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Post-Avicennan Arabic philosophy, with few exceptions, has received little scholarly attention, and remains to this day largely virgin territory. This neglect is particularly true of its development during the Mongol-Timurid period. Specifically, the period between Ṣadūqī (d. 672/1274) and Mīr Dāmād (d. 1041/1631) and the formation of School of Isfahan has received little attention by scholars. A major reason for this neglect is that many works of this period, the majority of which are still unedited, were written in the style of paraphrases, abridgements (muḥtasār), commentaries (ṣarḥ), super-commentaries, glosses (sg. ḥāṣya), and super-glosses. As such, they are considered unoriginal compositions, unworthy of modern scholars’ attention. Such stylistic assumptions are misleading given the extent of the period, its geographical scope, and the large number of works dating from this period that have yet to be studied. In considering the vast number of philosophical works extant from the Mongol-Timurid period, some scholars have even concluded that this time was indeed the golden age for Arabic philosophy.


With Hülegü’s patronage of Naṣīr ad-Dīn at-Ṭūsī, following the Mongol capture of Alamūt in 654/1256 and the sack of Baghdad in 656/1258, the Twelver-Shi‘i reception of Avicennan philosophy began under the aegis of the Il-Khāns. With respect to the Mongol’s patronage of the sciences, Bertold Spuler notes, “[h]owever slight an interest the Il-Khāns may have taken in learning for its own sake, they were far-sighted enough to make use of the Perso-Arab science for their own ends and encourage it so far as they could, or at least not to place obstacles in its way.” The Marāqa observatory, located near Tabrīz, was the center of philosophical and scientific activity during this period. Hülegü built it in 657/1259 according to the specifications of Naṣīr ad-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, who became its director. There, he prepared his renowned astronomical table, the Zīg-i Il-Hānī, which he completed near the age of seventy under Hülegü’s successor, the Il-Khān Abāqā (r. 663–680/1265–1282) to whom it is also dedicated. The Marāqa observatory apparently had an extensive library which served as a locus for scholars from all over Western and Eastern Asia.

With respect to the intellectual background of Naṣīr, attention should be drawn to an isnād of philosophers allegedly connecting him directly to Avicenna. The isnād enjoyed a wide circulation and is reported in a number of works. The isnād purports the following describes the sixth/twelfth century as “le triomphe de l’avicennisme,” in “La pandémie avicennienne au VIe/XIe siècle, présentation, éditio princeps et traduction de l’introduction du Livre de l’advenement du monde (Kitāb ḥudūth al-‘ālam) d’Ibn Ghaylān al-Balkhī,” Arabica 40 (1993), 287–344.


8 On the modern excavation of the Marāqa complex, see P. Vardjavand, La découverte archéologique du complexe scientifique de l’observatoire de Marāqa (Tehran: Amir Kabīr, 1366/1946); Ragep, Naṣīr al-Dīn, 1:14, n. 5.

9 See the Persian translation of Ibn Funduq al-Bayhaqī’s Tatimmat Šīwān al-ḥikma entitled Durrat al-ahbār va-Lum’at al-anwār, ed. M. Šafti’, 2nd ed. (Tehran: Šarīkat-i

chain of transmission: (1) Tūsī was a student of (2) Farīd ad-Dīn Dāmād (or Dāmāt) an-Nisābūrī, who was a student of (3) Ṣadr ad-Dīn as-Saraḥsī, who was a student of (4) Afdal ad-Dīn al-Gīlānī, who was a student of (5) Abū l-Abbās al-Lawkārī, who in turn was a student of (6) Bahmanyār, an acknowledged student of Avicenna.

Abū l-Abbās al-Faḍl ibn Muḥammad al-Lawkārī10 is the author of a fiḥrist (table of contents) of the Taʿlīqāt, a collection of notes from explanations given by Avicenna on fundamental concepts in logic, physics, and metaphysics recorded by Bahmanyār (d. 458/1066).11 He prepared the fiḥrist in 503/1109.12 Ibn Funduq al-Bayhaqī (d. 1066/1656) says in a well-known statement that al-Lawkārī was a student of Bahmanyār and that it was under him that philosophy (ʿulūm al-ḥikma) spread in Ḥurāsān.13 However, little documentation exists to detail its transmission. Al-Lawkārī’s major work is Bayān al-ḥaqq bi-damān as-sīdūq.14 It is divided into three sections: logic, physics, and metaphysics, and represents one of the earliest discussions of Avicenna’s philosophy, after Bahmanyār’s Kīṭāb at-Taḥṣīl. The introduction to the Bayān describes the work as a “middle book that combines commentary and concise exposition” (kitābun mutawassṣūṭa aṯ-ṣarḥa

---


11 See Badawi’s introduction to the Taʿlīqāt, 9.


wa-t-talḥiṣa), based on the works of Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī (d. 339/951) and Avicenna. Its style and arrangement resemble that of Bahmanyār’s at-Taḥṣil which, as Bahmanyār states in the introduction, follows that of Avicenna’s Dānišnāmah-yi ‘Alā’ī. Aside from the Bayān and the fiḥrist of the Ta‘līqāt, little else is known about al-Lawkār’s life and works except that he taught at Marw and probably died there sometime in the first quarter of the sixth/twelfth century.

As for Afḍal ad-Dīn al-Ḡilānī, he is ʿUmar ibn ʿAlī ibn Ḡilānī al-Balḥī, the author of Kitāb Ḥudūṭ al-ʿālam, an Aṣʿārī work criticizing Avicenna’s cosmogony. He was among the first generation of students in the Niẓāmīya college at Marw and Niṣābūr and he later had a number of disputations with Fāhr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī (d. 606/1209). Fāhr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī recorded one such disputation in the Munāẓarat in which he criticizes al-Ḡilānī for his weak defense of the temporal creation of the world. Because of the uncertainty of al-Lawkār’s death date, it cannot be established with any certainty that al-Ḡilānī studied with al-Lawkār. The purpose of attempting to link al-Ḡilānī, an Aṣʿārī theologian in the Niẓāmīya tradition, to al-Lawkār, a peripatetic philosopher in the Avicennan tradition, may have been an effort on the part of the biographical tradition to connect the study of philosophy in the Niẓāmīya tradition to an authoritative source in the personage of al-Lawkār.


Śadr ad-Dīn as-Saraḥshī is an otherwise unknown figure, except perhaps as a student of al-Ḡilānī. As for Fārīd ad-Dīn Dāmād, Ibn al-Fuwaṭī (d. 723/1323), the librarian and copyist at the Marāḡā observatory, names him as Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥaydar al-Faryūmaḏī (also known as al-Ḥakīm al-Ūṣūlī), without mentioning the nisba an-Niṣābūrī. It is very likely that he was Ṭūsī’s teacher because the latter quotes Fārīd ad-Dīn Dāmād in the epistle Raḥṭ al-ḥadīṯ bi-l-qadīm, and refers to him as “my teacher (ustāḏī), Fārīd ad-Dīn Muḥammad an-Niṣābūrī.” Ṭūsī likely studied under him at the Niẓāmīya in Niṣābūr between 610/1213 and 618/1221, during which time he also studied under Qūṭb ad-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad as-Sulāmī al-Miṣrī (killed in 618/1221). Both Fārīd ad-Dīn Dāmād and Qūṭb ad-Dīn al-Miṣrī studied under Faḥr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī. Fārīd ad-Dīn Dāmād’s most important students were Naṣīr ad-Dīn aṭ-Ṭūsī and the Šāfī’ī Šams

19 Alternatively, his ṭaqāb is given as Ǧīyā’ ad-Dīn and his nisba as an-Niṣābūrī; see Dībāḏī’s introduction to al-Lawkār’s al-Īlm al-ilāhī, 76–77.
21 Toliḏī ṭalqāq al-maḥāsah bi-inḍīnām rāsā’ul wa-faw’īd il-kalāmīya, ed. ‘A. Nūrānī (Tehran: Mu‘assasah-yi Muṭafā’-i İslāmī, Dānīšgāh-yi Tīhrān, 1359/1980), 483. Despite the discrepancy between these two names, reports agree that they are indeed the same person.
22 Al-Ḥwānsārī, Rauḍāt al-ṣaḥābat, 6:292, reports that he read Avicenna’s al-Īsārāt under Faḥr ad-Dīn Dāmād.
ad-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn ʿĪsā Ḥusrawshāhī at-Tabrīzī (d. 652/1263), the author of an abridgement (muḥtaṣar) of Avicenna’s as-Ṣifā’. 25

In his autobiography, Sayr wa-sulāk, Tūsī fails to mention Farīd ad-Dīn Dāmād and Qūṭb ad-Dīn al-Miṣrī among his teachers. 26 Written for the chief Ismāʿīlī ẓāʿīn, his autobiography is a stylized rendition of his conversion from exoteric kalām to esoteric Ismāʿīlī philosophy and dawah. This conversion may explain why he chose to mention only his Ismāʿīlī teachers, including Kamāl ad-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥāšīb, 27 and neglected to recognize his non-Ismāʿīlī teachers from the Nizāmīya in Nišābūr.

The significance of the isnād, at least from al-Ḡīlānī until Farīd ad-Dīn Dāmād—all of whom, it appears, studied and taught in Nizāmīya colleges of Ḥurāsān—is in establishing that the curriculum in these colleges was not restricted to the study of law and ḥadīth, but also included philosophy, particularly the works of Avicenna. The isnād, at least in connecting Tūsī to Farīd ad-Dīn Dāmād, also indicates that the Twelver-Ṣī’a reception of Avicenna’s philosophy, in part, was based on the Nizāmīya tradition of Ḥurāsān. Moreover, the isnād reveals that the two centuries after Avicenna’s death (428/1037) were important in establishing his over-arching influence on the history of philosophy, particularly in the East, and most importantly for the reception and transmission of his works. 28

27 Kamāl ad-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥāšīb was a student of Bābā Afḍal ad-Dīn Muhammad ibn Hasan Marāqī Kāshānī (d. 610/1213–14), as Tūsī states in the Sayr wa-sulāk; see Contemplation and Action, Persian text, 3. On Bābā Afḍal’s Ismāʿīlī affiliation, see J. Rypka, “Bābā Afḍal al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn Kāshānī (or Kāshī),” EI 2, 1:838–9; and W. Chittick, “Bābā Afḍal al-Dīn,” Elr, 3:285–91. For a discussion of his thought, see S.H. Nasr, “Afḍal al-Dīn Kashani and the Philosophical World of Khwaja Nasir al-Dīn Tūsī,” in Islamic Theology and Philosophy, Studies in Honor of George F. Hourani, ed. M.E. Marmura (Albany, New York: SUNY, 1984), 249–64. Kamāl ad-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥāšīb is often confused with Kamāl ad-Dīn Ibn Yūnūs, perhaps because they were both mathematicians (hence the former is called Ḥāšīb) and/or because they both have the same laqab Kamāl ad-Dīn. As such it is sometimes believed that Ibn Yūnūs was a student of Bābā Afḍal; see, for example, Daible, “al-Tūsī,” EP, 10:746.
28 For a general picture of the transmission of knowledge in Ḥurāsān, see R. Mattaheh, “The Transmission of Leaning, The Role of the Islamic Northeast,” in Madrasa, La transmission du savoir dans le monde musulman, ed. N. Grandin and M. Gaboriau (Paris: Arguments, 1997), 63–72 [I thank Beatrice Gruendler for bringing this article to my attention].

With the Mongol advance to Ḥurāsān and most likely before the sack of Nišābūr in 618/1221, Taṣūi departed for Iraq. There, he studied in Mosul with the recognized astronomer and mathematician Kamāl ad-Ḏīn Mūsā ibn Yūnus aš-Šāfīʿī (d. 639/1242), who was once himself a student in the Niẓāmīya in Baghdad. After completing his studies around the year 630/1233, Taṣūi wrote his main contribution to logic, the Asās al-iqtiḥās. While retaining the Arabic technical terms, this work is lucidly written in Persian, and thus rapidly became a model for later Persian logical works. It is divided according to the traditional eight books of the Aristotelian Organon and closely follows the logical parts of Avicenna’s aš-Šīfā’.

The major philosophical work on which much of Taṣūi’s reputation rests is the Hall muskīlāt al-Iṣārāt, a commentary on Avicenna’s al-Iṣārāt wa-t-tanbihāt. Written as his last work during his Ismāʿīlī phase, around 643/1246 in Alamāt, it was a response to Faḥr ad-Ḏīn ar-Rāzī’s critical commentary, the Šarḥ al-Iṣārāt. It embodies his subtle understanding of Ašʿarī kalām, which he likely learned as a student of Faḍr ad-Ḏīn Dāmād and Quṭb ad-Ḏīn al-Miṣrī at the Niẓāmīya in Nišābūr. Taṣūi’s other defense of Avicenna was contained in his Maṣāriʿ al-muṣārāt, a refutation of the crypto-Ismāʿīlī Tāǧ ad-Ḏīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm aš-Šahrastānī’s Muṣāraḍat al-falāṣīfa.
Aš'arī criticism of Avicenna focused on advancing objections raised by al-Gazālī (d. 505/1111) in his Tahāfuṭ al-falāsīfa. The three major objections refuted the theory of a pre-eternal world, the theory that God knows only the universal characteristics of particulars, as well as the Avicennan doctrine of the human soul that denies bodily resurrection.\textsuperscript{35} It appears that Ṣūṣī struggled with Aš'arī criticism until his final days in Baghdad, where he wrote his last work, the Tahāfuṭ al-Muḥāṣṣal.\textsuperscript{36} This work is a critical discussion of Faḥr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī's Muḥāṣṣal ḥjkār al-mutaqaddimin wa-l-muṭāḥhirīn min al-ʿulamā' wa-l-hukmā' wa-l-mutakallimin.

These two commentaries, Ṣarḥ al-Iṣārāt and Hall muṣkilāt al-Iṣārāt, spurred a series of adjudications (muḥākamat) that evaluated the arguments of Rāzī and Ṣūṣī. The earliest adjudication appears to be authored by Badr ad-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aṣ'ad at-Tustarī aṣ-Ṣāfī'ī (d. 732/1331).\textsuperscript{37} Other adjudications are by Ḥamāl ad-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Yusuf ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥilli (d. 726/1325), also known as al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli, and his student Qutb ad-Dīn Muḥammad (or Ṣāḥib) ibn Muḥammad al-Buwayhī ar-Rāzī (d. 766/1365), also known as Qutb at-Taḥtānī.\textsuperscript{38}

Ṭūṣī's lasting influence on Twelver-Šī'ism came as result of two principal works. The first, an abridgement of the eight books of the Organon, is the Taḵrīd al-manṭiq, for which al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli wrote

---


\textsuperscript{36} Ed. ʿA.A. Nūrānī, op. cit.


\textsuperscript{38} Aṭ-Ṭihrānī, ibid. Al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli's Muḥākama does not appear to be extant; see S. Schmidtke, The Theology of al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli (d. 726/1325) (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1991), 58. Qutb at-Taḥtānī's Muḥākamat bayna ʿarhay al-İṣārāt is extant and has been published along with Ṣūṣī's Hall muṣkilāt in al-İṣārāt wa-t-tanbihāt (Qum: ʿNaṣr al-Balāgā, 1373/1996). On Qutb at-Taḥtānī, see at-Ṭihrānī, Taḥaqāṭ ilām aṣ-Ṣīʿa, 3:200–2; and ʿA.A. Nīʿma, Falāṣifat aṣ-Ṣīʿa, hayātuhum wa-ārāʾuhum (Qum: Dār al-Kītab al-ʾIslāmī, 1987), 528–30.
the first commentary, the Ġawhar an-naḍīd fī šarḥ Kitāb at-Taḡrīd. The second work, the Taḡrīd al-kalām, was an abridgement of kalām and Twelver-Šīʿī dogmatics (ʾiṭiqād) for which al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli also wrote the commentary Kaṣīf al-murād fī šarḥ Taḡrīd al-ʾiṭiqād. Through al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli’s commentaries, both works became a part of the Twelver-Šīʿī college curriculum until the 1950s.

Ṭūsī’s Taḡrīd al-kalām can be divided into two sections. The first section, an analytical discussion of metaphysics and kalām, explores concepts of existence and non-existence (wujūd wa-l-ʿadam), quiddity (māḥīya), causality (ʿilla wa-l-maʿlūl), substance and accidents (ḡawāhir wa-l-aʿrād), bodies and forms (aḡsām wa-y-suwar), and predicables. This section introduces the essential philosophical issues of Avicenna’s metaphysics into the tradition of Twelver-Šīʿī kalām. Ḥilli’s commentary is not only useful in clarifying Ṭūsī’s discussions, but is also itself a resource for the history of kalām.

The Taḡrīd al-kalām’s second section is a discussion of dogmatics, specifically, God, prophecy, imāma, and the return (maʿād). There are fewer philosophical arguments in this section. Rather, the arguments are primarily premised on doctrinal grounds, stemming from the Quran and ʿhādīṭ. For example, contrary to Avicenna’s philosophical arguments against bodily resurrection, Ṭūsī accepts bodily resurrection primarily on doctrinal grounds. This fact notwithstanding, the importance of the work is that it is among the earliest, if not the first, to introduce Avicennan philosophical concepts into Twelver-Šīʿī dogmatics.

In sum, Ṭūsī played a pivotal role in the revival of Avicennan philosophy. He wrote a series of works effectively defending Avicenna against Ašʿārī criticism, particularly against that of aṣ-Ṣahrastānī and Faḥr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī. He also had a number of lively exchanges to

41 Ḥilli’s commentary Ġawhar an-naḍīd was replaced with a more recent introduction by Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar (b. 1904) entitled al-Maṭbuʿ (Qum: Intīšārāt-i Fīrūz Ābādī, 1375/1955).
43 Al-Ḥwansārī, Rawdāt al-ʿamārāt, 6:281, says that Ṭūsī was the first among the Twelver-Šīʿīs to write about dogmatics (ʾuqūd) in a philosophical way.
questions and criticisms about philosophy generally and Avicenna in particular. His lasting contribution, however, was in securing the introduction of Avicenna’s works into Twelver-Shī‘ism.

Al-‘Allāma al-Hillī (648–726/1250–1325) lived during the height of the Il-Hān rule in Iraq and Iran. His native town, al-Hilla, is situated between Kufa and Baghdad near the ruins of ancient Bābil. The town was surrendered to the Mongols shortly after the sack of Baghdad in 656/1258. Al-Hilla remained unscathed from the conquest despite its proximity to Baghdad. This was due in part to Ṭūṣī’s position as minister of Hūlegū as well as his relationship with the patricians of al-Hilla, including al-‘Allāma al-Hillī’s father. Al-‘Allāma al-Hillī began his studies of law and kalām in al-Hilla. Thereafter, he left, probably to Marāğa, where he studied under Ṭūṣī and Naḡm ad-Dīn al-Kātibī (d. 657/1276). Naḡm ad-Dīn al-Kātibī is the author of ar-Risāla aš-Šamsīya, a work on logic, and Ḥikmat al-‘ayn, a work on physics and metaphysics. Al-‘Allāma al-Hillī wrote a commentary on both works, the Qawā‘id al-ḡalīya and Īḍāḥ al-maqaṣīd, respectively. Under Naḡm ad-Dīn al-Kātibī, Hillī studied logic, physics, and metaphysics. Al-Kātibī introduced Hillī to three important figures. The first, Aṭīr ad-Dīn al-Abharī (d. 663/1264), authored al-Hīdāya fi l-hikma and an established introduction to logic, the Isāqūṯī. He also introduced Hillī to the works of Fāḥr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī and Muḥammad al-Ḥunṯī (d. 646/1248).


49 Al-Kātibī also authored a commentary on ar-Rāzī’s Muḥāṣṣal, the Muḥāṣṣal fi šarḥ al-Muḥāṣṣal, for which there is a copy of an autograph dated 717/1317; accord-
In all likelihood, Șihi left Marāğa after Ṭūsī’s death in 672/1274. He taught mainly in al-Ḥilla and, for a time, the Il-Ḥān Uḡaytī (r. 703–716/1304–1316) appointed him as a teacher in the Madrasa Sayyāra (mobile school), a distinguished position among scholars. This college served as a literary entourage that followed the Il-Ḥān on his travels. There, Șihi taught his most notable student, Qūṭb at-Taḥtānī, who later authored Risālat at-taṣawwurāt wa-t-taṣdiqāt, the first in a series of works that dealt with Avicenna’s epistemological notion that knowledge (‘ilm) is either through forming concepts or granting assent.51

Șihi continued Ṭūsī’s defense of Avicenna in Isārāt ilā maʾānī al-Isārāt, Ḥdā al-muʾdīlāt min ṣaḥ al-Isārāt, and Baṣt al-Isārāt.52 The Kitāb Kaṣīf al-ḥafṣa min Kitāb aṣ-Šifā is his principle commentary on Avicenna’s aṣ-Ṣifā. It appears that he only completed the first two books of the logic, the Eisagoge and Categories, from this work.53 Aside from his commentaries he wrote a number of philosophical expositions. His magnum opus is ʿArūr al-ḥafṣa fi l-ulām al-ʿaqūliya, which is divided into the three sections of logic, physics, and metaphysics.54 His other major work is his Tanqīḥ al-abḥāt fi maʿrifat al-ulām at-ṭalāt, from which he later wrote an abridgement entitled Marāṣid at-taqdīq wa-maqāṣid at-taḥqīq.55 Unlike his kalām works that address the arguments

51 Edited with Mullā Ṣaḍrā’s Risālat at-taṣawwur wa-t-taṣdiq, in Risālatān fī t-taṣawwur wa-t-taṣdiq, ed. M. Ṣarīʿatī (Qum: Muʾassasat-i Ismāʿīlīyān, 1416/1995).
52 These works do not appear to be extant; see Schmitdke, The Theology of al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli, 59. It should be noted that Șihi also wrote a work critical of Avicenna’s philosophy entitled Kaṣīf al-tahbīs min kalām ar-Rūʾis (“Exposing the Deceitful Statements of [Avicenna]”), no longer extant.
55 The extant portions of Marāṣid at-taqdīq wa-maqāṣid at-taḥqīq include only the logic part up to the fourth section of the Topics (Kitāb al-Ǧadal) and the metaphysics (Fāḥiṣtāt) section. For a description of the logic sections, see M.T. Dānišpāžūh and Ṭ. Muntazavī in Fihrist-i nūṣḥah-hā-yi ḥafi-yi Kitāb-ḵānah-yi Markazi-yi Dānišgāh-yi Tibrān (Tehran: Dānišgāh-yi Tibrān, 1330–1357S/1951–1978), 9:34–35, no. 2301; this manuscript is dated 710/1310 and includes the author’s iǧāza as well as that of his son, Fahl al-Muḥaqqiqīn. I am preparing a critical edition and translation of the first book of the logic, the Eīṣagoge. As for the metaphysics section, found in another manuscript, see at-Taḥtābāʾī, Maktabat al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥilli, 185.
of the *mutakallimūn* together with those of the philosophers, these philosophical works are primarily strict expositions of logic, physics, and metaphysics in the Avicennan tradition.

In conclusion, the twofold significance of Tūsī for the Avicennan tradition rests in defending Avicenna against an established Aš'arī tradition within the Nizāmīya and in successfully introducing Avicenna’s philosophy into Twelver-Šī‘ism. Al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī is recognized for establishing these works as part of the Šī‘ī commentary tradition that began with his own commentaries on Tūsī’s *Taḡīds*. These commentaries fixed Tūsī’s works and those of the Šāfti Naḡm ad-Dīn al-Kāṭibī as part of the Twelver-Šī‘ī college curriculum well into the modern period. The symbiosis between Twelver-Šī‘ism and the Šāfti-Nizāmīya tradition is well documented, at least within the legal studies tradition. This symbiosis is also documented for the Twelver-Šī‘ī tradition of studying Avicenna’s philosophy. In studying the Twelver-Šī‘ī reception of Avicenna, one needs to begin with the Nizāmīya tradition of studying Avicenna’s works that began perhaps as early as Abū l-Ma‘ālī al-Ǧuyaynī (d. 478/1085) and culminated in the works of al-Gazālī and Fāḥr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī.

---


57 See D. Stewart, *Islamic Legal Orthodoxy: Twelver Shi‘ite Responses to the Sunni Legal System* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1998).
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Fig. 1. Philosophers in the East after Avicenna