

# Studia graeco-arabica

13

---

2023

PISA  
UNIVERSITY  
PRESS

### Editorial Board

Mohammad Ali Amir Moezzi, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris  
Carmela Baffioni, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli

Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, Oxford

Charles Burnett, The Warburg Institute, London

Hans Daiber, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a. M.

Cristina D'Ancona, Università di Pisa

Thérèse-Anne Druart, The Catholic University of America, Washington

Gerhard Endress, Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Richard Goulet, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris

Steven Harvey, Bar-Ilan University, Jerusalem

Henri Hugonnard-Roche, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris

Remke Kruk, Universiteit Leiden

Concetta Luna, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa

Alain-Philippe Segonds (†)

Richard C. Taylor, Marquette University, Milwaukee (WI)

### Staff

Elisa Coda (Executive Editor), Cristina D'Ancona, Issam Marjani, Cecilia Martini Bonadeo

### Submissions

Submissions are invited in every area of the studies on the transmission of philosophical and scientific texts from Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and early modern times. Papers in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish are published. Prospective authors are invited to check the *Guidelines* on the website of the journal, and to address their proposals to the Editor in Chief.

### Peer Review Criteria

*Studia graeco-arabica* follows a double-blind peer review process. Authors should avoid putting their names in headers or footers or refer to themselves in the body or notes of the article; the title and abstract alone should appear on the first page of the submitted article. All submitted articles are read by the editorial staff. Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review to at least one reviewer. *Studia graeco-arabica* does not release referees' identities to authors or to other reviewers. The journal is committed to rapid editorial decisions.

### Subscription orders

Information on subscription rates for the print edition of Volume 13 (2023), claims and customer service: [press@unipi.it](mailto:press@unipi.it).

Web site: <http://learningroads.cfs.unipi.it/sga>

Service Provider: Università di Pisa, ICT - Servizi di Rete Ateneo

ISSN 2239-012X (Online)

ISBN 978-88-3339-881-5

Registration at the law court of Pisa, 18/12, November 23, 2012.

Editor in Chief: Cristina D'Ancona ([cristina.dancona@unipi.it](mailto:cristina.dancona@unipi.it))

Mailing address: Dipartimento di Civiltà e Forme del Sapere, via Pasquale Paoli 15, 56126 Pisa, Italia.

Italian Scientific Journals Ranking: A (ANVUR, Classe A)

Indexing and Abstracting; ERIH PLUS (SCH ESF); Index Islamicus (Brill Bibliographies); Scopus (Elsevier)

© Copyright 2023 by Pisa University Press Polo editoriale - Centro per l'innovazione e la diffusione della cultura

Università di Pisa

Piazza Torricelli 4 - 56126 Pisa

P. IVA 00286820501 · Codice Fiscale 80003670504

Tel. +39 050 2212056 · Fax +39 050 2212945

E-mail [press@unipi.it](mailto:press@unipi.it) · PEC [cidic@pec.unipi.it](mailto:cidic@pec.unipi.it)

[www.pisauniversitypress.it](http://www.pisauniversitypress.it)

*Studia graeco-arabica*. Vol. 1 (2011)- . - Pisa : Pacini editore, 2011- . - Annuale. Dal 2021: Pisa : Pisa university press.

180.05 (23.)

1. Filosofia araba - Periodici 2. Filosofia greca - Periodici

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the Publisher. The Publisher remains at the disposal of the rightholders, and is ready to make up for unintentional omissions. *Studia graeco-arabica* cannot be held responsible for the scientific opinions of the authors publishing in it.

### Cover

Mašhad, Kitābhāna-i Āsitān-i Quds-i Raḍawī 300, f. 1v; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, grec 1853, f. 186v

# “Rectifying Faith” Through Philosophy: On al-‘Āmirī’s *al-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i‘tiqād*

M. Cüneyt Kaya\*

## Abstract

This article aims to introduce al-‘Āmirī’s (d. 381/992) *al-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i‘tiqād*, which had been listed among his lost works in the studies on him. This text, referred to by al-‘Āmirī himself six times in his four extant works, provides us with important insights for understanding al-‘Āmirī’s thought, particularly his use of philosophical terminology and teachings in explaining religious doctrines, used in polemics against the theologians. After establishing *al-Iršād*’s position in al-‘Āmirī’s oeuvre, I first introduce its unique manuscript at the British Library, Collection of Oriental Manuscripts, Or. 9840. I then explain its aim, content, and structure in general, and determine its approximate date of composition; finally, I present the introduction of *al-Iršād* as an appendix.

Reading the history of philosophy through major philosophers who created extensive philosophical systems and then nurtured strong traditions of reexamination and criticism can provide the researcher with an overview of continuities and changes. However, this may (and often does) lead one to ignore other philosophers overshadowed by these influential figures. This is also true in the history of Islamic philosophy, which for a long time advanced by concentrating on al-Fārābī (d. 339/950) and the debate between al-Ġazālī (d. 505/1111) and Ibn Ruṣd (d. 595/1198) in the context of the relationship between religion and philosophy. For approximately 30 years now, the focus of studies on philosophy in Islam has been oriented towards Ibn Sīnā (d. 428/1037). Given the impact of Ibn Sīnā on the history of Islamic philosophy, there are unquestionable reasons for this approach. In fact, this proclivity toward Ibn Sīnā’s philosophy has led to a serious research agenda in terms of exploring the venture of Islamic philosophy in the centuries after his death in the context of his views, influencing intellectual traditions even outside philosophy. This orientation, however, seems to have led to a neglect of the period leading up to Ibn Sīnā, i.e., approximately the first three centuries of Islamic philosophy.

One of the many “victims” of this negligence has been Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-‘Āmirī (d. 381/992), Ibn Sīnā’s older contemporary. Al-‘Āmirī was a philosopher connected to the “Kindian tradition” through Abū Zayd al-Balḥī (d. 322/934), a direct student of al-Kindī (d. ca. 252/866), and al-‘Āmirī refers to al-Balḥī in his *al-Amad* as “our

---

\* I would like to thank Jawdath Jabbour (CNRS, Aix-en-Provence), Özgür Kavak (Marmara University, Istanbul), Teymour Morel (University of Geneva), Nurullah Ardiç (Istanbul Technical University), and the anonymous referee of the article for their valuable comments and suggestions on the first draft of this article. All errors are, of course, my sole responsibility.

master” (*şayḫunā*).<sup>1</sup> He also had a close relationship with philosophical circles in Bağdād,<sup>2</sup> and as I have argued elsewhere on the basis of *al-Mağālis al-sab‘ bayna al-Şayḫ wa-l-‘Āmirī*, al-‘Āmirī presumably met the young Ibn Sīnā in the years 980-85 in Buḫārā, where they discussed several philosophical issues.<sup>3</sup> Although not all of al-‘Āmirī’s texts have survived, his extant works are enough to show his extensive knowledge of the history and the problems of philosophy. He was acquainted with philosophical literature inherited by the Islamic world through the Graeco-Arabic translation movement, particularly Neoplatonic texts.<sup>4</sup> Additionally, one the particularities of al-‘Āmirī’s works is the focus on several issues also examined by theologians (*mutakallimūn*), and, having studied them from a philosophical perspective, such as the relationship between God and the world, the different types of creation, the immortality of the soul and the free will of human beings in relation to divine destiny. It is especially striking that when examining these problems, as a philosopher, he directly confronted theologians in a way that we only see later in Ibn Rušd’s *Tabāfut al-Tabāfut*, *Faṣl al-maqāl*, and *al-Kašf ‘an manābiḡ al-adilla fī ‘aqā’id al-milla*. Al-‘Āmirī also mastered the religious sciences, specifically *kalām*, and had a thorough knowledge of its schools, a feature that he did not hesitate to exhibit in his works. Finally, al-‘Āmirī’s efforts to harmonize religious teachings and terminology with philosophical ones, combined with his interest in the history of religions, seem to have enabled him to develop a theoretical and comparative perspective on the phenomenon of religion.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *al-Amad ‘alā al-abad*, ed. E.K. Rowson, Dār al-Kindī, Beirut 1979, p. 75; Id., *al-Amad ‘alā al-abad*, in Sa’īd al-Gānimī (ed.), *Arba‘ rasā’il falsafīyya*, Dār al-tanwīr, Beirut 2015, pp. 147-266, at p. 171; Id., *Kitābū’l-emed ale’l-ebed: Somsuzluk Peşinde*, ed. and translated into Turkish by Y. Kara, Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, Istanbul 2013, pp. 40-1.

<sup>2</sup> Al-‘Āmirī’s philosophical fragments preserved in the works of Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, Ibn Miskawayh, and in the text of *Şiwān al-ḥikma* traditions provide a wealth of information regarding his relation with philosophical circles in Bağdād. On the importance of these works as a source for al-‘Āmirī’s life and teachings, see E. Wakelnig, “Philosophical Fragments of al-‘Āmirī Preserved Mainly in al-Tawḥīdī, Miskawayh and in the Texts of the *Şiwān al-Ḥikma* Tradition”, in P. Adamson (ed.), *In the Age of al-Fārābī: Arabic Philosophy in the 4<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> Century*, Warburg Institute, London 2008, pp. 215-238.

<sup>3</sup> For the edition, Turkish translation, and study of *al-Mağālis*, see M.C. Kaya, *Bir ve Çok: Āmirī Felsefesinde Tanrı ve Ālem*, Klasik, Istanbul 2017. *Al-Mağālis al-sab‘ bayna al-Şayḫ wa-l-‘Āmirī* (*Seven Sessions between the Master [Ibn Sīnā] and al-‘Āmirī*) consists of 7 sessions including 41 questions and answers. On the geographical and historical conditions of the meeting between the young Ibn Sīnā and his older contemporary al-‘Āmirī, see pp. 15-32. The answers to the debate recorded in *al-Mağālis* are mostly consistent with the approach of al-‘Āmirī according to his extant works, which lead me to conclude that it is Ibn Sīnā who asks questions or comments while the one who answers is al-‘Āmirī. I summarized my evaluations on *al-Mağālis* in “A New Source for al-‘Āmirī Studies: *al-Majālis al-sab‘ bayna al-Şayḫ wa-l-‘Āmirī*”, *Nazariyat: Journal for History of Islamic Philosophy and Sciences* 1/2 (2015), pp. 1-34. After my edition of *al-Mağālis*, Maqṣūd Muḥammadī also edited the text on the basis of four manuscripts, but attributing it wrongly to Ibn Sīnā instead of al-‘Āmirī; see Ibn Sīnā (?), *Al-Mağālis al-sab‘a bayna al-Şayḫ wa-l-‘Āmirī*, in M. Muḥammadī (ed.), *Mağmū‘a-e Rasā’il (1)*, Mu’assasa-e Pejuḫaṣṣī-i Ḥikmat wa-Falsafa-e Īrān, Tehran 1400 h.ş., pp. 1-41.

<sup>4</sup> Particularly, in his *al-Fuṣūl fī al-ma‘ālim al-ilāhiyya*, al-‘Āmirī paraphrases approximately 25 sections of Proclus’ *Elements of Theology*. Wakelnig, the editor and German translator of *al-Fuṣūl*, exhibits the Neoplatonic components inherited in the philosophical teachings of al-‘Āmirī precisely. See E. Wakelnig, *Feder, Tafel, Mensch: Al-‘Āmirī’s Kitāb al-Fuṣūl fī l-ma‘ālim al-ilāhiyya und die arabische Proklos-Rezeption im 10. Jh.*, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2006.

<sup>5</sup> For a general account of al-‘Āmirī’s life, works and doctrine, see E. Wakelnig, “Neoplatonic Development”, in U. Rudolph – R. Hansberger – P. Adamson (eds.), *Philosophy in the Islamic World: Volume 1: 8<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> Centuries*, translated into English by R. Hansberger, Brill, Leiden – Boston 2017, pp. 250-72, at pp. 256-72. Moreover, Ḥalifāt’s

This article aims to introduce and examine al-‘Āmirī’s *al-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i’tiqād* (*The Guidance to Rectifying Faith*), assumed to be lost until recently, based on its only known copy, which may give us new insights into al-‘Āmirī’s views and his place in the history of philosophy in Islam.

In the introduction to one of his later works, *al-Amad ‘alā al-abad*, al-‘Āmirī lists his 17 works with their titles, and makes general reference to some of his other works, including short treatises, answers to questions on various subjects, commentary (*ṣarḥ*) on the basic branches of logic and interpretation (*tafāsīr*) of the literature on natural sciences, and Persian works for political leaders (*bi-ism al-umarā’ wa-l-ru’asā’*).<sup>6</sup> Among the works he mentions by name, *al-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i’tiqād* is listed after *al-Ibāna ‘an ‘ilal al-diyāna* and *al-I‘lām bi-manāqib al-Islām*. As a philosopher who enjoyed referring to his own works, al-‘Āmirī mentions *al-Iršād* six times in his four extant works, one of which is *al-Amad*. In its 19<sup>th</sup> section, where he evaluates the different perspectives on the nature of reward and punishment in the hereafter, al-‘Āmirī states that he closely examined the claims of the Zoroastrians (*al-mağūs*), Dualists (*al-tanawiyya*), Jews, and Christians on this subject in his *al-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i’tiqād* (*fa-qad istaqṣaynā dīkrabā*).<sup>7</sup> Secondly, in the first section of his *al-Taqrīr li-awğūḥ al-taqdīr*, on the relationship between free will and divine destiny, al-‘Āmirī states that he had a detailed discussion on the existence (*anniyyatihī*), unity, and the attributes of the True Being (*al-mawğūd al-ḥaqq*), who is necessary in Himself, in his *al-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i’tiqād* (*wa-qad ašba’nā al-qawl*).<sup>8</sup> In the part of the same work where he examines the “rare possible” (*al-mumkin al-nādir*), he considers extraordinary events such as miracles (*mu’ğizāt*) of the prophets and the *karāmāt* of the *awliyā’* within the scope of “rare possible”, and explains magic (*al-siḥr*) and talisman (*al-tilsimāt*) as associated with “divine meanings and psychical effects (*bi-l-ma’ānī al-ilāhiyya wa-l-ta’īrāt al-rūḥāniyya*)”, referring his reader to *al-Iršād* for further discussion: “We have discussed (*wa-qad awda’nā*) these issues (*abwāb*) to the extent of revealing the cause (*‘illa*), especially for he, whose goal is true (*ḥaqq*), and has not fallen into the trouble of underestimating religion (*ṣarī‘at*), in *al-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i’tiqād*.”<sup>9</sup> *Al-Iršād* also appears in al-‘Āmirī’s *al-Ibṣār wa-l-mubṣar*, where he focuses on the way the sense of sight works. In the first part of the work, he mentions the four types of seeing (*ibṣār*) according to philosophers, namely, sensual (*al-ḥissī*), estimative (*al-wahmī*), intellectual (*al-‘aqlī*), and sacred (*al-qudsī*). Al-‘Āmirī writes that he explained the first three types in his other works, adding that he interpreted (*qad sabaqa ṣarḥuhū*) the “sacred seeing” in his *Kitāb al-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i’tiqād*, in the context of issues on prophecy (*fī al-nubuwwāt*).<sup>10</sup>

---

partially collective volume of al-‘Āmirī’s works, and Turhan’s Turkish monograph on him should be noted as important sources for al-‘Āmirī in non-Western languages. See respectively *Rasāil Abī al-Ḥasan al-‘Āmirī wa-ṣaḍarātuhū al-falsafiyya*, ed. S. Ḥalifāt, Manšūrāt al-Ġāmi’a al-Urduniyya, ‘Ammān 1988; K. Turhan, *Āmirī ve Felsefesi*, Klasik, Istanbul 2020.

<sup>6</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *al-Amad*, pp. 55-56 Rowson, pp. 149-150 Gānimī, pp. 4-7 Kara.

<sup>7</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *al-Amad*, p. 152 Rowson, p. 253 Gānimī, pp. 170-171 Kara.

<sup>8</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *al-Taqrīr li-awğūḥ al-taqdīr*, in Saḥbān Ḥalifāt (ed.), *Rasā’il Abī al-Ḥasan al-‘Āmirī wa-ṣaḍarātuhū al-falsafiyya*, Manšūrāt al-Ġāmi’a al-Urduniyya, ‘Ammān 1988, pp. 303-41, at p. 305; Id., *al-Taqrīr li-awğūḥ al-taqdīr*, in Sa’īd al-Gānimī (ed.), *Arba’ rasā’il falsafiyya*, Dār al-tanwīr, Beirut 2015, pp. 91-145, at p. 97.

<sup>9</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *al-Taqrīr*, p. 331 Ḥalifāt, pp. 131-2 Gānimī.

<sup>10</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *al-Ibṣār wa-l-mubṣar*, in S. Ḥalifāt (ed.), *Rasā’il Abī al-Ḥasan al-‘Āmirī wa-ṣaḍarātuhū al-falsafiyya*, Manšūrāt al-Ġāmi’a al-Urduniyya, ‘Ammān 1988, pp. 411-37, at p. 413.

Finally, al-‘Āmirī refers to *al-Irşād* twice in his *al-I‘lām*, which he wrote to demonstrate Islam’s superiority over other religions. In the section where he compares religions in terms of worship, he states that there is common ground in financial worship (such as *zakāt*) among most religions besides Christianity, arguing that Manichaeism also follows Christianity in this respect, and that Mani established a religion that is a mixture of Christianity and Zoroastrianism. Then, he writes that he explained (‘*alā nahw mā šaraḥnāhu*) this topic in his *al-Irşād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i‘tiqād*.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, al-‘Āmirī concludes his discussion on how to understand Qur’anic text by referring to *al-Irşād*: “It is not possible for the human intellect to truly comprehend the benefits inherent in the *Qur’ān* without knowing the conditions of interpretation (*šarā’it al-tafsīr*) beforehand, which we explained [to them] at length (*wa-qad istaqṣaynā dikrahū*) in our *al-Irşād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i‘tiqād*”.<sup>12</sup>

Al-‘Āmirī’s references to *al-Irşād* show that it has an important place in his corpus.<sup>13</sup> The only known copy to date is located in the British Library, in the Collection of Oriental Manuscripts, Or. 9840.<sup>14</sup> A microfilm of this copy is also located in the library of the King Faisal Center for Research and Islamic Studies.<sup>15</sup> The microfilm copy consists of the catalog information prepared by the British Library. According to the catalog information, the title of the work is *al-Irşād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i‘tiqād*, written by Yūsuf al-‘Āmirī; this particular copy is 15.5 × 10.5 cm in size, has 198 leaves, and was copied in 1126 AH/1714 CE.

The title of the work and the name of the author are recorded on the title page of the volume (fol. 1a) as follows:

كتاب الإرشاد في تصحيح الاعتقاد للعامري غفر الله له ولجميع المسلمين آمين

A crossed-out ownership statement dated to 1208 (1793–4) appears just below the title and indicates that the volume belonged to al-Ḥāğğ Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Mağribī:<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *Kitāb al-i‘lām bi-manāqib al-Islām*, ed. A.‘A. Ġurāb, Dār al-kitāb al-‘Arabī, Cairo 1967, p. 145.

<sup>12</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *al-I‘lām*, p. 199 Ġurāb. Both Ḥalīfāt and Turhan list al-‘Āmirī’s own references to *al-Irşād*. Ḥalīfāt, after the list, states the following about its nature (*Rasā’il*, pp. 471–3): “Al-‘Āmirī presumably presents his intellectual conception of religion in *al-Irşād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i‘tiqād*, [which] is established [based] on interpretation (*ta’wīl*), and analysis (*taḥlīl*). Therefore, the question of how much he was influenced by the tendencies of the Iḥwān al-ṣafā’ and the Qarmatians comes to mind”. As for Turhan, according to him “it is clear that various issues ranging from metaphysics to the philosophy of religion and the history of comparative religions have been dealt with in *al-Irşād*” (p. 32). For Turhan’s interpretation on al-‘Āmirī’s references to *al-Irşād*, see *Āmirī ve Felsefesi*, pp. 142, 165, 175, 274.

<sup>13</sup> As noted in the above references, the name of *al-Irşād* is mentioned twice in *al-I‘lām* as *al-Irşād ilā taṣḥīḥ al-i‘tiqād*, while in the other three works, it is referred to as *al-Irşād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i‘tiqād*.

<sup>14</sup> <https://bit.ly/3KFBTmx>. I thank Muhammed Beheşti Aydoğın (Warwick University), who examined this copy at the British Library and photographed it for me. Since I have not yet obtained the necessary permissions from the British Library, I am not able to include sample photographs of the copy here. In addition, since I have not had the opportunity to examine the copy myself, I cannot make any evaluation about the copy regarding its binding, paper, or ink.

<sup>15</sup> <https://library.kfcris.com/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.pl?biblionumber=1072697>. In the catalog, based on the title page of the copy, the name of the book was recorded as *Kitāb al-Irşād fi taṣḥīḥ al-i‘tiqād*. I am grateful to Yusuf Arıkaner (Çankırı Karatekin University, Çankırı, Türkiye) for informing me of the existence of *al-Irşād* there, and for providing me with an electronic version of this microfilm. In this version, while some folios are repeated twice (ff. 33b–34a, 54b–55a, 73b–74a, 121b–122a, 142b–143a, 169b–170a, 189b–190a), one folio is missing (ff. 188b–189a).

<sup>16</sup> Although I have not been able to determine the identity of al-Ḥāğğ Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Mağribī, I have encountered a similar ownership statement in two other works. The first one is a copy of al-Nawawī’s (d. 666/1277) *al-Tibyān fi ādāb ḥamalāt al-Qur’ān* in MS Dār al-kutub al-zāhiriyya 8482 dated 1209h./1794–95; see

دخل في ملك الفقير الحاج محمد بن أحمد المغربي ١٢٠٨ .

There are 17 lines in each folio of the manuscript, which was copied with a *nashī* script using a thick reed pen. The chapter titles, and the first or first few words of sentences that can be considered as the beginning of a paragraph were written in red ink. There are gaps in some places throughout the copy, and in a few places misspelled words are crossed out. It is noteworthy that in two places (fol. 96b, 132a), the missing parts were completed in the margin: the sign ۲ is used to indicate the part where the correction was entered, and the sign صح was added at the end of the correction. Scribal errors are frequently encountered, either due to negligence of the copyist or to original errors in the text from which he copied. Letters are punctuated regularly throughout the copy but there are very few vocalizations except for the *šadda* and double *fatḥa*, which we encounter from time to time. Two dots are regularly placed under the letter *yā*, even if it is *alif maqṣūra*. The catchwords (*muš‘ira*) are placed in the lower left corner of the versos of the folios (b) throughout the copy. The rectos (a) are numbered from beginning to end, using Arabic numerals in the upper left corner and Indian numerals in the upper middle.

The text includes two colophons. The first and undated colophon in which the title of *al-Iršād* is mentioned appears on fol. 198a13-16:

تم كتاب الإرشاد لتصحيح الاعتقاد والحمد لله رب العالمين وصلاته على خير خلقه محمد النبي  
وعلى آله الطاهرين وسلم كثيرًا.

The second colophon is on fol. 198a16-198b9. Here it states that *al-Iršād* was copied by Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Omar al-Qalī al-Ḥanafī al-Šinnāwī on 25 *Šarwāl* 1126 (3 November 1714):<sup>17</sup>

وقد وقع الفراغ منه على يد الفقير الحقير المعترف بالعجز والتقصير وهو محمد بن محمد بن محمد ابن عمر القلعي وطننا الحنفي مذهبًا الشنّاوي خرقه وطريقة في يوم السبت المبارك خامس  
عشرين يومًا خلون من شهر شوال الذي هو من شهر سنة ١١٢٦ غفر الله له ولوالدين ولمشاخه  
ومحبّيه ولقارئه ولسامعه ولمن دعا له بالمغفرة آمين والحمد لله رب العالمين .

The first lines of the introduction of the text are partially missing, due to three lacunae on fol. 1b. This has led al-‘Āmirī’s name to appear just as “Yūsuf al-‘Āmirī” and the title to be restricted to its first word, *al-Iršād*:<sup>18</sup>

Ṣ.M. Ḥaymī, *Fibris maḥṭūṭāt al-Dār al-kutub al-zāhiriyya: ‘Ulūm al-Qur’ān al-karīm*, Maṭbū‘āt maḡma‘ al-luḡa al-‘Arabiyya, Damascus 1984, vol. II, p. 65. The other ownership statement by al-Maḡribī is in a copy of al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baḡdādī’s *al-Sābiq wa-l-lāḥiq fī tabā‘ud mā bayna wafāt rāwīyayn ‘an šayḥ wāḥid* in the MS Chester Beatty Library 3508, also dated 1209; see Al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baḡdādī, *al-Sābiq wa-l-lāḥiq fī tabā‘ud mā bayna wafāt rāwīyayn ‘an šayḥ wāḥid*, ed. M. al-Zahrānī, Dār al-ṣamay‘ī, Riyāḍ 2000, pp. 36-8.

<sup>17</sup> The identity of the scribe seems unknown for now. Since the *nisba* “al-Qalī” is used for names of both Yaman and Maḡrib origin, it does not provide much information. The *Šinnāwīyya* order, to which the scribe belongs, is one of the sub-branches of the *Badawīyya* order, which was founded by Aḥmad al-Badawī (d. 675/1276) and is more commonly found in Egypt; see M. Kara, “Bedeviyye”, in *Turkish Encyclopedia of Islam* <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/bedeviyye> (accessed on January 13, 2023). Given the self-identification of the scribe as “al-Ḥanafī”, it appears less plausible that he is from Maḡrib.

<sup>18</sup> [...] shows the lacuna in the copy.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ وَبِهِ نَسْتَعِينُ [...] يَوْسُفَ الْعَامِرِي فِي الْإِرْشَادِ [...] وَفَقَّكَ اللَّهُ لِمُصَالِحِ الدَّارَيْنِ وَأَبَاحَ لَكَ [...] لِاقْتِنَاءِ مَكَارِمِ الْخِصَالِ وَسَهَّلَ عَلَيْكَ اِكْتِسَابَ مَحَامِدِ الْأَفْعَالِ. وَقَفْتُ – أَدَامَ اللَّهُ تَأْيِيدَكَ يَا ابْنَ الْأَفْضَلِ الْأَحْرَارِ وَالْأَجَلَةَ مِنَ الْأَخْيَارِ – عَلَى مَا اعْتَرَكَ مِنَ الشَّبَهَاتِ الَّتِي يَتَسَلَّقُ بِهَا الْمَوْلُدُونَ لِلْحَيْرَةِ فِي الْأَبْوَابِ الْاِعْتِقَادِيَّةِ.

In the name of God, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful, and with Him we seek help. [Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn] Yūsuf al-‘Āmirī [said] in *al-Iršād [li-taṣḥīḥ al-i’tiqād]* (*The Guidance to Rectifying Faith*): May God grant you success in [attaining] the welfare of both worlds, allow you [...] to acquire noble traits, and make it easy for you to obtain praiseworthy actions. I am aware – may God perpetuate your support, O son of the virtuous, free, and most valuable among the good people – of the doubts that afflict you, and [how] those who generate bewilderment climb into the issues about faith [using these doubts].

Although the title of the work does not appear in its complete form in the introduction, on fol. 10a3-4, al-‘Āmirī clearly states the book’s name: “So, this book was called as *al-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i’tiqād (iq qad luqqiba al-kitāb bi-l-Iršād li-taṣḥīḥ al-i’tiqād)*”.

Al-‘Āmirī states in the introduction that he wrote *al-Iršād* for someone he describes as “the son of the virtuous, free, and most valuable among the good people” (*ibn al-afāḍil al-aḥrār wa-l-aḡilla min al-abyār*) and adds that he did so following the addressee’s struggling with some bewildering doubts (*al-šubuhāt*) about faith. Then, al-‘Āmirī discusses three doubts that can cause confusion in one’s faith (ff. 1b-3b) before indicating that he will resolve these doubts in a logical manner, in order to give general and introductory information on religion (ff. 3b-4a).

The first of these doubts arise from the words of the Persian physician Burzūya in the introduction of his translation of *Kalīla wa Dimna* from Sanskrit to Persian. According to al-‘Āmirī, Burzūya thinks that the principles (*uṣūl*) of the different religions present too many differences among one another, which renders it impossible for one to examine and compare them in detail during their lifetime. In this circumstances, for Burzūya, believing in a religion means following something blindly, and it is therefore, he states, not appropriate for a wise man to blindly follow something without any justification for it (ff. 1b-2a).<sup>19</sup>

The second doubt, according to al-‘Āmirī, is expressed by “one of the leading figures of the dialecticians” (*ba’d a’immat al-ḡadaliyyīn*) against “theologians in general” (*‘alā*

<sup>19</sup> For Burzūya’s evaluations on religions, see ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Muqaffa’, *Kalīla wa Dimna*, ed. ‘A. ‘Azzām – Ṭ. Ḥusayn, Hindawi, Cairo 2014, p. 64. Al-‘Āmirī’s use of the sentence *a’nī bibā qawlahū* (“I mean his saying [in what follows]”) before quoting Burzūya’s words give the impression that it is a direct quotation. However, Burzūya’s views on religion in ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Muqaffa’s (d. 142/759) translation of *Kalīla wa Dimna* from the Pahlawī to Arabic differs from al-‘Āmirī’s quotation. This may for one of the following possibilities: (i) al-‘Āmirī had a different Arabic translation of *Kalīla wa Dimna* than that of Ibn al-Muqaffa; (ii) the use of the sentence *a’nī bibā qawlahū* does not correspond to a direct quotation; (iii) al-‘Āmirī read *Kalīla wa Dimna* directly from its Pahlawī version, before himself translating or paraphrasing the passages. As pointed out above, al-‘Āmirī states in the introduction of *al-Amad* that he wrote Persian works for political leaders, which would make it very plausible that he could read the *Kalīla wa Dimna* in its Pahlawī version.



*kāffa al-mutakallimīn*). The other three lacunae in this part of the copy make it difficult to completely read this discussion, but generally speaking, it focuses on an argument regarding the conversion from one faith to another. The text reads that many people who are “awake and distinguished” (*min dawī al-yaqaza wa-l-tabrīz*) leave the theological sect to which they belong for various reasons, switching to an opposite one. These people then consider their previous views as heresy, and their new sect as the “righteous and true path” (*bi-l-hudā wa-l-rašād*). In the face of this insecure situation, the one with doubt asks: “Then how can a wise man among us be happy and at peace with one of these views, feeling safe with this change and [intersectarian] transition?” (fol. 2b).

As for the third doubt, it is put in the mouth of an unidentified leader of the natural scientists (*aḥad ru’asā al-ṭabī’iyyīn*) whose target is *kalām* and the *mutakallimūn* in general. According to this natural scientist, although theologians have undertaken the task of confirming the existential purpose of religions, an examination of theological sects shows that their views contain many inconsistencies from the perspective of the “sciences”. This is followed by some examples of such views of theologians: the parts that make up the stone decompose as the stone rolls; the black color of the crow is constantly renewed at every moment; the non-existent is a thing that can be qualified as a substance, black, movement, or knowledge in the state of the non-existence; God does not create properties such as heating and lighting in the substance of fire, nor does He create properties such as humidification, cooling, fluidity, and quenching in the substance of water. Against these “scientifically” invalid views of the theologians, there are scientists/philosophers (*ḥukamā*) who have shown such superior intellectual capacity to have invented philosophical sciences that can never be ignored due to their benefit for humanity and the world, such as medicine, geometry, logic, music, and astronomy. Consequently, such invalid teachings by the theologians raise doubt about the religions they advocate (ff. 2b-3b).

Al-‘Āmirī states afterwards that upon the request of his addressee, whom he takes as being somewhat familiar with the philosophical sciences, he will resolve these doubts in the framework of the principles set forth in logic and not in a controversial manner, and through this promising to offer a general and introductory discourse on religion.

In the “Chapter on what is needed for any doubt [about faith] (*muftataḥ mā yuḥtāğ ilayhi fī kull al-ṣubuhāt*)” (ff. 4a-29b), al-‘Āmirī tries to determine the definition, purpose, and structure of religion (*milla*, and *dīn*) without referring to any particular one. He also indicates that the content of *al-Iršād* will be structured according to the discussion he presents here. There are six religions followed by people in the four climates (*al-aqālīm al-arba’a*) according to al-‘Āmirī. The *Qur’ān* (22:17) identifies them as being Islam, Judaism, Sabianism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism, and polytheism.<sup>20</sup> Although these six religions differ in terms of content, they are shaped around the following

<sup>20</sup> *Qur’ān*, 22:17: “As for the believers, those who follow the Jewish faith, the Sabians, the Christians, the Magians, and the idolaters, God will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection; God witnesses all things.” For the translation see M.A.S.A. Haleem (trans.), *The Qur’an: A New Translation*, Oxford U.P., Oxford 2005, p. 210. Al-‘Āmirī points out the difficulty of limiting the number of religions to six and he draws attention to the large number of religions in India in particular, but he argues all existing religions can be somehow reduced to these six (ff. 8a-b).

four components: creeds (*i'tiqādāt*), worship (*'ibādāt*), transactions (*mu'āmalāt*), and punishments (*mazāğir*). These in turn are divided into two groups based on the theoretical and practical power they are related to: the creeds are related to the human theoretical faculty (*al-quwwa al-naẓariyya*), while the other three are based on the practical faculty (*al-quwwa al-'amaliyya*).

Since *al-Irşād* aims “to show the right path in rectifying the matters related to faith”, al-‘Āmirī focuses on its “theoretical” issues. At this point, he identifies five principles of faith that are common to all six religions, referring again to the *Qur’ān* (4:136): God, prophets, books, angels, and the afterlife.<sup>21</sup> Then, he divides these five principles into a total of 12 sub-categories in order to establish a common framework for examining the principles of belief.

1. The Object of Worship (*ma'būd*)
  - a. His existence
  - b. His unity
  - c. His attributes
2. The Prophets (*rusul*)
  - a. The nature of prophecy
  - b. The necessity of prophecy
  - c. Differences between true and false prophets
  - d. The accuracy of the prophecy of the prophet
3. The [Revealed] Books (*kutub*)
  - a. Matters related to the discipline of *tafsīr*
  - b. Matters related to the discipline of *ta'wīl*
4. The Angels (*malā'ika*)
  - a. Existence of spiritual substances that are in the position of essences (*lubāb and ḥulāṣā*) compared to other beings
5. Life after Death (*ma'ād*)
  - a. Existence of constant reward and punishment
  - b. States of people after death

---

<sup>21</sup> *Qur’ān*, 4:136: “You who believe, believe in God and His Messenger and in the Scripture He sent down to His Messenger, as well as what He sent down before. Anyone who does not believe in God, His angels, His Scriptures, His messengers, and the Last Day has gone far, far astray”; see trans. Haleem (above, n. 20), p. 63. Al-‘Āmirī also states that when the Prophet Muḥammad spoke about the nature of belief he pointed to these five principles. He again refers to *Qur’ān* 2:285, where these five principles are mentioned: “The Messenger believes in what has been sent down to him from his Lord, as do the faithful. They all believe in God, His angels, His scriptures, and His messengers. ‘We make no distinction between any of His messengers,’ they say, ‘We hear and obey. Grant us Your forgiveness, our Lord. To You we all return!’”; see trans. Haleem (above, n. 20), p. 33.

Al-‘Āmirī follows this framework by giving to the *Iršād* a structure of six main sections, each having a title that starts with *muftataḥ* (literally means “introduction”, and “opening”):<sup>22</sup>

[1<sup>st</sup>] Chapter: What is needed for any doubt [about the faith] (*muftataḥ mā yuḥtāğ ilayhi fī kull al-šubuhāt*) (fol. 4b)

- A. Solution of the first doubt (fol. 13b)
- B. Solution of the second doubt (fol. 18a)
- C. Solution of the third doubt (fol. 22b)

[2<sup>nd</sup>] Chapter: What is needed for knowledge of the Creator (*muftataḥ mā yuḥtāğ ilayhi fī ma‘rifat al-šāni‘*) (fol. 29b)

- A. First premise (fol. 31b)
- B. Second premise (fol. 35b)
- C. On the existence (*anniyya*) of the Almighty Creator (fol. 42b)
- D. On proving the temporal creation of the world (*ḥadaṭ*) (fol. 46b)
- E. On determining (*ḥadd*) the doubts of heretics (*al-qā’ilīn bi-l-ilḥād*) (fol. 57a)
  - i. The heretical objection (fol. 58b)
  - ii. The heretical objection (fol. 59a)
  - iii. The heretical objection (fol. 60a)
  - iv. The heretical objection (fol. 62a)
  - v. The heretical objection (fol. 63b)
  - vi. The heretical objection (fol. 64b)

[3<sup>rd</sup>] Chapter: What is needed for the knowledge of the proof of the unity [of the Creator] (*muftataḥ mā yuḥtāğ ilā ma‘rifatihī bi-iṭbāt al-waḥdāniyya*) (fol. 67b)

- A. Claims of the Harranians (fol. 70a)
- B. [Claims] of the Greeks (fol. 78a)
- C. Claims of the Dualists (fol. 79a)
- D. Claims of the Zoroastrians (fol. 83b)
- E. Proving the unity (fol. 78b)
- F. Solution of the doubts of those who claim plurality (fol. 93b)

[4<sup>th</sup>] Chapter: What is needed for the knowledge of the God Almighty’s attributes (*muftataḥ mā yuḥtāğ ilā ma‘rifatihī fī šifāt al-Bārī ḡalla ḡalālubū*) (fol. 99b)

- A. On the attributes of the God Almighty (fol. 107a)

[5<sup>th</sup>] Chapter: What is needed for the knowledge of prophecies (*muftataḥ mā yuḥtāğ ilā ma‘rifatihī fī al-nubuwwāt*) (fol. 112a)

- A. On the nature of prophecy (fol. 121a)
- B. On the necessity of prophecy (fol. 128a)

<sup>22</sup> Al-‘Āmirī also uses the word *muftataḥ* to indicate the main chapters of his *al-I‘lām* and *al-Taqrīr*.

C. On the difference between true and false prophets (fol. 141b)

D. On the truth of the prophecy of Muḥammad (fol. 160b)

[6th] Chapter: What is needed for the knowledge of the revealed books (*muftataḥ mā yuḥtāğ ilā ma‘rifatihī min al-kutub al-munazzala*) (fol. 171a)

A. On the nature of the exegetical sources (fol. 181b)

B. On *ta’wīl* and its parts (fol. 182b)

C. On proving the angels (fol. 188a)

D. On proving the afterlife (fol. 192a)

The copy of *al-İrşād* ends with two very striking notes that both start with *qāla ṣāhib al-kitāb* (“The author of this book said”), and provide remarkable information on the fate of *al-İrşād* and on al-‘Āmirī’s life. The first note on ff. 197a9-198a4 reads as follows:

قال صاحب الكتاب: قد أتينا من جملة ما قمنا شرحه في أول الكتاب على الفنون الأحد عشر ولم يبق من أقسامه إلا الفن الواحد وهو القول في تعرف حال الإنسان بعد موته. ولما صححنا العزم على الشروع فيه لحقنا فجأة من شناعات الجدليين ومشاغبات الحشويين وتثويرهم الغاغة علينا وتهيجهم السلاطنة على البطش بنا وإعراض الإخوان لمخالفتهم عنا وحرص الفتاك على استلاب مهجتنا أمراً أئكلنا قوة العقل وأعد منا سلطان [١٩٧ ب] الفكر واضطرنا إلى قطع القول فيه وإيثار السكوت عنه. وقد عرفتم معشر إخواننا ممن قرأ هذا الكتاب أن الذي بقي علينا من شرح هذا الباب أمر في نهاية الصعوبة لأنه متصل بوصف أحوال البدء والإعادة وقد سماه الله تعالى في كتابه «نبأ عظيمًا» وهو قوله تعالى جدّه ﴿قُلْ هُوَ نَبَأٌ عَظِيمٌ ﴿١﴾ أَنْتُمْ عَنْهُ مُعْرِضُونَ ﴿٢﴾ مَا كَانَ لِي مِنْ عِلْمٍ بِالْمَلَأِ الْأَعْلَى إِذْ يَخْتَصِمُونَ ﴿٣﴾ إِنَّ يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ إِلَّا أَنَّمَا أَنَا نَذِيرٌ مُّبِينٌ ﴿٤﴾ إِذْ قَالَ رَبُّكَ لِلْمَلَائِكَةِ إِنِّي خَالِقٌ بَشَرًا مِنْ طِينٍ ﴿٥﴾ إِلَىٰ قَوْلِهِ ﴿إِنَّ هُوَ إِلَّا ذِكْرٌ لِلْعَالَمِينَ ﴿٦﴾ وَلَتَعْلَمُنَّ نَبَأَهُ بَعْدَ حِينٍ ﴿٧﴾ وَبِمَثَلِهِ قَوْلُهُ ﴿عَمَّ يَتَسَاءَلُونَ ﴿٨﴾ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ الْعَظِيمِ ﴿٩﴾ الَّذِي هُمْ فِيهِ مُخْتَلِفُونَ ﴿١٠﴾ كَلَّا سَيَعْلَمُونَ ﴿١١﴾ إِلَىٰ قَوْلِهِ ﴿يَوْمَ يُنْفَخُ فِي الصُّورِ فَتَأْتُونَ أَفْوَاجًا ﴿١٢﴾ وَفُتِحَتِ السَّمَاءُ فَكَانَتْ أَبْوَابًا ﴿١٣﴾﴾. وإن خطبًا يكون من الخطر والعظم بهذا المحل فلن يليق بنا الخوض فيه مع نقصان علمنا وضعف عقولنا إلا بخلاء من النزوغ ورخي من البال وإجماع من الفكر وسلامة من الخواطر ومهما ابتلي العاقل [١٩٨ أ] منّا بأضداد هذه الأحوال كان الترك له أمدح به والكف عنه أروح له. ومتى أؤدنا السلامة عن العوائق المخوفة رجونا -متع الله تعالى جدّه بحسن التوفيق- لإتمامه وما ذلك على الله بعزيز.

The author of this book said: We have completed the eleven chapters that we had explained in a general way at the beginning of the book. Of its divisions, only one chapter remains, which is about exploring the states of human being after his death. We were firmly resolved to start [this chapter] when we were suddenly befallen by the outrages of the dialecticians and the mischiefs of the literalists, by their provoking the mob against us, and their inciting the sultans to oppress us. [Moreover, our] friends turned away to oppose us, and the killer

strived to plunder our soul. This is how we were bereft of [our] intellectual faculty, deprived of [our] authority to think, and compelled to cease speaking about [the twelfth chapter] and to prefer to be silent about it. And you, our brothers who have read this book, already know that what remains for us to explain in this chapter is a very difficult subject, because it is related to the description of the states of the beginning and the return. God Almighty called it in his Book “momentous announcement.” It is what God Almighty said: “Say, ‘This message is a mighty one, yet you ignore it. I have no knowledge of what those on high discuss: it is only revealed to me that I am here to give clear warning.’ Your Lord said to the angels, ‘I will create a man from clay.’ (...) This is only a warning for all people. In time you will certainly come to know its truth” (Q 38:67-88).<sup>23</sup> Likewise, He said: “What are they asking about? The momentous announcement about which they differ. They will find out. (...) A Day when the Trumpet will sound and you will come forward in crowds, when the sky will open up like wide portals” (Q 78:1-19).<sup>24</sup> Given the seriousness and significance of the situation in this place, it is not appropriate for us to plunge into [this subject] with the deficiency of our knowledge and the weakness of our intellects, not till we are devoid of deviance, relaxed in mind, focused in thought, and safe from any idea that comes to our mind unexpectedly. Whenever the intelligent one suffers from the opposites of those states, leaving it (i.e., not to examine the subject) is more praiseworthy and desisting from it more comforting to him. And once we have secured ourselves from frightening obstacles, we hope – may God Almighty grant [you] with good success – to complete it, and that is not difficult for God.

According to the note, after discussing 11 of the 12 titles he identified at the beginning of the book on the principles of faith, when he was about to start the 12<sup>th</sup> title, in which he aimed to examine the states of human beings after death, al-‘Āmirī was harshly criticized by groups he refers to as “dialecticians” (*al-ğadaliyyīn*) and “literalists” (*al-ḥaṣawīyyīn*). Although the nature of the critique is unknown, it seems that the accusations against al-‘Āmirī intensified day after day, with these groups both provoking the mob (*al-ğāga*) against him, and pushing sultans (*al-salātina*) to arrest him. Al-‘Āmirī also states that he was abandoned by his friends in these difficult conditions and that he had to stop writing the rest of his work and remain silent since he was not in a position to think clearly.

He also draws attention in this note to the extremely difficult nature of the 12<sup>th</sup> subject and indicates that he did not find the opportunity to properly examine it. The topic of this chapter is presented as “momentous announcement” (*naba’ ‘azīm*) in a clear reference to the Qur’anic wording for the afterlife. For him, this issue necessitates comprehensive scrutiny of the entire progression of existence from the beginning to its eventual return to its ultimate principle (*al-bad’ wa-l-ī’āda*); here, he partially quotes the verses from Qur’ān 38:67-88 and 78:1-19 to justify the significance of the subject. Al-‘Āmirī completes the note by recalling the difficulty of his situation and prays to be able to complete this foregone subject once he is freed from these “frightening obstacles” (*al-‘awā’iq al-muḥawwifa*) (ff. 197a-198a).

Unfortunately, the scarcity of information on al-‘Āmirī’s life does not allow us to know the details of events he mentions in this note. However, one can find some information on the difficulties he encountered in Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī’s (d. 414/1023)

<sup>23</sup> Trans. Haleem (above, n. 20), pp. 293-4.

<sup>24</sup> Trans. Haleem (above, n. 20), p. 405.

*al-Imtā' wa-l-mu'ānasa*. Al-Tawhīdī presents on the 17<sup>th</sup> night a discussion between Abū Sulaymān al-Maqdisī al-Bustī, one of the supposed authors of the *Rasā'il Iḥwān al-ṣafā'*, and al-Ġarīrī, the attendant (*ġulām*) of Ibn Ṭarāra.<sup>25</sup> Strongly opposing al-Maqdisī's approach that advocates reconciling religion and philosophy, al-Ġarīrī mentions al-ʿĀmirī among the philosophers who share al-Maqdisī's view:

Also, this is the very same that al-ʿĀmirī attempted, yet he was constantly driven from one land to another, his life was threatened, and there were people waiting for to kill him. At one time he would protect himself at the court of Ibn al-ʿAmīd, at another he would seek refuge with the military commander in Nīsābūr, and a third time he would approach the ordinary people with books he had composed in support of Islam. Yet despite that, he was suspected and accused of heresy, of belief in a pre-eternal world, and of talking about matter, about form, time, and space, and other such nonsense, things that God has not sent down in His book, that His prophets were not summoned for, and that His community has never entered into. And yet he spoke gently to people who held every [kind of] heretical innovation (*bid'ā*). Each of them would sit with him, and he would present his teachings to anyone who assumed an inner meaning for the literal one and an outward meaning for the inner one.<sup>26</sup>

Since *al-Imtā'* records the nightly sessions of al-Tawhīdī and Ibn Sa'dān (d. 375/985-6), and that the latter's office as vizier of the Būyid Şamşām al-Dawla (r. 372-376/983-987) did not last more than one or two years after his appointment in 373/983, it is possible to consider that the event al-Ġarīrī mentions happened no later than 374/984. In this case, these events probably took place during al-ʿĀmirī's stay in Ray and Nīsābūr. ʿĀmirī was then living in Ray under the patronage of the Būyid vizier Abū al-Faḥ Ibn al-ʿAmīd (d. 366/976), whom he accompanied during the short stay of the vizier in Bağdād in 364/974.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, if we continue to follow al-Ġarīrī's narration, some of al-ʿĀmirī's views must have led to negative reactions during his stay in Ray, which would have forced him to take shelter from such attacks with his patron, Ibn al-ʿAmīd.

The person al-Ġarīrī refers to as “the military commander (*şāhib al-ğayş*) in Nīsābūr” is identified by Ḥalīfāt as probably being Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sīmğūr (d. 378/989).<sup>28</sup> A member of the Sīmğūrīs, a line of Turkish military commanders and governors for the Sāmānids in the 4<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> century Ḥurāsān,<sup>29</sup> Abū al-Ḥasan served as

<sup>25</sup> That is Abū al-Farağ al-Mu'āfā ibn Zakariyyā al-Ġarīrī al-Nahrawānī (d. 390/1000), the *qādī* of Bağdād. I follow Griffel – Hachmeir regarding the reading the names al-Ġarīrī and Ibn Ṭarāra, instead of al-Ḥarīrī and Ibn Ṭarāra, as appears in the text respectively; see F. Griffel – K. Hachmeir, “Prophets as Physician of the Souls: A Dispute About the Relationship Between Reason and Revelation Reported by al-Tawhīdī in his *Book of Delightful and Intimate Conversations (Kitāb al-Imtā' wa-l-mu'ānasa)*”, *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* LXII (2010-11), pp. 223-57, at p. 242, nn. 52-53.

<sup>26</sup> Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawhīdī, *al-Imtā' wa-l-mu'ānasa*, ed. A. Amīn – A. al-Zayn, Lağnat al-Ta'lif wa-l-Taḥqīq wa-l-Naşr, Cairo 1939-44, vol. II, pp. 15-16. I quote the translation of Griffel – Hachmeir in “Prophets as Physician of the Souls” (above, n. 25), pp. 246-47.

<sup>27</sup> Wakelnig, “Neoplatonic Development” (above, n. 5), p. 256.

<sup>28</sup> Ḥalīfāt, *Rasā'il*, pp. 95-96.

<sup>29</sup> For Sīmğūrīs see E. Merçil, “Simcüriler”, in *Turkish Encyclopedia of Islam*, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/simcüriler> (accessed on 15 January, 2023).

commander at various intervals over 336-378/948-989, during which he protected scholars and organized sessions for scientific and literary discussions among scholars.<sup>30</sup>

Al-Ġarīrī’s remark that al-‘Āmirī composed books supporting Islam in order to counter the criticisms made against him brings to mind his *al-I‘lām*. We know that al-‘Āmirī wrote *al-I‘lām* for someone he referred to as “Abū Naṣr”.<sup>31</sup> Rowson and Ḥalīfāt both argued that this “Abū Naṣr” is either the historian Abū Naṣr al-‘Utbī, the uncle of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-‘Utbī (vizierate 367-372/977-982), vizier of the Sāmānid amīr Nuḥ ibn Maṣṣūr (r. 365-387/976-997), or Abū Naṣr Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ismā‘īl al-Mikālī, one of leading figures of Nīsābūr.<sup>32</sup>

The fact that al-‘Āmirī refers to *al-I‘lām* in *al-Iršād* and to *al-Irsād* in *al-I‘lām* supports the likelihood that these two works were written during the same period and in the same region. On the other hand, we know that al-‘Āmirī refers to *al-Iršād* in his *al-Taqrīr*, which he composed for the abovementioned Abū al-Ḥusayn al-‘Utbī possibly in Buḥārā. However, in his *al-Irsād*, al-‘Āmirī does not refer neither to *al-Taqrīr*, nor to *al-Amad*, which he wrote in 375/985-6 also in Buḥārā. Consequently, it seems that the campaign against al-‘Āmirī took place during his stay in Ray and Nīsābūr around 360-367/970-977, before his last stay in Buḥārā; these events are what caused *al-Iršād* to remain incomplete.

The second note, which immediately follows the first one on fol. 198a5-13, serves as a cautionary message by al-‘Āmirī to its future readers about copies and their circulations:

وقال صاحب الكتاب: قد استعجلني بعض أصحابي إلى تمكينهم من انتساخ ما كنت أتممه من أبوابه أولاً فأولاً قبل التصفح لمجموعه فاطلبتهم بالمراد منه ثم لما استتب لي مطالعته أوجب حكم التصنيف يعتبر المأخذ الكثيرة منه أو تقديم المؤخر من تذاكيره وهذه هي النسخة التي توليته تهذيبها بعد التصفح لأبوابها فمن وقعت إليه نسخة مخالفة لهذا الترتيب فليعلم أنها هي النسخة الأولى وليمهد لي العذر فيه والله ولي الصنع والخيرة.

The author of the book said: Some of my friends have urged me to enable them to copy one by one the [book’s] chapters I had completed before reviewing them as a whole. I asked them to give it back. Then, as its perusing was proceeding well for me, the composition [of the book] required [me] to take many sources into consideration or to give priority to the notes placed in the later [parts of it]. And this is the copy that I undertook to revise after reviewing its chapters. Whoever comes across a copy with a different arrangement from this one, let him know that he is dealing with the first copy, and let him accept my apology for this. God it is who bestows creation and what is best.

Al-‘Āmirī states in the note that some of his friends were in a hurry to take the chapters he had completed one by one before he had a chance to review the entire book, and that he took this copy back from them to make the necessary revisions. He emphasizes that this copy

<sup>30</sup> In his *Iyār al-nazar fī ‘ilm al-ğadal*, the famous Aš‘arite theologian ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Bağdādī (d. 429/1037-38) reports his discussion with al-‘Āmirī before Niẓām al-Dawla Abū ‘Alī ibn Nāṣir al-Dawla Abū al-Ḥasan, who is exactly the same Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Simğūr, on the divisions of the categories; see ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Bağdādī, *Iyār al-nazar fī ‘ilm al-ğadal*, ed. A.M. ‘Arrūbī, Asfār, Kuwait 2019, pp. 120-1.

<sup>31</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *al-I‘lām*, p. 74 Ġurāb.

<sup>32</sup> Al-‘Āmirī, *al-Amad*, p. 12 (Rowson’s introduction); Ḥalīfāt, *Rasā’il*, pp. 91-93.

of *al-Irşād* was produced after all sections were examined and necessary organizations were made, warning readers coming across copies with a different structure that they comprise the “first draft”, not the final one, and he asks for forgiveness for this confusion.

Another particular element that makes *al-Irşād* very important for al-‘Āmirī studies is his references to his own works. The work he most frequently cites in *al-Irşād* is *al-Ibāna ‘an ‘ilal al-diyāna* (7 references), followed by *al-Nask al-‘aqlī wa-l-taṣawwuf al-millī* (5 references), *al-I‘lām bi-manāqib al-Islām* (3 references), and *al-Ibṣār wa-l-mubṣar* (2 references). He also refers to his commentaries on Aristotle’s *al-Burhān* (*Posterior Analytics*) (2 references), *al-Ġadal* (*Topics*), *al-Ḥaṭāba* (*Rhetoric*), *Analytics*,<sup>33</sup> and *Sam‘ al-kiyān* (*Physics*),<sup>34</sup> which, with the exception of his commentary on *al-Burhān*, have never been mentioned among al-‘Āmirī’s works until now.<sup>35</sup>

It is clear that, when edited, *al-Irşād* will provide us with important clues to understanding al-‘Āmirī’s teachings more accurately. In addition to many points that will support the comparative analysis of religions that he proposed in his *al-I‘lām*, it also demonstrates how al-‘Āmirī, as a philosopher, studied issues at the intersection of theology and philosophy by confronting theologians and supporters of literal interpretation. While al-‘Āmirī’s metaphysical views have often been studied through his works on divine destiny and *al-Fuṣūl*, thanks to *al-Irşād*, we have now the opportunity to more elaborately understand his views on the existence, unity, and attributes of God, and his relationship with the world. Moreover, the copious references to the history of religions, prominent figures of Greek philosophy, and various intellectual schools in the history of Islam extensively dispersed throughout the book make *al-Irşād* immensely significant for understanding al-‘Āmirī’s philosophical views and comprehending the philosophical milieu of Islam in the 4<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> century.

---

<sup>33</sup> While al-‘Āmirī refers to his commentary on *Kitāb Anālūtīqā* (the scribe incorrectly wrote it as *Abūlūtīqā*) (fol. 39a10), elsewhere he refers to the commentary he wrote on *Kitāb al-Taḥlīlāt* (fol. 174a4-5). With these two different references, it is possible that al-‘Āmirī meant the *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics* together, which are known as *Kitāb al-Qiyās* and *Kitāb al-Burhān* respectively in the Islamic world, and in this case, we conclude that he wrote commentary on both of these works of Aristotle.

<sup>34</sup> In *al-Irşād*, al-‘Āmirī mentions his commentaries on the first, second, and fourth chapters of Aristotle’s *Physics* (ff. 49a11-12, 70b13, 96a11-12). Whether al-‘Āmirī wrote complete commentary covering the other parts of *Physics*, which consists of eight chapters in total, is still unknown.

<sup>35</sup> *Al-Irşād* includes the names of two particular people, whose identities would likely increase our limited knowledge about al-‘Āmirī’s life. However, I have not yet been able to identify them. The first is Abū Ḡassān \*Makka\* ibn \*Naṣr\* al-A‘rābī, of whom al-‘Āmirī reports that he asked him about the etymology of the word *milla* (fol. 7a3-4). The other name is Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Buḥārī. In the context of the miracles showing the prophecy of Muḥammad, al-‘Āmirī writes “Our master (*ṣayḥunā*) *faqīh* Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Buḥārī – may God have mercy on him – explained this issue in detail (*wa-qad istaqṣābā*) in his work known as *A‘lām al-nu-buwwa*” (fol. 161b12-14).



## Appendix

## Introduction of al-Iršād

[١ ب] بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ وَبِهِ نَسْتَعِينُ  
 [...] يوسف العامري في الإرشاد [...] وفكك الله لمصالح الدارين وأباح لك [...] لاقتناء مكارم  
 الخصال وسهّل عليك اكتساب محامد الأفعال. وقفت -أدام الله تأييدك<sup>1</sup> يا ابن الأفاضل الأحرار  
 والأجلة من الأخيار- على ما اعتراك من الشبهات التي يتسلق بها المولّدون للحيرة في الأبواب  
 الاعتقادية، إحديتها الشبهة التي أوردتها برزويه<sup>2</sup> المتطبّب<sup>3</sup> في مفتاح الكتاب الذي تولّى نقله  
 من لسان الهند إلى لسان الفرس وهو المعروف بكليلة ودمنة<sup>4</sup> أعني بها قوله «إن الاختلافات  
 الواقعة في الأصول المليّة قد بلغت من الكثرة إلى حدّ لا يحصى عددها، بل لن تفي الأعمار  
 لاستقراءها فضلاً عن تأمل الأدلّة عليها. ثم كل واحد من أرباب النحل يدّعي أنّه هو المتمسك  
 بالحقّ وأنّ كافّة من خالفه قد انهمك في الضلال. فإذا كانت الأعمار البشرية<sup>5</sup> قاصرة بأربابها  
 عن تتبّع جميع المذاهب وكانت [٢أ] العقول الجزئية غير كافية لغلي ما يورد لها من صنوف  
 الحجج وكان العاقل غير مسوّغ له القنوع بدرجة المقلّد في دينه المتبّع لما اتّفق له منه ولا سيّما  
 إذا عُرِفَتْ أنّ صورة المقلّد تكون شبيهة بصورة من عوتب على إهماله حسن آداب المؤاكلة  
 فذكر أنّه متقيّل أباه فيه، فمن أين يلحق الإنسان شأؤ<sup>6</sup> المستبصر في دينه وبأية جهة مثال روح  
 المستيقن بعقيدته؟»<sup>7</sup>  
 والثانية ما أوردته بعض أئمّة الجدليين من السؤال المتوجّه على كافّة المتكلمين أعني به قوله  
 «إنّ الواحد فالواحد مّن يشهد له بالرححان وعقله لما \*صفتها حد\* معتقداً لإحدى هذه النحل  
 المشهورة ومحتجاً [...] ثم يبيّن [...] عنها إلى نقيضها إمّا لرؤية قد أدّته إليها وإمّا [...] اعتقاده الأول  
 إلى الكفر والإلحاد وشاهداً لاعتقاده الثاني بالهدى والرشاد وهذا<sup>8</sup> <ما> قد شاهدناه في عدد من  
 ذوي اليقظة والتبريز أعني به النقلة عن المذهب إلى المذهب. ثم لا نشك أنّ الابتلاء بمثله [٢ ب]

1 تأييدك  
 2 براويه  
 3 المتطبّب  
 4 ودمته  
 5 البشرية  
 6 شاءو  
 7 بنغيده  
 8 هذاي

- في اعتقاده الثاني، بل وفي جميع ما يتفق له من الاعتقادات الأخر غير مأمون عليه. فإذا العاقل منا متى يسعد بأمنه من التقلب والتحوال وكيف تفيد الطمأنينة بإحدى<sup>9</sup> هذه الأقوال.
- والثالث ما استطال أحد رؤساء الطبيعيين من الطعن المتوجّه وإعانة أرباب الدين أعني به قوله «إننا لا نشكّ أنّ الذين انتدبوا لتأكيد غر<sup>ض</sup> الأديان هم الفرقة المنتحلة لصناعة الكلام ثمّ ما من طائفة منهم إلا ومتى فتشت أقاويلها انكشفت أباطيلها، بل لا نحتاج في تحقيق ركافة دعاويهم 5 والانتباه على سخافة مبادئهم إلى فضل قوّة في النقل نحو ادّعاء بعضهم تفكك أجزاء الحجر عند دورانه وادّعاء الآخرين تجدد سواد الغراب دائماً في آثائه وادّعاء الآخرين أنّ ما لا وجود له أصلاً وهو معدوم على الإطلاق قد يجوز أن يكون في حال عدمه جوهرًا أو سوادًا أو حركة أو علمًا وادّعاء الآخرين أنّ الله تعالى جدّه ما خلق في جوهر النار قوّة الإحراق والانضاج والتسخين [أ3] والإضاءة ولا في جوهر الماء قوّة الترطيب والتبريد والسيلان وتسكين العطش. هذه وأشكالها من أصولهم 10 الواهية التي يدلّ أوائل سماعها على ضعف عقول المنتمين إليها. ثمّ بإزائهم قوم قد بلغوا من الكمال في العقول إلى نهاية أمكنهم بها استخراج هذه الصناعات<sup>10</sup> الحكميّة كالتبّ والهندسة والمنطق والموسيقى والتنجيم وغيرها ما لا غنية للعباد والبلاد عن الاستعانة بها بل يضطرّ قوام العالم في مصالحه إليها ولن يجوز لنا أن نظنّ بهؤلاء الكلمة أنّهم مهمما<sup>11</sup> كانوا أفنوا<sup>12</sup> من العقول الوافرة بل خصّوا<sup>13</sup> بمكانه من العنايات الصادقة قد تبدّوا<sup>14</sup> عن أبواب ليس يغني عنها النازلون من 15 التخلف بالمحلّ الذي وصفناه فلو أنّ اليقين وروحه في الأصول لاو...ة كان مرجوًا وض...ل...ه. لكان الأولى بأجلّة<sup>15</sup> الحكماء والمعتنين بمصالح أو أنّ يكونوا<sup>16</sup> هم السابقين إلى من دون المتكلمين الذين ليس يوجد ولا واحد منهم بدال من نفسه على براعة تؤدّي به إلى استنباط [ب3] صناعة أو إثارة حكمة».
- فهذه هي الشبهات العانية التي شكوت تعلق المجاز بها ووفرت حاجتك إلى من يعتنق حلّها 20 ثمّ وصفت أنّك لا ترضى أن يكون حلّها<sup>17</sup> مؤنسًا على توهيمات المجادلين ومعارضات المشاغبين بل يجب أن يكون ذلك مبنياً على مقدّمات مصدّقة لأصول الحقائق ومقاييس ألفة لحدود المنطق ولا يقتصر أيضًا بالتأليف على جلّ هذه الشبهات الثلاثة دون أن ينضاف إليه شرح ما يضطرّ إلى معرفته من الأصول المليّة والمآخذ الدينية وما وقع من الخلاف في أركانها بين الأوّلين والآخريين وما

<sup>9</sup> بأحد

<sup>10</sup> الفناعات

<sup>11</sup> معما

<sup>12</sup> افنو

<sup>13</sup> خصّو

<sup>14</sup> تبدّو

<sup>15</sup> باجيلة

<sup>16</sup> يكونو

<sup>17</sup> حلّها

يجوز أن يعتمد في تصحيحها من الحجج والبراهين . وسألتنني مع الوفاء لك بما التمسته والإتمام لما أملتته أن أجعل التصنيف مجنبًا عن المطالبات الغامضة والمجادلات الوحشة . ولعمري أن الشبهات الثلاثة التي أومأت إليها ووصفت حاجتك إلى حلها المعدودة من الآفات المحقرة والعوارض المشككة وحقّ لأمثالك الذين شاموا [ ٤ أ ] طرفًا من الأصول الحكمية وشذوا في نبذ من العلوم الحقيقية بل فازوا بخطوة من الفهم الزكي وكلفوا بالاختصاص للعزم القوي أن يهتموا لهذه الشأن ويتطلبوا له هذا الشرح والتبيان ولا سيما إن عرفت أن الدافية قد أعضل وأن الخطب بمكانه قد استفحل وأن أعداء دين الحق قد طمعوا في استغواء الخواص فضلًا عن الضعفة من العوام وأنا لما أدين الله تعالى به من نظرة الدعوة الإلهية والملة الحنيفية بمقدار ما أيّدت به من العلم والمعرفة وأكرمت بمزيته من رونق الحكمة وخصوصًا في أجل ما يتقرب به إلى الله تعالى وأنهم بما يعود بصلاح الآخرة والأولى ملتزم صرف السعي إليه وناقض أكثر شغلي عليه بل موجب إسعافك به وراغب إلى الله سبحانه في حسن التوفيق له وإيّاه أسأل أن يجعل لك ولأشباhek من عشاق الحق وأهله ومبغضي الباطل وحزبه من العقول الصحيحة واعظًا وراقيبًا ومن النفوس القويمة سامعًا ومطيعًا إنه [ ٤ ب ]<sup>18</sup> الموفق لعباده ولا قوة إلا به .

كّرت «إنه» في أول الورق ٤ ب<sup>18</sup>

