AVICENNA’S IMMEDIATE DISCIPLES: THEIR LIVES AND WORKS

Ahmed H. al-Rahim

The history of post-Avicennan philosophy begins with al-Jūzjānī, Bahmanyār, Ibn Zayla, and al-Ma’ṣūmī, who, despite the paucity of reliable reports in the bio-bibliographical literature, appear to have played a central role in the collection and transmission of Avicenna’s writings. Moreover, these individuals did not just gather the master’s oeuvre; they also wrote commentaries on and summaries of his major and minor philosophical works. A detailed study of their lives and works remains a major desideratum.¹

In this article I will attempt to answer the following questions about Avicenna’s immediate disciples including, though I will argue that they were not immediate, al-Lawkārī and al-Īlāqī: Who were they? How extensive was their study and contact with Avicenna? What role did they play, if any, in the transmission and defence of his philosophy? With which writings of Avicenna are they associated in the bio-bibliographical literature? What works and commentaries did they themselves compose? And who were their students and to what extent can this be determined?

¹ D. Gutas, ‘Notes and Texts from Cairo Manuscripts, II: Texts from Avicenna’s Library in a Copy by ‘Abd al-Razzāq aṣ-Ṣīnāḥī’, Manuscripts of the Middle East, 2 (1987), 13–22 (p. 9 n. 17); an exception is D. C. Reisman’s work on Bahmanyār and Ibn Zayla, The Making of the Avicennan Tradition: The Transmission, Content, and Structure of Ibn Sīnā’s ‘al-Mubāḥāthāt’ (The Discussions), Islamic Philosophy, Theology, and Science: Texts and Studies, 49 (Leiden, 2002). See also the references below to Y. Michot’s work (some of which appeared in print after this article was completed), including Ibn Sīnā: Lettre au vizir Abū Sa’d; Édito princeps d’après le manuscrit de Bursa, Sagesses musulmanes, 4 (Beirut, 2000); and ‘Le Riz trop cuit du Kirmānī: Présentation, édition, traduction et lexique de l’épître d’Avicenne contestant l’accusation d’avoir pastiché le Coran’, in Mélanges offerts à Hossam Elkhadem par ses amis et ses élèves, ed. by F. Dalemans and others (Brussels, 2007), pp. 81–129.
Introduction

In his biography of Avicenna, Abū ‘Ubayd al-Jūzjānī relates the following vivid account of the nightly study sessions that took place at Avicenna’s residence, which presumably was in Hamadhān, while Avicenna was still in the service of the Būyid amīr, Abū Ṭāhir Shams al-Dawla (r. 387–419/997–1021). In this report al-Jūzjānī also establishes his connection to Avicenna’s philosophical summum, the Shīfā:3

Every night students [talabat al-‘ilm] would gather at his house, while by turns I would read from the Shīfā and another would read from the Qānūn. When we finished [reading], different kinds of singers arrived, a drinking party [majlis al-sbarāb] was prepared with [all of] its accompaniments, and we engaged [ourselves] in it. [In those days] instruction [taadir] would take place at night, because of the lack of free time during the day on account of [Avicenna’s] service to the Amīr.3

In Tatimmat Siwān al-ḥikma Zahir al-Dīn Ibn Funduq al-Bayhaqī (d. 565/1169), or his source(s), embellishes al-Jūzjānī’s report with the following details, which are again repeated in later biographies of Avicenna:4

While by turns Abū ‘Ubayd would read [yaqra‘u min] from Kitāb al-Shīfā, al-Ma‘ṣūmī would read from al-Qānūn, <Ibn Zayla would read from al-Iṣbārat and Bahmanyār would read from al-Ḥaṣil wa-l-maḥṣūl>.5

---


5 Al-Bayhaqī, Tatimmat Siwān al-ḥikma, ed. by M. Shafi (Lahore, 1935), p. 49; all of the following Tatimma references are to the Shafi edition (other editions of al-Bayhaqī’s
The significance of this report and its later recensions (indicated above by the angle brackets, which appear only in Shafi‘i’s edition) is not in its historical veracity, because the Isbārāt wa-l-tanhibāt appears to have been composed after the period in Hamadhān, but in the way that it clearly associates each of Avicenna’s four disciples with certain of his works. Another point that this report establishes is the identity of Avicenna’s direct disciples; that is, those whom the bio-bibliographical tradition — which began with al-Jūzjānī, who mentions himself only; the other names, as noted, appearing only in later recensions — regarded as the most loyal to Avicenna’s philosophy and to his madhhab (see below). The study sessions in Hamadhān with Avicenna might be identified with reading sessions (majālis al-qirā‘a), where al-Jūzjānī and perhaps others would read Avicenna’s texts back to him, apparently for discussion and possibly in order to establish an archetype of his text (al-nuskha al-dustūr).6


6 Gohlman says that the Isbārāt, as noted by al-Jūzjānī in the bibliography (p. 96), ‘was the last work written by Ibn Sinā, so that the latter two examples, not found in the earlier manuscripts of Ibn Funduq [al-Bayhaqī], seem to be false interpolations’ (Ibn Sinā, p. 128). On the dating of the Isbārāt and Avicenna’s other philosophical works, see Gutas, Avicenna, pp. 82–98, 145; for an alternative, earlier dating of the Isbārāt, see J. Michot, ‘La Réponse d’Aviceenne à Bahmanyār et al-Kirmānī: Présentation, traduction critique et lexique arabe-français de la Mubābaṭa III’, Le Muséon, 110.1–2 (1997), 153–64; on Michot’s dating of the Isbārāt, see D.C. Reisman’s comments, ‘A New Standard for Avicenna Studies’, Journal of the American Oriental Society, 122 (2002), 564–65.

7 I thank Fritz Zimmermann for his discussion of this section at the ‘Post-Avicennian Science and Philosophy’ conference at Bar-Ilan University, 21–23 November 2005, where I presented a version of this paper; also see J. P. Berkey, ‘Tadrīs’, in EF, X, 80; on dustūr, see A. Gacek, The Arabic Manuscript Tradition: A Glossary of Technical Terms and Bibliography, Handbuch der Orientalistik, 58 (Leiden, 2001), p. 46.
Al-Jūzjānī

Al-Jūzjānī is the only immediate disciple whom Avicenna identifies by name in his autobiography. He says that he met him after arriving in Jurjān (403/04–c. 1013/14). His full name is Abū ‘Ubayd ‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Muḥammad al-Jūzjānī. Little is known about his life and background, apart from his companionship of and dedication to Avicenna. In his introduction to the Shifā, al-Jūzjānī explains why he sought out Avicenna and became his disciple:

My love for the philosophical sciences [al-‘ulām al-bikmiyya] and my desire to acquire true knowledge [al-ma‘arif al-haqiqiya] prompted me to abandon my country and emigrate to the country where Avicenna — may God perpetuate his days — resided, because the reports about him that came to my attention as well as his discourse [kalām] to which I was exposed required that I favor him above everybody else known for this discipline and associated with this subject [jumla]. The reports that had reached me about him indicated that he was proficient in these sciences already as a young man — an adolescent still in his teens — and that he had written many works [tasāni‘], that he would hardly withhold them [from others], and that he showed little interest in keeping [dah] copies [for himself]. My desire was thus confirmed that I should go to him and join his company, and insistently request from him to concern himself [only] with writing while I concerned myself with keeping [what he wrote]. So I went to Jurjān where he resided at the time; he was then approximately thirty-two years old.


11 Gutas, Avicenna, pp. 39–40 (Gutas’s translation; Arabic glosses are mine); Avicenna, Shifā, 1, 1.
Al-Jūzjānī’s own account indicates that he was familiar with Avicenna’s philosophical writings before their meeting in Jurjān. These writings would have included Avicenna’s (1) al-Majmūʿ: al-Ḥikma al-ʿArūḍiyya; (2) al-Ḥāṣil wa-l-mahṣūl and its section on ethics, viz. (3) al-Bīrūn wa-l-ītm. In his bibliography of Avicenna’s works al-Jūzjānī mentions that al-Ḥāṣil was in twenty volumes (mujallad) and that al-Bīrūn was in two volumes,12 which indicates that he had either read the works or knew their details.13 Al-Jūzjānī does not mention in the bibliography Avicenna’s first work, Maqāla fi l-Nafs ‘alā sunnat al-ikḥtiṣār, which might indicate that he was not aware of it; on the other hand, he may simply not have mentioned it, as, indeed, Avicenna does not name it in his autobiography. What is clear from the introduction of the Shifā’ is that al-Jūzjānī was at least familiar with some of Avicenna’s writings and with his reputation as an up-and-coming philosopher who merited seeking out, to the exclusion of any other philosopher.

What was the nature of al-Jūzjānī’s relationship with Avicenna? In his Kīṭāb Kayfīyat al-aflāk al-Jūzjānī touches upon this question. There he says, ‘when I began serving [bīna ttisāli bi-khbīdat] al-Shaykh Abūʿ Ali [Avicenna] I was eager to acquire his writings and obtain his books […]. I used to keep his books [kāna ‘indi labu kutub] on mathematics which befit his [attainment of knowledge], among them was his book on the principles of geometry [usāl al-bandasa], which was a summary [nukhtīṭasār] of Euclid’s [Elements].’14 More than any other disciple, al-Jūzjānī appears to have played the role of a private secretary (kāṭib, mudawwin) to Avicenna, whose job it was to record and preserve his works.15 In the introduction to the Shifā’ al-Jūzjānī says that, given Avicenna’s commitments to statecraft,

I could therefore avail myself of only a few opportunities during which I took down some dictation on logic and physics. When I appealed to him to compose long works and commentaries, he referred to the commentaries he had written and books he had composed in his native country. I had heard, however, that these were widely dispersed and that people who owned a copy of them withheld them [from others]; as for him, it was not his habit [‘āda] to save a copy for himself, just as it was not his habit to make a copy from his archetype [yubarrīr mina l-dustūr] or transcribe [an archetype] from his rough draft [yukbriju mina

12 Gohlman, Ibn Sinā, pp. 46–47; also see the longer bibliography, ibid., pp. 92–93.
13 Gutas, Avicenna, p. 94.
14 Sezgin, GAS, vi, 281 n. 3 (translation mine).
15 Al-Fārābī also appears to have had a secretary who recorded his writings: al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 102.3; Ibn Abī Usaybi’ā (d. 668/1270), ‘Uyān al-anbā’ fi ʾtbaqāt al-ʿaṭibā’, ed. by A. Müller, 2 vols (Königsberg, 1884; repr. Frankfurt a.M., 1999), ii, 139.19; see Gutas, Avicenna, p. 39 n. 2.
al-sawād]: he would only either dictate or himself write the manuscript and give it to the person who had commissioned it from him. Moreover, he suffered from successive misfortunes, and disasters destroyed his books.16

As Avicenna’s secretary al-Jüzjānī’s duties would have included the following: (1) taking dictation from Avicenna (istamlaytubu fibā shay’an mina l-manṭiqi wa-l-ṭabi’iyyāt),17 in the biography al-Jüzjānī says that Avicenna dictated (amlā ʿalayya) to him al-Mukhtaṣar al-Auṣat fī l-manṭiq.18 (2) keeping copies of his works, in particular the archetypes, of which — and to al-Jüzjānī’s oft-repeated complaint — Avicenna appears to have been careless in keeping; (3) tracking down lost manuscripts of his works; (4) authenticating copies of Avicenna’s works and keeping a hand list of his published writings (whose end-product was al-Jüzjānī’s bibliography).

Of all Avicenna’s disciples al-Jüzjānī appears to have been the most devoted to the quest of locating his master’s lost works and to encouraging him to (re)write new ones. As for the genesis of the Šīfā’ al-Jüzjānī wrote two accounts:19 The first is in his introduction to that work, while the second is found in his biography of Avicenna, which he wrote after his death. In the former al-Jüzjānī presents himself and the other disciples (whose names are not mentioned) as appealing to Avicenna to rewrite some of his lost works. Al-Jüzjānī says:

In the meantime, the hope of ever obtaining his lost works [taṣanifubu al-fa’ita] having dimmed, we asked him to rewrite them. He said, ‘I have neither the time nor the inclination to occupy myself with close textual analysis and commentary. But if you [pl.] would be content with whatever I have readily in mind, [which I have thought] on my own, then I could write for you [pl.] a comprehensive work [taṣnif jāmi‘] arranged in the order which will occur to me’. We readily offered our consent to this and urged that he start with the physics. He began with that and wrote approximately twenty folia, but was then interrupted by administrative disruptions.20

Al-Jüzjānī’s use of the plural pronoun makes clear that he was not alone in making this request of Avicenna and so cannot take sole credit. In the biography, by contrast, al-Jüzjānī uses the singular pronoun when relating the genesis of the Šīfā’. He says:

16 Gutas, Avicenna, p. 40; Šīfā’, 1, 2; Gacek, Arabic Manuscript Tradition, pp. 46, 73.
17 Šīfā’, 1, 2.2.
Then I asked him to comment on the works of Aristotle, but he said that he was not free to do so at that time. ‘But if you would be satisfied with my composing a work in which I would set forth what, to me, is sound in these sciences, without debating with those who disagree or devoting myself to their refutation, I would do that.’ I was satisfied with it, and so he began with the physics of a work which he called the *Shifā*.

What is common to both accounts is an explanation of Avicenna’s conception of his philosophical school (*madhab*), namely, a new synthesis of Peripatetic philosophy, to be distinguished from the literal-minded commentary and exegetical tradition associated, at that time, with the School of Baghdad and its leading proponent, Abū l-Faraj ibn al-Ṭayyib (d. 435/1043). The *Shifā* then came to represent this new way of doing philosophy for later generations of philosophers, and for some philosophizing theologians as well, most notably, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209). The *Shifā* served also as Avicenna’s summa of the philosophical sciences, replacing Aristotle’s as the subject of study and the object of commentary and philosophical discussions.

Other than the introduction to the *Shifā* al-Jūzjānī also compiled the sections on geometry, astronomy, music, and arithmetic for Avicenna’s *Najāt* and *Dānishnāmi-yi ‘Alāʾī*,23 al-Bayhaqī confirms this in his report, saying that al-Jūzjānī wrote the supplementary (*alḥaqāq*) sections on the mathematical sciences (*t̮arafān mina l-ʾulūmi l-riyāḍiya*) for those two works.

There are a number of explanations as to why al-Jūzjānī wrote these sections on the mathematical sciences. The first is that it was his attempt, following the Peripatetic tradition, to supply those sections that he thought were missing. In other words, it was an apologetic effort whose goal was to avert the criticism of Avicenna’s would-be detractors.26 The second is that Avicenna appears to have had neither the time

nor the inclination to reproduce what he had already written of the mathematical sciences in the Shifāʾ (these sections were in fact the last ones that he himself wrote for any work) and simply left it for al-Jūzjānī, his secretary, to do. The question of al-Jūzjānī’s faithfulness to the Shifāʾ in compiling the Ṣafāt and Dānishnāmi-yī ‘Alāʾī’s mathematical sections still needs to be determined.

In fine, al-Jūzjānī’s lasting contribution to the Avicennan tradition was his role, as Avicenna’s secretary, in organizing and preserving his works. Moreover, he encouraged Avicenna to continue writing and, in so far as it was possible, to remain focused on the practice of philosophy rather than politics. Whether al-Jūzjānī taught any of Avicenna’s works or had any students of his own is unknown. He appears to have remained with Avicenna until his death in 428/1037. The date of al-Jūzjānī’s own death is unknown. Answers to these and other questions perhaps will only be found once we have had a closer examination of the manuscript tradition of his works and those of Avicenna.

The following is a list of al-Jūzjānī’s works:

1. An elucidation of the difficulties (fasara mushkilāt) of the Qānūn: al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 94; Shahrazūrī, Nuzhat al-arwāḥ, p. 317. This work does not appear to be extant.

2. Kitāb al-Hayawān (in Persian); al-Bayhaqī reports that there was a copy in the Niẓāmīyya library (kbazāna) in Nishābūr: Tatimma, p. 94. This work does not appear to be extant.

3. Kayfīyat tarkib al-afālāk: Brockelmann, GAL, S1, 828; Sezgin, GAS, vi, 281. 27


5. Sharḥ Risālat Ḥayy ibn Yaqẓān: al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 94; al-Shahrazūrī, Nuzhat al-arwāḥ, p. 317. The title is unattested elsewhere, and the work does not appear to be extant; the ascription is spurious, and the author was in fact Ibn Zayla (see below).

---


28 On Farghānī, see Sezgin, GAS, vi, 149–51. See also the contribution of Jamil Ragep to the present volume.
Bahmanyār

In his autobiography Avicenna does not mention Bahmanyār by name. In one of the replies, however, found in the Mubāḥathāt collection Avicenna addresses Bahmanyār by the honorific al-Shaykh al-Fāḍil, and in the others as al-Shaykh. Avicenna’s use of this title indicates that he considered Bahmanyār to be more of a colleague than a pupil. Bahmanyār’s earliest known biographer is al-Bayhaqī, who identifies him only as Bahmanyār, to which al-Shahrazūrī later added ibn al-Marzūbānī. Ibn Abī Uṣaybī ‘a is the first biographer to give what appears to be his full name: Abū l-Ḥasan Bahmanyār ibn al-Marzūbān. Muḥammad-Bāqir al-Khwānsārī (d. 1313/1895) likewise provides the kunya Abū l-Ḥasan, and adds the nisba al-A’jamī al-Ādharbāyyānī (‘non-Arab, Azerbajjānī’). The title Kiyā Rā‘īs (and Kiyā) given by Niẓāmī-‘Arūḍī (d. 556/1161) appears to be a conflated form of Bahmanyār with Kiyā Abū Ja’far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Marzūbānī.


30 For a detailed discussion of Bahmanyār’s name and title, see Reisman, Avicennan Tradition, pp. 185–92; also see H. Daiber, who refers to two letters by Avicenna appended to a manuscript of the Mubāḥathāt where he apparently addresses Bahmanyār as al-Shaykh al-Fāḍil (‘Bahmanyār, Kiā’, in Elb, iii, 502).

31 Al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 91.


34 Khwānsārī, Rawdāt al-jannāt, ii, 153.

35 Kitāb Čahār Maqāla, ed. by M. M. Qazwīnī (Leiden, 1910), p. 82; E. G. Browne, Revised Translation of the ‘Čahār Maqāla’ (‘Four Discussions’) of Niẓāmī-‘Arūḍī of Ša-
marqand, Followed by an Abridged Translation of Mirzā Muḥammad’s Notes to the Per-
Perhaps a more reliable source for Bahmanyār’s name is MS Petermann II 466 (Staatsbibliothek Berlin), where in the introduction to one of the fascicles of the Mubāḥathāt it is given as Abū l-Ḥusayn Bahmanyār ibn al-Marzubān al-Kāṭib (the chancellery secretary).  

The little that is known of Bahmanyār’s life and works is reported in al-Bayhaqī’s Tatimma:

[Bahmanyār] was a disciple of Abū ‘Ali [ibn Sinā]. He was a Zoroastrian [majūsī l-miṣlā] who was not proficient in Arabic [kalām al-Arābī]. He was from ʿĀdharbāyjān. Abū ‘Ali’s Mabāḥith is largely in Arabic of Bahmanyār’s questions [masāʾīl], which seek [answers to] difficult [philosophical] problems [ghawāmiḍ al-musabkāt}. Bahmanyār’s writings include Kitāb al-Taḥṣil, Kitāb al-Zīnā fī l-mantūq, Kitāb al-Bahja wa-l-saʿāda, Kitāb al-Musāqī, and many Rasāʾīl. That Bahmanyār was a disciple of Avicenna there is little doubt. On the other hand, just when they first met and how extensive their contact was is difficult to know. It is unclear whether Bahmanyār participated in the aforementioned Hamadhanī nightly study sessions, since, as we have seen, al-Jūzjānī does not name names in his biography of Avicenna. Niẓāmī-ʿArūḍī reports of their meeting in Isfahān, while Avicenna was in the service of ‘Alāʾ al-Dawla (c. 415–28/1024–37). Beyond the reports of al-Bayhaqī and Niẓāmī-ʿArūḍī (who are followed by, among others, al-Shahrzūrī and al-Khwānsārī) there is little else in establishing the date and location of their first meeting.

An earlier date for their meetings is suggested by Reisman, who argues that Bahmanyār’s possible aristocratic lineage — that he was the son of Ispahbad (amīr) Marzubān — identifies him as the ‘aristocratic young man, one of the sons of the commanders’, who is mentioned in the letter ‘Memoirs of a Disciple from Rayy’. This identification, if correct, would place Bahmanyār’s meeting with Avicenna in

35 Reisman suggests that because of Bahmanyār’s possible lineage he could have served, for a time, as a secretary to Sayyida’s son Majd al-Dawla (Avicennan Tradition, pp. 185, 191).


38 Browne, Revised Translation of the ‘Chabār Maqāla’, p. 92; Reisman, Avicennan Tradition, p. 193.
Rayy as early as 404/05–1014/15,\(^{39}\) which presumably would include him among the participants in the study sessions in Hamadhān.

There remains some uncertainty as to whether Bahmanyār was a Zoroastrian or Muslim. To be sure, his lineage would indicate that he was a Zoroastrian, but perhaps his kunya—be it Abū l-Ḥasan or Ḥusayn—if authentic, would indicate that he was either a Muslim, or, at least, had given his son(s) a Muslim name. Bahmanyār’s maternal uncle (ḳbāl), Abū Maṃṣūr Bahrām ibn Khūrshid ibn Yazdīyār, to whom he dedicates his Kitāb al-Ṭabṣīl, is considered by al-Khwānsārī to have been, like his nephew, a Zoroastrian (majūsī) until his ‘conversion’ to Islam.\(^{40}\)

As for Bahmanyār’s death date, al-Bayhaqī reports that he died nearly thirty years after Avicenna in 458/1066.\(^{41}\) Brockelmann, who does not indicate his source(s), gives an earlier death date of 430/1038,\(^{42}\) which suggests that Bahmanyār—who would have died only a year after Avicenna—was closer to him in age, thus reinforcing the suggestion made earlier that he would have been more of a colleague than a pupil. Without knowing Brockelmann’s source, however, it is difficult to accept his date as conclusive. Nevertheless, one argument for accepting this date is that Bahmanyār—like his colleagues Ibn Zayla and Maʾṣūmī (on whom see below)—probably died sometime shortly after Avicenna. According to this line of reasoning, the later date given by al-Bayhaqī for Bahmanyār’s death was intended to connect Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Lawkārī (who died sometime after 503/1109) to the latter and thus back to Avicenna himself. In other words, this Ḣsnād of philosophers provided the needed authority for al-Bayhaqī’s statement that it was under al-Lawkārī that the philosophical sciences spread in Khurāsān.\(^{43}\) But even if we admit al-Bayhaqī’s death date for Bahmanyār, al-Lawkārī would have been too young to have studied in any serious way with al-Shaykh al-phaltī.\(^{44}\)


\(^{44}\) The extending of Bahmanyār’s life to meet that of al-Lawkārī is perhaps an example of the *muʾammār* phenomenon (those men who were blessed by God with longer than
In the bio-bibliographical tradition Bahmanyār is known mainly as a commentator on Avicenna. He is associated with two works in particular: the Mubāḥathāt and the Taʿliqāt. The Mubāḥathāt consists in part of Bahmanyār’s questions and Avicenna’s responses to him; various versions appeared after Avicenna’s death. The Taʿliqāt is a collection of notes taken by Bahmanyār of explanations given by Avicenna on fundamental terms in logic, physics, and metaphysics, for which al-Lawkārī prepared the ḥibrīst (table of contents) in 503/1109. It is unclear whether the discussions (mubāḥathāt) between Avicenna and Bahmanyār or the notes (taʿliqāt) taken by him took place in Hamadhān, Ḩfahān, or both. There is some evidence to suggest that Bahmanyār began work on what eventually took shape as the Mubāḥathāt by corresponding with Avicenna even before he met him.

Bahmanyār’s philosophical summa is Kitāb al-Taḥṣīl (or Taḥṣīlāt); it was written in Arabic in Ḩfahān sometime between 415/1024 and 428/1037 and is dedicated to his maternal uncle Bahrām ibn Khūrshīd. The work is structured according to Avicenna’s Dānisbnāmā-yi Ḩālī with sections on logic, metaphysics, and physics (in that order), and it appears to have been translated, possibly by Bahmanyār himself, into Persian;74 ʿAbd al-Latif al-Baghdādī (d. 629/1231–32) says he wrote a summary (ḥashaltu) of the Taḥṣīl.75 Al-Khwānsārī says that the Taḥṣīl is composed according the way of the Peripatetics (masbūṭāt) and that a certain Fāḍil al-Khafārī (?) wrote a gloss on it (naqalaʿ anbū fī ḥāšbiyatib) which does not appear to be extant.76 In the bio-bibliographical tradition Bahmanyār is connected with Avicenna’s al-Ḥāṣil wa-l-maḥṣūl, but this connection appears to be based on the similarity of titles.77 Whether there is in fact a connection between al-Ḥāṣil and al-Taḥṣīl will have to await further study.

average life spans) encountered in books on hadith transmitters; see G. H. A. Juynboll, ‘Muʿammār’, in EL, vii, 258. Gutas also casts doubt on whether al-Lawkārī in fact studied with Bahmanyār (Notes and Texts, p. 9).


76 Al-Khwānsārī, Rawdāt al-jannāt, ii, 153; al-Ṭīhrānī, Dbarīʿa, iii, 395.


78 Al-Khwānsārī, Rawdāt al-jannāt, ii, 153.

79 Gutas, Avicenna, p. 96.
The following is a list of Bahmanyār’s works:

1. Kitāb al-Tahṣīl: ed. by M. Muṭahhari (Tehran, 1375Sh/1996); partial Russian translation with commentary by A.V. Sagadeeva, *Perevod s arabskogo vrodnayast`ya i kommentarii* (Baku, 1983–86); al-Bayhaqī, *Tatimma*, p. 91; al-Baghdādī, Hadiyyat al-ʿārifīn, i, 244; al-Ṭīhrānī, *Dbarı’a*, iii, 395; Anawati, *Mu’allafāt Ibn Sinā*, pp. 18–19. An extract (faṣl) of this work on the existence of the soul and active intellect is also extant: Brockelmann, *GAL*, S1, 828; see also the paper by Heidrun Eichner in the present volume.

2. Kitāb al-Zīna fi l-manṭiq: al-Bayhaqī, *Tatimma*, 91. The title also appears as Kitāb ar-Rutha fi l-manṭiq in the M. K. ‘Ali edition of the *Tatimma*, which is perhaps the result of a scribal or an editorial error with respect to the pointing of the diacritics (both words share the same consonantal skeleton). This work does not appear to be extant.⁵¹


4. Kitāb fi l-Mūṣīqā: al-Bayhaqī, *Tatimma*, p. 91. This work does not appear to be extant.


6. Risāla fi Marāṭib al-mawjūdāt: ed. and trans. by S. Poper, ibid.; ed. by Saʾd, ibid.; Anawati, ibid., p. 19. This epistle is identical to the *Risāla fi Ithbāt al-mawjūdāt* that is misattributed to Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī (Daiber, ‘Bahmanyār’, iii, 502).⁵²

7. Maqāla fi Umūr al-nafs wa quwābā (Istanbul, MS N. Paşa, 1350H, fols 54—57v). It appears to be the same as the *Maqāla fi ārāʾ al-Māsšāʾin fi umūr*

⁵¹ N. Rescher says that this work could be no more than an extract from the logic of the *Tahṣīl* (*The Development of Arabic Logic* (Pittsburgh, 1964), p. 157).

al-nafs wa quwābāh, which Daiber describes as a supplementary treatise to Avicenna’s Kitāb al-Nafs of the Sbilā; and which deals mainly with perception (idrāk) of the souls of man and stars; also see al-Khwānsārī’s account of Bahmanyār’s theory of the souls, Rawḍāt al-Jannāt, ii, 158.


Ibn Zayla

Ibn Zayla like Bahmanyār is not mentioned by Avicenna in his autobiography (nor by al-Jūzjānī in his biography of Avicenna). Al-Bayhaqī gives his name as Abū Maḥṣūr al-Ḥusayn ibn Ṭāhir ibn Zayla, while Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a gives Ibn Zaylan. However, we read in Ibn Zayla’s Kitāb al-Kāfī fī l-mūsiqā, which perhaps is the most authoritative source, that his name is Abū Maḥṣūr al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar ibn Zayla. The details of his life are little known. He is said to have been a Zoroastrian, but given his name and that of his father and grandfather, he was likely to have been a Muslim. According to al-Bayhaqī he was from Ṣisfān, which is where he was most likely to have met Avicenna (who was there from c. 415–28/1024–37). Like Bahmanyār he appears to have corresponded with Avicenna before meeting him. In a letter to Avicenna that reflects the nature of their relationship he wrote:

In our Master’s statement at the beginning of The Cure, I came upon some contradictory and conflicting points that fall outside the consensus of scholars. So it would behoove him (Avicenna) to provide a correction of that and to disclose the points of view [of his approach], if he can.

53 Al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, pp. 92–93; Durrat al-akḥbār, p. 58; Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a, Uyun al-anbāʾ, ii, 19; Shahrazūrī, Nuzbat al-arwāb, p. 317; Baghdādī, Ḥadiyyat al-ʿarifīn, v, 244; al-Zirikli, al-Alām, ii, 254; Kāḥhāla, Muʿjam al-muʿallifīn, iv, 13; and Brockelmann GAL, i, 458, and S1, 829.

54 Al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 92, followed by al-Shahrazūrī, Nuzbat al-arwāb, p. 317; al-Zirikli, al-Alām, ii, 254; Kāḥhāla, Muʿjam al-muʿallifīn, iv, 13; Brockelmann, GAL, S1, 829.

55 Uyun al-anbāʾ, ii, 19.

56 Ibn Zayla, Kitāb al-Kāfī fī l-mūsiqā, ed. by Z. Yūsuf (Cairo, 1964), p. 2; Brockelmann gives his name as Abū Maḥṣūr al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭābir ibn ʿUmar ibn Zayla (GAL, i, 458); see Reisman, Avicennan Tradition, pp. 195–96.

In his response Avicenna addresses Ibn Zayla by the following titles: *mawla*, *ra'is*, and *ḥakīm* (master, leader, and philosopher respectively).\(^{58}\) These titles indicate that Avicenna thought of him more as a fellow philosopher than a pupil. The deference shown to Ibn Zayla is supported by his death date — only twelve years after Avicenna’s own — in 440/1049.\(^{59}\) Furthermore, Ibn Zayla’s use of blunt and direct language in addressing Avicenna indicates that his tone was not that of a (respectful) student but of a fellow philosopher (*ḥakīm*).

The longer bibliographical works state that Avicenna dictated the *Ta’liqātto* Ibn Zayla (‘allaqabu ‘anbu’).\(^{60}\) This ascription seems misplaced, because there is no evidence that Avicenna had conceived of a work with that title; the notes that came to form the contents of the *Ta’liqāt* are generally associated with Bahmanyar and al-Lawkari.\(^{61}\) Nevertheless, further investigation of the manuscripts of the *Ta’liqāt* is needed to determine Ibn Zayla’s role, if any, in that work.

The bio-bibliographical works consider Ibn Zayla as an exegete of Avicenna’s more ‘allusive works’, which is largely due to his commentary (*sbarḥ*) on *Ḥayy ibn Yaẓzan*.\(^{62}\) However, the *Mubāḥathāt* collection shows him to have been also interested in more conventional Peripatetic issues, for example, the classification of the sciences, especially the issue of the scope of the logician’s rightful field of enquiry, which is raised in the introduction to the *Śbifā*, as well as other issues raised in *al-Samā*‘ *al-ṭabī‘ī* of the *Śbifā*.\(^{63}\)

The following is a list of Ibn Zayla’s works:


3. Kitāb fī l-Nafs: al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 93. This work does not appear to be extant.


Al-Maʿṣūmī

Al-Maʿṣūmī appears to have been the closest in age to Avicenna. Brockelmann gives the date of his death as 430/1038. Avicenna does not mention him in his autobiography, nor does al-Jūzjānī. Al-Bayhaqī reports that his name (ism) is either Aḥmad or Muḥammad with the patronymic ibn Aḥmad; and that his kunya is Abū ʿAbdallāh and title al-faqīb (the jurist), which appear to be quoted from Avicenna’s Kitāb fī l-ʿIsbq, which was dedicated to al-Maʿṣūmī.54

In the correspondences, al-Asʿīla wa-l-ajwība, between Abū Rayḥān Muḥammad al-Bīrūnī (c. 442/1050) and Avicenna his name appears as Abū Saʿīd Aḥmad ibn ʿAli al-Maʿṣūmī. Little else is known about him. Al-Bayhaqī says of the latter work:

When Abū ʿAli [Ibn Sinā] responded to Abū Rayḥān’s questions the latter objected to those answers and replied in terms that were in bad taste [sūʿ al-adab] and unseemly. And so Abū ʿAli refused to reply to him and it was al-Maʿṣūmī who responded [in his stead] to Abū Rayḥān’s objections, saying: ‘If you had chosen, Abū Rayḥān, terms other than those in addressing a philosopher [ḥakīm], it would have been more seemly to the intellect [ʿaqīl] and knowledge [ʿilm].’55

The Asʿīla wa-l-ajwība consists of ten questions about Aristotle’s al-Samāʾ wa-l-ʾālam, eight of which al-Bīrūnī posed to Avicenna, who responded to each one. The work also includes al-Bīrūnī’s responses to the latter, to which al-Maʿṣūmī

64 Brockelmann, GAL, S1, 828.
65 Al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, pp. 102–03. Al-Zirikli, al-Aʿlām, p. 228, quotes from al-Bayhaqī in his entry on al-Maʿṣūmī, but gives his name as Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Aḥmad al-Maʿṣūmī.
66 Al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, pp. 95–96; Durrat al-akhbār, pp. 60–61; Shahrazūrī, Nuzbat al-arwāḥ, pp. 317–18; al-Zirikli, al-Aʿlām, vi, 228; and Brockelmann, GAL, i, 458, and S1, 828.
responded. Al-Ma’sūmī’s rebuke of al-Bīrūnī and responses to him in the As’īla indicate his loyalty to Avicenna and defence of his madhbāb.

Al-Ma’sūmī is also the author of Kitāb fi l-Mufāraqāt wa i’dād al-‘uqūl wa-l-aflāk wa tartib al-mubdī’āt, on incorporeal beings (mufāraqāt); of which al-Bayhaqī says there was a copy in the Nizāmiyya library at Nisābūr, which was seized (akhadhabā) by Jamāl al-Mulk (d. 473/1080–81), Nizām al-Mulk’s eldest son, never to be seen again. This book is also described by Al-Bayhaqī as ma’sbūq kāffat al-ḥukāmā’ (the beloved of all the philosophers). Al-Bayhaqī reports that he saw a Risāla fi ‘Alimiyat Allāh ta’āla ascribed to al-Ma’sūmī, but expresses doubt about its authorship.

The following is a list of al-Ma’sūmī’s works:


2. Kitāb fi l-Mufāraqāt wa i’dād al-‘uqūl wa-l-aflāk wa tartib al-mubdī’āt: al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 95. This work does not appear to be extant.

3. Risāla fi ‘Ālimiyat Allāh ta’āla: al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 96. This work does not appear to be extant.

Summary

The first generation of Avicennan philosophers — al-Jūzjānī, Bahmanyār, Ibn Zayla, and al-Ma’sūmī — appear to have been contemporaries of Avicenna, fellow philosophers rather than pupils, who wrote their own works in addition to summaries of Avicenna’s. Al-Jūzjānī may have been the one exception to this observation. He assumed the role of a famulus (kāthib, muḍawwin) to Avicenna in organizing and preserving his writings. The relatively late date for Bahmanyār’s death, 458/1066, may have been contrived by al-Bayhaqī to provide an isnād-like line of transmission of Avicenna’s philosophy to the next generation of Avicennists, most notably to al-Lawkārī (see below). How then to understand the spread of Avicenna’s philosophy in Khurasān? Part of the evidence is already in al-Bayhaqī’s Tatimma and other bio-bibliographical sources. Al-Bayhaqī reports that he witnessed copies of the works of Avicenna’s disciples in the libraries of the Nizāmiyya, where no doubt they, along with Avicenna’s own writings, were studied and taught. Thus we have to begin examining the Nizāmiyya intellectual tradition as a major source for the transmission of Avicennan philosophy.
Appendix

In this final section, I address two philosophers, al-İlāqī and al-Lawkārī. The bibilographical tradition connects them directly, though dubiously, to Avicenna and to his immediate circle of disciples, respectively.

Al-Lawkārī

Al-Bayhaqi attributes the spread of the sciences of philosophy (‘ulūm al-ḥikma) in Khurāsān to Abū al-‘Abbās al-Faḍl ibn Muḥammad al-Lawkārī. Little else, however, is known or reported about al-Lawkārī’s life and the exact role he played in this transmission. His nisba is to the town of Lawkar, which is situated on the outskirts of Marw (al-Shāḥijān). Al-Lawkārī’s death date is disputed. Quoting Ṣādiq-İsfahānī’s (d. 1059/1650) Persian gazette titled Shāhid-i Ṣādiq, Āgḥā-Buzurg al-Ṭibrānī gives 464/1071 as the date of al-Lawkārī’s death; Mudarris-Ṭabrīzī (d. 1373/1974), without providing his source, gives 458/1065; and Brockelmann, who likewise does not provide his source, gives 517/1123. The latter date appears likely to be the correct one or close to it, since according to one manuscript of the Ta’liqāt, al-Lawkārī is reported to have completed its fibrist (table of contents) in 503/1109. Other than Brockelmann’s estimate, there is as yet no definitive early source for al-Lawkārī’s date of death.

68 Al-Bayhaqi, Tatimma, pp. 120–22; Durrat al-akhbār, pp. 80–81; Shahrazūrī, Nuzbat al-arwāḥ, p. 327; Baghdādi, Ḥadiyyat al-‘ārifīn, v. 244; al-Ṭibrānī, Dbarī’at, IX, III, 948; Muḥammad-‘Ali Mudarris-Ṭabrīzī, Rayḥānat al-adab fi tarājim al-ma’rūfīn bi-l-kaniya aw-l-qaṣab, 6 vols (Tehran, 1333Sh/1954), v, 139; and Brockelmann, GAL, I, 460.

69 Al-Bayhaqi, Tatimma, p. 120; al-Shahrazūrī, Ta’rīkb al-ḥikmat, p. 327.


73 Mudarris-Ṭabrīzī, Rayḥānat, v, 139.

74 Brockelmann, GAL, I, 460.

75 See Badawi’s introduction to the Ta’liqāt, p. 9.
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Al-Bayhaqī reports that al-Lawkārī had been a student of Bahmanyār (which, in many cases, is followed uncritically in later medieval and some modern biographical works). This, however, is unlikely given the probable death date of both philosophers (see above, the section on Bahmanyār). This teacher-student relationship was likely posited either by al-Bayhaqī or by his source(s) partly because the names of both philosophers are associated with the Ta’liqāt but also because of the scholarly need to establish an isnād-like authority, going back to Avicenna himself, for the transmission of philosophy in Khurāsān.

Another report associates al-Lawkārī with ʿUmar al-Khayyām (d. 517/1123), Abū Ḥātim al-Muẓaffar al-Asfīzārī (?), and Maymūn ibn Najīb al-Ḥāstī (d. 482/1089). This report states that these four scholars were commissioned to prepare a Zīj (astronomical table) for Malik-Shāh (r. 465–85/1072–92) in 427/1035 or 468/1075. But this report seems doubtful if one considers the account written by Ibn al-ʿAthīr (d.630/1233) in al-Kāmil fi l-taʿrīkh. He, too, writes about a group of scholars commissioned by Malik-Shāh to prepare a Zīj in 467/1074 but neglects mentioning al-Lawkārī as being among these three scholars. Had al-Lawkārī been involved with preparing this Zīj, Ibn al-ʿAthīr likely would have reported this. This association of al-Lawkārī with the famous ʿUmar al-Khayyām, then, appears to be the

---


77 Brockelmann, GAL, S1, 856.


sort of literary fabrication or trope that is often encountered in medieval Arabic biographical works. It would be appropriate to call this trope 'the meeting of great minds'. It was intended to convey the sense that contemporaneous (and at times not exactly contemporaneous) ‘great minds’ invariably met and collaborated on some important scholarly work.

Al-Lawkārī is the author of a summum of Peripatetic philosophy titled *Bayān al-ḥaqq bi-ḍīmān al-ṣidq* (The Explanation of Reality with the Assurance of Veracity).\footnote{Thus far, only the *Eisagoge* of the Logic and the Metaphysics have been edited, both under the general title of *Bayān al-ḥaqq bi-ḍīmān al-ṣidq: al-Manṭiq, al-Madkhal*: ed. by I. Dibājī (Tehran, 1364h/1986) and *al-ʿilm al-ilābī*: ed. by I. Dibājī, Majmūʿah-yi Andishāh-yi Islāmī, 2 (Tehran, 1414/1995); also see F. Griffel’s discussion of al-Lawkārī’s works, *Apostasie und Toleranz im Islam: Die Entwicklung zu al-Ghazālīs Urteil gegen die Philosophie und die Reaktionen der Philosophen*, Islamic Philosophy, Theology, and Science, 40 (Leiden, 2000), pp. 341–49.} This work is divided into three successive sections: logic, physics, and metaphysics. After Bahmanyār’s *Kitāb al-Taḥṣil*, this book is one of the earliest and most comprehensive discussions of Avicennan philosophy. In its *Eisagoge* (*al-Madkhal*), al-Lawkārī describes the *Bayān al-ḥaqq* as ‘a middle-length’ book which combines commentary and concise exposition (kitābun mutawassistiṭun ajmaʿa l-sbarḥa wa-ṭalkbiha) of works of Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī and Avicenna. At the beginning of the metaphysics, al-Lawkārī states further that:

> We intend to discourse about the fundamentals of metaphysics [*uṣūl al-ʿilm al-ilābī*] by way of concise exposition and commentary together, such that we do not forsake any of its canons; and without [any] prolixity by mentioning [all of] its branches [*fiṭrāʾ*]; [that is,] except in one science, namely, [the one] on the state of the human soul on its return [ḥal al-nafs al-insāniyya ḍinda maʿādhibā], when it is separated from [its] bodily connection [*al-ʿilāqa al-badaniyya*].\footnote{Al-Lawkārī, *Bayān al-ḥaqq: al-ʿilm al-ilābī*, p. 3.}

It is well established that the *De anima* was one of the main concerns of Avicenna’s philosophical investigations.\footnote{Gutas, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition*, pp. 254–61.} As such, it is noteworthy that al-Lawkārī, in his discussion of the metaphysics, singles out the science concerning the soul and its return.\footnote{See, e.g., the twenty-second section (*faṣl*), ‘‘Fī ‘ilm an-nafs baʿda l-mufāraqa’, in *Bayān al-ḥaqq: al-ʿilm al-ilābī*, pp. 388–90.} However, the extent to which al-Lawkārī’s discourse on the soul is based on Avicenna’s will have to await further examination of the *Bayān al-ḥaqq*.

In addition to *Bayān al-ḥaqq* and the *fibrīst* of the *Taʿlīqāt*, al-Lawkārī authored *Qaṣīdab-yi Asrār-i l-ḥikma* (Poem of the Secrets of Philosophy) and a
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commentary (Sbarḥ) on the same work, which closely follows the structure and subject matter of the Qaṣida, both of which are in Persian,95 as well as other poetry (diwān sbī’r).96 Like Ibn Mālik’s (d. 672/1274) famous al-Alfīyya in the field of Arabic grammar, the Qaṣida was intended as a pedagogical tool to help students memorize the basic principles of logic, physics, and metaphysics. Al-Lawkārī is also reported to have authored some epitomes (mukhtatāras),97 presumably, of philosophical works, although there appears to be no evidence of any such titles in the bio-bibliographical literature.

**Al-Lawkārī’s Students**

Al-Lawkārī, according to al-Bayhaqī, was among the well-respected lords (arbāb al-buyūtāt) of Marw, where he may have taught at the Nizāmiyya madrasa there.98 Al-Bayhaqī states that al-Lawkārī had a number of students. Although these do not appear to have been prolific or of lasting consequence, they do appear to have benefited by official patronage from the Saljuq in Khurāsān.

Al-Lawkārī’s students include Qutb al-Zamān Muḥammad ibn Abī Ṭāhir al-Ṭabāsī l-Marwazī, who, as his nisba indicates, was from Marw.99 His patron for a period of time was the Saljuq Wazīr Naṣīr al-Dīn Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd ibn al-Muẓaffar ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Abī Tawbah al-Marwazī (d. or k. 530/1136). Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī describes the latter as having himself studied the sciences of the ancients (naẓara fī ‘ulūmi l-awā’ili wa shtagbala bi-taḥṣilī tilkā l-‘ulūm).90 Al-Bayhaqī appears to have known Qutb al-Zamān and had visited his library.91

---


97 Al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 121.


100 Tabaqāt al-Shafi’īyya, vii, 294.

101 Al-Bayhaqī, Tatimma, p. 163.
Quṭb al-Zamān’s students included an Abū l-Faṭḥ ibn Abī Sa‘īd al-Fundūraṭī. He was a Saljūq bureaucrat, who after retiring apparently devoted himself completely (i’takāf) to studying, inter alia, philosophy (al-ḥikma) at the madrasa of Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf ibn Ḥasan al-Hamadhānī l-Būzanajīrī (d. 535/1140), a popular religious leader and jurist in Būzanajird, a town in Hamadhān. Al-Bayhaqi says that al-Fundūraṭī wrote a number of works (tašānīf) on meteorology (al-ābār al-‘ulwiyya) as well as a Kitāb fī Tafāṣīl al-ḥayawānāt (Book on the Species of Animals), neither of which appears to be in extant.

Another one of al-Lawkari’s students was al-Qāḍī Majd (or Muḥammad) al-Aḍḍal ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Turkī. He had a number of disputations (munāẓarat) with Sharaf al-Zamān Muḥammad al-İlaqī (discussed below), in which, according to al-Bayhaqi, al-Turkī displayed only a superficial knowledge of the issues (zawābir al-kutub). Additionally, al-Bayhaqi reports that al-Turkī preserved (ḥāfīzan) many of Avicenna’s works; though he exhibited knowledge of their contents (maṭālib muṣannafātihī), he did not delve deeply into the theoretical sciences (al-maʾqūlāt). Al-Turkī lived in Bukhara and worked as a judge. He also taught medicine, arithmetic (ḥisāb), and, presumably, Avicenna’s works at his local mosque (masjid maḥallatihī) until the time of his death in the second half of the sixth/twelfth century.

Al-İlaqī

Sayyid Sharaf al-Zamān (al-Bayhaqi; Sharaf al-Dīn, in Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa) Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-İlaqī (or al-İlaqī) is a third-generation follower of Avicenna and the author of a number of works on philosophy and medicine. Al-Bayhaqi says that he resided in Bākharz in Qūhistān, a dependency of Khurāsān.

92 Al-Bayhaqi, Tatimma, p. 123; his nisba is to a town in Nisābūr, vocalized Fundūraṭ or Fandūraṭ; see Yaqūt, Muʿjam al-buldān, iv, 278; and Samʿānī, al-Ansāb, iv, 402, respectively.
93 See Yaqūt, who gives his name as Abū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb ibn Yūsuf ibn Ḥasan ibn Wahrah al-Hamadhānī l-Būzanajīrī, Muʿjam al-buldān, i, 507.
94 Al-Bayhaqi, Tatimma, pp. 124–25.
95 Gutas, ‘Notes and Texts’, p. 16 n. 18.
97 Yaqūt, Muʿjam al-buldān, i, 316; Le Strange, Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 357.
before leaving for Balkh in order to serve its governor al-Amīr ‘alā’ al-Dīn Qumāj ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Balkhi (?).⁹⁸ Al-Īlāqī’s nisba connects him to the district of Ilāq, bordering Farghāna and Shāsh.⁹⁹ Alternatively, there are two other places named Ilāq: a town in the vicinity of Nishābūr (hence his late-attested nisba al-Nishābūrī); and a village in Bukhara. However, al-Īlāqī does not appear to have lived at any of these places, so the name may derive from a family connection to one of these cities named Ilāq.

The question of al-Īlāqī’s death date and of whether he was a student of Avicenna is discussed by Rudolph Sellheim in his description of a manuscript of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s (d. 606/1209) Mulakhkhas fi l-ḥikma. Sellheim (and more recently Gerhard Endress) does not question Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a’s (and presumably al-Shahrazūrī’s) report that al-Īlāqī was a student of Avicenna. This report led Sellheim to question al-Bayhaqi’s report (and Brockelmann’s reading of it) that al-Īlāqī was killed in the battle of Qatwān (or Qatawān), where the Saljūq sultan Aḥmād Sanjār (r. 511–52/1118–57) was defeated by the Qarakhānids (r. 389–607/999–1211) in 536/1141 because, as Sellheim says, al-Īlāqī would have to have been over a hundred years old. Sellheim also suggests that that al-Bayhaqi, in reporting al-Īlāqī’s death date, may have confused him with another Ilāqī, namely, the Shāfī‘ī jurist Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad ibn Dāwūd ibn Riqwān al-Īlāqī (d. 539/1144). While it is not beyond al-Bayhaqi to be imprecise or even to exaggerate his reports, there appears to be little (textual) evidence to dismiss his account of al-Īlāqī’s death date; and even less evidence in support of the reports of Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a and al-Sharazūrī (particularly the latter’s, who reports that al-Īlāqī was killed in the battle of Qatwān but nevertheless was a student of Avicenna, linking al-Bayhaqi’s report with that of Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a).¹⁰⁰ Al-Īlāqī thus appears

⁹⁸ In Shafī‘ī’s edition of the Tatimma the name appears (perhaps incorrectly) as ‘alā’ al-Dīn ibn Qumāj; the full name is provided in Ibn Fuwaṭī (d. 723/1323), Majma‘ al-ādāb fī mu‘jam al-alqāb, ed. by M. Kāzim, 6 vols (Tehran, 1416H/1995), ii, 342–43; and for a narrative of al-Amīr Qumāj’s exploits, see Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, x, 162ff., xi, 86ff.


¹⁰⁰ The erroneous dating of al-Īlāqī’s life in the bio-bibliographical literature will have to be corrected; e.g., al-Baghdādi, Hadīyat al-‘arifīn, vi, 71; Brockelmann (who gives al-Īlāqī’s death date as 536/1141 but says he was a student of Avicenna), GAL, i, 485, S1, 887; R. Sellheim, Materialien zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte, Verzeichnis der orientalisch- en Handschriften in Deutschland, 17, A, 2 vols (Wiesbaden, 1976), i, 147; and A. Z. Iskander, ‘A Doctor’s Book on Zoology: Al-Marwazi’s Ṭabā‘ī al-ḥayawān (Nature of Animals)
to have been a contemporary of al-Bayhaqī, who reports that he had a number of
disputations with al-Lawkārī’s student ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Turkı at a mosque in
Bukhara (see the section above on al-Lawkārī’s students). Al-Bayhaqī also reports
that al-Īlāqī used to meet with (iḥbatāla ila) ʿUmar al-Khayyām; however, there
appears to be no evidence to substantiate this meeting of great minds.\(^{101}\)

In philosophy, al-Īlāqī wrote a brief epistle (risāla) on definitions in logic and
philosophy, which was completed in 534/1139–40 (the title remains unknown)\(^{102}\)
— whose contents will need to be compared with the definitions of philosophical
terms in the *Taʿlīqāt* — and exchanged epistles with Tāj al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Karīm
Muḥammad al-Shahrastānī (d. 548/1153) on the question of the nature of the Nec-


\(^{102}\) See L. Cheikho, ‘Catalogue raisonné des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque orientale de
l’Université de Saint Joseph’, *Mélanges de l’Université Saint Joseph de Beyrouth*, 10 (1925),
107–79 (p. 140). I am currently preparing a critical edition and translation of this work.

\(^{103}\) ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Shahrastānī, *Al-Mīlal wa-l-nīhal*, Persian trans. by A.Ş. T. İsfahānī,
wa maṣābīb al-abrār*, ed. by ‘A. H. al-Ḥā’irī (Tehran, 1989), *dawāzda-bizdab*, no. 17; al-Shahrastānī,
*Maṣūfī-i maktub-i Tājaddīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd-l-Karīm Shahrastānī mun’aqīd dar kḥvārazm,
baṃrāb-i maktūb-i Shahrastānī biḥ Muḥammadīlāqī va pasūq-i ān dar bāra-yi ‘ilm-i vājīb al-vujūd*
(Tehran, 1990); al-Shahrastānī, *Ṭafsīr al-Shahrastānī, al-musammā maṣūfī al-asrār wa-maṣābīb al-abrār*,
ed. by M.ʿA. Ādharshab, 1 vol to date (Tehran, 1417–1997–), i, 57; G. Monnot, ‘Shahrastānī’, in *El*, ix,
214–16; and W. Madelung and T. Mayer, *Struggling with the Philosopher: A Refutation of
Avicenna’s Metaphysics*, Ismaili Texts and Translations Series, 2 (London, 2001), pp. 7–8; and Richter-Bernburg, *Īlāqī*,
pp. 642–43.

\(^{104}\) On al-Īlāqī’s medical works, see Richter-Bernburg, *Īlāqī*, pp. 642–43.
Other works al-Bayhaqī mentions are *Kitāb al-Ḥayawān* (Book on Animals), *Kitāb al-Lawāḥiq* (Book of the Appendices), 105 *Kitāb fī lʿdād al-wafq* (Book of the Harmonious Arrangement), 106 and two ‘mirrors for princes’, *Dust-nāma* and *Sulṭān-nāma*; all of these works, however, seem to be lost.
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105 This work, in all probability, is not by al- Ḳīḥ but by Avicenna; on the latter’s *Lawāḥiq, Appendices* to his *Ṣbīfa*, see Gutas, *Avicenna*, pp. 141–44.