

## Shahrastānī

Shahrastānī, Tāj al-dīn Abū l-Faḥ Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Aḥmad, also called (al-Imām) al-Afḍal, born 467/1074 or 469/1076, died end of Sha‘bān 548 / Nov. 1153, Iranian theologian and independent thinker who, by his *K. al-Milal wal-niḥal* where he expounds his knowledge of religious groups and philosophical schools inside and outside the Islamic world, won great fame and, for a long time, enjoyed almost undisputed authority, even in European orientalism.

*Biography:* Born in Shahristāna, a settlement near Nasā (Eastern Iran) at the edge of the desert Qara Qum (= Darra Ġaz during the Mongol period, today Daregaz at the Irano-Turkmenistani border),<sup>1</sup> he went, probably after primary education in Jurjāniyya/Ürgenç, to Nēshāpūr in order to study on a broader scale: Ḥadīth with ‘Alī b. Aḥmad al-Madīnī (who died already in 494/1100), Shāfi‘ī jurisprudence with Abū l-Muẓaffar Aḥmad al-Kh<sup>w</sup>āfi (d. 500/1106), and theology with Salmān b. Nāṣir al-Anṣārī (d. 512/1118).<sup>2</sup> Afterwards he seems to have traveled for some time, for we know from his own words (in his *K. al-Milal*) that he met, at an unknown date and place, the Nizārī dā‘ī Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ (d. 518/1124). When he finally settled in Kh<sup>w</sup>ārazm he gave lectures which betray a certain Bāṭinī spirit; one of them, formulated in Persian in order to better reach the audience, was published (by him or one of his disciples) under the title of *Majlis-i maktūb-i Shahrastānī mun‘aqid dar Kh<sup>w</sup>ārazm*. In this text he treated the relation between creation (*khalq*) and God’s creative word “Be” (*kun*), i. e. the “command” (*amr*; cf. sura 7:54) which was understood as a kind of hypostasy in Ismā‘īlī thinking. In 510/1117, at about forty, he left Kh<sup>w</sup>ārazm, obviously for ever, and went on the Ḥajj. On his way back he was offered a teaching post at the Nizāmiyya in Baghdad. But he seems not to have been admitted into the main curriculum, for instead of dealing with jurisprudence, Ḥadīth or *kalām* he gave courses of a paraenetic character (*majlis wa‘z*) which were attended by a wider audience. He owed his job to a friend whom he knew from Kh<sup>w</sup>ārazm, the Shāfi‘ī jurist As‘ad Mīhanī (461/1069–527/1133) who himself was only a “docent” (*mudarris*) and possibly not yet in a leading position

1 Cf. D. Krawulsky, *Iran – Das Reich der İlḥāne* 77.

2 The latter two had been disciples of the “Imām al-ḥaramayn” al-Juwaynī; Kh<sup>w</sup>āfi was a fellow-student of Ghazālī (cf. T. Mayer, *Keys to the Arcana* 4).

at the madrasa.<sup>3</sup> Our information comes from a critical observer, the historian Maḥmūd Khwārazmī (d. 568/1173) who afterwards taught at the Nizāmiyya himself and met Shahrastānī personally in his youth. He praises Shahrastānī's intellectual qualities but cautions the reader against the inconstancy and disorientedness of his Weltanschauung (*al-takhabbuṭ fi l-i'tiqād*; cf. the quotation in Yāqūt, *Muḥjam al-buldān* s. v. *Shahristān*). With his Iranian and Ismā'īlī leanings, Shahrastānī did apparently not fit into the religious climate of the capital. In any case he stayed in Baghdad only for three years.

It seems, however, that he never joined the Ismā'īlī community; Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ's isolationist policy as well as his practice of secrecy towards the non-Ismā'īlī Muslim environment may not have been to his taste. He rather sympathized with older Bāṭinī ideas of no immediate political relevance, such as the twofold negative theology advocated by thinkers like Abū Ya'qūb al-Sijistānī (d. after 361/971), in order to uphold God's absolute transcendence. In spite of this "unorthodox" horizon he abstained from any polemics against Sunni ideas and maintained a broad-minded, though somewhat ambivalent, religious outlook. This may have been the reason why, back in Eastern Iran, he was offered an administrative job under the Seljuk sultan Sanjar b. Malikshāh (reigned 511/1118–552/1157), for Sanjar tried to keep good relations with the Ismā'īlī community on the Alamūt.<sup>4</sup> In his *K. al-Milal wal-niḥal* which he wrote a few years later (in 521/1127–1128 when Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ was already dead), he shows his acquaintance with the Ismā'īlī concept of Heilsgeschichte (in the famous fictitious dialogue between the Ṣābiāns and the *ḥunaḥā'* which he inserted between the first and the second part of his book) and with the Ismā'īlī tradition of philosophical doxography (by referring to Pseudo-Ammonius or to the *K. Ṣiwān al-ḥikma*). He dedicated the book to Nāṣir al-dīn Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. Abī Tawba Muẓaffar (d. 530/1135) who had become Sanjar's wazīr during the same year,<sup>5</sup> and (as a consequence?) he was appointed acting director (*nā'ib*) of the *dīwān al-rasā'il*, i. e. the chancery (or "foreign office") in Marv, Sanjar's seat of government. When, in 526/1131, Ibn Abī Tawba fell out

3 He had studied in Marv with Sam'ānī's grandfather Abū l-Muẓaffar (d. 489/1096) and was teaching at the Nizāmiyya since 507/1113–1114 (F. Griffel, *Al-Ghazālī's Philosophical Theology* 72); cf. also Kaḥḥāla, *Muḥjam al-mu'allifīn* II 250.

4 Cf. the remark made by 'Aṭāmalik Juwaynī when, after the conquest of the castle by the Mongols in 1256, he checked Sanjar's correspondence (*Tārīkh-i Jahāngushāy* III 214f. / trs. Boyle, *History of the World-Conqueror* II 682). Sanjar had been in Baghdad in 513/1119 after having defeated his nephew Maḥmūd b. Malikshāh (Griffel, *Al-Ghazālī* 310, n. 75). Did he take Shahrastānī with him when he left Baghdad? Miḥānī, too, gave up his post in 513 (ib. 72).

5 Cf. 'Abbās Iqbāl, *Wizārat dar 'ahd-i salāṭīn-i Buzurg-i Saljūqī* (Tehran 1338 š./1959), p. 263f.

of favor Shahrastānī addressed the same work, possibly in a slightly revised version, to Majd al-dīn Tāj al-ma‘ālī ‘Alī b. Ja‘far al-Mūsawī (d. 550/1155), the *naqīb al-ashrāf* of the Alids in Tirmidh. Some manuscripts still retain the original dedication; in other ones it is totally omitted.

We know about the change of addressee only by way of Shahrastānī’s preface to his *K. al-Muṣāra‘a* which he likewise dedicated to Majd al-dīn al-Mūsawī but wrote almost one decade later, shortly before Sanjar’s defeat by the Qara Khitay in 536/1141. Meanwhile he was deeply involved in a critical evaluation of the Avicennian system, taking up the transcendentalist approach he owed to Ismā‘īlī thinking and turning it against Ibn Sīnā’s concept of God. Due to the political situation, however, he could not finish the book; it breaks off in chapter 5, on the “incipience” (*hadath*) of the world. Interestingly, he never refers to Ghazālī’s *Tahāfut* which had been written, with a similar intention, almost half a century before. Perhaps the book was not available or not known to him, but it may also be that his Shī‘ī sponsor, who was a descendant of Mūsā al-Kāẓim, was not in the mood of being confronted with a Sunni approach. Yet Shahrastānī had developed part of his arguments already at an earlier date, namely in a letter which he addressed to ‘Umar b. Sahlān al-Sāwī when Majd al-dīn’s predecessor Ibn Abī Tawba was still in office (see bibliography, nr. 7). Afterwards he wrote a letter of similar contents to Sāwī’s teacher Sharaf al-zamān Īlāqī (d. 536/1141; cf. nr. 8), and when putting the book into its definite shape he did not do so without asking for Majd al-dīn’s judgment. Among theologians, Avicenna’s “system” was still a matter of discussion and controversy. Like Ghazālī, Shahrastānī was not an unconditional admirer of the great philosopher, and when, one generation later, Sharaf al-dīn al-Mas‘ūdī (who died between 585 and 590 / ca. 1190) wrote the first commentary on Ibn Sīnā’s *Ishārāt* he put the emphasis on the problems which were still open.<sup>6</sup> It was not until Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210) that a more affirmative approach was chosen.

We are still not able to fix the chronology of Shahrastānī’s biography with sufficient clarity. He may have lost his high-ranking position at Marv when Ibn Abī Tawba incurred Sanjar’s displeasure, and he seems soon to have moved to Tirmidh where Majd al-dīn lived and was known especially for his interest in astronomy (Bayhaqī, *Lubāb al-ansāb* 573, line 2–6 and 574, line 3–6). Perhaps he went there at the recommendation of the *naqīb al-ashrāf* of Marv who likewise belonged to Majd al-dīn’s family (Bayhaqī 575, 8–576, 9). Finally Sanjar himself took refuge in Tirmidh when he was defeated by the Qara Khitay. But this did not happen until 536/1141 when Shahrastānī had possibly already renounced

6 Cf. Griffel, *Al-Ghazālī* 62 and 117.

at being sponsored by anybody and withdrawn to his birth-place where he could live with his family or some remote kinsmen. It was probably there that, in 538/1143–1144, he started writing a commentary of the Qurʾān (*Mafātīḥ al-asrār wa-maṣābiḥ al-abrār*) which, again, he did not complete; the manuscript stops at the end of sūrat al-Baqara. The unicum from which this work has been edited was owned by the Kubrawī shaykh Ṣadr al-dīn Ibn Ḥamōya (644/1246–722/1322), a student of Naṣīr al-dīn Ṭūsī,<sup>7</sup> whose forbear ʿAlī b. Muḥammad Ibn Ḥamōya (d. 539/1144 in Nēshāpūr) had been acquainted with Shahrastānī personally (Bayhaqī, *Tatimmat Ṣiwān al-ḥikma* 142, l. 8). Here, too, Shahrastānī did not see any reason for concealing his sympathy for Ismāʿīlī-inspired exegesis, and the Banū Ḥamōya, originally a Shāfiʿī Sufi family from Juwayn, did obviously not bother either. Bayhaqī, however, who knew Shahrastānī’s publications quite well<sup>8</sup> upbraided him with having “deviated” in the *Mafātīḥ* from the right path (*Tatimma* 143, l. 5–9).

With regard to other points of personal conviction Shahrastānī’s stance was less ambiguous. In his historical “imaginaire,” the Omayyads, and the caliphate as such, did not count very highly; under Sanjar and the upcoming Khwārazm-Shāhs this was normal in Iran, and not only among Shīʿi. Likewise, and in spite of his search for a new paradigm, Shahrastānī seems never to have denied his Ashʿarī formation. At some moment in his life (around 530/1135?; Steigerwald, *Pensée* 297), after having composed his *K. al-Milal*, he wrote his *Nihāyat al-aqdām fī ʿilm al-kalām* where Ashʿarī is called *shaykhunā* (or only *al-shaykh?*, cf. p. 11, l. 12). Yet the title of this book may have been understood as indicating that the “feet” of conservative *kalām* do not lead beyond a certain limit (“Theology as far as it goes”), for he restricts himself to dealing with 20 basic statements on which the theologians (*al-mutakallimūn*) may rely whereas at the end he says that he hopes to have the opportunity of writing about 20 other ones where they go astray (p. 503, pu. ff.). However, he seems never to have done so, in spite of the fact that we know of other books of his which belonged to the same genre: his *K. Ghāyat al-marām fī ʿilm al-kalām* or his *Talkhīṣ al-aqsām li-madhāhib al-anām*. He may have composed them mainly for teaching purposes; not every madrasa or sponsor was ready to tolerate “deviating” ideas.

Shahrastānī’s attempt at merging different traditions may have found successors in a later generation, for instance with Fakhr al-dīn Rāzī (d. 606/1210). But the immediate future did not yet leave much room for such experiments.

7 For him cf. GAL S 1/803; Kaḥḥāla, *Muʿjam al-muʿallifīn* XII 70; T. Mayer, *Keys to the Arcana* 59 n. 196.

8 He even collects a few of his dicta (*Tatimma* 143, l. 13–144, l. 3).

Shahrastānī died in the year when Sanjar was taken captive by the Oghuz and urban civilization collapsed in Khorasan. Only two persons are mentioned as having been his disciples: Sam‘ānī (who testified to this fact in his *Mu‘jam al-shuyūkh*) and a certain Mujīr (al-dīn) Baghdādī about whom we have only scarce information (cf. Yāqūt, *Irshād* III 66, l. 14–15). His grave may have continued being venerated in the area as that of a “Mollā Muḥammad” (cf. Ādharshab 50 n. 3).<sup>9</sup>

*The main works:* D. Gimaret is the first to have noticed that the part on the Islamic sects in the *K. al-Mīlal* is structured according to the *ḥisāb dīwānī*, the usage of book-keeping in the Iranian chanceries as described in Shahrastānī’s fifth preface. There had always been heresiographical works which were written for administrative purposes (census, taxes, etc.); cf. for instance the chapter in Khwārazmī’s *Maḥāṭib al-‘ulūm*. But with regard to the internal arrangement Shahrastānī is unique. His classification makes use of a specific terminology which he knew from personal experience, and he could thus abstain from organizing the material according to the traditional scheme of the 73 *firaq*. However, his system presupposed a special way of “formatting” the pages which was neglected by later copyists. The printed versions retain the original arrangement only in certain passages where the text is presented in two columns per page. Moreover, Shahrastānī’s originality in matters of form does not quite extend to the contents of the book. He relies heavily on older sources, e.g. ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī’s *Farq bayna l-firaq*, and he commits mistakes when structuring his material. His presentation remains, however, valuable in places where he had access to works which are no longer available to us: e.g. to a complete version of Ibn al-Rāwandī’s *Faḍā’ih al-Mu’tazila*, or a copy of Abū l-Qāsim al-Ka’bī’s *K. al-Maqālāt* which seems to have been different from the unique manuscript which we still dispose of.<sup>10</sup> He used one of the *Maqālāt* works written by Abū ‘Īsā al-Warrāq, possibly in its original, and he reproduces Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ’s Nizārī manifesto *al-Fuṣūl al-arba‘a* in an Arabic translation which he had made himself on the basis of the Persian text. The chapter on the Ismā‘īliyya stands at the end of the Islamic section and contains a good deal of pertinent observations. When he says that in periods where the *imām* is in hiding the *ḥujja* has to be manifest (ed. Badrān 425, l. 3–4 / French translation 552–553) he seems to hint at the actual situation where Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ rep-

9 Quoted by T. Mayer, *Keys to the Arcana* 17.

10 Preserved in Jordan. The manuscript contains, besides parts from the *Maqālāt*, also some chapters of Ka’bī’s *‘Uyūn al-masā’il*. Hüseyin Hansu, Istanbul, is preparing an edition.

resented the Nizārī community in Iran.<sup>11</sup> The Ithnā‘asharī concept of *ghayba* is severely criticized (ed. Badrān 358, l. 8 ff.–360, l. 1 / French translation 503–505).

Noteworthy and detailed, though not always reliable are also Shahrastānī’s comments about the Iranian religions. In his chapter on Mazdaism he fixes his mind on the kind of religion which existed before Zoroaster and invents a community called “Gayomarthians” who never existed. With regard to later pre-Islamic Mazdaism, however, he is well versed and keeps searching for new information, e. g. a fragment from a *maqālāt* work written by Jayhānī, who belonged to the family of wazirs at the Sāmānid court (cf. my *Der Eine und das Andere*, pp. 385–387). The notes about fire-temples which form part of an appendix would have fitted better into an earlier passage, but could possibly no longer be inserted there because of his special way of structuring the pages (ib. 884). Interestingly, he does not include the Zoroastrians (or “Magi”) among the dualists (*thanawīyya*); he rather reserves this latter epithet for the ancient Iranian sects, especially Manicheism. In doing so he seems to ultimately take up a differentiation used in the Sasanid period when Mazdaism was no “sect” but represented the “orthodoxy”.

For the Manicheans (*Mānawīyya*), who in other heresiographical works frequently appear as *zanādiqa*, he relied on Abū ‘Īsā al-Warrāq whom he normally quotes on the basis of the material found in Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī’s *Ārā’ wal-diyānāt*. This also applies to his chapter on the Mazdakiyya where, however, he adds a passage which may be an authentic fragment of Mazdak’s doctrine preserved in early Ismā‘īlī tradition (cf. H. Halm, *Die Sieben und die Zwölf*). For the other pre-Islamic Iranian sects (the Kantaeans, the Māhāniyya, the Ṣiyāmiyya) he does not have much material; in the case of the Kantaeans he may have even been in doubt of the correct spelling (*Kanthiyya?*). The later heretical movements which arose in Iran during the Islamic period (Bihāfarīd, Sonbādh etc.) are only briefly mentioned and not treated under a common separate heading.

The chapters on the Jews and the Christians are relatively elaborate, but less original and not entirely void of mistakes; Nestorius for instance, the eponym of the Nestorian church, is said to have lived in the time of the caliph al-Ma’mūn. As to Islam, Shahrastānī treats Ash‘arī quite extensively (which is normally not the case in heresiographical works), and with regard to Mu‘tazilism he

11 F. Daftary in: Festschrift Halm 59–60. Nizār, one of the elder sons of the former Fātimid caliph al-Mustanshir who was already approaching his fifties, had been executed in 488/1095 in favor of his younger brother Aḥmad, the future caliph al-Musta‘lī; cf. in detail now H. Halm, *Kalifen und Assassinen* (Munich 2014), pp. 87 ff.

emphasizes the importance of Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī. In any case, his overall perspective was doxographical rather than heresiographical; this is why, in the second half of his book, he deals with the philosophical schools of Antiquity. Later on, however, the reception of his work took a different course. When the book was studied in Sunni madrasas outside Iran only its first part attracted wide interest. The Ismāʿīlī undercurrent was no longer noticed, whereas this bias is still clearly referred to in the three oldest biographical reports we have about Shahrastānī (in Samʿānī's *Tahbīr*, Bayhaqī's *Tatimmat Šiwān al-ḥikma*, and Maḥmūd Khwārazmī's *Taʾrīkh Khwārazm*). The same applies to European research. Cureton's edition which appeared as early as 1842–1846 (in two volumes) and Haarbrücker's German translation (Halle 1850–1851) were mainly perceived as information about religious movements in Islam whereas the summaries of pre-Socratic or Avicennian philosophy which are found in the *Milal* did not catch much attention.

The unusually wide and speedy reception of the book is demonstrated by the great number of manuscripts. In Turkish libraries alone, seven of them date to the time before 600 H., and one of these was even copied in the year before Shahrastānī's death, in Tustar. Yet no autograph seems to exist; remarks to the contrary which are found in the ms. Escorial 1525 are based on a false pretention. There are two Persian translations, one by Faḏlullāh Turka-yi Iṣfahānī from the year 843/1440 (dedicated to Shāhrukh) and another one by Muṣṭafā b. Khāliqdād al-Hāshimī al-ʿAbbāsī which was made in India, for the Moghul ruler Jahāngīr (r. 1016/1605–1037/1627). When the Ottomans had occupied Egypt, Nūḥ b. Muṣṭafā, an Egyptian Ḥanafī jurist who died in 1070/1660, translated the book into Turkish. In Europe the reputation of the book led to UNESCO financing an exemplary French translation which appeared between 1986 and 1993. However, the critical apparatus attached to the work, especially the one to the first volume (by D. Gimaret), clearly pointed to the deficiencies of Shahrastānī's achievement.

Shahrastānī's other books remained relatively unknown, and more than half of them are lost. The *Nihāyat al-aqdām* has survived due to an autograph which is preserved in the Majlis Library, Tehran. The *Majlis* contains a long paragraph on the character typology of Moses and Khidr (referring to sura 18:67–82) which may be related to the *Qiṣṣat Mūsā wal-Khaḏīr* mentioned separately in the bibliographies (see below, nr. 17). The topic is alluded to also on the first pages of the *Mafātīḥ al-asrār*. For a long time, Khaḏīr had been a chiffre for Sufi exegesis, and Shahrastānī had studied, in Nēshāpūr, with Abū Naṣr al-Qushayrī, the son of the author of the *Risāla Qushayrīyya*. But he always kept a certain distance to Sufism proper, and he never mixed it up with theology. As to his philosophical outlook, he still describes, in his *K. al-Milal*, Avicenna's

system quite objectively and at considerable length, contrasting him thus with the earlier representatives of Graeco-Arabic philosophical tradition from Kindī onward who are mentioned only in a dry list of names. As a consequence of his “wrestling with the Philosopher”, however, in the *K. al-Muṣāraʿa*, he felt motivated to put forth the idea that God, though still being *wājib al-wujūd* as Avicenna had said, is ultimately above existence as well as non-existence and therefore cannot be comprehended by the human mind. Human beings may talk about His attributes, but they can only predicate them of Him in an equivocal way.

Naṣīr al-dīn Ṭūsī, who had got his first education from a maternal uncle who had still studied with Shahrastānī, countered Shahrastānī’s attack against Avicenna in a book which he called *Maṣārīʿ al-muṣārīʿ* (“The Downfalls of the Wrestler” or the “Places where he had to give up”). He found Shahrastānī’s logical training inadequate and his understanding of philosophical problems deficient; in his view Shahrastānī had remained an old-fashioned *kalām*-theologian, similar to Fakhr al-dīn Rāzī who had equally tried in vain to correct Ibn Sīnā (especially in his commentary of the *Ishārāt*). As a matter of fact, Shahrastānī had never studied with a philosopher. Ibn Funduq al-Bayhaqī (d. 565/1169) incensed him with the remark that, in comparison, Ghazālī had better succeeded in combining *sharʿa* (the Divine Law) with *ḥikma* (Wisdom, i.e. philosophy). Bayhaqī proudly reports that when hearing Shahrastānī speak as a discussant in a scholarly circle headed by one of the Banū Ḥamōya (in Nēshāpūr?) he had dared rebuke him with regard to his unprofessional style. Shahrastānī had already written his *Mafātīḥ* at that moment, and he was much older than Bayhaqī. But Bayhaqī had not only seen the *Mafātīḥ*, he had also read the *Majlis*, and he did not conceal his misgivings about the approach used in these texts and the objections against Ibn Sīnā (*Tatimma* 142, l. 2 and 142, 8–143, 4). He may have overlooked that meanwhile Shahrastānī had possibly shifted, under the influence of Majd al-dīn Mūsawī, to a more Ithnāʿasharī orientation. His *Mafātīḥ* witness to the high esteem which he had for the *ahl al-bayt* and especially for Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq; this had already been an attitude characteristic for his teacher Salmān al-Anṣārī. His ecumenical outlook had always allowed for a certain syncretism. As a matter of fact, his *tafsīr* contains a lot of traditional material which may be found in earlier Shiʿi or Sufi Quranic hermeneutics, e. g. in Ṭabrisī’s *Majmaʿ al-bayān* or Maybudī’s *Kashf al-asrār*. But the text also refers to a formula which Shahrastānī had heard from Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ in his youth: “Our God is the God of Muḥammad” (*Milal*, ed. Badrān 444, l. 4). Used by an Ismāʿīlī this slogan had been non-committal and left the individual creed in suspense. Shahrastānī had originally criticised it because of its *taqīyya* tendency, but later on he rather emphasized its ecumenical overtones.

One century later, Ṭūsī (597/1201–672/1274), in his *Sayr wa-sulūk*, the autobiographical report about his spiritual “awakening”, unconditionally called Shahrastānī a *dā‘ī al-du‘āt* (ed. Badakhchani, § 6). But Shahrastānī seems never to have held any official position in the *da‘wa* hierarchy; Ṭūsī being in Ismā‘īlī service himself at that time was apparently no longer aware of the floating atmosphere of the past.<sup>12</sup> Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) who knew Shahrastānī’s works quite well judged the situation more perceptively; Shahrastānī, he says, sympathized with Shiism but not necessarily only with Ismailism (*Minhāj al-sunna* III 209, l. 11–210, l. 6, arguing against Ḥillī who had claimed Shahrastānī for Imāmism). Interestingly, the mystic ‘Umar al-Suhrawardī (539/1145–632/1234) who had been advised in his youth by his teacher ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Gīlānī not to read Shahrastānī’s *Nihāyat al-aqdām* nevertheless developed ideas similar to those of Shahrastānī’s non-Ash‘arī works when, in his later years, he wrote his *Rashf al-nasā’ih al-īmāniyya* (A. Hartmann in: EI<sup>2</sup> IX 779a and 781a). Even the conservative Ḥanbalī jurist Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350) did not abstain from praising Shahrastānī for having refuted Avicenna (*Ighāthat al-lahfān* II 263). Tāj al-dīn al-Subkī (d. 769/1368) defended him against all rumours of unorthodox belief (*Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyya* VI 130, ll. 6–14). But being an Egyptian he lacked any deeper knowledge of Iranian intellectual history; the complexity of Shahrastānī’s personality was no longer perceived. It was only rediscovered due to the research done by Iranian scholars in the second half of the twentieth century (Nā‘imī, Dānišpažūh). Shahrastānī’s openness for “non-orthodox” ideas was probably rooted in a cautious scepticism typical for Iran and his period.

### Bibliography

A: Shahrastānī’s own works:

Bayhaqī tells us that Shahrastānī’s publications comprised more than 20 *mujallad* (*Tatimma* 142, l. 5). We enumerate first the works which are still preserved, in alphabetical order:

1) *Maḡātib al-asrār wa-maṣābiḥ al-abrār*, 1–2 Facsimile Tehran 1368 sh./1989; also ed. Muḡammad ‘Alī Ādharshab, vol. 1ff. Tehran 1997 ff. – English translation of the first part (*Tafsīr sūrat al-Fātiḡa*) by Toby Mayer, *Keys to the Arcana. Shahrastānī’s esoteric commentary on the Qur’ān*. Oxford UP 2009; cf. the review

12 Ṭūsī’s father had been introduced to Ismā‘īlī thinking by a maternal uncle of his who had known Shahrastānī personally.

by A. Shihadeh in: *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 21/2010/194–196. – Analysis of the contents by G. Monnot in: *Annuaire EPHE* 92/1983–97/1989; id., *Le commentaire d'Al-Shahrastānī sur Coran 2, 62 (édition et traduction)*, in: *Mélanges Farid Jabre* (Beirut 1989), pp. 147–166; id., *Opposition et hiérarchie dans la pensée d'al-Shahrastānī*, in M.A. Amir-Moezzi / Ch. Jambet / P. Lory (edd.), *Henry Corbin. Philosophies et sagesses* (Turnhout 2005), pp. 93–104; T. Mayer, *Shahrastānī on the Arcana of the Qurʾān. A Preliminary Evaluation*, in: *JQS* 7, 2/2005/61–100; Mustafa Öztürk, *The Different Stances of al-Shahrastānī. A Study of the Sectarian Identity of Abū l-Faḥḥ al-Shahrastānī in Relation to His Qurʾānic Commentary, Maḥāṭiḥ al-asrār*, in: *Ilahiyat Studies* (Bursa) 1/2010/195–239; T. Mayer, *Shahrastānī's Hanīf Revelation. A Shiʿi Philosophico-Hermeneutical System*, in: F. Daftary / G. Miskinzoda (edd.), *The Study of Shiʿi Islam. History, Theology and Law* (London 2014), pp. 563–583; id., *The Cosmogonic Word in al-Shahrastānī's Exegesis of Sūrat al-Baqara*, in: *JQS* 16, 2/2014/1–41; id., *Paradoxes in al-Shahrastānī's Lexicological Methodology*, in: S.R. Burge (ed.), *The Meaning of the Word. Lexicology and Qurʾānic Exegesis* (Oxford 2015), pp. 255–279.

2) *Majlis-i maktūb-i Shahrastānī munʿaqid dar Khwārazm*, published several times by Sayyid Muḥ. Reżā Jalālī Nāʿīnī, first as an appendix to his edition of Turka-yi Iṣfahānī's *Tanqīḥ al-adilla* (see below nr. 4), then in his *Šarḥ-i ḥāl ve āthār-i Ḥujjat al-ḥaqq ... Shahrastānī* (Tehran 1343 sh./1964), again as an appendix (38 pp.), and finally in: *Dō maktūb* (Tehran 1369 sh./1990). The latter version was reedited with French translation by Diana Steigerwald, *Majlis. Discours sur l'Ordre et la création*. Canada, Les Presses de l'Université Laval 1998. – Analysis by D. Steigerwald, *The Divine Word (kalīma) in Shahrastānī's Majlis*, in: *Studies in Religion* 25/1996/335–352 and Leonard Lewisohn, *From the 'Moses of Reason' to the 'Khidr of the Resurrection'. The Oxymoronic Transcendent in Shahrastānī's Majlis-i maktūb dar Khwārazm*, in: Omar Alī-de-Unzaga (ed.), *Fortresses of the Intellect. Ismaili and other Islamic Studies in Honour of Farhad Daftary* (London 2011), pp. 403–429. Cf. also D. De Smet, *Le Verbe-impératif dans le système cosmologique de l'ismaélisme*, in: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 73/1989/397–412.

3) *Masʿala fi ithbāt al-jawhar al-fard*, a short treatise on the existence of the atom, ed. A. Guillaume in: *Nihāyat al-aqdām* (below nr. 6), pp. 505–511. Analysis by Carmela Baffioni, *Atomismo e antiatomismo nel pensiero islamico* (Napels 1982), pp. 179–210.

4) *al-Milal wal-niḥal*, ed. William Cureton, 1–2, London 1842–1846; reprint Leipzig 1923. Also printed Būlāq 1261/1846, Cairo 1317/1899 (in the margin of Ibn Ḥazm, *Fiṣal*), Bombay 1314–1315 / 1897 etc. The best Egyptian edition to date is by Muḥ. Faḥallāh Badrān, 1–2, Cairo 1366/1947–1375/1955; it is, however, based only on manuscripts found in Cairo (the oldest of which has been neglected). –

A certain ‘Umar b. Khaḍīr b. ‘Umar al-İṣbahānī abridged the text in his *al-Qawā’id al-badriyya fi ‘aqā’id al-bariyya* (Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf al-zunūn* 1357), but no copy seems to have survived. The old Persian translation by Turka-yi İṣfahānī (*Tanqīḥ al-adilla wal-‘ilal*) was edited by Nā’īnī, Tehran 1321 sh./1942, <sup>2</sup>1335/1957, <sup>3</sup>1350/1970, as was Muṣṭafā Khāliqdād’s translation which had been finished 1021/1612 in Lahore (*Tawḍīḥ al-milal*, Tehran 1358 sh./1979). Nūḥ b. Muṣṭafā’s translation into Ottoman Turkish appeared in Cairo 1263/1847 (later also Istanbul 1279/1862). After Theodor Haarbrücker’s German translation (*Schahras-tanis Religionspartheien und Philosophenschulen*, Halle 1850–1851) there were translations into English (by A.K. Kazi and J.G. Flynn: *Muslim Sects and Divisions. The Section on Muslim Sects in Kitāb al-Milal wa’l-Niḥal*; London 1984), into French (by J.C. Vadet: *Les dissidences de l’Islam*; Paris 1984), and into Russian (by S.M. Prozorov: *Kniga o religijach i sektach*; Moscow 1984), all of them earlier than the UNESCO translation: Daniel Gimaret, Guy Monnot, Jean Jolivet, *Livre des Religions et des Sectes*, avant-propos par M.A. Sinaceur, 1–2, Louvain 1986–1993 (Collection UNESCO d’oeuvres représentatives, Série arabe). [Additions by G. Monnot in: M.A. Amir-Moezzi (ed.), *Islam. Identité et Altérité. Hommage à Guy Monnot* (Turnhout 2013), pp. 24 s.].

Further studies: a) in general, Carra de Vaux in EI<sup>1</sup> IV 283 f. s. v. *Shahrastānī*; D. Gimaret in EI<sup>2</sup> VII 55a s. v. *al-Milal wa’l-niḥal*; Muḥ. b. Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ al-Ṣuḥaybānī, *Manhaj al-Shahrastānī fi kitābiḥi al-Milal wal-niḥal* (Riyāḍ 1417/1997); Josef van Ess, *Der Eine und das Andere. Beobachtungen an islamischen häresiographischen Texten* (Berlin 2011), pp. 860–900. b) in detail, following the order of the book: Giuseppe Gabrieli, *I prolegomeni dello Shahrastānī alla sua opera su le Religioni e le Sette*, in: Bessarione, ser. II 9/1905/86–92 and 150–157; Adam R. Gaiser, *Satan’s Seven Specious Arguments. Al-Shahrastānī’s Kitāb al-Milal wa’l-Niḥal in an Ismā’īlī Context*, in: *Journal of Islamic Studies* 19/2008/178 ff. – Dominique Sourdel, *La classification des sectes islamiques dans le K. al-Milal d’al-Ṣahrastānī*, in: SI 31/1970/239–247. – S.J. Badakhchani, *Shahrastānī’s Account of Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ’s Doctrine of Ta’līm*, in: Amir-Moezzi, *Islam. Identité et Altérité* 27–55. – A. Guillaume, *Christian and Muslim Theology as Represented by Al-Shahrastānī and St. Thomas Aquinas*, in: BSOAS 13/1950/551–580; Gérard Troupeau, *Les croyances des chrétiens présentées par un hérésiographe musulman du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: MUSJ 50/1984/671–688; William Montgomery Watt, *Ash-Shahrastānī’s Account of Christian Doctrine*, in: *Islamochristiana* 9/1983/249–259; id., *Al-Shahrastānī over de triniteitsleer*, in: P.S. van Koningsveld (ed.), *Historische betrekkingen tussen moslims en christenen* (Nijmegen 1981), pp. 1 ff. – The chapter on Mazdaism and the other dualist movements was translated separately by S.M. Prozorov, with an extensive commentary, in: Yanis Eshots (ed.), *Ishraq. Islamic philosophy yearbook* (Russ.),

Moscow 2/2011/150–188 and 3/2012/573–600. For Mazdakism cf. Heinz Halm, *Die Sieben und die Zwölf*, in: Vorträge XVIII. DOT Lübeck 1972, pp. 170–177; Mansour Shaki, *The Cosmogonical and Cosmological Teachings of Mazdak*, in: Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce, 1–2, Leiden 1985, pp. 527–543. – On the Šābians and their fictitious disputation with the Ḥunafā': Henry Corbin, *Rituel sabéen et exégèse ismaélienne du rituel*, in: Eranos-Jahrbuch 19/1950/188–200; Yves Marquet, *Sabéens et Iḥwān al-Şafā'*, in: SI 24/1966/52–80; Charles Genequand, *Idolâtrie, astrolâtrie et sabéisme*, in: SI 89/1999/109–128. – On the philosophical section cf. F. Rosenthal, *Aş-Şayḥ al-Yūnānī and the Arabic Plotinus Source*, in: *Orientalia* 21/1952/461–492, 22/1953/370–400, 24/1955/42–66; J. Jolivet in: *Annuaire EPHE* 97/1988–100/1992; Carmela Baffioni, *Una "storia della filosofia greca" nell' Islam del XII secolo*, in: *Elenchos* 2/1981–7/1987; Jules Janssens, *Le Livre des Religions et des Sectes d'al-Shahrastānī. Une conception particulière de l' historiographie de la pensée*, in: *Bull. Philos. Médiévale* 35/1993/104–112; Jean Michot, *L' Avicennisation de la Sunna. Du Sabéisme au leurre de la Ḥanīfiyya*, ib. 113–120; also Daniel De Smet, *L' héritage de Platon et de Pythagore. La "voie diffuse" de sa transmission en terre d' Islam*, in: R. Goulet / U. Rudolph (edd.), *Entre Orient et Occident* (Geneva 2011), pp. 87–133 (especially 119 ff.). – Bruce B. Lawrence, *Shahrastānī on Indian Idol Worship*, in: *Studia Islamica* 38/1973/61–73; id., *Shahrastānī on the Indian Religions*, The Hague / Paris 1976; also Hilman Latief, *Comparative Religion in Medieval Muslim Literature*, in: *The American Journal of Islamic Social Science* 23, nr. 4, 2006, pp. 28–62.

5) *Muṣāra'at al-falāsifa*, ed. Suhayr Muḥ. Mukhtār, Cairo 1396/1976. – *Struggling with the Philosopher. A Refutation of Avicenna's Metaphysics*. New Arabic Edition and English Translation by W. Madelung and Toby Mayer. London 2001. – ed. Ḥasan al-Mu'izzī, together with Naṣīr al-dīn Ṭūsī's *Maṣāri' al-muṣāri'*. Qum 1405/1985. The *Maṣāri'* alone also ed. W. Madelung, Tehran 2004. – Analysis by W. Madelung, *Aş-Şahrastānīs Streitschrift gegen Avicenna und ihre Widerlegung durch Naṣīr al-Dīn aṭ-Ṭūsī*, in: *Akten VII. Kongress für Arabistik und Islamwissenschaft* (Göttingen 1974), pp. 250–259; J. Jolivet, *Al-Shahrastānī critique d' Avicenne dans la lutte contre les philosophes*, in: *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 10/2002/275–292; Aygün Akyol, *Mūsāraati'l Felāsife'ye göre Şehristānī'nin felsefî görüşleri* (Ankara, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü 2003); Toby Mayer, *The Absurdities of Infinite Time. Shahrastānī's Critique of Ibn Sīnā and Ṭūsī's Defence*, in: R. Hansberger / M. Afifi al-Akiti / Ch. Burnett (edd.), *Medieval Arabic Thought*. Essays in Honour of Fritz Zimmermann (London / Turin 2012), pp. 105–134.

6) *Muṣāra'at al-Muṣāra'a*, a philosophical correspondence between Shahrastānī and 'Umar b. Sahlān al-Sāwī who dedicated his *Başā'ir al-Nāṣiriyya fi 'ilm al-mantiq* (ed. Muḥammad 'Abduh, Cairo 1316/1898) to the same Maḥmūd

b. Abī Tawba to whom had been dedicated Shahrastānī's *Milal*. Preserved in two manuscripts: Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı, Revan Köşkü 2042/23 (Kat. Karatay nr. 8974) and Kazan, University Library 1125, fol. 99<sup>r</sup>–136<sup>v</sup> (first mentioned by Theodor Menzel in: *Der Islam* 17/1928/94). Shahrastānī refers to two ontological arguments which he had raised against Ibn Sīnā already in his *K. al-Muṣāra'a*. Sāwī defends Ibn Sīnā; his answer begins in the Kazan manuscript on fol. 107<sup>r</sup>. In general cf. R. Wisnovsky in P. Adamson (ed.), *Interpreting Avicenna* (Cambridge 2013), p. 193 ff.<sup>13</sup>

7) *Nihāyat al-aqdām fi 'ilm al-kalām*, ed. A. Guillaume (who read *iqdām* instead of *aqdām*), with an English translation (*The Summa Philosophiae of ...*); Oxford 1934. Reprint of the Arabic text, Baghdad (Muthannā) n. d.

8) Questions addressed by Taj al-dīn Sharaf al-zamān Muḥammad (b. Yūsuf al-Īlāqī) to Shahrastānī, on the knowledge inherent in the Necessary Being; Ms. Teheran, Library of the Parliament 599, pp. 242–250 (Kat. Dānišpažūh III 357 who reads, however, *al-Sahlānī* instead of *al-Īlāqī*), facsimile edition by Nā'inī in *Dō maktūb*. Īlāqī died 536/1141 in the battle of Qaṭwān; cf., with further biographical detail, Nā'inī, *Dō maktūb* 73, n. 1. The topic is also treated in the *K. al-Muṣāra'a*; cf. Madelung/Mayer, *Struggling*, Ar. text 67–92 / Engl. trs. 60–74.

9) *Sharḥ sūrat Yūsuf*, manuscript in al-Azhar library (cf. Nā'inī, *Dō maktūb* 96). Maḥmūd Khwārazmī states that this commentary of sura 12 was written in a “subtle philosophical style” (*bi-'ibāra laṭīfa falsafīyya*; Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-buldān* III 377b, l. -4f.). In it Shahrastānī put forward the idea that not only Joseph was a prophet but also all his brothers (Jamāluddīn Murtaḍā al-Rāzī, *Tabṣirat ul-'awāmm* 160, -4). Cf. also Ibn Taymiyya, *Dar' ta'arūḍ al-'aql wal-naql*.

10) *al-Manāhij wal-bayyināt* (or *wal-āyāt*), against Ibn Sīnā. Nā'inī mentions a manuscript in Istanbul, Veliyeddin (*Dō maktūb* 97). Bayhaqī heard parts of the book from Shahrastānī himself. Quoted as *al-Manāhij wal-bayānāt* by Naṣīr al-dīn Ṭūsī in his *Sharḥ al-Ishārāt li-Abī 'Alī Ibn Sīnā* (ed. Sulaymān Dunyā, Cairo 1957, II 129, l. 14–16), according to Fakhr al-dīn Rāzī's (lost) *K. al-Jawhar al-fard*. The book therefore also contained a discussion of atomism.

The books which seem to be lost are known to us by way of early bibliographical information, in:

a) Maḥmūd Khwārazmī, *Ta'riḫ Khwārazm* (quoted in Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-buldān* III 377b, ll. 24-apu.):

13 The text will supposedly be treated by Lukas Muehlealer and Reza Pourjavady in a project called “Sāwī in defense of Avicennan philosophy” (Berlin), but F. Griffel is also working on the topic.

11) *Ghāyat al-marām fī ‘ilm al-kalām*. Identical with *Nihāyat al-aqdām?* (whose title appears only at the end of its preface; = nr. 6)

12) *al-Irshād ilā ‘aqā’id al-‘ibād* (quoted in *Nihāyat al-aqdām* 55, l. 9).

13) *Risāla fī l-Mabda’ wal-ma’ād*.

14) *Daqā’iq al-awhām*.

15) *al-Aqtār, fī l-uṣūl*.

b) Ibn Funduq al-Bayhaqī, *Tatimmat Ṣiwān al-ḥikma* 141, ult.–142, 7:

16) *al-‘Uyūn wal-anhār*. The book is quoted in Shahrastānī’s *Mafātīḥ al-asrār* (nr. 1) under sura 2:36.

17) *Qiṣṣat Mūsā wal-Khidr*.

c) Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf al-zunūn*:

18) *Talkhīṣ al-aqṣām li-madhāhib al-anām, fī l-kalām* (472, l. 11–13). Also mentioned by Ṣafadī (*Wāfī* III 278, l. 16) as different from *Nihāyat al-aqdām* (nr. 6).

19) *Ta’rīkh al-ḥukamā’* (291, ll. 24–25 and 1097, ll. 11–12). Quoted as *Ta’rīkh in Mafātīḥ al-asrār* ad sura 2:36? Or are we simply dealing with an error committed by Ḥājjī Khalīfa? (cf. H. Beveridge in: JRAS 1900, p. 550f.).

d) Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt al-jannāt*:

20) *Asrār al-‘ibāra* (vol. VIII, p. 27, pu.-ult.: with a short quotation). Nā’īnī reads *‘ibāda* instead of *‘ibāra* (*Dō maktūb* 51).

A few further titles are listed in Gimaret’s introduction to his French translation of the *Mīlal* (p. 7f.), but without bibliographical reference.

On Shahrastānī’s biography: ‘Abd al-Karīm Muḥ. Sam‘ānī (d. 562/1166), *al-Taḥbīr fī l-mu’jam al-kabīr*, 1–2, ed. Munīra Nā’jī Sālīm (Baghdad 1395/1975) II 160–161 nr. 791, and *al-Muntakhab min Mu’jam al-shuyūkh*, 1–4, ed. Muwaffaq b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Qādir (Riyāḍ 1996), pp. 1502–1503. Also id., *Dhayl Ta’rīkh Baghdād*, quoted in Subkī (see below). – Ḥāhīr al-dīn al-Bayhaqī, also known as Ibn Funduq (d. 565/1169), *Ta’rīkh ḥukamā’ al-Islām* (= *Tatimmat Ṣiwān al-ḥikma*), ed. Muḥ. Kurd ‘Alī (Damascus 1365/1946), pp. 141–144, nr. 86. – Ḥāhīr al-dīn Maḥmūd al-Kh<sup>w</sup>ārazmī (d. 568/1173), *Ta’rīkh Kh<sup>w</sup>ārazm*, quoted in Yāqūt, *Mu’jam al-buldān* (1–5, Beirut 1955–1957) III 377a, l. -8–377b, ult. and Dhahabī, *Ṣiyar* XX 288, 3–12 (see below). – Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a’yān wa-anbā’ abnā’ al-zamān*, ed. Iḥsān ‘Abbās (1–8; Beirut 1968–1977), IV 273–275 nr. 611. – Dhahabī, *Ṣiyar a’lām al-nubalā’* XX 286–288 nr. 194 and *al-Ibar bi-khabar man ghabar* IV 132, ll. 9ff. (where Shahrastānī is said to have died at the age of 81). – Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī bil-wafayāt* III 278–279 nr. 1319. – Tāj al-dīn al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyya* VI 128–130 nr. 653. – Kh<sup>w</sup>ānsārī, *Rawḍāt al-jannāt* (1–8, Qum/Beirut 1390/1970–1392/1972) VIII 26–31 nr. 675. Only the first three sources contain original reports. All other biographers from Ibn Khallikān onward reproduce or comment upon the material found there.

Further sources: Naṣīr al-dīn Ṭūsī, *Sayr wa Sulūk*, ed. and trs. S.J. Badakhchani, *Contemplation and Action* (London 1998), p. 26. – Yāqūt al-Rūmī, *Irshād* (= *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*) ed. D. Margoliouth, 1–7, Leiden/London 1907–1927. – Ibn Funduq al-Bayhaqī, *Lubāb al-ansāb wal-alqāb wal-aʿqāb*, ed. Maḥdī al-Rajāʾī, 1–2 (Qum 1410/1990). – Ibn Taymiyya, *Minhāj al-sunna al-nabawīyya*, 1–4 (Būlāq 1321/1903). – Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Ighāthat al-laḥfān* (1–2, Cairo 1961).

Modern secondary literature: GAL<sup>2</sup> 1/550–551 S 1/762–763; Muhammed Tanci in “İslam Ansiklopedisi” XI 393–396; B. Lawrence in “The Encyclopedia of Religion” XIII 199–200; G. Monnot in EI<sup>2</sup> IX 214–216; J. van Ess in “Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart” VII 743–744 (Engl. trs. “Religion Past & Present” XI 398); Ömer Faruk Harman and Mustafa Sinanoğlu in “Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi” XXXVIII 467–470. – M.T. Dānīshpāzūh, *Dāʾir al-duʿāt Taj al-dīn-i Shahrastānā-ī*, in: Nāma-yi Āstān-i Quds 8/1347 sh. (= 1968), pp. 72–80 and 9/1348 sh. (= 1969), pp. 61–71. – Nāʾimī, *Šarḥ-i ḥāl* (1964), see above under *Majlis-i maktūb* (nr. 2). – J. van Ess, *Das Geburtsjahr des Šahrastānī*, in: *Der Islam* 89/2012/111–117; G. Monnot, *L’univers religieux d’al-Shahrastānī*, in: *Annuaire EPHS* 101/1992–1993/198–201; id., *Les controverses théologiques dans l’oeuvre de Shahrastānī*, in: A. Le Bolluec (ed.), *La controverse religieuse et ses formes* (Paris 1995), pp. 281–296; F. Daftary, *The Ismaʿīlis. Their history and doctrines* (Cambridge 1990), pp. 368–369; D. Steigerwald, *La pensée philosophique de Shahrastānī* (Sainte Foy, Les Presses de l’Université Laval 1997); ead., *Al-Shahrastānī’s Contribution to Medieval Islamic Thought*, in: T. Lawson (ed.), *Reason and Inspiration in Islam*, Festschrift H. Landolt (London 2005), pp. 262–273; Muḥ. Ḥusaynī Abū Saʿda, *Al-Shahrastānī wa-manhajuhū al-naqdī. Dirāsa muqārana maʿa āraʾ al-falāsifa wal-mutakallimīn* (Beirut 2002). – Cf. also T. Mayer’s introduction to his translation of the *Mafātīḥ al-asrār* (above, nr. 1).

On the Ismāʿīlī influence: Angelika Hartmann, *Ismāʿīlitische Theologie bei sunnitischen ʿUlamāʾ des Mittelalters*, in: L. Hagemann / E. Pulsfort (edd.), “Ihr alle aber seid Brüder”, Fs. A.-Th. Khoury (Würzburg 1990), pp. 190–206; W. Madelung and P. Walker, *The Kitāb al-Rusūm waʾl-izdīwāj waʾl-tartīb Attributed to Abdān (d. 286/899)*, in: Omar Alí-de-Unzaga, *Fortresses of the Intellect. Ismaili and Other Islamic Studies in Honour of Farhad Daftary* (London 2011), pp. 103–163 (pp. 106–107); Farhad Daftary, *The Concept of Ḥujja in Ismaili Thought*, in: *Differenz und Dynamik im Islam*. Festschrift für Heinz Halm (Würzburg 2012), pp. 55–65; Seyyed Jalal Badakhchani, *Shahrastānī’s Account of Ḥasan-i Šabāḥ’s Doctrine of Taʿlīm*, in: M.A. Amir-Moezzi (ed.), *Islam. Identité et Altérité* (Turnhout 2013), pp. 27–55.

D. Krawulsky, *Iran – Das Reich der Īlḥāne. Eine topographisch-historische Studie* (Wiesbaden 1978); F. Griffel, *Al-Ghazālī’s Philosophical Theology* (Oxford 2009).