Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī (634/1236 — 710/1311), one of the highly esteemed figures of the intellectual life of the Eastern lands of Islam during the late 7th/13th and early 8th/14th century, authored two major works in the field of philosophy that soon became popular — a commentary on Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī’s (executed 587/1191) Ḥikmat al-ishrāq, that is written in Arabic, dedicated to the vizier Jamāl al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Muhammad al-Dastjirdānī and completed in 694/1295, and an independent work written in Persian, Durrat al-tāj li-ghurrat al-dubāj that was completed between 693/1294 and 705/1306. Durrat al-tāj consists of a fātiḥa, five chapters (jumla) and a khātimah of four sections.

(quṭb) dealing with theology (uṣūl-i dīn), law (furuʿ-i dīn), practical philosophy (ḥikmat-i ‘amalī) and Sufi practice.

Whereas the Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-īshrāq has been published at least twice⁴, no complete edition of the very extensive Durrat al-tāj is available so far⁵. Between 1317-1320sh/1938-1941 Sayyid Muḥammad Mishkāt published five portions of the work, namely fātiḥa, jumla 1: logic (mantiq), jumla 2: first philosophy (falsafa-yi īlāhī), and jumla 5: metaphysics (ilm-i īlāhī)⁶. Sayyid Ḥasan Mishkān Ṭābāsī in 1324sh/1945 published portions of jumla 4 on mathematics (ilm-i riyāḍī). In 1369sh/1991, Māḥduktbānū Ḥumāʿī published sections three and four of the khāṭima⁷.

Although a systematic comparison of the two texts still needs to be done, it has already been established that in his commentary on Ḥikmat al-īshrāq, Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī depended heavily on the Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-īshrāq by his contemporary Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Mahmūd al-Shahrazūrī (d. after 687/1288), although Quṭb al-Dīn refrains from making this explicit throughout the text⁶.

---

² Lithograph edition by Asad Allāh Ḥarātī. Tehran 1313-1315sh/1895-1897, containing also Mullā Šadrā’s (d. 1050/1640) glosses on Quṭb al-Dīn’s commentary [recently reprinted without place and date]. Critical edition by ʿAbd Allāh Nūrānī & Mahdī Muḥaqiq. Tehran 1380sh/2001 (Wisdom of Persia; 50). The English introduction by Hermann Landolt, which is announced on the cover of the volume, is not included in the book. In the following, we will refer to the critical edition only. Hans Daiber mentions another edition by Ibrāhīm Ṭābātābāʾī (Tehran 1934) that was not available to us (Bibliography of Islamic Philosophy 1-2. Leiden 1999, vol. 1, p. 751 no. 7316).

³ For a description of important manuscripts of the work, see Mīnuvī: „Mullā Quṭb Shīrāzī,“ pp. 188-190.

⁴ The third edition that was at our disposal (Tehran 1369sh/1990) has the original pagination for each separate volume, as well as consecutive pagination for the editor’s introduction and all five volumes; in the following both paginations will be indicated, the consecutive pagination in square brackets, respectively.

⁵ Thus, her edition does not, as suggested by Hans Daiber (Bibliography, vol. 1, p. 751 no. 7315), replace the edition by Sayyid Muḥammad Mishkāt.


As for *Durrat al-tāj*, Sayyid Muḥammad Mishkāt has shown Qūtb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī’s heavy dependence in major parts of the work on earlier sources which he had translated verbatim into Persian\(^7\). The main part of the *fātiḥa* is in fact a translation of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s (d. 606/1209) *Asrār al-tanzīl*, and the remaining portions of the *fātiḥa* are translated partly from Ghazālī’s (d. 555/1111) *Ḥyāʾ ‘ulūm al-dīn* and partly from *Taqāsīm al-ḥikma* of Ibn Sīnā (d. 428/1037); some quotations are moreover taken from Zamakhsharī’s (d. 538/1144) *al-Qisṭās fi l-ʾarūḍ*. Mishkāt also discusses Qūtb al-Dīn’s sources for those parts of the book that were not included in his edition. He remarks that the first section of *jumla 4* (mathematics) is a translation of *Tahrīr-i Uqlīdiss* by Qūtb al-Dīn’s contemporary Muḥyī al-Mīllā wa l-Dīn Yaʿqūb b. Muḥammad al-Maghribī al-Andalusī al-Qurtūbī (d. between 680/1281 and 690/1291) into Persian\(^8\), whereas the second section of this *jumla* is a translation of *Talkhīṣ-i Majiṣṭi* by ʿAbd al-Malik b. Muḥammad al-Shirāzī (d. ca 596/1200), as Qūtb al-Dīn himself mentions. The fourth section of *jumla 4* (on music) is taken from the *Risāla al-Sharafīyya fi l-nasab al-taʿlīfiyya* by Qūtb al-Dīn’s contemporary Ṣafī al-Dīn al-

---

\(^7\) See *Durrat al-tāj*. Ed. Mishkāt, introduction, [pp. 69-71] and vol. 1, pp. 132-133 n. 2 [212-213].


Urmawī (d. 693/1294)\(^9\) with some additional material taken from Fārābī’s (d. 339/950) *al-Mašīqī al-kabīr* and Ibn Siňā’s chapter on music in *al-Shišā*. Two works by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Arba’īn fī usūl al-dīn* and *Asrār al-tanzīl*, were the main sources for section one (*usūl-i dīn*) of the *khāṭima*. He assumed that the last section of the *khāṭima* on Sūfī practice was probably taken from Sa’īd al-Dīn al-Farghānī’s (d. 695/1296) *Manāḥij al-‘ibād ilā l-maʿād*\(^10\). Māhdukhtbānī Humāṯī, in her introduction to the partial edition of 1991, shows that the section on practical philosophy of the *khāṭima* is taken from *Laṭāʿīf al-ḥikma* of Sirāj al-Dīn al-Urmawī (d. 682/1283-84), with the exception of one portion which is a translation from Fārābī’s *Fuṣūl al-madānī* and some small additions from Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s *Kitāb al-Arbā’īn*\(^11\).

As for the portions on logic, first philosophy, physics and metaphysics (*jumla* 1, 2, 3, and 5), Mishkāt assumed at the time that these likewise did not originate with Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī but rather consisted of quotations from or translations of earlier sources. Mishkāt states that he was unable to identify those sources, yet given the Illuminationist character of those chapters he suggests that Quṭb al-Dīn’s sources were either one or several texts by Suhrawardi or Shahrazūrī’s *Shajara al-ilāhiyya*\(^12\). Mishkāt’s educated guess was repeated by later scholars, though at times

---


\(^10\) Following a hint by William C. Chittick, but without mentioning that this has already been established by Sayyid Muhammad Mishkāt, John Walbridge has recently argued again that the section of Sūfī practice is taken completely from Sa’īd al-Dīn al-Farghānī’s *Manāḥij al-‘ibād ilā l-maʿād*. See John T. Walbridge: „A Sufi Scientist of the Thirteenth Century: The Mystical Ideas and Practices of Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī.” In: *The Heritage of Sufism. Volume II. The Legacy of Medieval Persian Sufism (1150-1500)*. Ed. Leonard Lewisohn. Oxford 1999, pp. 323-340. The degree of Quṭb al-Dīn’s dependence on this work, however, was not established by Walbridge who writes (p. 326-327): „Though I have not seen the *Manāḥij*, the identity of the *Manāḥij* with the chapters on *fiqh* and mysticism in the *Pearly Crown* can be established by two proofs. First, the section headings of the first and the second parts of the *Manāḥij* are identical with those of the *Pearly Crown*. Second, Quṭb al-Dīn himself says that the mysticism chapter was written by someone else, and Jāmī in his biography of Farghānī quotes several passages from the *Manāḥij* which agree word for word with the corresponding passages of the *Pearly Crown*.”


\(^12\) Ed. Mishkāt, introduction, [p. 69].

in a less than precise manner and often without credit being given to him.

Among the Illuminationists of his time, Qūṭb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī was of course closely familiar with Shahrazūrī’s Sharḥ Ḥikmat al-ishrāq. However, there are no indications that he also knew the latter’s Shajara al-ilāhiyya (dated 680/1282); on the contrary, the Shajara seems to have become popular only during the 9th/15th century. The earliest philosopher aware of Shahrazūrī’s Shajara was apparently Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawānī (d. 908/1502) who refers to a Thamara of the Shajara — presumably some kind of summary or extract of the Shajara, about which nothing further is known at the moment.

13 Walbridge (Science, p. 82) seems to prefer to ignore Mishkāt’s guess when he writes: „Nevertheless, none of the philosophically important chapters, with the exception of parts of the practical philosophy and the mysticism, were direct translations.” However, later on he writes (Science, p. 176): „The sections that are genuinely Qūṭb al-Dīn’s were popular in that they avoided the more arcane areas of mystical philosophy…. Other important sources include Avicenna’s Book of Healing, Suhrawardi’s Paths and Havens and Philosophy of Illumination, and Shahrazūrī’s Divine Tree for the philosophical sections; …”. See also Science, pp. 160-161 where he writes: „I have based this work on the assumption that Suhrawardī was the most important influence on Qūṭb al-Dīn. His best-known philosophical work, after all, was a commentary on The Philosophy of Illumination; and the influences of Suhrawardī on The Pearly Crown are plain…. Based on my very unsystematic investigation of The Book of Paths and Havens, I suspect that The Pearly Crown’s relation to Suhrawardī’s thought would be much clearer in its light.“ — Nowhere throughout his study does Walbridge define which sections of the work he considers to be „genuinely Qūṭb al-Dīn’s” nor does he indicate where exactly he found Qūṭb al-Dīn to be dependent on the mentioned writings of Suhrawardī and Shahrazūrī. — Baker (Classification, p. 241) writes: „Apart from the introduction, the encyclopaedia consists of five books dealing with logic, metaphysics, natural philosophy, mathematics and theodicy, as well as a four-part conclusion on religion and mysticism. The materials for each book are drawn from the works of various authors. Viewed as a metaphysical treatise, it was mainly influenced by the writings of Ibn Sinā and Suhrawardī.”


sively used the *Shajara* as a source was apparently Ibn Abū Jumhūr al-
Aḥšāʿī (d. after 906/1501) who was introduced to Illuminationist philos-
ophy, as it seems, by a student of Dawānī, Sharaf al-Dīn Hasan al-Fattāl
al-Najafī (alive in 870/1465-66)\(^{16}\). Extensive use of the *Shajara* was also
made by Maḥmūd al-Nayrizī (d. after 932/1526) in his commentary on
Alwāḥ al-ʾimādiyya of Suhrawardī\(^{17}\). In the 11th/17th century, the work
was well known among and frequently quoted from by the representa-
tives of the so-called School of Isfahān\(^{18}\).

Quṭb al-Dīn was equally, if not more, familiar with the writings of his
older contemporary Saʿd b. Manṣūr Ibn Kammūna (d. 683/1284) whose
work seems to have been much more popular at the time than the writ-
ings of Shahrazūrī\(^{19}\). In his detailed description of Illuminationist manu-
scripts in the libraries of Istanbul, Hellmut Ritter lists four copies of
Shahrazūrī’s commentary on Suhrwardī’s *Talwīḥāt*, among them the
autograph and another copy written during the third decade of the 8th/
14th century; for the remaining two, he does not give any dates. Of Ibn
Kammūna’s commentary on the same work, he lists seventeen copies,
ten of which are dated between the years 684/1286 and 766/1364-65,
and four of which were copied during the lifetime of Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shī-
rāzī. Ritter further describes two codices, each containing at least two
writings by Ibn Kammūna, respectively\(^{20}\). Another indicator that Shah-

---

16 Cf. Sabine Schmidtke: „The Influence of Šams ad-Dīn Šahrazūrī (7th/13th century)
on Ibn Abī Ğumhūr al-Aḥsāʾī (d. after 904/1499). A preliminary note.“ In: *Encounters of
Words and Texts: Intercultural Studies in Honor of Stefan Wild on the Occasion of His
eadem: *Theologie, Philosophie und Mystik im zwölfferschitischen Islam des 9./15.
906/1501)*. Leiden 2000, p. 17 and passim.

17 A comprehensive study of Maḥmūd al-Nayrizī is currently being prepared by Reza
Pourjavady.

18 See Hossein Ziai: „The Manuscript of al-Shajara al-Ilāhiyya. A Philosophical
Encyclopaedia by Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Shahrazūrī.“ In: *Iranshenasi* 2 i (1990),

19 For Ibn Kammūna, see Sabine Schmidtke: „Studies on Saʿd b. Manṣūr Ibn Kam-
mūna (d. 683/1284): Beginnings, Achievements, and Perspectives.“ In: *Persica* 19
(2003), pp. 105-121. — In their respective studies both John Walbridge and Osman Bakar
ignore Ibn Kammūna as a contemporary of Quṭb al-Dīn and as a significant interpreter of
Suhrawardī.


razūri’s work was not popular during his lifetime or shortly after his death is the absence of information about his biography\(^{21}\).

It has also been pointed out by Henry Corbin that Ḥeutb al-Dīn had in his possession a precious copy of Ibn Kammūna’s *Sharḥ al-talwīḥāt*, which in 692/1292-93 he gave as a present to one of the sons of the amīr\(^{22}\). Moreover, a codex containing numerous writings by Ibn Kammūna that was copied by a student of Ḥeutb al-Dīn, Tāj al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Sharīf al-Kirmānī, is extant\(^{23}\). This indicates the popularity of Ibn Kammūna’s writings also among students of Ḥeutb al-Dīn and suggests that perhaps Ḥeutb al-Dīn was reading Ibn Kammūna’s writings with Tāj al-Dīn al-Kirmānī and possibly also with other students of his\(^{24}\). It is, moreover, likely that Ḥeutb al-Dīn may have met Ibn Kammūna personally some time between 665/1266 and 667/1268 when he is known to have been in Baghdad\(^{25}\), which seems to have been Ibn Kammūna’s permanent place of residence.

As was recently shown by Sayyid Husayn Sayyid Mūsawī, Ḥeutb al-Dīn quotes from the writings of Ibn Kammūna in *Sharḥ Hikmat al-ishrāq*\(^{26}\); as a rule, Ḥeutb al-Dīn refers to him as *baʾd al-afādīl min al-muʿāṣirīn* or *al-muʿāṣirūn min al-afādīl*. Mūsawī mentions Ibn Kammūna’s specific view on three issues and notes that on the first two Ḥeutb al-Dīn followed, but on the third criticized Ibn Kammūna. The first was Ibn Kammūna’s notion that *taṣdīq* was a subdivision of *taṣawwur*\(^{27}\). The


\(^{23}\) Fāṭiḥ 3141. For Tāj al-Dīn al-Kirmānī, see Mīnuvi: „Mullā Ĥeutb Shīrāzī.“ p. 192.

\(^{24}\) The manuscript of the *iḫāza* issued by Ḥeutb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī to Tāj al-Dīn al-Kirmānī (dated 696/1296-97; ms Yusuf Agha (Konya) 6624, fol. 281) that might contain more information on what al-Kirmānī studied with Ḥeutb al-Dīn was unavailable to us.


\(^{27}\) In his glosses to *Sharḥ Hikmat al-ishrāq* (p. 41), Mullā Șadrā points out that this specific notion in fact originated with Ibn Kammūna, not with Ḥeutb al-Dīn. See also Mūsawī: „Mullā Șadrā wa Ibn Kammūna,“ pp. 46-48.

second was the issue of the preternity of the soul\textsuperscript{28}. The third was the notion that the simple cannot emanate from the composed (lā yajūzu ṣudūr al-baṣīt min al-murakkab)\textsuperscript{29}. A further issue — which Mūsawi does not point out — in which Ṭūṭ al-Dīn sides with Ibn Kammūna is in the field of modal logic, where Ibn Kammūna states that „no Bs are necessarily Js“ equals „no Bs are always Js“.

This issue was first discussed in Ibn Kammūna’s correspondence with Kātibī (d. 675/1276) and was later reflected in his Kāshf\textsuperscript{30}. Ṭūṭ al-Dīn was aware of the discussion between Ibn Kammūna and Kātibī and, being on the side of Ibn Kammūna, he criticized the argument of Kātibī whom he refers to as ba‘d al-akābir al-fuḍalā’ min al-muta’ akhkhirīn\textsuperscript{31}. The most extensive independent work by Ibn Kammūna on philosophy was a book arranged in seven chapters (abwāb)\textsuperscript{32}, each containing seven fuṣūl, composed for Dawlat Shāh b. al-amīr Sayf al-Dīn Sanjar al-Sāhibī\textsuperscript{33}, that he completed on 19 Dhū l-Qa‘da 676/13 April 1278 and that later circulated under the titles al-Kāshf or al-Jaḍīd fi l-ḥikma and other similar titles (hereafter: Kāshf)\textsuperscript{34}. A systematic comparison


\textsuperscript{29} Sharḥ Hikmat al-ishrāq, pp. 249:10-250:5; cf. Mūsawi: „Mullā Ṣadrā wa Ibn Kammūna,“ pp. 48-51. We were unable so far to find the exact quote in Ibn Kammūna’s writings; however, similar arguments and wordings are to be found in his Kāshf (p. 249), in his Maqāla fi ithbāt abadiyyat nafs al-insān (p. 97) and in his Maqāla fi anna l-nafs laysat bi-mīzāj al-badan wa lā kā’ina ‘an mīzāj al-badan (In: Barkhā: Taṣḥīh-i Risāla-yi Azaliyyat al-nafs, pp. 138-139). — Another quotation that is without doubt taken from a writing of Ibn Kammūna — either from his correspondence with Kātibī (d. 675/1276) or from Kāshf — is to be found in Sharḥ Hikmat al-ishrāq, pp. 90:1-91:4.

\textsuperscript{30} Kāshf (as n. 34), pp. 203-205.


\textsuperscript{34} Edited with introduction by Ḥāmid Mar‘īd al-Kābīsī (Baghdad 1403/1982). On the basis of this edition an MA thesis was written on the text under the guidance of Hans
between this work and Qūṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī’s *Durrat al-tāj* shows that the latter’s portions on first philosophy, physics and metaphysics (*jumla* 2, 3, and 5) are in fact translations of chapters (*abwāb*) 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of Ibn Kammūna’s *Kāshīf*. Apart from very minor differences, most of which seem to be the result of corruptions of the printed text of the *Kāshīf* (or at times possibly also of the manuscript Qūṭb al-Dīn used, as distinct from the manuscripts used by the modern editor), there are no differences to be observed between the text of Ibn Kammūna and Qūṭb al-Dīn’s translation. He even kept editorial statements by Ibn Kammūna that disagree in fact with the context of *Durrat al-tāj*. In the section on first philosophy, for example, Qūṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī translated Ibn Kammūna’s statement that the discussion on *al-kayfīyyāt bi-l-kamm al-munfaṣīl* belonged to arithmetics and is therefore beyond the purpose of this book, i.e. the *Kāshīf* (p. 281-282), although Qūṭb al-Dīn treats arithmetics at length in *jumla* 4. Of course, Qūṭb al-Dīn also translated everything Ibn Kammūna himself took from earlier sources, such as Suhrawardī’s *Maqāmāt al-Ṣūfiyya*35.

The text of *jumla* 1 of *Durrat al-tāj* dealing with logic is much less dependent on the *Kāshīf* than is the case with the text of *jumla* 2, 3, and 5. In particular the first three chapters (*maqālāt*) of this *jumla* are not dependent on the *Kāshīf*, although Qūṭb al-Dīn was clearly inspired by Ibn Kammūna’s *Kāshīf*; the number of chapters and the respective chapter headings correspond exactly with the *Kāshīf*. In those three chapters Qūṭb al-Dīn used several other sources, some of which are indicated, namely Ibn Sīnā, his *Shīfā*’ and *Ishārāt wa l-tanbīḥāt*, Fārābī, Suhrawardī’s *Muṭāraḥāt*, *Awsat-i Jurjānī, al-Mulakhkhash fī l-ḥikma wa l-maṭīq* by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Buqrāt’s (Hippokrates’) *Fuşūl*; he further refers to *ustādḥ khāṭām-i ḥukamā’, ba’ḍī az muḥaqiqān* and to

---


Chapters 4, 5, and 7 of the section on logic are clearly dependent on Ibn Kammūna’s work; Quṭb al-Dīn translated here with very minor exceptions the complete text of the corresponding chapters of Kāshīf, supplementing them with numerous commenting, exemplifying or otherwise supplementary additions. In some cases Quṭb al-Dīn further adds critical remarks, directed against ba’ḍī muta’ākhkhīrān or ba’ḍī (az) muta’ākhkhīrān, whose identity, again, still needs to be clarified. Throughout chapters 4, 5, and 7, moreover, he makes a number of editorial changes. He further subdivides the material presented in each chapter (maqālat) of the logic section into several tā’lim, even when he takes material from Ibn Kammūna. Chapter (maqālat) six is a verbatim translation of the corresponding chapter (faṣl) six of the Kāshīf. (See appendix)

Quṭb al-Dīn states in the introduction to Durrat al-tāj that he was commissioned by amīr Dubāj b. Fīlshāh, the ruler of Gilān, to compose a comprehensive book on philosophy containing logic, physics, metaphysics and mathematics in Persian. It can safely be assumed that Quṭb al-Dīn was paid for the work; it is likely that in order to get the job done, he generally selected those writings of earlier and particularly contemporary scholars that he regarded as the best in the respective discipline and translated them. His procedure in the section on logic suggests that he initially intended to use the Kāshīf merely as a guideline for the philosophical section; he did not continue with this procedure during the later sections, possibly for lack of time or other practical reasons.

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-Shūrāzī, suggests that his significance as a philosopher should be reconsidered. A fair evaluation of his originality in this disci-

37 Cf. Durrat al-tāj, vol. 1, p. 9 [89].
38 Cf. Durrat al-tāj, vol. 1, p. 21 [101].
40 Cf. Durrat al-tāj, vol. 1, p. 21 [101], where Quṭb al-Dīn states that he was very busy at the time.

pline requires a careful study of his commentary on Ḥikmat al-ishrāq. From the descriptions Corbin gives of this work⁴¹, as well as from the few references to quotations taken from Ibn Kammūna’s writings presented above, it appears that Qūṭb al-Dīn’s own philosophical views are clearly discernible in the Sharḥ. By contrast, given its heavy dependence on Ibn Kammūna’s Kāshif, Durrat al-tāj can hardly serve as a source for the study of Qūṭb al-Dīn’s philosophical views⁴². This does not apply, however, to the field of logic; his composition of the first three chapters in this section and his commentaries on and supplements to the text of Ibn Kammūna’s Kāshif in the remaining four chapters of this jumla, make this an important source for the study of his views in this discipline — if, indeed, this section was written by Qūṭb al-Dīn himself and not similarly taken from another, so far unidentified source. Moreover, since Qūṭb al-Dīn follows Ibn Kammūna in the arrangement of his material, not only in the sections on philosophical issues, but also on logic — as can be seen from the identical chapter headings in this section — Qūṭb al-Dīn can probably not be credited with a partly new, original classification of the sciences as suggested by Osman Bakar⁴³. His originality in this regard can only be claimed when the entire, encyclopaedic character of Durrat al-tāj is taken into consideration, including the fātiha, jumla 4 and the khātima.

For the further study of Ibn Kammūna it would be highly desirable to have a new critical edition of his Kāshif. This must take into account the translation of this work by Qūṭb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī in his Durrat al-tāj. Since Qūṭb al-Dīn translated the text some thirty years after Ibn Kammūna completed the Kāshif, he must have done so on the basis of a very early copy — possibly even an autograph — of the work. Moreover, a careful examination of the extant manuscripts of Ibn Kammūna’s Kāshif would also be useful to establish an improved edition of Qūṭb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī’s Durrat al-tāj.

⁴² See also Vesel: Les encyclopédies persanes, p. 14.
⁴³ Bakar: Classification, pp. 249-262 (Chp. 11: Qūṭb al-Dīn’s Classification of the Sciences).

APPENDIX

Ibn Kammūna’s Kāshif and Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī’s translation of this work into Persian, contained in his Durrat al-tāj


al-Bāb 1: fi ālat al-nazar al-musammāt bi-l-mantiq (pp. 149ff)
al-Faṣl 1: fi māhiyyat al-mantiq wa manfa’atihi wa umūr yantafi’u biḥā tawṭi’ā (pp. 151-156)

Jumla 1: dar mantiq (vol. 2, pp. 1ff [293ff]) maqālat 1: dar bayān-i māhiyyat-i mantiq wa manfa’at-i ān — dar bayān mawdū’-i mantiq — dar bayān-i umūr ki taqdim-i ān wājib ast tawṭi’ā rā wa īn mushtamal ast bar muqaddima wa sih faṣl (p. 13 [305])

Further divided into 3 sections (taʿlīm):
dar bayān-i māhiyyat-i mantiq wa manfa’at-i ān (p. 1 [293]), dar bayān-i mawdū’-i mantiq (p. 8 [300]), dar bayān-i umūr ki taqdim-i ān wājib ast tawṭi’ rā wa īn mushtamal ast bar muqaddima wa sih faṣl (p. 13 [305])

Apart from the chapter heading and the introductory paragraphs (Kāshif 151:4-13/ Durrat al-tāj vol. 2, p. 1 [293]:10-21), Quṭb al-Dīn has not directly translated any text from the Kāshif. Instead, he used several other sources some of which are mentioned: Ibn Sīnā: Dānishnāma-yi ʿalāʾī (p. 2 [294]); Ibn Sīnā: Shīfā’, pp. 2 [294], 4 [296], 10 [302], 23 [315]; „Muta’akhkhirān“, pp. 3 [295], 13 [305], 28 [320], 35 [327], 41 [333]

Further divided into 2 sections (taʿlīm):
dar aqsām wa ahkām-i maʿrifat ki ān rā aqwāl-i shārīḥa khwānand (p. 44 [336]),

al-Faṣl 2: fi ikhtisāb al-taṣawwurāt (pp. 157-160)

Further divided into 2 sections (taʿlīm):
dar aqsām wa ahkām-i maʿrifat ki ān rā aqwāl-i šārīḥa khwānand (p. 44 [336]),
al-Faṣl 3: fī l-qaḍāyā wa-aqṣāmihā (pp. 161-168)

dar aghlāṭ-i aqwāl-i shāriḥa (p. 48 [340])
Apart from the chapter heading, Qutb al-Dīn has not translated any text from the Kāshīf.

maqālat 3: dar qaḍāyā wa aqsām wa aḥkām-i ān (vol. 2, pp. 50-97 [342-389])
Further divided into 7 sections (taʾlīm):
dar taʾrīf wa taqṣīm-i qaḍīyya (p. 51 [343]);
dar ajzāʿ-i ḥamliyya (p. 54 [346]);
dar khusūs wa ḥāṣr wa ḥmāl-i qaḍāyā (p. 56 [348]);
dar taḥqīq-i maḥṣūrāt (p. 61 [353]);
dar ʿudūl wa taḥṣīl (p. 79 [371]);
dar jihāt (p. 83 [375]);
daqāyā-yi ṣharṭī (p. 87 [379])
Apart from the chapter heading, Qutb al-Dīn has not translated any text from the Kāshīf. Instead, he used several other sources some of which are mentioned: Ibn Sīnā (pp. 54 [346], 62 [354], 67 [359], 76 [368], 78 [370]); Ibn Sīnā: al-Shīfāʾ (pp. 57 [349], 58 [350], 66 [358], 68 [360], 70 [362], 110 [402]); Ibn Sīnā: Manṭiq-i Shīfāʾ (p. 75 [367]); Ibn Sīnā: al-Ishārāt (pp. 57 [349], 58 [350], 70 [362], 71 [363]); Fārābī (pp. 63 [355], 73 [365]); al-Muṭṭarahāt (Suhrawardī) (p. 70 [362]); al-Awsaf-i Jurjānī (p. 70 [362]); al-Mulakhkhas (Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī) (p. 70 [362]); Buqrāt: al-Fuṣūl (p. 70 [362]); “ustādh-i khātam-i ḥukmāmā” (p. 58 [350]); “mutaʾakhkhirān” (pp. 69 [361], 71 [363], 72 [364]); “baʿḍī az muḥaqiqān” (p. 78 [370]).

al-Faṣl 4: fī lawāzim al-qaḍīyya ʿinda l-infīrādīhā (pp. 169-176)

maqālat 4: dar lawāzim-i qaḍāyā ʿinda l-infīrād (vol. 2, pp. 97-122 [389-414])
Further divided into 4 sections (taʾlīm):
dar talāzum wa taʿāndūl-i shariyyāt-i basīt wa mukhtalīt (p. 98 [390]);
dar tanāqūd (p. 112 [404]);
daqāq-i mustawī (p. 118 [410]);
daqāq-i naqīd (p. 121 [413])

al-Faṣl 5: fi l-qiyās al-basīṭ (pp. 177-187)

Commenting additions: pp. 116 [408]:7-11, 117 [409]:13-16 & chart, 119 [411]:5-7, 121 [413]:8-9
Supplementary additions: pp. 97 [389]:11-113 [405]:2, 120 [412]:17-121 [413]:6

Further divided into a muqaddima and 3 sections (taʿlīm): dar taʿrif-i ḥujjat wa qiyās wa taqsīm-i ʾishān (p. 123 [415]); dar qiyās-i iqtirānī… az dū ḥamlī (p. 125 [417]); dar qiyās-i iqtirānī-yi sharṭī (p. 139 [431]); dar qiyās-i istithnāʾ (p. 142 [434])

Change in the order of the arrangement of the text: pp. 124 [416]:12-125 [417]:9
Critical additions: pp. 132 [424]:5-18 (directed against baʿdī mutaʾakhkhirān), 139 [431]:17-140 [432]:5 (directed against baʿdī az mutaʾakhkhirān), 141 [433]:14-21 Exemplifying additions: pp. 131 [423]:14-17, 134 [426]:6-19
Variations: The introductory paragraphs in Kāshiḏ (p. 177:4-7) and Durrat al-tāj (pp. 123 [415]:5-124 [416]:11) constitute different texts, respectively. The following
al-Faṣl 6: ʿfi tawābiʿ al-aqyisa wa-lawāḥiqā (pp. 189-193)

texts are also not related to each other: Ḵāṣif p. 182:10-15 ≠ Durrat al-tāj pp. 135 [427]:8-136 [428]:3; Ḵāṣif pp. 182:22-183:2 ≠ Durrat al-tāj pp. 137 [429]:21-138 [430]:1

maqālat 6: dar tawābiʿī aqyisa wa lawāḥiqā ān (vol. 2, pp. 144-152 [436-444]) Further divided into 10 sections (taʿtim): dar qiyyās murakkab (p. 145 [437]); dar qiyyās-i khulf (p. 145 [437]); dar qiyyās-i muqassam (p. 147 [439]); dar takthir-i qiyyās (p. 147 [439]); dar qiyyās-i ḍamīr (p. 147 [439]); dar qiyyās-i ʿaks (p. 148 [440]); dar qiyyās-i dūr (p. 148 [440]); dar istiqrār-i natalij wa natalij-i ṣadiqa az muqaddimāt-i kādhība (p. 149 [441]); dar iktisāb-i qiyyās (p. 150 [442]); dar taḥlīl-i qiyyās (p. 151 [443])

Commenting additions to the text: pp. 148 [440]:12-13, 20-22, 149 [441]:20-22, 150 [442]:6-7

Exemplifying additions to the text: pp. 149 [441]:5-7, 8, 8-9, 10, 11-12, 13, 14-19

maqālat 7: dar sināʿat panjgānāt-i kī burhān, wa jadal, wa khitābat, wa shīr, wa mughālāta ast (vol. 2, pp. 153-177 [445-469]) Further divided into 5 (taʿtim): dar burhān (p. 153 [445]), dar jadal (p. 156 [448]), dar khitābat (p. 158 [450]), dar shīr (p. 159 [451]), dar mughālāta (p. 160 [452])

Commenting additions to the text: pp. 160 [452]:13-16, 16-18, 161 [453]:15-17, 162 [454]:5-13, 163 [455]:12-22, 124 [456]:2-4, 5-13, 177 [469]:13-16

Supplementary additions to the text: pp. 170 [462]:4-177 [469]:8

P. 177 [469]:8-13 is again identical with Ḵāṣif p. 207:3-5. Qutb al-Dīn omitted, though, Ibn Kammūna’s last two lines

al-Faṣl 7: ʻfi l-ṣanāʿī al-khams allatī huwa al-burhān wa l-jadal wa l-khitāba wa l-shīr wa l-mughālāta (pp. 195-207)

Further divided into 10 sections (taʿtim): dar qiyyās murakkab (p. 145 [437]); dar qiyyās-i khulf (p. 145 [437]); dar qiyyās-i muqassam (p. 147 [439]); dar takthir-i qiyyās (p. 147 [439]); dar qiyyās-i ḍamīr (p. 147 [439]); dar qiyyās-i ʿaks (p. 148 [440]); dar qiyyās-i dūr (p. 148 [440]); dar istiqrār-i natalij wa natalij-i ṣadiqa az muqaddimāt-i kādhība (p. 149 [441]); dar iktisāb-i qiyyās (p. 150 [442]); dar taḥlīl-i qiyyās (p. 151 [443])

Commenting additions to the text: pp. 148 [440]:12-13, 20-22, 149 [441]:20-22, 150 [442]:6-7

Exemplifying additions to the text: pp. 149 [441]:5-7, 8, 8-9, 10, 11-12, 13, 14-19

maqālat 7: dar sināʿat panjgānāt-i kī burhān, wa jadal, wa khitābat, wa shīr, wa mughālāta ast (vol. 2, pp. 153-177 [445-469]) Further divided into 5 (taʿtim): dar burhān (p. 153 [445]), dar jadal (p. 156 [448]), dar khitābat (p. 158 [450]), dar shīr (p. 159 [451]), dar mughālāta (p. 160 [452])

Commenting additions to the text: pp. 160 [452]:13-16, 16-18, 161 [453]:15-17, 162 [454]:5-13, 163 [455]:12-22, 124 [456]:2-4, 5-13, 177 [469]:13-16

Supplementary additions to the text: pp. 170 [462]:4-177 [469]:8

P. 177 [469]:8-13 is again identical with Ḵāṣif p. 207:3-5. Qutb al-Dīn omitted, though, Ibn Kammūna’s last two lines


(Kāshif 207:6-7) where the latter explains that he did not bring any examples, for OrCreate the text here.

al-Faṣl 4: fī l-kayfiyyāt al-maḥṣūsa (pp. 285-294)

al-Faṣl 5: fīmā layṣa min sha’nihi an yahisṣa bi-l-hiss al-żāhir min anwā’ al-kayf (pp. 295-310)

al-Faṣl 6: fī l-ṣiḥda (pp. 311-315)

al-Faṣl 7: fī l-ḥaraka (pp. 317-330)

al-Bāb 4: fī l-ajsām al-ṭabi’iyya wa-muqawwamātihā wa-aḥkāmihā (pp. 331ff)

al-Faṣl 1: fī muqawwamāt al-jism al-ṭabi’i wa aḥkāmih al-ṭāmāma (pp. 333-346)

al-Faṣl 2: fī l-’anāsir wa aḥwālihā bi-ṭibār al-infirād (pp. 347-357)

al-Faṣl 3: fī ḥalāt hadhīhi l-’anāsir ʿinda imtīzājihā wa tarakkūbihā (pp. 359-362)

al-Faṣl 4: fī l-kaʿīnāt allattī ḥudūthuhā min al-’anāsir bi-ghayr tarkīb (pp. 363-371)

al-Faṣl 5: fī mā yatakawwanu ʿan al-ʿanāsir bi-tarkīb minhā (pp. 373-379)

al-Faṣl 6: fī ithbāt al-muḥaddid li-l-jiḥāt wa dhikr lawāzimihi (pp. 381-390)

al-Faṣl 7: fī ʿaʾīr al-aflāk wa l-kawākib (pp. 391-405)

al-Bāb 5: fī l-nufūs wa ʿṣfātihā wa āthārihā (pp. 407ff)

maqālāt 4: dar kayfīyyāt-i maḥṣūsa bi-ḥawāss-i zāhir (vol. 3, pp. 68-78 [546-556])

maqālāt 5: dar awwā’-i kayf ki ʾishān rá bi ḥiss-i zāhir dar natawān yāft (vol. 3, pp. 79-94 [557-572])

maqālāt 6: dar idāfat (vol. 3, pp. 94-98 [572-576])

maqālāt 7: dar ḥarakat (vol. 3, pp. 98-111 [576-589])

Jumla 3: dar ʿilm-i asfal ki ʾilm-i ṭabiʿi ast fann 1: dar aṣām-i ṭabiʿi (vol. 4, pp. 1ff [621ff])

maqālāt 1: dar muqawwamāt-i [jism-i] ṭabiʿi wa aḥkām-i ʾāmma-i án na aḥkām-i khāṣṣ bi-har jismī (vol. 4, pp. 1-14 [621-634])

maqālāt 2: dar ʾanāsir wa aḥwāl-i án bi ʾtibār-i infirād (vol. 4, pp. 14-26 [634-646])

maqālāt 3: dar aḥwāl-i in ʾanāsir bi ʾtibār-i imtizāj wa tarkīb-i ʾishān (vol. 4, pp. 26-30 [646-650])

maqālāt 4: dar kāʿināt-ī ḥudūth-i ʾishān az ʾanāsir na bi tarkīb ast (vol. 4, pp. 30-38 [650-658])

maqālāt 5: dar ānā jutukawwūn miḥa- vac az ʾanāsir bi-tarkīb wa ān mawālīd-i thalāthah ast: mādan wa nabāt wa ḥayawān (vol. 4, pp. 38-45 [658-665])

maqālāt 6: dar ithbāt-i muḥaddid-ī jiḥāt wa dhikr-i lawāzim-i ān (vol. 4, pp. 45-55 [665-675])

maqālāt 7: dar sāʾīr-i aflāk wa kawākib wa dhikr-i jumla az aḥwāl-i ʾishān (vol. 4, pp. 55-69 [675-689])

fann 2: dar nufūs wa ʿṣfāt wa āthār-i ān (vol. 4, pp. 70ff [690ff])

al-Faṣl 1: fi ithbāt wujūd al-nafs (pp. 409-417)

al-Faṣl 2: fi mā yazharu ‘an al-nafs min al-quwā al-nabāṭiyya (pp. 419-424)

al-Faṣl 3: fi quwā al-hiss wa l-ḥaraka al-irādiyya (pp. 425-437)\(^{44}\)

al-Faṣl 4: fi l-quwā allatī lā na’lamuḥā hāšila li-ghayr al-insān min al-ḥayvanāt al-ākhar (pp. 439-444)

al-Faṣl 5: fi l-manāmāt wa l-wahy wa l-ilhām wa l-mu’jīzāt wa l-ka‘rāmāt wa l-āthār al-gharābība al-ṣādira ‘an al-nafs wa darajāt al-‘ārifīn wa maqāmātihim wa kayfiyyat irtīyādihim (pp. 445-462)

al-Faṣl 6: fi abadiyyat al-nafs wa aḥwāliḥā ba’da kharāb al-badan (pp. 463-474)

al-Faṣl 7: fi ithbāt al-nufūs al-samā‘yya (pp. 475-478)\(^{46}\)

maqālat 1: dar ithbāt-i wujūd-i nafs wa ānki mā’qūlāt-iū mumkin nābāshad ki dar [ālatf-i] badanī [ḥāšīl shūd wa-ānkiū dar ta’aqqul ki kamāl] dhātī ā ust az badan mustaghnīst (vol. 4, pp. 70-78 [690-698])

maqālat 2: dar quwā-yi nābātī ki az nafs-i zāhir mīshavad wa shakk namīkūnīm ki īnsān wa ḥayawān-i a’jam wa nabāt dar ān mushtarikand (vol. 4, pp. 79-84 [699-704])

maqālat 3: dar quwā-yi ḥiss wa ḥarakat-i īrādī ki az nafs-i īnsān sādīr mīshavad wa shakk namīkūnīm dar ān ki bāqī-yi ḥayawān rā ḥāsīl ast (vol. 4, pp. 85-97 [705-717])

maqālat 4: dar quwatī-yi jand ki namīdānīm ki gharā-yi īnsān rā ḥāsīl ast az ḥayawānāt (vol. 4, pp. 97-103 [717-723])\(^{45}\)

maqālat 5: dar manāmāt wa wahy wa ilhām wa mu’jīzāt wa ka‘rāmāt wa āthār-i gharib ki az nafs sādīr shūd wa darajāt-i ʿarifān wa maqāmāt wa kayfiyyat-i riyyādat-i īshān (vol. 4, pp. 103-118 [723-738])

maqālat 6: dar abadiyyat-i nafs wa aḥwāl-iū ba’d az kharāb-i badan (vol. 4, pp. 119-130 [739-750])

maqālat 7: dar ithbāt-i nufūs-i samawī wa kayfiyyat-i tasawwūrat-i īshān wa taḥarrukāt-i īshān (vol. 4, pp. 131-135 [751-755])

\(^{44}\) Due to a corruption of the print of the Kāshīf, the section corresponding to Durrat al-tāj, vol. 4, p. 97 [717]:8-14, which according to the order of the text should appear on p. 437 following line 7, is mistakenly printed on p. 440 lines 7-12.

\(^{45}\) Durrat al-tāj, vol. 4, p. 100 [720]:10-11 is incomplete and corrupt. For the correct and complete passage, see Kāshīf p. 441 lines 19-22.

\(^{46}\) The print of the Kāshīf is corrupt on p. 475, where approximately three lines are missing at the end of the page; on p. 476 lines 20-25 are also corrupt.

al-Bāb 6: fi l-uqūl wa āthārīhā fi al-‘alāmâyn al-jismānī wa l-rūḩānī (pp. 479ff)

al-Faṣl 1: fi anna l-‘aql huwa maṣdar wujūd al-nufūs kullihā (pp. 481-485)

al-Faṣl 2: fi annahu law là al-‘aql la-mā kharajat al-nufūs fi ta’aqqulatihā min al-quwwa ilā l-fi‘l (pp. 487-492)

al-Faṣl 3: fi bayān asnād mā là yatanāhā min al-ḥarakāt wa l-hawādith ilā l-‘aql (pp. 493-499)

al-Faṣl 4: fi kayfiyyat kawn al-‘aql maṣdarān li-l-ajsām (pp. 501-506)

al-Faṣl 5: fi anna l-tashabbuh bi-l-‘aql huwa ghāyat al-ḥarakāt al-samāwiyaa (pp. 507-511)

al-Faṣl 6: fi bayān anna l-‘aql yajibu an yakuna ḥayyan mudrikan li-dhātihī wa ḥaghayrihi (pp. 513-518)

al-Faṣl 7: fi bayān kathrat al-‘uqūl (pp. 519-524)

al-Bāb 7: fi wājjīb al-wujūd wa wāḥdāniyyatihi wa nu’ūt jalālihi wa kayfiyyat fi’lhi wa-‘ināyyatihi (pp. 525ff)

al-Faṣl 1: fi ithbāt wājjīb al-wujūd li-dhātihī (pp. 527-533)


al-Faṣl 1: fi ithbāt wājjīb al-wujūd li-dhātihī (pp. 527-533)

al-Faṣl 2: fi kayfiyyat kawn al-‘aql maṣdarān li-l-ajsām (pp. 501-506)

al-Faṣl 3: fi bayān asnād mā là yatanāhā min al-ḥarakāt wa l-hawādith ilā l-‘aql (pp. 493-499)

al-Faṣl 4: fi kayfiyyat kawn al-‘aql maṣdarān li-l-ajsām (pp. 501-506)

al-Faṣl 5: fi anna l-tashabbuh bi-l-‘aql huwa ghāyat al-ḥarakāt al-samāwiyaa (pp. 507-511)

al-Faṣl 6: fi bayān anna l-‘aql yajibu an yakuna ḥayyan mudrikan li-dhātihī wa ḥaghayrihi (pp. 513-518)

al-Faṣl 7: fi bayān kathrat al-‘uqūl (pp. 519-524)

al-Bāb 7: fi wājjīb al-wujūd wa wāḥdāniyyatihi wa nu’ūt jalālihi wa kayfiyyat fi’lhi wa-‘ināyyatihi (pp. 525ff)

47 At the end of faṣl 5 of the Kāshīf, the last paragraph (= Durrat al-tāj, vol. 5, pp. 33:12-34:4 [795:12-796:4]) is missing; it is to be found at the end of faṣl 6 (Kāshīf, p. 518:1-9).

al-Faṣl 2: fi wājib al-wujūd wāḥid (pp. 535-542)\(^{48}\)

maqālat 2: dar ānki wājib al-wujūd yakī ast wa ū rā bar hīj kathratī bi wajhī az wujūh ḥaml natawān kard (vol. 5, pp. 53-62 [815-824])

al-Faṣl 3: fi tanzīh wājib al-wujūd (pp. 543-547)


al-Faṣl 4: fi mā yan’atu bihi wājib al-wujūd min nu’ūt al-jalāl wa l-ikrām (pp. 549-555)

maqālat 4: dar ānji wājib al-wujūd rā bi ān wasf kunand az šīfāt-i jalāl wa īkrām (vol. 5, pp. 67-75 [829-837])

al-Faṣl 5: fi tabyīn kawn šīfāt al-wājib li-dhātihi lā tūjību kathra (pp. 557-561)

maqālat 5: dar bāyān ānki šīfāt-i wājib al-wujūd li-dhātīhi mūjīb-i kathratī nīstand na bi-ḥasab-i taqawwum-i dhāt-i ū wa na bi-ḥasab-i ānji darū mutaqarrar shūd ḫa’d az taqawwum-i dhāt-i ū (vol. 5, pp. 75-80 [837-842])

al-Faṣl 6: fi kayfīyyat fi’l wājib al-wujūd wa tartīb al-mumkinât ū’ānu (pp. 563-579)

maqālat 6: dar kayfīyyat-i fi’l-i wājib al-wujūd wa tartīb-i mumkinât az ū (vol. 5, pp. 80-99 [842-861])

al-Faṣl 7: fi ‘ināyat wājib al-wujūd bi-makhlūqātīhi wa rāḥmatīhi lahum wa ḥikmatīhi fi ijādīhim (pp. 581-598)\(^{49}\)

maqālat 7: dar ‘ināyat-i wājib al-wujūd bi-makhlūqāt ū wa rāḥmat-i ū ışhān rā wa ḥikmat-i ū dar ijād-i ışhān (vol. 5, pp. 99-119 [861-881])

---

48 The printed text of the Kāshīf is corrupt on p. 538:10-13, where p. 538:5-9 is repeated by mistake; Kāshīf p. 538:7-9 is a misplaced and corrupt repetition of p. 538:2-4. A comparison of the text with the corresponding passage in Durrat al-tāj shows that something is missing here.

49 The respective formulations of the concluding ḥamdalā are different in Kāshīf (p. 598:15-16) and in Durrat al-tāj (vol. 5, p. 119 [881]:6-8)