

CHAPTER 18

IBN ABĪ JUMHŪR AL- AḤSĀ'Ī (D. AFTER 1491) AND HIS *KITĀB MUJLĪ MIR'ĀT* *AL-MUNJĪ*

SABINE SCHMIDTKE

THE spiritual and intellectual life in the Eastern lands of Islam during the post-Avicennan period was dominated by the peripatetic philosophy of Ibn Sīnā (d. 428/1037), the philosophical mysticism of Muḥyī l-Dīn Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 638/1240) and the teachings of *Shaykh al-ishrāq* Shihāb al-Dīn Yaḥyā al-Suhrawardī *al-maqtūl* (in 597/1191). Over time, these different intellectual perspectives increasingly interacted with traditional Muʿtazilite and Ashʿarite *kalām*, culminating within Twelver Shīʿism in the philosophy of representatives of the so-called School of Iṣfahān in the eleventh/seventeenth century and, during the Qājār period, in the different intellectual strands of the School of Tehran (Pourjavady, forthcoming). Ibn Sīnā's philosophy was primarily received through Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's (d. 672/1274) influential commentary on the *Ishārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt* (Gacek, Pourjavady, and Wisnovsky, forthcoming). For the spread of Ibn al-ʿArabī's ideas in the Islamic East, the writings of his prominent disciple Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī (d. 673/1273–74) were of primary significance (Todd 2014), as well as the writings of the latter's students, namely ʿAfīf al-Dīn al-Tilimsānī (d. 690/1291), Saʿīd al-Dīn al-Farghānī (d. 695/1296), Muʿayyid al-Dīn al-Jandī (d. ca 700/1300), and Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī (d. 688/1289). Within Imāmī circles, the interpretations and adaptations of Ibn al-ʿArabī's notions through the writings of Jamāl al-Dīn (Kamāl al-Dīn) ʿAlī b. Sulaymān al-Baḥrānī al-Sitrāwī (fl. first half seventh/thirteenth century) (Madelung 1989; Taghavi 2013) and Bahā' al-Dīn Ḥaydar b. ʿAlī al-Āmulī (d. after 787/1385) proved authoritative (Agha-Tehrani 1996). Besides these two strands, Suhrawardī's philosophy of illumination soon developed into one of the dominant schools of Islamic philosophy and had a long-lasting impact on Imāmī theology and philosophy from the seventh/thirteenth century onward. Most of the later Twelver Shīʿite thinkers saw Illuminationist teachings through the eyes (1) of the Jewish philosopher ʿIzz al-Dawla Ibn Kammūna (d. in or after 683/1284), who was widely

known as *shāriḥ al-Talwīḥāt*, on grounds of his commentary on Suhrawardī's *Kitāb al-Talwīḥāt* (completed in 667/1268), the first of its kind (Pourjavady and Schmidtke 2006b), (2) of Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd al-Shahrazūrī, a younger contemporary of Ibn Kammūna as it seems, who was still alive in 687/1288 and is mostly known for his encyclopedic *al-Shajara al-ilāhiyya fī 'ulūm al-ḥaqā'iq al-rabbāniyya* (completed in 680/1281) (Pourjavady and Schmidtke 2006a),¹ and (3) of Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī (d. 710/1311) whose commentary (*sharḥ*) on Suhrawardī's *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq* was widely received. When composing his *Sharḥ*, Quṭb al-Dīn extensively used both Ibn Kammūna's *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt* as well as Shahrazūrī's earlier commentary on *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*, which was far less influential than Quṭb al-Dīn's *Sharḥ* (Pourjavady and Schmidtke 2004, 2006a, 2007, 2009). Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī (b. ca. 838/1434–35, d. after 906/1501) was the first Imāmī scholar to amalgamate in his magnum opus Mu'tazilite and Ash'arite *kalām*, Peripatetic and Illuminationist philosophy, and philosophical mysticism, as is already indicated by the title of the work, *Kitāb Mujlī mir'āt al-munjī fī l-kalām wa-l-ḥikmatayn wa-l-taṣawwuf* (Madelung 1978; Schmidtke 2000).

Little is known about Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm b. Ḥasan Ibn Abī Jumhūr's life, and his scholarly biography can only rudimentarily be reconstructed on the basis of self-testimonies contained in his writings, his colophons, and his *ijāzas* (Bū Khamsīn 1993; Schmidtke 2000, 2009; Ghufrānī 2013). The outlines of his formation can be gleaned from an *ijāza* Ibn Abī Jumhūr issued on 10 Jumādā I 896/1491 in Mashhad to his patron and host Sayyid Muḥammad b. Šāliḥ al-Gharawī al-Qummī (d. 931/1524–25). In addition to a comprehensive autobibliography providing an inventory of his writings up to 896/1491, the *ijāza* contains seven chains of transmission, each one of which starts with one of Ibn Abī Jumhūr's teachers (Schmidtke 2000, appendix 3; editio princeps in Schmidtke 2009). Born around 838/1434–35 in the village of al-Taymiyya in al-Ḥasā' on the Eastern coast of the Arabian Peninsula, Ibn Abī Jumhūr began his education in his homeland, as is suggested by the names of scholars originating from this region that are mentioned in the first four chains of transmission as his immediate teachers (see also generally Pakatchi 2013), namely (1) his father, Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī b. Ḥusām al-Dīn Ibrāhīm b. Ḥasan b. Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī (d. before 895/1489–90), whom he identifies as his "first teacher" (*shaykhī wa-ustādhi al-awwal*) and who in turn had studied with Nāṣir al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Ibn Nizār al-Aḥsā'ī, *qāḍī l-quḍāt* in Baḥrayn under the Banū Jarwān, (2) Ḥirz al-Dīn al-Baḥrānī al-Awālī (al-Awā'ilī/al-Awābilī), who had studied with Fakhr al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Makhdam al-Awālī (al-Awā'ilī/al-Awābilī) al-Baḥrānī, (3) Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Kamāl al-Dīn Mūsā al-Mūsawī al-Ḥusaynī al-Aḥsā'ī, and (4) Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad al-Mūsawī al-Ḥusaynī (who was in turn a student of various scholars from al-Qaṭīf). In 877/1472–73, when circa thirty-eight years of age, Ibn Abī Jumhūr set out for a pilgrimage to Mecca and

¹ Shahrazūrī's *Shajara* has been edited twice in recent years: (1) ed. Muḥammad Najīb Kūrḳūn (Çemberlitaş, İstanbul: Elif Yayınları, 2004); 2nd ed. Beirut: Dār Šādir; İstanbul: Maktabat al-Isrshād, 2007); (2) ed. Najafquli Ḥabībī (Tehran: Mu'assasa-yi pizhūhishī-yi ḥikmat va falsafa, 1383/2004–5). In this chapter, reference is given to Ḥabībī's edition only.

continued from there to the shrines of the imams in Iraq. It may have been during this trip that he spent a considerable length of time in Najaf, where he studied with (5) Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥasan al-Fattāl al-Najafī (fl. 870/1465–66), who was in turn a student of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawānī (d. 908/1502) (Pourjavady 2011, 8). With Ḥasan al-Fattāl, Ibn Abī Jumhūr presumably studied the Illuminationist philosophy of the *Shaykh al-ishrāq*. Ibn Abī Jumhūr is also known to have paid during his early career a brief visit (of about a month) to Jabal 'Āmil, where he possibly studied with the (6) Shaykh 'Alī b. Hilāl al-Jazā'irī, and he visited at some stage Kāshān where he studied with (7) Wajīh al-Dīn b. 'Alā al-Dīn Faṭḥ Allāh b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Shams al-Dīn Ishāq b. Faṭḥān al-Wā'iz al-Qummī al-Kāshānī (fl. 877/1473). Over the following decades Ibn Abī Jumhūr sojourned repeatedly in Mashhad, a city that had apparently become as a second home to him during those years. Here he was closely attached to his patron and host Sayyid Muḥsin b. Muḥammad al-Riḍawī. At the latter's request Ibn Abī Jumhūr commented upon his own *Zād al-musāfirīn*, an early treatise of his on *kalām*, completing the autocommentary, *Kashf al-barāhīn li-sharḥ Zād al-musāfirīn*, on 17 Dhū l-Ḥijja 878 / 5 May 1474 in the house of his patron (Ghufrānī 2013, 138 ff., no. 52). Earlier during the same year Ibn Abī Jumhūr held a series of debates with a Sunnī scholar from Herat, the venue for the first and third sessions again being his patron's house (Ghufrānī 2013, 236–54, no. 67). The duration of Ibn Abī Jumhūr's first visit to Mashhad as well as his whereabouts over the next decade are unknown,² but there is evidence that in 886/1481–82 he was in Baḥrayn: in Ṣafar 886/1481 we find him in al-Ḥasā', and in Dhū l-Qa'ḍa 886/1482 he is attested to have been in al-Qaṭīf. Between 888/1483 and 889/1484, Ibn Abī Jumhūr paid a second visit to Mashhad. Here he dictated, in four sessions, his *al-Bawāriq al-muḥsiniyya li-tajallī al-Durra al-jumhūriyya*, an autocommentary on his *Durra al-jumhūriyya* in which the author discusses some questions of Illuminationist philosophy (completed in Muḥarram 888/1483),³ and it is here that he completed in Dhū l-Qa'ḍa 888/1483 a work on legal theory, *Kāshifat al-ḥāl 'an aḥwāl al-istidlāl* (Ghufrānī 2013, 126 ff., no. 51). The only extant copy of the *Bawāriq* ends with a collation note (dated 890 AH) according to which the anonymous scribe had collated the text together with the author—Mashhad may again have been the likely venue (Schmidtke 2009, 56). The *Bawāriq* is also the earliest extant testimony for Ibn Abī Jumhūr's engagement with Illuminationist philosophy. In Muḥarram 889/1484 Ibn Abī Jumhūr concluded another brief credal tract in Mashhad, *Risāla tashṭamil 'alā aqall mā yajib 'alā l-mukallaḥīn min al-'ilm bi-uṣūl al-dīn* or *al-Risāla al-mashhadiyya fī l-uṣūl al-dīniyya wa-l-i'tiqādāt al-ḥaqqiyya bi-l-dalā'il al-yaqīniyya* (Ghufrānī 2013, 49 f., no. 22), this being the latest dated evidence for his second sojourn in the city. Over the next five to six years Ibn Abū Jumhūr apparently traveled extensively. In 893/1488 we find him back in his hometown, al-Taymiyya, where

² He had issued an *ijāza* to al-Sayyid Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥasan b. Ḥusām al-Dīn Ibrāhīm b. Yūsuf b. Abī Shabāna, dated 3 Rabī' II 880 / 6 August 1475 at an unknown location; see Ghufrānī 2013, 15 ff. no. 2.

³ The colophon contains no indication as to where the work was completed. For an argument in favor of Mashhad, see Schmidtke 2009, 55. Cf., however, Ghufrānī 2013, 57, who maintains that the *Bawāriq* was completed in Awāl in Baḥrayn.

he completed his autocommentary on his brief credal tract *Maslak al-afhām fī ʿilm al-kalām*, entitled *al-Nūr al-munjī min al-zalām*. Shortly before or perhaps during the year 894/1488–89 he undertook another pilgrimage to Mecca and continued his journey from there to Iraq. It was during this trip that he began composing his supercommentary *Mujlī mirʾāt al-munjī*, as he explains in the introduction to the work (*Mujlī*, 3 ff. [1, 133 ff.])⁴ In Rabīʿ I 895/1490 he completed his *al-Masālik al-jāmiʿiyya sharḥ al-Risāla al-Alfiyya*, a commentary on the *Risāla al-Alfiyya* of al-Shahīd al-awwal (d. 786/1384) on ritual prayer, in Najaf. From here, he seems to have proceeded immediately to Mashhad, this now being his third visit to that city. For the following two years (895/1490–897/1492) we possess ample evidence for Ibn Abī Jumhūr’s presence in this city. By the end of Jumādā II 895/1490 he completed a rough copy of his *Mujlī mirʾāt al-munjī*, followed by the completion of the fair copy on 16 Ṣafar 896/1490. In the following spring, on 24 Rabīʿ II 896/1491, he issued an *ijāza* for this work to Muḥammad b. Ṣāliḥ al-Gharawī (Ghufrānī 2013, 21, no. 6), followed by another comprehensive *ijāza* issued again to his patron and host on 10 Jumādā I 896/1491 that includes his autobibliography (Ghufrānī 2013, 19 ff., no. 5; Schmidtke 2009, 62 ff.). Muḥammad b. Ṣāliḥ had also studied two other works of Ibn Abī Jumhūr with the author, namely *al-Masālik al-jāmiʿiyya* (*ijāza* dated 4 Jumādā I 896/1491; cf. Ghufrānī 2013, 17 ff., no. 4) and *Kāshifat al-ḥāl* (for which he was granted two *ijāzas*, on 15 Jumādā I 896/1491 and on 20 Jumādā I 896; cf. Ghufrānī 2013, 22 ff., nos. 7 and 8). Ibn Abī Jumhūr evidently stayed in Mashhad until the early autumn of 897/1492. In Ṣafar or Ramaḍān 897 / December 1491 or July 1492 he completed his *ḥadīth* compilation *Ghawālī al-laʾālī al-ʿazīziyya*, and in Dhū l-Qaʿda 897/1492 he issued another *ijāza* to his host for this work (Ghufrānī 2013, 23 f., no. 9). Toward the end of 897/1492 or the beginning of 898/1493 Ibn Abī Jumhūr apparently left Mashhad for Astarābād. This is suggested by yet another *ijāza* he granted to his patron (with whom he was traveling) on 15 Jumādā I 898/1493 in Q-l-qān (or Q-l-fān) in the region of Astarābād (Ghufrānī 2013, 28 f., no. 12). Sometime later, in Dhū l-Ḥijja 898/1493, he issued an *ijāza* to a certain Jalāl al-Dīn Bahrām b. Bahrām b. ʿAlī al-Astarābādī for his *Ghawālī al-laʾālī* (Ghufrānī 2013, 29 ff., no. 13), and in Ramaḍān 899/1494, he gave an *ijāza* to ʿAṭāʾ Allāh b. Muʿīn al-Dīn b. Naṣr Allāh al-Sarawī al-Astarābādī for his *al-Masālik al-jāmiʿiyya*, both in the region of Astarābād (Ghufrānī 2013, 30 ff., no. 14). About two years later, in Shaʿbān 901/1496, Ibn Abī Jumhūr completed in Astarābād a fair copy of his *Durar al-laʾālī al-ʿimādiyya*, which is dedicated to a certain local vizier, ʿImād al-Dīn. It was perhaps also during his sojourn in Astarābād that Ibn Abī Jumhūr issued an *ijāza* to another student of his, Sharaf al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Sayyid ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn b. al-Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn al-Hāshimī al-Ṭālaqānī al-Kāshī for his *Ghawālī*, with no indication as to the place and date of issue.⁵ The two latest dated pieces of evidence for his life indicate that Ibn Abī Jumhūr continued traveling in the Arabian peninsula and Iraq. On 25 Dhū l-Qaʿda 904/

⁴ Reference will be given in this chapter to the edition of 1329/1911 (ed. Aḥmad al-Shirāzī; republ. Tehran 2008) as well as, in square brackets, the recent critical edition by Riḍā Yahyā Pūr Fārmad (5 vols., Beirut, 2012).

⁵ Cf. Ghufrānī 2013, 24ff. no. 10, where 912/1506–7 is suggested as a possible date for this *ijāza*.

1499 he finished another commentary on the *Bāb al-ḥādī 'ashar* of the 'Allāma al-Ḥillī in Medina (Schmidtke 2006, 2013; Ibn Abī Jumhūr (*Sharḥ*); on this work see also below), and on 9 Rajab 906/1501—Ibn Abī Jumhūr was by then circa sixty-eight years of age—he issued an *ijāza* in al-Ḥilla to 'Alī b. al-Qāsim al-'Adhāqa for the *Qawā'id al-aḥkām* of the 'Allāma (Ghufrānī 2013, 32 ff., no. 15). Nothing is known about his life after this date.

Ibn Abī Jumhūr's *Kitāb Mujlī mir'āt al-munjī* was thus written at a later stage of the author's life. Completed in Jumādā II 895/1490 (rough copy) in Mashhad, when the author had reached an approximate age of fifty-seven years, the *Mujlī* was an autocommentary on the *Kitāb al-Nūr al-munjī min al-zalām* (finished two years earlier, in 893/1488, in al-Taymiyya in al-Ḥasā'), which in turn was a commentary on the author's very concise *Kitāb Maslak* (or *Masālik*) *al-afḥām fī 'ilm al-kalām* (date and place of composition unknown). Judging by the number of extant (recorded) manuscript copies—seventy according to Ghufrānī (2013, 181–206)—the *Mujlī* was Ibn Abī Jumhūr's by far most popular work.⁶ Among later thinkers, it was in particular Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsā'ī (d. 1241/1826) who quotes the *Mujlī* extensively in his own writings.

As the title of the basic work indicates, it was essentially a work on theology. This is also reflected by its overall structure that has already been provided by the basic work, *Maslak al-afḥām*: following an introduction (*muqaddima*) containing discussions of the prolegomena, the bulk of the work is divided into two parts, one on divine unicity (*al-qism al-awwal fī l-tawḥīd*)—with discussions about the notion of *tawḥīd*, the proofs for the existence of God, and about His attributes—and a second part on actions (*al-qism al-thānī fī l-af'āl wa-hiya l-'awāriḍ al-lāzima 'inda i'tibār fayḍ al-mawjūdāt 'an al-dhāt al-muqaddasa*) corresponding to the chapters on divine justice in Mu'tazilite works. Here, the author treats moral obligation (*taklīf*), man's capacity, will and actions, divine acts of grace (*al-tāf*, sing. *lutf*), prophecy, imamate, annihilation (*fanā'*) and resurrection (*i'āda*), repentance (*tawba*), and belief (*īmān*). The work ends with a lengthy concluding section (*khātima*) in the course of which Ibn Abī Jumhūr discusses in detail various mystical notions and adds, toward the end, four “admonitions” (*waṣāyā*, sg. *waṣīyya*) for his readers.

In his *al-Nūr al-munjī*, Ibn Abī Jumhūr comments on the text of the *Maslak* in a comprehensive manner, often expanding on the mystical and philosophical (mostly Illuminationist) dimensions of the issues under consideration (these are still absent in the *Maslak*). By contrast, on the level of the *Mujlī*, Ibn Abī Jumhūr in most instances restricts himself to elaborating on specific notions or arguments mentioned in the two other works, and this as a rule in great detail. The author usually considers only those issues worthy to be elaborated upon that originate within either the Illuminationist or

⁶ While *Maslak al-afḥām* is independently preserved in one manuscript in the Marwī collection (Schmidtke 2009, 54), the *Nūr al-munjī* is exclusively transmitted as part of the *Mujlī*. Riḍā Yahyā Pūr Fārmad published separately *al-Nūr al-munjī min al-zalām ḥāshiyat Maslak al-afḥām* (2 vols., Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā' li-l-tibā' wa-l-nashr wa-l-tawzī', 2013), which contains no material that would go beyond what is contained in his edition of the *Mujlī* (see n. 4). This edition will not be referred to in the present chapter.

the mystical tradition.⁷ On the rare occasions where the basic work and the commentary deal with strictly theological issues with no corresponding concept in philosophy or mysticism, the supercommentary as a rule remains silent. Originating from within the Imāmī Mu‘tazilī tradition, Ibn Abī Jumhūr refers at all three textual levels to the followers of Mu‘tazilite doctrines as the ‘*adliyya* without ever explicitly associating himself with this group—such reservation toward the Mu‘tazila being a characteristic trait for most Imāmī theologians (Madelung 1979). It is noteworthy that the author refers the reader in the *Nur al-munjī* and the *Mujlī* repeatedly to “our works on theology” (*kutubunā al-kalāmiyya*), implying that the commentary and the supercommentary are not to be counted among his strictly theological works.

Throughout his supercommentary, Ibn Abī Jumhūr freely combined traditional Mu‘tazilite theology with notions of Peripatetic and Illuminationist philosophy, and of philosophical mysticism, thus creating an apparently unprecedented synthesis of these strands. On this basis he furthermore sought to mediate between the doctrines of the Mu‘tazilites and the Ash‘arites. While in his earlier theological writings there are no traces of either mystical or Illuminationist thought, the author’s concern to reconcile opposing Ash‘arite and Mu‘tazilite views is already clearly prevalent in them. To judge from the evidence of his earlier *kalām* works, notably the *Kashf al-barāhīn*, a commentary on the author’s *Zād al-musāfirīn* (completed in 878/1474), as well as the more extensive *Ma‘īn al-ma‘īn fī uṣūl al-dīn*,⁸ to which he frequently refers in his *Kashf al-barāhīn* and which was apparently completed before 878/1474, the author was at the time not yet engaged with Illuminationist philosophy or philosophical mysticism. In the majority of issues that would not provoke a contradiction with inherently Twelver Shī‘ī doctrines he maintained traditional Mu‘tazilite views, usually adopting the positions of Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī (d. 436/1044) and his school, as was characteristic for Imāmī theologians since the sixth/twelfth century (Ansari and Schmidtke 2014), freely mixing them with peripatetic terminology and concepts whenever they did not go against any theological doctrines. On that basis, he sought to harmonize Ash‘arite and Mu‘tazilite positions—a tendency he further developed in the *Kitāb al-Mujlī*. It is therefore likely that Ibn Abī Jumhūr got acquainted with the thought of Suhrawardī only after 878/1474, possibly through his teacher Ḥasan al-Fattāl, with whom he studied in Najaf. Moreover, from the evidence in the *Mujlī* it seems evident that the *Shajara* of Shahrazūrī was Ibn Abī Jumhūr’s principal source for Illuminationist philosophy. It is uncertain, by contrast, when and through whom he was introduced to philosophical mysticism, but this strand of thought was doubtlessly a living tradition in his homeland Baḥrayn, as is

⁷ For the structure of the work, including its numerous lengthy digressions, see Ghufrānī 2013, 147–81, no. 53; Ibn Abī Jumhūr, *Mujlī* (ed. R. Y. Farmād), 5:1817–77. Both overviews are largely based on the marginal lemmata added by the editor of the lithograph edition of 1911, Aḥmad al-Shīrāzī; see also the 2008 Tehran reprint of the 1911 edition, *alif-ḥāḥā*.

⁸ *Ma‘īn al-ma‘īn fī uṣūl al-dīn* (also known as *Sharḥ Ma‘īn al-fikar fī sharḥ al-Bāb al-ḥādī ‘ashar*) was a supercommentary on the author’s *Ma‘īn al-fikar fī sharḥ al-Bāb al-ḥādī ‘ashar*, which in turn was—as the title indicates—a commentary on the *Bāb al-ḥādī ‘ashar* of the ‘Allāma al-Ḥilli. See Ghufrānī 2013, 233 ff., no. 64.

visible in the writings of Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī b. Sulaymān al-Baḥrānī and the *Sharḥ Nahj al-balāgha* of the latter's student Kamāl al-Dīn Maytham b. 'Alī b. Maytham al-Baḥrānī (d. after 681/1282)—Ibn Abī Jumhūr incorporated numerous lengthy quotations from the *Sharḥ* into the *Mujlī*. In addition to this, Ibn Abī Jumhūr was evidently familiar with at least some of the writings of Ḥaydar al-Āmulī.

Throughout the *Mujlī* and the underlying commentary the influence of Shahrazūrī's *Shajara* is evident. In his *al-Nūr al-munjī* Ibn Abī Jumhūr follows in many instances Shahrazūrī's line of argumentation as is found in his *Shajara*. Most striking is the influence of the *Shajara* on Ibn Abī Jumhūr's supercommentary, the *Mujlī*. Throughout his supercommentary, Ibn Abī Jumhūr quotes numerous lengthy passages and at times entire chapters of the *Shajara*. Given the textual agreement between the *Mujlī* and the *Shajara* in all instances, Ibn Abī Jumhūr must have had a copy of the work at his disposal rather than having gleaned the material from an intermediary source (Schmidtke 2000, appendix 2).

Throughout his work, Ibn Abī Jumhūr refrains from identifying the source of his lengthy quotations from the *Shajara*. Neither the name of the author nor the title of the work is explicitly referred to anywhere in his *Mujlī*. In most cases Ibn Abī Jumhūr does not even alert his readers when adducing passages that he had gleaned from the *Shajara*, thus creating the impression that the subsequent elaborations are his own. In a number of instances he remarks that what follows or what has been said is the view of others, thus indicating that he is opening a quotation. Occasionally he introduces a quotation from the *Shajara* by stating that this is the view of "one of the later representatives from among the Illuminationists" (*ba'd ahl al-ishrāq min al-muta'akhhirīn*), "a later [scholar]" (*ba'd al-muta'akhhirīn*), "one of the later Muslim philosophers" (*ba'd al-muta'akhhirīn min al-ḥukamā' al-islāmiyyīn*), or "one from among the people of wisdom" (*ba'd ahl al-ḥikma*) (Schmidtke 2000, appendix 2). Given the popularity of Shahrazūrī's *Shajara* at the time of Ibn Abī Jumhūr's writing, such remarks may well have been clear indications as to whom they refer to.

Taking into consideration his entire oeuvre in the field of *kalām*, Ibn Abī Jumhūr developed over his lifetime from a conventional theologian whose doctrinal views were predominantly characterized by Mu'tazilite notions, as was typical for Imāmī theologians up to his time, into a thinker who predominantly maintained philosophical and mystical notions. This having been said, the concern to mediate between opposing views of different strands of thought, be it within the field of *kalām* or beyond, is a trait that characterizes his entire oeuvre in this field. In the following, the significance of the various intellectual strands for his thought as they present themselves in his magnum opus, the *Kitāb al-Mujlī*, will be outlined.⁹

Philosophical notions characterize Ibn Abī Jumhūr's views in his *Mujlī* in a number of central issues. This is the case, for example, with the questions that occur in

⁹ For a detailed study of Ibn Abī Jumhūr's thought in his *Mujlī* and in his earlier works, see Schmidtke 2000.

his discussion about the divine attribute of power (*Mujlī*, 131 ff. [2, 537 ff.]), namely (1) whether God is a necessary cause (*mūjib*) or a freely choosing agent (*mukhtār*), (2) whether God has created the world ex nihilo or whether creation is coeternal with God, its first cause, and (3) whether God can create an endless multiplicity without intermediary or whether from God, who is one in every respect, only one immediate effect can result while creation in its entirety occurs as an hierarchic emanation. In all three issues, Ibn Abī Jumhūr opts for the philosophical view rather than that of the theologians. Moreover, he argues that the views of the philosophers and the theologians are essentially identical. This claim, however, rests upon Ibn Abī Jumhūr's interpretative modification of the respective theological position.

God acts, Ibn Abī Jumhūr maintains in his *Mujlī*, on grounds of His knowledge of Himself and of the best possible order of being. With this Ibn Abī Jumhūr is in complete agreement with the philosophers. For Mu'tazilite theologians, this was unacceptable: they reproached the philosophers for conceptualizing God as a necessary cause (*mūjib*) whose acting is a necessary consequence of His essence rather than created by a free choosing agent (*mukhtār*) whose acts are preceded by knowledge and intention and therefore follow Him in time. Ibn Abī Jumhūr defends the philosophical definition of divine omnipotence in his *Nūr* and his *Mujlī* against the opposing view of the (Mu'tazilite) theologians. He refers to the philosophical distinction between *metaphysical* necessitating as it applies to God's acting and *natural* necessitating as it applies to natural causes. By contrast with the case of God, the latter do not necessitate anything on grounds of knowledge and they are unconscious of their effects. Having accepted the philosophical understanding that God is the first cause of all being from which creation necessarily emanates, Ibn Abī Jumhūr further opts for the philosophical view that creation, or at least parts of it, are coeternal with the first cause from which they emanate. By consequence, he denies the theological doctrine of a *creatio ex nihilo* (*ḥudūth al-ʿālam*). Again, he defends the philosophical position against the *mutakallimūn* according to whom the philosophers contradict the Qur'ānic message: Ibn Abī Jumhūr maintains that the philosophical notion of "temporal eternity" (*qidam zamānī*) of creation is in full agreement with the Qur'ānic notion of the createdness of the world. He argues philosophically that parts of the creation may well exist simultaneously with God. Essentially (*bi-l-dhāt*), however, creation in its entirety is created (*muḥdath*), since only God, the necessary existent due to His essence (*wājib al-wujūd bi-dhātihi*), is "essentially eternal" (*qadīm dhātī*). It is the philosophical notion of essential createdness (*ḥudūth dhātī*), therefore, that distinguishes in his view created beings from the Divine rather than createdness in time (*ḥudūth zamānī*). When addressing the scope of God's power, Ibn Abī Jumhūr likewise opts for the philosopher's position that the absolute unity of the cause necessitates the unity of the effect. Although he defends himself in his *Mujlī* against the reproach of supporting the philosophical notion that from God, who is one in every respect, only one effect can occur immediately (*al-wāḥid lā yaṣdur ʿanhu illā l-wāḥid*), there are numerous indications that he agreed in fact with the philosophers' view and that he considered the theologians' view, according to which this violates the doctrine of divine omnipotence that extends by definition to all contingents that are subject to

power, to be invalid. This also suggests that Ibn Abī Jumhūr considers creation to be hierarchic emanation in the Neoplatonic sense.

A further indication that Ibn Abī Jumhūr endorses in his *Nūr* and his *Mujlī* the philosophical understanding of the Divine is that he equates the divine attribute of will with the philosophical notion of divine providence (*'ināya*), while he negates the theological definition of the Mu'tazilites that God's being willing means that He knows about the benefits of an action (*Mujlī*, 219:20–24 [3, 825:15–826:5]). By defining God's will as His unchanging knowledge about the most perfect order of things and acknowledging that this order must as a result necessarily emanate from God, Ibn Abī Jumhūr had renounced the Mu'tazilite understanding of divine will: neither is God's will temporal nor His knowledge of the most perfect order subject to change or dependent on external events. Rather, God knows eternally and unchangingly.

The philosophical notion of divine providence also determines Ibn Abī Jumhūr's concept of the “why” of God's acting (Schmidtke 2000, 127 ff.). In his *Mujlī*, he negates the Mu'tazilite doctrine according to which God acts on the basis of specific, concrete motives (*ghāya mu'ayyana*) and in view of something that is situated outside His own essence (*Mujlī* 222:7–12 [3, 832:17–833:4]). The essential primary intention (*al-qaṣd al-awwalī/al-qaṣd al-dhātī/al-maqṣūd al-dhātī*) that is at the basis of God's acting, according to Ibn Abī Jumhūr, is rather His knowledge of Himself and of the perfect order, or, being in its most perfect form (*al-wujūd 'alā l-wajh al-akmal*). The concrete, specific advantages and benefits created beings experience as a result of God's acting are nothing but necessary consequences of what is essentially intended (*al-tābi' wa-l-lāzim li-mā huwa l-mawjūd bi-l-dhāt*). Their basis is therefore not an essential primary purpose by an accidental one (*al-qaṣd al-'araḍī*) (*Mujlī*, 222:15–24 [3, 833:9–834:2]).

In all these issues in which Ibn Abī Jumhūr adopts the philosophical points of view, his elaborations in the *Mujlī* rely on Shahrazūrī's *Shajara*. Moreover, Ibn Abī Jumhūr follows Shahrazūrī also with respect to those questions in which the Illuminationists disagree with the positions of the Peripatetics. Ibn Abī Jumhūr adopts, for example, the Illuminationist notion of illuminative knowledge by presence (*'ilm ḥuḍūrī ishrāqī*) and shared his criticism of the Avicennan notion of knowledge by quoting in extenso the relevant sections of the *Shajara* (*Mujlī*, 136:14–140:26 [2, 552:6–565:4]; cf. *Shajara* 3/472 ff.). Drawing on the notion of knowledge by presence, Ibn Abī Jumhūr also does not concede that God's knowledge of particulars implies change in Him, as has been maintained by the philosophers when arguing against the theologians' notion of divine omniscience that includes all details and changes that occur in the course of time.

Ibn Abī Jumhūr also follows Shahrazūrī when adopting the latter's doctrines of transmigration (*tanāsukh*) of incomplete souls (*al-nāqīṣūn*) following their deaths into bodies of animals for the purpose of purification. However, by contrast to Shahrazūrī, Ibn Abī Jumhūr maintains at the same time the theological doctrine of bodily resurrection (*al-ma'ād al-jismānī*). Shahrazūrī distinguished three positions regarding the fate of souls in the hereafter: (1) the view of the Peripatetics, who maintain that at death all souls will be separated from the corporeal; (2) the view of the “Reincarnationists” (*tanāsukhiyya*), who teach that the cycle of transmigration is eternal, as all souls are

corporeal and therefore subject to an infinite process of reincarnation to human and subhuman bodies; (3) those who believe that at death the perfect souls and the intermediate in perfection are disembodied, whereas the deficient souls undergo a process of transmigration for the purpose of purification. Shahrazūrī refuted the Peripatetic view of the disembodiment of all souls at death and also rejects categorically the position of the “Reincarnationists.” He stated that he was unable to trace the names of adherents of this position and assumed that they have died out by his time.

The proponents of the third position, who maintain that at death only the perfect and the intermediate in perfection are disembodied, while the imperfect transmigrate from one physical body to another, are in his view “the most excellent among the philosophers and people of religion” (*afāḍil al-ḥukamā’ wa-l-milliyīn*). He pointed out that the proponents of metempsychosis differ in their beliefs on the modes and directions of the transmigration of the imperfect human souls and subsequently reviewed what he considered to be the two principal concepts of metempsychosis. One concept was maintained by the Brethren of Purity (*Ikhwān al-Ṣafā*), as well as by some other, anonymous groups. They held that the souls are initially attached only to the lowest species of bodies, namely atoms, minerals, or plants. From there, they gradually ascend into higher bodies until they reach human bodies. Those souls that attain perfection in human bodies escape the corporeal world at death and rise into the lower spheres of Paradise. The imperfect souls, by contrast, transmigrate once more into bodies of lower, subhuman species suitable to their evil traits, for the purpose of purification. From there they reascend gradually into higher bodies until they again reach human bodies. Once purified, they also escape from the corporeal world.

Shahrazūrī stated that a different, second belief of metempsychosis was maintained by the ancient sages of Greece (Empedocles, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle), Persia, China, India (Būdhāsaf), and Egypt (Agathodaemon, Hermes), as well as by “others from among the most excellent philosophers of the nations” (*wa-ghayruhum min afāḍil ḥukamā’ al-umam*). In contrast to the *Ikhwān al-Ṣafā*, the proponents of this notion maintained that only human bodies are prepared to receive souls through direct emanation from the separate intellect. Subhuman bodies, by contrast, receive souls only through transmigration of human souls. Souls that have attained purification in animal bodies immediately escape the corporeal world at the death of their animal bodies. According to Shahrazūrī, some representatives of this second concept of transmigration of souls, among them “the Buddha” (Būdhāsaf), believed that a human rational soul can transmigrate into animal bodies only, whereas others allowed its transmigration into any subhuman species—animals, plants, or minerals.

Shahrazūrī revealed his own view in his evaluation of the two concepts. With respect to the first group, he repudiated the possibility of metempsychosis of human rational souls in subhuman species other than animals as well as their belief that all species of bodies, that is, atoms, minerals, plants, and animal and human bodies, receive souls through direct emanation. He showed more sympathy for the second notion and particularly supported the doctrine which he ascribed to Būdhāsaf, according to which only human bodies are prepared to receive souls through direct emanation from the separate

intellect, whereas animal bodies only receive transmigrated human souls, either directly or indirectly. Shahrazūri explicitly repudiated the possibility of the transmigration of souls into the bodies of plants and minerals. Whereas at death the perfect in happiness immediately escape to the World of Light, and the intermediate in happiness ascend to the World of Suspended Images, the perfect in misery transmigrate to animal bodies for the purpose of purification from evil traits. The duration of this process of metempsychosis differs according to the quantity of the evil traits of a respective soul. Once purified, the soul ascends into the lower spheres of the World of Suspended Images. Souls that are unsuccessful in attaining purification do not remain eternally attached to animal bodies, but are eventually also separated from the bodies and ascend into the World of Images, where they become, in accordance with their evil traits, attached to shadows of suspended forms.

Shahrazūri's final evaluation of the arguments of the various groups for their respective notions leaves no doubt that he himself supported this doctrine. He concluded that, in general, the claim of the veracity of transmigration is correct (*ṣaḥīḥ*). Evaluating the respective proofs in detail, however, he expressed doubts about whether they are decisive. He stated that, whereas the proofs for the invalidation (*ibtāl*) of metempsychosis are not decisive, the proofs for the veracity of metempsychosis and reincarnation are also not decisive (*burhāniyya*) and only rhetorically convincing (*iqnāʿiyya*). However, since intuition (*ḥads*), inspiration (*ilhām*), and spiritual exercise (*riyāḍa*) also indicate the veracity of this doctrine, the proofs become decisive. To support the doctrine, he moreover pointed out that "there is no nation and no people with whom the [doctrine of] metempsychosis has not got a strong hold, even if they differ regarding its modalities, details, and directions, since this does not concern the affirmation of metempsychosis" and quotes those Qurʾānic verses and prophetic traditions that indicate the veracity of metempsychosis and the necessity of its occurrence. All this, Shahrazūri concluded, are signs (*ishārāt*) and hints (*rumūz*) that indicate its veracity.

In his elaborations on the fate of the soul after death, Ibn Abī Jumhūr quotes extensively from Shahrazūri's *Shajara*, again without identifying his source. The way he selects and arranges passages from the *Shajara* indicates the extent to which he follows Shahrazūri's supportive attitude toward metempsychosis and where he deviates from his views. Ibn Abī Jumhūr follows Shahrazūri's belief that imperfect human souls are transferred at death into animal bodies, corresponding to their moral traits. According to their progress in purification they ascend into bodies of more noble animals until they are sufficiently purified to escape to the lower ranks of paradise. Souls that remain unsuccessful in attaining purification are eventually also transferred to animal bodies within the World of Images. Ibn Abī Jumhūr only disagrees with Shahrazūri insofar as he also adheres to the Islamic belief that God will restore the flesh and bones of the dead for the Judgment following His annihilation of the physical structure and order of the world. In order to harmonize this belief with the notion of metempsychosis, he adopts some elements of one of the anonymous views related by Shahrazūri in his *Shajara* in his account of the first concept of metempsychosis, whose adherents combined their notion of metempsychosis with their belief in the resurrection of the material world. As it has

been stated for the proponents of this doctrine, Ibn Abī Jumhūr distinguishes between the minor resurrection (*al-qiyāma al-ṣuġhrā*), which consists in the disembodiment of the particular soul, and the major resurrection (*al-qiyāma al-kubrā*), that is, the eventual restoration of the material world that follows its prior annihilation.

Ibn Abī Jumhūr also adopts in his *Mujlī* key notions that he had gleaned from philosophical mysticism. The doctrine of the unity of being (*waḥdat al-wujūd*) as it had been developed within the school of Ibn al-ʿArabī proved essential for his understanding of divine unicity (*tawḥīd*) (Schmidtke 2000, 49–55). Ibn Abī Jumhūr distinguishes in his *Nūr* three levels of *tawḥīd*: existential unity (*tawḥīd wujūdī*) at the top level, followed by unity of the divine attributes (*tawḥīd ṣifātī*) at the next lower (*adnā*) level. The lowest rank corresponds to the orthodox Islamic definition of *tawḥīd* (*tawḥīd islāmī*), that is, the denial of polytheism (*shirk ṣāḥir*) as expressed in Qurʾān 47:19 (“Know thou therefore that there is no god but God”). In his supercommentary (*Mujlī* 109 ff. [2, 478 ff.]), Ibn Abī Jumhūr identifies the highest level of *tawḥīd*, existential unity, with Ibn al-ʿArabī’s notion of the absolute, unlimited, and exclusive reality of the divine essence (*al-aḥadiyya al-ilāhiyya*) that is devoid of any multiplicity (Ibn al-ʿArabī, *Fuṣūṣ*, 1:90). In the terminology of Ḥaydar Āmulī, this level is called *tawḥīd wujūdī*, *tawḥīd wujūdī bāṭinī*, *tawḥīd ḥaqīqī* as well as *tawḥīd al-awliyāʾ* (*Asrār*, 70, 77–81; *Naṣṣ*, 351, 352, 355, 381 and *passim*). The next lower level corresponds to inclusive unity (*waḥdāniyyal wāḥidiyya*) in Ibn al-ʿArabī’s system that comprises the divine names and attributes, each one pointing to another aspect of the Divine. The plurality of God’s names and attributes is also the cause for the multiplicity (*kathra*) of created beings. These are the loci (*maẓāhir*) in which God manifests Himself. Ḥaydar Āmulī labels this level of unity *tawḥīd ṣifātī* or *tawḥīd fi ʿlī* (*Asrār*, 79 f.). The lowest level of unity corresponds to *tawḥīd al-dalīl* in the terminology of Ibn al-ʿArabī or *tawḥīd ulūhī/tawḥīd ulūhī ṣāḥirī/tawḥīd al-anbiyāʾ* according to Ḥaydar Āmulī (*Asrār*, 70, 73–75; *Naṣṣ*, 355, 357, 404).

On the basis of the notion of the unity of existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*), Ibn Abī Jumhūr rejects the peripatetic understanding of being as an analogous term (*bi-l-tashkīk*), and he denies that existence is accidentally (*ʿarīḍan*) attached to the quiddities (*māhiyyāt*) of contingent things (*mumkināt*) when they exist. He rather identifies quiddities as archetypes (*aʿyān thābita*), which he defines, in agreement with Ibn al-ʿArabī and his followers, as things that are real in God’s knowledge (*thābita fī ʿilmihī taʿālā*) irrespective of whether they exist in the external world or not. From the point of view of exclusive unity these are identical with God. As soon as they come into being in the external world, they are manifestations (*maẓāhir*) of the absolute being (*wujūd muṭlaq*) (*Mujlī*, 122–30 [2, 517–37]). Ibn Abī Jumhūr refrains from pursuing the notion of archetypes in his *Mujlī* any further, and he specifically does not employ Ibn al-ʿArabī’s doctrine of creation as a twofold process of emanation, namely, essential theophany (*al-tajallī al-dhātī*) and sensuous theophany (*al-tajallī al-shuhūdī*), which Ibn al-ʿArabī had developed in this context (Chittick 1994, 17).

The mystical notion of the unity of existence further marks Ibn Abī Jumhūr’s conceptualization of the divine attributes. While he followed in his earlier writings the doctrines of Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī in denying the Bahshamite notion of the divine attributes as

“states” (*ahwāl*) and in taking the divine essence as the ontological basis of all of God’s essential attributes that can be distinguished from each other mentally (*dhihnan*) on the basis of their respective characteristics (*ahkām*), he distances himself from this view in his *Maslak* and his *Nūr*. In both works he maintains that the divine attributes are not additional to God’s essence, neither in external reality (*khārijan*) nor mentally (*dhihnan*). In his *Mujlī*, Ibn Abī Jumhūr elaborates on this by arguing with the different levels of unity as had been defined by Ibn al-‘Arabī and his school. Divine attributes vanish at the highest level of *tawḥīd wujūdī*, whereas at the lower level of *tawḥīd ṣifātī* they can be observed as manifestations (*mazāhir*) of the divine essence. As such, neither mentally nor externally could they be taken to be something additional to God’s essence.

Mystical notions further influenced Ibn Abī Jumhūr’s views regarding the issue of man’s freedom to act. In his earlier writings he negated the Mu‘tazilite concept of man as autonomous producer (*fā‘il*) of his actions. On the basis of the philosophical notion of causality, he had argued that man is only the immediate cause of his actions (*mubāshir qarīb li-af‘ālihi*). Being himself contingent and as such an effect, the existence of immediate causes depends upon the existence of their respective causes that eventually depend on the Necessary Existent. On the other hand, Ibn Abī Jumhūr agrees with the earlier Mu‘tazilites that the actions that proceed from man must rely on him (*istinād al-af‘āl al-ṣādīra min al-‘abīd ilaihim*). The concept of choice (*ikhtiyār*) and, thus, of divine justice (‘*adl*) is thus maintained in his view: man, who is the immediate cause of his actions, is their “real cause” (‘*illa bi-l-ḥaqīqa*), whereas God, the ultimate cause of man’s actions, is not their real cause but rather their “cause in a metaphorical sense” (‘*illa ‘alā sabīl al-majāz*). The correct position for Ibn Abī Jumhūr is therefore an intermediary one between the two extremes, determinism (*jabr*) and freedom of action (*tafwīd*).

In his *Mujlī* Ibn Abī Jumhūr argues for a middle position between determinism and free will on the basis of the mystical notion of unity of existence. Considered from the level of the revealed law (*martabat al-sharī‘a*), the actions of man are attributable to him. From the more elevated point of view, the level of being, which allows a deeper insight into the true existential unity (*muta‘ammiq fī l-tawḥīd al-wujūdī al-ḥaqīqī*), all multiplicity (*kathra*) vanishes and the observer grasps that all is included in divine providence. The true understanding of the intermediary position between determinism and free will implies both levels of consideration simultaneously.

Another topic with respect to which Ibn Abī Jumhūr was deeply influenced by the mystical tradition is the realm of prophecy and imamate. Here he argues for the necessity of the prophetic mission and the installment of the imam, among other arguments, with the mystical notion of the necessary existence of the Perfect Man (*insān kāmil*). As manifestations of the divine completeness both the prophet and the imam serve as intermediary between the absolute, transcendent Divine and man who is needy and dependent on the corporeal. In addition, Ibn Abī Jumhūr adopts Ibn al-‘Arabī’s notions of apostleship (*risāla*), prophethood (*nubuwwa*), and sainthood (*walāya*). In agreement with Twelver Shī‘ī notions, however, he identifies sainthood with the imamate. Moreover, Ibn Abī Jumhūr rejects Ibn al-‘Arabī’s identification of Jesus with the seal of

absolute sainthood (*khatam al-walāya al-muqayyada*) and replaces him with Imām ‘Alī b. ‘Alī Ṭālib and the hidden Imām.

Ibn Abī Jumhūr’s notions with respect to the realm of the promise and the threat (*al-wa‘d wa-l-wa‘īd*) are again in full agreement with the Twelver Shī‘ī doctrine. On the basis of the definition that belief (*īmān*) solely consists of conviction in the heart and confirmation with the tongue, he rejects the Mu‘tazilite definition of works being an integral part of belief. Accordingly, he considers the morally obliged man (*mukallaf*) who fulfills the main criterion of belief, namely, conviction in the heart (*taṣḍīq bi-l-qalb*), to be a believer who is entitled to remain eternally in Paradise, irrespective of the quantity and severity of his acts of disobedience in this world. Further characteristically Twelver Shī‘ī is Ibn Abī Jumhūr’s notion that a sinner (*fāsiq*) who refrains from repenting can be released from punishment in the Hereafter either through God’s immediate forgiveness (*‘afw*) or through intercession (*shafā‘a*) either by the Prophet or the imams.

Ibn Abī Jumhūr underlying motivation to integrate the diverse elements consists in mediating between divergent, doctrinally apparently incompatible intellectual strands. His focus is on the divergences between theology and philosophy on the one hand and between Mu‘tazilites and Ash‘arites on the other. With respect to all issues with regard to which Ibn Abī Jumhūr adopts the doctrines of the philosophers, he attempts to prove that their views do not disagree in fact from those of theology. In those issues that are related to divine justice Ibn Abī Jumhūr further attempts to harmonize Mu‘tazilite and Ash‘arite notions with each other. This concerns particularly the question about the “why” of God’s acting as well as the issue of man’s actions that has been discussed earlier. On the basis of philosophy and mysticism he formulates an intermediary position from which he strives to neutralize the disagreements between the doctrines of the two schools. Arguing from his philosophical notion as to why God acts, combined with his distinction between the primary, essential purpose and the accidental purpose, he concludes that the Ash‘arite and the Mu‘tazilite notions as to the “why” of God’s acting do not differ as a matter of fact. The Mu‘tazilite claim that God acts for a purpose is correct insofar as this applies to the specific advantages and benefits that follow necessarily from His perfect actions, which are based on an essential purpose. The Ash‘arite claim that God does not act on grounds of a purpose is likewise correct insofar as this means that the specific advantages and benefits are not intended on grounds of a primary purpose. Taking an intermediary position between determinism and free will, Ibn Abī Jumhūr concludes that the conflict between Mu‘tazilites and Ash‘arites is in fact resolved. The difference of opinion between the two groups, he argues, is exclusively based on the fact that each group is maintaining a too extreme position. Whereas the Mu‘tazilites over-emphasize man’s independence in his acting and consider him as the complete cause of his actions, the Ash‘arites mistakenly take God as the sole and immediate cause of all created beings, including human actions.

About eight years after having completed the *Mujlī* in 896/1490, Ibn Abī Jumhūr composed another theological treatise that was presumably his last work in this discipline (Schmidtke 2006, 2013; for a critical edition, see Ibn Abī Jumhūr, *Sharḥ*). The title of the work indicates its formal frame—it is a commentary (*sharḥ*) on the *Bāb al-ḥādī ‘ashar*

of the ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī (d. 726/1325). At the end of the work the author reports that he composed the treatise following a request of a group of companions and that he completed it on 25 Dhū l-Qaʿda 904 / 4 July 1499 in Medina, where he sojourned during that year. Throughout the work the author repeatedly refers to his earlier works—namely the *Mujlī* and the *Maʿīn al-maʿīn*.

Ibn Abī Jumhūr maintains in his *Sharḥ* a more conventional theological stance than in any of his earlier extant works, especially the *Mujlī*. It is only occasionally that he attempts to mediate between Ashʿarites and Muʿtazilites or to harmonize the conflicting views of theology and philosophy. In central issues, such as the issue of God's actions, he considers the philosophers to be the principal opponents. The influence of mysticism in his *Sharḥ* is considerable. However, in contrast to his *Mujlī* this does not induce him to maintain a position in his *Sharḥ* that would be in conflict with central theological notions. Ibn Abī Jumhūr also treats Illuminationist thought with great care in his *Sharḥ*. On the issue of divine knowledge he refrains even from mentioning the Illuminationist doctrine of knowledge by presence. Regarding the fate of the human souls he still shows his sympathies for the doctrine of metempsychosis as upheld by the Illuminationists, while remaining faithful, as in the *Mujlī*, to the doctrine of bodily resurrection.

One can only speculate on the reasons for Ibn Abī Jumhūr's cautious approach in his *Sharḥ*. It cannot be excluded that he attempted to mediate between Muʿtazila and Ashʿariyya and between theology and philosophy only regarding those issues that were of special significance to him while skirting others that he deemed less important. However, the various contradictions within the text seem to speak against this view of his strategy.

More plausible as an explanation might be the dynamism that is found in the work. The author begins his commentary in the style of a conventional doctrinal treatise and only later starts to introduce elements going beyond the conventional theological framework. The entire introduction and nearly the entire chapter dealing with God and His attributes reflect characteristic Muʿtazilite notions. Only toward the end of the chapter does Ibn Abī Jumhūr deviate from this course when introducing the mystical notion of *tawḥīd* in his elaborations on God's unicity. This then determines his discussions in the following section on the conceptualization of divine attributes. The following chapter of the *Sharḥ* dealing with divine justice again starts off rather conventionally. This changes only in the fourth section of this chapter, where God's actions are dealt with. In the following sections there are other features of mediation between different strands of thought, for example, on the issue whether God is under any ethical obligation. The following chapters on prophecy, imamate, and resurrection contain many of the characteristic notions found in the *Mujlī*.

Ibn Abī Jumhūr states at the end of the work that he had presented his commentary to a group of students during his stay in Medina in 904/1499–1500. On the basis of the author's remark in the *Mujlī* it is known that he was reproached by a student in front of others. The attacker had accused him of adopting the philosophical view favoring the interpretation that from God only one effect occurs and creation should thus be understood as a process of hierarchical emanation over the view that God can immediately

produce multiplicity.¹⁰ It may have been criticism like this that induced the author to restrict himself to conventional theology in order to avoid further attacks. Perhaps trust developed between Ibn Abī Jumhūr and his students as time went on, so that he felt increasingly encouraged to express his own views more freely in this circle.

REFERENCES

- ‘Abd al-Hādī Bū Khamsīn, M. 1993. *Al-Shaykh Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā’ī: Qudwat al-‘ilm wa-l-‘amal*. Beirut: Dār al-Bayān al-‘Arabī. Reprinted Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā’ li-l-tibā‘a wa-l-nashr wa-l-tawzī‘, 1434/2013.
- Agha-Tehrani, M. 1996. “Sayyid Haydar Amuli (719–787/1319–1385): An Overview of His Doctrines.” MA thesis, University of Toronto.
- Ansari, H., and S. Schmidtke. 2014. “Al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī: His Writings on Theology and Their Reception.” In *The Study of Shi‘i Islam: History, Theology and Law*, ed. F. Daftary and G. Miskinzoda. London: I.B. Tauris, 475–97.
- Chittick, W. C. 1994. *Imaginal Worlds: Ibn al-‘Arabī and the Problem of Religious Diversity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gacek, A., R. Pourjavady, and R. Wisnovsky. Forthcoming. *The Commentaries on Avicenna’s Ishārāt: An Analytical Inventory*.
- Ghufṛānī, ‘Abd Allāh al-. 2013. *Fihriṣ muṣannafāt al-Shaykh Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā’ī: Kashshāf bibliyūghrāfi li-muṣannafāt Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-makḥṭū‘a wa-l-maṭbū‘a wa-ijāzātihi fi l-riwāya wa-ṭuruqihi fi l-ḥadīth*. Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā’ li-l-tibā‘a wa-l-nashr wa-l-tawzī‘.
- Ḥaydar Āmulī. (*Asrār*) 1362/1983. *Asrār al-sharī‘a wa-aṭwār al-ṭarīqa wa-anwār al-ḥaqīqa*. Ed. Muḥammad Kh^wājāwī. Tehran: Mu’assasa-yi muṭālī‘āt va taḥqīqāt-i farhangī.
- Ḥaydar Āmulī. (*Jāmi‘*) 1968. *Jāmi‘ al-asrār wa-manba‘ al-anwār: La philosophie shi‘ite*. Introductions and index by H. Corbin and O. Yahia. Tehran: Iranian Institute of Philosophy.
- Ḥaydar Āmulī. (*Naṣṣ*) 1988. *K. Naṣṣ an-nuṣūṣ: Le Texte de Textes. Commentaire des “Fosūs al-hikam” d’Ibn ‘Arabī. Les Prolégomènes*. Introductions and index by Henry Corbin et Osman Yahia. Paris/Tehran: Institutū Īrān va Farānsa-yi pizhūhishhā-yi ‘ilmī. Ḥaydar Āmulī. (*Secrets*) 1989. *Inner Secrets of the Path*. Trans. Assadullah al-Dhaakir Yate. Shaftesbury: Element Books.
- Ḥaydar Āmulī. (*Tafsīr*) 1414–16/1995–97. *Tafsīr al-muḥīṭ al-a‘ẓam wa-l-baḥr al-khiḍamm fi ta’wīl Kitāb Allāh al-‘azīz al-muḥkam*, 7 vols. Ed. Muḥsin al-Mūsawī at-Tabrizī. Tehran: Mu’assasat al-ṭibā‘a wa-l-nashr.
- Ḥillī, Ḥasan b. Yūsuf b. al-Muṭahhar al-. (*Bāb*) 1365/1986. *Al-Bāb al-ḥādī ‘ashar*. Ed. M. Muḥaqqiq. Tehran: Mu’assasa-yi Muṭālā‘āt-i Islāmī-yi Dānishgāh-i McGill bā hamkāri-yi Dānishgāh-i Tihṛān. Contains also al-Miqdād al-Suyūrī, *al-Nāfi‘ yawm al-ḥashr fi sharḥ al-Bāb al-ḥādī ‘ashar*.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr. (*Dū majmū‘a*) 1387/2008. *Dū majmū‘a-yi khaṭṭī az āthār-i kalāmī falsafī fiqhī-yi Ibn Abī Jumhūr Aḥsā’ī (d. pas az 906 h./1501 m.): Nuskha-yi bargardān-i du dastnawīs-i Kitābkhāna-yi Madrasa-yi Marvī (Tihṛān)*. Persian introduction and indices by A. R. Raḥīmī Rīseh, English introduction by S. Schmidtke. Tehran: Iranian Institute of Philosophy.

¹⁰ *Mujlī* 106–7 [1, 462]; cf. Schmidtke 2000, 89–94.

- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Kashf*) 1422/2001–2. *Kashf al-barāhīn fī sharḥ Zād al-musāfirīn*. Ed. al-Shaykh Wajih b. Muḥammad al-Musabbih. Beirut: Mu'assasat Umm al-Qurā li-l-taḥqīq wa-l-nashr.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Ma'īn*) *Ma'īn al-ma'īn fī uṣūl al-dīn*. MS Qum, Mar'ashī 5284/1.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Maslak*) 1329/1911. *Maslak al-afḥām fī 'ilm al-kalām*. In *Mujlī mir'āt al-munjī fī l-kalām wa-l-ḥikmatayn wa-l-taṣawwuf*, ed. Aḥmad al-Shīrāzī. Tehran. Reprinted with an introduction, table of contents, and indices by S. Schmidtke. Tehran: Institute of Islamic Philosophy, 2008.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Maslak*) 2012. In *Mujlī mir'āt al-munjī fī l-kalām wa-l-ḥikmatayn wa-l-taṣawwuf*, ed. R. Yaḥyā Pūr Fārmad. 5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā' li-l-tibā'a wa-l-nashr wa-l-tawzī'.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Mujlī*) 1329/1911. *Mujlī mir'āt al-munjī fī l-kalām wa-l-ḥikmatayn wa-l-taṣawwuf*. Ed. Aḥmad al-Shīrāzī, Tehran. Reprinted with an introduction, table of contents, and indices by S. Schmidtke. Tehran: Institute of Islamic Philosophy, 2008.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Mujlī*) 2012. Ed. R. Yaḥyā Pūr Fārmad. 5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā' li-l-tibā'a wa-l-nashr wa-l-tawzī'.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Nūr*) 1329/1911. *Al-Nūr al-munjī min al-ẓalām*. In *Mujlī mir'āt al-munjī fī l-kalām wa-l-ḥikmatayn wa-l-taṣawwuf*, ed. Aḥmad al-Shīrāzī. Tehran. Reprinted with an introduction, table of contents, and indices by S. Schmidtke. Tehran: Institute of Islamic Philosophy, 2008.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Nūr*) 2012. In *Mujlī mir'āt al-munjī fī l-kalām wa-l-ḥikmatayn wa-l-taṣawwuf*, ed. R. Yaḥyā Pūr Fārmad. 5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā' li-l-tibā'a wa-l-nashr wa-l-tawzī'.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Risāla*) 1414/1993. *Risāla tashtamil 'alā aqall mā yajib 'alā l-mukallifīn min al-'ilm bi-uṣūl al-dīn*. Ed. A. al-Kinānī [as *Zād al-musāfirīn fī uṣūl al-dīn*]. Beirut: Mu'assasat Umm al-Qurā li-iḥyā' al-turāth.
- Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī. (*Sharḥ*) 1435/2014. *Sharḥun 'alā l-bāb al-ḥādī ashār*. 3 vols. Ed. R. Yahyapur Farmad. Supervision and introduction S. Schmidtke. Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā' li-l-tibā'a wa-l-nashr wa-l-tawzī'.
- Ibn al-'Arabī, Muḥyī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Alī. (*Fuṣūṣ*) 1946. *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*. Ed. Abū l-'Alā 'Afīfī. Cairo: Isā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī.
- Ibn Kammūna, Sa'd b. Maṣṣūr (*Sharḥ*) 2009. *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥāt al-lawḥiyya wa-l-'arshīyya*. 3 vols. Ed. N. Ḥabībī. Tehran: Markaz al-buḥūth wa-l-dirāsāt li-l-turāth al-makhtūṭ.
- Madelung, W. 1978. "Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī's Synthesis of kalām, Philosophy and Sufism." In *La signification du Bas Moyen Age dans l'histoire et la culture du monde musulman: Actes du 8ème Congrès de l'Union européenne des arabisants et islamisants (Aix-en-Provence, 1976)*. Aix-en-Provence: Édisud, 147–56.
- Madelung, W. 1989. "Baḥrānī, Jamāl-al-Dīn." In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. 3, ed. E. Yarshater. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 529.
- Pakatchi, Ahmad. 2013. "Shī'ī Learning and Culture in Bahrain." In *Encyclopaedia Islamica*, vol. 4, ed. W. Madelung and F. Daftary. Leiden: Brill, 196–200.
- Pourjavady, R. 2011. *Philosophy in Early Safavid Iran: Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Nayrīzī and His Writings*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pourjavady, R. Forthcoming. *Islamic Philosophy during the Qājār Period*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pourjavady, R., and S. Schmidtke. 2004. "Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī's (d. 710/1311) *Durrat al-Tāj* and Its Sources. (Studies on Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī I)." *Journal Asiatique* 292: 309–28.

- Pourjavady, R., and S. Schmidtke. 2006a. "Some Notes on a New Edition of a Medieval Philosophical Text in Turkey: Shams al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī's *Rasā'il al-Shajara al-ilāhiyya*." *Die Welt des Islams* 46: 76–85.
- Pourjavady, R., and S. Schmidtke. 2006b. *A Jewish Philosopher of Baghdad: 'Izz al-Dawla Ibn Kammuna (d. 683/1284) and His Writings*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pourjavady, R., and S. Schmidtke. 2007. "The Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī (d. 710/1311) Codex (Ms. Mar'ashī 12868) (Studies on Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī II)." *Studia Iranica* 36: 279–301.
- Pourjavady, R., and S. Schmidtke. 2009. "Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī (d. 710/1311) as a Teacher: An Analysis of His *ijāzāt*. (Studies on Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī III)." *Journal Asiatique* 297: 15–55.
- Schmidtke, S. 2000. *Theologie, Philosophie und Mystik im zwölfterschiitischen Islam des 9./15. Jahrhunderts. Die Gedankenwelten des Ibn Abī Ğumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī (um 838/1434–35—nach 906/1501)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Schmidtke, S. 2006. "Ibn Abī Ğumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī und sein Spätwerk *Sharḥ al-Bāb al-ḥādī 'aṣar*." In *Reflections on Reflections: Near Eastern Writers Reading Literature*, ed. A. Neuwirth and A. C. Islebe. Wiesbaden: Ergon, 119–45.
- Schmidtke, S. 2009. "New Sources for the Life and Work of Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī." *Studia Iranica* 38: 49–68.
- Schmidtke, S. 2013. "Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī and His *Sharḥ al-Bāb al-ḥādī 'aṣar*." In *Islam: Identité et altérité. Hommage à Guy Monnot, O.P.*, ed. M. A. Amir-Moezzi. Turnhout: Brepols, 369–84.
- Shahrazūrī, Shams al-Dīn al-. (*Shajara*) 1383/2004–5. *Rasā'il al-Shajara al-ilāhiyya fī 'ulūm al-ḥaqā'iq al-ilāhiyya*. 3 vols. Ed. N. Ḥabībī. Tehran: Mu'assasa-yi pizhūhishī-yi ḥikmat va falsafa.
- Taghavi, Alireza Sayyed. 2013. "Al-Baḥrānī, Abū al-Ḥasan Jamāl al-Dīn." In *Encyclopaedia Islamica*, vol. 4, ed. W. Madelung and F. Daftary. Leiden: Brill, 187–88.
- Todd, R. 2014. *The Sufi Doctrine of Man: Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī's Metaphysical Anthropology*. Leiden: Brill.