*, ed. by E. Maalouf, Beirut: Dār al-nahār li-al-nashr, 1969, p. xxii.

<sup>119</sup>. Tūdḥī, Niẓām al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Faḍl Allāh ibn Aḥmad, “Sharḥ al-Lamahāt,” Topkapı Ahmad III 3251 (Istanbul, n.d.), f. 1b.

<sup>120</sup>. Tūdḥī, f. 159a.

<sup>121</sup>. Maalouf, p. xxii.

<sup>122</sup>. See Kaḥḥāla, *Mu‘jam al-mu‘allifīn*, vol. 4, p. 67 and Āghā Buzurg, *al-Dharī‘a*, vol. 15, p. 11.

<sup>123</sup>. Ni‘ma, A., *Falāsifat al-Shī‘a: ḥayātuhum wa-ārā‘uhum*, Beirut: Dār al-fikr al-lubnānī, 1987, pp. 354-355.

<sup>124</sup>. Pourjavady, Schmidtke, *A Jewish philosopher*, p. 36; Ḥillī, Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Kāshī, “Ta‘līqāt ‘alā Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt,” MS Ragıp Paşa 852, Istanbul, 752, f. 212a.

<sup>125</sup>. Corbin, H., “Prolégomènes III”, in Suhrawardī, *Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 3, p. 132. Compare Brockelmann, *GAL*, S1, p. 783.

<sup>126</sup>. This account is drawn from De Bruijn, J.P., “Muṣannifak”, *EF*<sup>2</sup>, vol. 7, p. 663, and Ṭāsh Kubrī Zādah, *al-Shaqā‘iq al-nu‘māniyyah fī ‘ulamā’ al-dawlat al-‘uthmāniyyah*, ed. by S.M.T. Behbahani (Tehran: Majles-e šorā-ye Eslāmi, 2010), pp. 149ff.

<sup>127</sup>. I draw this short account from Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, pp. 53ff.

<sup>128</sup>. Pourjavady reports 10 February. Assuming 5 Rabī‘ II is correct, this would be 11 February in the Julian calendar. Cf. Pourjavady, *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran*, p. 59.

<sup>129</sup>. Ziai, “Muqaddimah-i muṣaḥḥiḥ”, in: Harawī, *Anwāriyya*, p. sīzdah [xiii]; Corbin, “Prolégomènes II”, in Suhrawardī, *Oeuvres Philosophiques*, vol. 2, p. 60.

<sup>130</sup>. Ziai was aware of this aspect of Harawī’s text (p. shānzdah [xvi]), and tried to indicate with double square brackets where Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī’s text is present in Harawī’s text. It seems he sometimes missed instances of this.

<sup>131</sup>. The hiatus spans Suhrawardī, *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq, Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 2, p. 113-125. Cf. Harawī, *Anwāriyya*, p. 28.

<sup>132</sup>. The hiatus spans Suhrawardī, *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq, Oeuvres Philosophiques...*, vol. 2, p. 125-153. Cf. Harawī, *Anwāriyya*, p. 30.

<sup>133</sup>. Ritter, “Philologica IX”, p. 284.

---

<sup>134</sup>. Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Kurdī al-Zībārī, “Naẓm Hayākīl al-nūr,” MS Laleli 2486 (Istanbul, copied 1019), folio 1a: الهياكل حوتها مما الإشراقيين مذهب على الإلهية الحكمة ألفية: الإشراق كتاب من وشيء شرحها زيادات مع النورية

<sup>135</sup>. MS 11619, Qom, Mar‘ashī, ff. 119–23 and MS 16679, Tehran, National Library of Iran, ff. 29b-33a.

<sup>136</sup>. Kuşpınar, B., *Ismā‘īl Ankaravī on The Illuminative Philosophy: His İzāhu ‘l-Ḥikem Its edition and analysis in comparison with Dawwānī’s Shawākīl al-Ḥūr, together with the translation of Suhrawardī’s Hayākīl al-Nūr* (Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization, 1996).

<sup>137</sup>. Kuşpınar, p. 56.

<sup>138</sup>. Ḥazīn, Muḥammad ‘Alī, *The Life of Sheikh Mohammad Ali Hazin* [=Tadhkirat al-aḥwāl], Translated by F.C. Belfour, London: The Oriental Translation Fund, 1830, p. 58.

<sup>139</sup>. Ḥazīn, p. 78.

<sup>140</sup>. Compare Khatak, S.K., *Shaikh Muḥammad ‘Alī Ḥazīn: His life, times & works*, Lahore: Sh. Mohammad Ashraf, 1944, p. 17, and Ḥazīn, p. 110.

<sup>141</sup>. Ḥazīn, p. 105-106.

<sup>142</sup>. *Risāla dar fihrist-i asātidha wa-taṣnīfāt-i khud*: MS 1778 of the Collection of the Asiatic Society (formerly Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal). Utilized by Khatak from which I draw here.

<sup>143</sup>. Khatak, p. 156-157.

<sup>144</sup>. Khatak, p. 207. Khatak claims that the first treatise compares the position of the Peripatetics and the Illuminationists.

<sup>145</sup>. Ḥazīn, p. 94.

<sup>146</sup>. Ḥazīn, p. 124.

<sup>147</sup>. The first three chapters: Ḥaydarābādī, *Nihāyat al-zuhūr*, pp. 181-324; The seventh chapter: Karimi Zanjani Asl, *Ḥikmat-i ishrāqī dar hind*, pp. 220-239.

<sup>148</sup>. Ḥaydarābādī, *Nihāyat al-zuhūr*, p. 41.

<sup>149</sup>. Ḥaydarābādī, *Nihāyat al-zuhūr*, p. 50.

<sup>150</sup>. Compare: 2 words missing Ḥaydarābādī, *Nihāyat al-zuhūr*, p. 301 / Suhrawardī, *Hayākīl al-nūr*, in Dawānī, *Thalāth rasā‘il*, p. 81; 4 words added Ḥaydarābādī, p. 307 / Suhrawardī, p. 81; 18 words missing Ḥaydarābādī, p. 311 / Suhrawardī, p. 81; 8 words added Ḥaydarābādī, p. 323 / Suhrawardī, p. 83.