

*History of Muslim Historiography*², Leiden, 1968, pp. 152-3 and index. Idem, s.v. "Ibn Abī Tāhir," *EP*. Sezgin, *GAS I*, pp. 348-49. *Sechster Band des Kitāb Bagdād*, ed. and German tr. H. Keller, Leipzig, 1908 (with intro.), ed. Moḥammad Zāhed Kawṭar, Cairo, 1949. See also *DMBE II*, pp. 672-76.

(C. EDMUND BOSWORTH)

EBN AMĀJŪR. See BANŪ AMĀJŪR.

EBN ‘ĀMER. See ‘ABD-ALLĀH B. ‘ĀMER.

EBN AL-‘AMĪD, cognomen of two famous viziers of the 4th/10th century: Abu’l-Faḏl and his son Abu’l-Faḥ. The father of the first was called Ḥoseyn. Tawḥīdī claims that this Ḥoseyn was of humble origin, a *naḳḳāl* (wheat-sifter) in the grain market of Qom (*Aḳlāq al-wazīrayn*, p. 82). This, however, is probably not true. After occupying major administrative posts, Ḥoseyn was appointed chief of the chancery (*dīwān al-rasā’el*) at the court of the Sāmānid amir Nūḥ b. Naṣr in Khorasan and was given two honorific titles: "Amīd" (chief; doyen) and "Shaikh."

Not much is known about Ḥoseyn’s son, Abu’l-Faḏl before he became the vizier of Rokn-al-Dawla, the Buyid sultan who ruled a district which included Ray, Hamadān, and Isfahan; but the fact that he occupied such a post indicates that he took the same line as his father. His early education combined Arabic poetry and Greek sciences and philosophy. His fame as a vizier spread far and wide, and many poets and men of letters were attracted to his court. The poet Motanabbī in one of his panegyrics speaks of him as one who had met Aristotle, Alexander, and Ptolemy. Meskawayh and Tawḥīdī both confirm his interest in philosophy, but the latter adds that Abu’l-Faḏl did not hesitate to kill his adversaries—a trait not quite befitting a philosopher. During his vizirate, Abu’l-Faḏl won several honorific titles: "Ra’īs," "Ostād," "the second Jāḥeẓ," etc.

Apart from a collection of epistles and some poetry, Abu’l-Faḏl left no books. Tawḥīdī copied some wise sayings and proverbs from a book by him entitled *al-Ḳalq wa’ l-ḳolq*, but this book remained in draft form (*Aḳlāq al-wazīrayn*, p. 328; *al-Baṣā’er VI*, p. 165). In his style, he was not as fond of *saj’* (rhymed prose) as his contemporary Ṣāḥeb b. ‘Abbād was. He admired Jāḥeẓ’s style a great deal, but could not emulate it well. This was due, according to Tawḥīdī, to the fact that Abu’l-Faḏl lacked several of the natural and circumstantial qualities which Jāḥeẓ possessed (*Emtā’*, I, p. 66).

When Abu’l-Faḏl died in 360/971, he was succeeded in the vizirate by his son of twenty-two years, Abu’l-Faḥ, who served two Buyid sultans: Rokn-al-Dawla and his son Mo’ayyad-al-Dawla. Abu’l-Faḥ was a good prose writer, in the manner of the

secretaries of the *dīwān* (q.v.), and was highly respected by the military. For this reason, he was given the title "Ḍu’l-kefāyatayn," that is, master of both the pen and the sword. Six years into his vizirate, in 366/977, he was killed after having fallen out of favor with the powerful Buyid sultan ‘Azod-al-Dawla; he had also indulged excessively in pleasures, to the point of being oblivious to the intrigues being concocted around him. According to Ṣābī, however, his violent end was due to two factors: a) Rokn-al-Dawla’s lenient treatment of him, and b) the fact that he had inherited rather than earned the vizirate (*Ṭa’ālebī, Yatīma II*, p. 217).

Bibliography: (For cited works not given in detail, see "Short References.") Abū Hayyān Tawḥīdī, *Aḳlāq al-wazīrayn*, ed. M. b. Tāwīt al-Ṭanjī, Damascus, 1965. Idem, *al-Emtā’ wa’l-mo’ānasa*, 3 vols., ed. A. Amīn and A. Zayn, Cairo, 1939-44. Idem, *al-Baṣā’er wa’l-ḳaḳā’er* 10 vols., ed. W. Qādī, Beirut, 1988. Meskawayh, *Tajāreb al-omam*, 3 vols., Cairo, 1914. Ṭa’ālebī, *Yatīma*, 4 vols., ed. M. M. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd. Ebn Ḳallekān, *Wafayāt al-a’yān*, 8 vols., ed. E. ‘Abbās, Beirut, 1968-72. Yāqūt-al-Ḥamawī, *Mo’jam al-odabā’*, 7 vols., ed. E. ‘Abbās, Beirut, 1993.

(IHSAN ABBAS)

EBN AL-‘ARABĪ, MOHYĪ-al-DĪN Abū ‘Abd-Allāh Moḥammad Ṭā’ī Ḥātemī (b. 17 Ramaẓān 560/28 July 1165; d. 22 Rabī’ II 638/10 November 1240), the most influential Sufī author of later Islamic history, known to his supporters as *al-Šayḳ al-akbar*, "the Greatest Master." Although the form "Ebn al-‘Arabī," with the definite article, is found in his autographs and in the writings of his immediate followers, many later authors referred to him as 'Ebn ‘Arabī', without the article, to differentiate him from Qāzī Abū Bakr Ebn al-‘Arabī (d. 543/1148).

Life, views, terminology.

He was born in Murcia in Spain, and his family moved to Seville when he was eight. He experienced an extraordinary mystical "unveiling" (*kašf*) or "opening" (*foṭūḥ*) at about the age of fifteen; this is mentioned in his famous account of his meeting with Averroes (Addas, pp. 53-58; Chittick, 1989, pp. xiii-xiv). Only after this original divine "attraction" (*jaḍba*) did he begin disciplined Sufī practice (*solūḳ*), perhaps at the age of twenty (Addas, p. 53; Chittick, 1989, pp. 383-84). He studied the traditional sciences, Hadīth in particular, with many masters; he mentions about ninety of these in an autobiographical note (Badawī). In 597/1200 he left Spain for good, with the intention of making the *ḥajj*. The following year in Mecca he began writing his monumental *al-Fotūḥāt al-makkīya*; the title, "The Meccan Openings," alludes to the inspired nature of the book. In 601/1204 he set off from Mecca on his way to Anatolia with Majd-al-Dīn Eshāq, whose son Ṣadr-al-Dīn Qūnawī (606-73/1210-74) would be his

most influential disciple. After moving about for several years in the central Islamic lands, never going as far as Persia, he settled in Damascus in 620/1223. There he taught and wrote until his death.

Ebn al-‘Arabī was an extraordinarily prolific author. Osman Yahia counts 850 works attributed to him, of which 700 are extant and over 450 probably genuine. The second edition of the *Fotūḥāt* (Cairo, 1329/1911) covers 2,580 pages, while Yahia’s new critical edition is projected to include thirty-seven volumes of about five hundred pages each (vol. 14, Cairo, 1992). By comparison, his most famous work, *Foṣūṣ al-ḥekam* (Bezels of wisdom), is less than 180 pages long. Scores of his books and treatises have been published, mostly in uncritical editions; several have been translated into European languages.

Although Ebn al-‘Arabī claims that the *Fotūḥāt* is derived from divine “openings”—mystical unveilings—and that the *Foṣūṣ* was handed to him in a vision by the Prophet, he would certainly admit that he expressed his visions in the language of his intellectual milieu. He cites the Koran and Hadith constantly; it would be no exaggeration to say that most of his works are commentaries on these two sources of the tradition. He sometimes quotes aphorisms from earlier Sufis, but never long passages. There is no evidence that he quotes without ascription, in the accepted style, from other authors. He was thoroughly familiar with the Islamic sciences, especially *tafsīr*, *feqh*, and *kalām*. He does not seem to have studied the works of the philosophers, though many of his ideas are prefigured in the works of such authors as the *Ekwān-al-Ṣafā’* (q.v.; Rosenthal; Takeshita). He mentions on several occasions having read the *Eḥyā’* of Ḡazālī, and he sometimes refers to such well known Sufi authors as Qoṣayrī.

In short, Ebn al-‘Arabī was firmly grounded in the mainstream of the Islamic tradition; the starting points of his discussions would have been familiar to the ‘*olamā’* in his environment. At the same time he was enormously original, and he was fully aware of the newness of what he was doing. Most earlier Sufis had spoken about theoretical issues (as opposed to practical teachings) in a brief or allusive fashion. Ebn al-‘Arabī breaks the dam with a torrent of exposition on every sort of theoretical issue related to the “divine things” (*elāhīyāt*). He maintains a uniformly high level of discourse and, in spite of going over the same basic themes constantly, he offers a different perspective in each fresh look at a question. For example, in the *Foṣūṣ al-ḥekam*, each of twenty-seven chapters deals with the divine wisdom revealed to a specific divine word—a particular prophet. In each case, the wisdom is associated with a different divine attribute. Hence, each prophet represents a different mode of knowing and experiencing the reality of God. Most of the 560 chapters of the *Fotūḥāt* are rooted in similar principles. Each chapter represents a “standpoint” or “station” (*maqām*) from which reality, or a specific dimension of real-

ity, can be surveyed and brought into the overarching perspective of the “oneness of all things” (*tawḥīd*).

Ebn al-‘Arabī assumed and then verified through his own personal experience the validity of the revelation that was given primarily in the Koran and secondarily in the Hadith. He objected to the limiting approaches of *kalām* and philosophy, which tied all understanding to reason (‘*aql*), as well as to the approach of those Sufis who appealed only to unveiling (*kaṣf*). It may be fair to say that his major methodological contribution was to reject the stance of the *kalām* authorities, for whom *taṣbīḥ* (declaring God similar to creation) was a heresy, and to make *taṣbīḥ* the necessary complement of *tanzīḥ* (declaring God incomparable with creation). This perspective leads to an epistemology that harmonizes reason and unveiling.

For Ebn al-‘Arabī, reason functions through differentiation and discernment; it knows innately that God is absent from all things—*tanzīḥ*. In contrast, unveiling functions through imagination, which perceives identity and sameness rather than difference; hence unveiling sees God’s presence rather than his absence—*taṣbīḥ*. To maintain that God is either absent or present is, in his terms, to see with only one eye. Perfect knowledge of God involves seeing with both eyes, the eye of reason and the eye of unveiling (or imagination). This is the wisdom of the prophets; it is falsified by those theologians, philosophers, and Sufis who stress either *tanzīḥ* or *taṣbīḥ* at the expense of the other.

If Ebn al-‘Arabī’s methodology focuses on harmonizing two modes of knowing, his actual teachings focus more on bringing out the nature of human perfection and the means to achieve it. Although the term *al-ensān al-kāmel* “the perfect human being” can be found in earlier authors, it is Ebn al-‘Arabī who makes it a central theme of Sufism. Briefly, perfect human beings are those who live up to the potential that was placed in Adam when God “taught him all the names” (Koran 2:30). These names designate every perfection found in God and the cosmos (*al-‘ālam*, defined as “everything other than God”). Ultimately, the names taught to Adam are identical with the divine attributes, such as life, awareness, desire, power, speech, generosity, and justice. By actualizing the names within themselves, human beings become perfect images of God and achieve God’s purpose in creating the universe (Chittick, 1989, especially chap. 20).

Even though all perfect human beings—i.e., the prophets and the “friends” (*awliā’*) of God—are identical in one respect, each of them manifests God’s uniqueness in another respect. In effect, each is dominated by one specific divine attribute—this is the theme of the *Foṣūṣ*. Moreover, the path to human fulfillment is a never-ending progression whereby people come to embody God’s infinite attributes successively and with ever-increasing intensity. Most of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s writings are devoted to explaining

the nature of the knowledge that is unveiled to those who travel through the ascending stations or standpoints of human perfection. God’s friends are those who inherit their knowledge, stations, and states from the prophets, the last of whom was Moḥammad. When Ebn al-‘Arabī claimed to be the “seal of the Moḥammadan friends” (*ḵātam al-awliā’ al-moḥammadīya*), he was saying that no one after him would inherit fully from the prophet Moḥammad. Muslim friends of God would continue to exist until the end of time, but now they would inherit from other prophets inasmuch as those prophets represent certain aspects of Moḥammad’s all-embracing message (Chodkiewicz, 1986).

The most famous idea attributed to Ebn al-‘Arabī is *waḥdat al-wojūd* “the oneness of being.” Although he never employs the term, the idea is implicit throughout his writings. In the manner of both theologians and philosophers, Ebn al-‘Arabī employs the term *wojūd* to refer to God as the Necessary Being. Like them, he also attributes the term to everything other than God, but he insists that *wojūd* does not belong to the things found in the cosmos in any real sense. Rather, the things borrow *wojūd* from God, much as the earth borrows light from the sun. The issue is how *wojūd* can rightfully be attributed to the things, also called “entities” (*a’yān*). From the perspective of *tanzīh*, Ebn al-‘Arabī declares that *wojūd* belongs to God alone, and, in his famous phrase, the things “have never smelt a whiff of *wojūd*.” From the point of view of *tašbīh*, he affirms that all things are *wojūd*’s self-disclosure (*tajallī*) or self-manifestation (*ẓohūr*). In sum, all things are “He/not He” (*howa lā howa*), which is to say that they are both God and other than God, both *wojūd* and other than *wojūd*.

The intermediateness of everything that can be perceived by the senses or the mind brings us back to imagination, a term that Ebn al-‘Arabī applies not only to a mode of understanding that grasps identity rather than difference, but also to the World of Imagination, which is situated between the two fundamental worlds that make up the cosmos—the world of spirits and the world of bodies—and which brings together the qualities of the two sides. In addition, Ebn al-‘Arabī refers to the whole cosmos as imagination, because it combines the attributes of *wojūd* and utter nonexistence (Chittick, 1989).

Influence on Persian Sufis and Philosophers.

Tracing Ebn al-‘Arabī’s influence in any detail must await an enormous amount of research into both his own writings and the works of later authors. Most modern scholars agree that his influence is obvious in much of the theoretical writing of later Sufism and discernible in works by theologians and philosophers.

Waḥdat al-wojūd, invariably associated with Ebn al-‘Arabī’s name, is the most famous single theoretical issue in Sufi works of the later period, especially in the area under Persian cultural influence. Not

everyone thought it was an appropriate concept, and scholars such as Ebn Taymīya (d. 728/1328) attacked it vehemently. In fact, Ebn Taymīya deserves much of the credit for associating this idea with Ebn al-‘Arabī’s name and for making it the criterion, as it were, of judging whether an author was for or against Ebn al-‘Arabī (on this complex issue, see Chittick, forthcoming).

Although Ebn al-‘Arabī’s name is typically associated with theoretical issues, this should not suggest that his influence reached only learned Sufis. He was the author of many practical works on Sufism, including collections of prayers, and he transmitted a *ḵerqa* that was worn by a number of later shaikhs of various orders. As M. Chodkiewicz (1991) has illustrated, his radiance permeated all levels of Sufi life and practice, from the most elite to the most popular, and this has continued down to modern times. Today, indeed, his influence seems to be on the increase, both in the Islamic world and in the West. The Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi Society, which publishes a journal in Oxford, is only one of many signs of a renewed attention to his teachings.

Ebn al-‘Arabī’s first important contact with Persian Islam may have come through one of his teachers, Makīn-al-Dīn Abū Šojā’ Zāher b. Rostam Eṣfahānī, whom he met in Mecca in 598/1202 and with whom he studied the *Šaḥīḥ* of Termedī. He speaks especially highly of Makīn-al-Dīn’s elderly sister, whom he calls Šaykat-al-Ijezāz (“Mistress of Hejāz”), Faḵr-al-Nesā’ (“Pride of womankind”) bent Rostam, adding that she was also Faḵr-al-Rejāl (“Pride of men”) and that he had studied Hadith with her. It was Makīn-al-Dīn’s daughter, Neẓām, who inspired Ebn al-‘Arabī to write his famous collection of poetry, *Tarjomān al-ašwāq* (Nicholson, pp. 3-4; Jahāngīrī, pp. 59-62).

In 602/1205 Ebn al-‘Arabī met the well-known Sufi Awḥad-al-Dīn Kermānī (d. 635/1238) in Konya and became his close friend; he mentions him on a number of occasions in the *Fotūḥāt* (Chodkiewicz et al., pp. 288, 563; Addas, pp. 269-73). Awḥad-al-Dīn’s biographer tells us that Ebn al-‘Arabī entrusted his stepson Qūnawī to Awḥad-al-Dīn for training (Forūzānfar, pp. 86-87), and Qūnawī confirms in a letter that he was Kermānī’s companion for two years, traveling with him as far as Shiraz (Chittick, 1992b, p. 261).

Qūnawī is the most important intermediary through which Ebn al-‘Arabī’s teachings passed into the Persian-speaking world. He taught Hadith for many years in Konya and was on good terms with Jalāl-al-Dīn Rūmī, but there is no evidence in Rūmī’s works to support the oft-repeated assertion that he was influenced by the ideas of Ebn al-‘Arabī or Qūnawī (Chittick, forthcoming). Nevertheless, Rūmī’s commentators typically interpreted him in terms of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s teachings, which had come to define the Sufi intellectual universe.

Qūnawī is the author of about fifteen Arabic works,

including seven books and a number of relatively short treatises. These works are much more systematic and structured than those of his master. His focus on certain specific issues in Ebn al-‘Arabī’s writings, such as *wojūd* and the perfect human being (*al-ensān al-kāmel*), helped ensure that these would remain the central concern of the school. Certain terms typically ascribed to Ebn al-‘Arabī, such as *al-ḥazarāt al-elāhīya al-ḵams*, “the five divine presences,” seem to be Qūnawī’s coinages. In *al-Fokūk* (ed. M. Ḵājāvī, Tehran, 1371Š./1992), Qūnawī explains the significance of the chapter headings of the *Foṣūṣ*; this work was used directly or indirectly by practically all the *Foṣūṣ* commentators (Chittick, 1984).

Qūnawī wrote a few minor Persian works, but probably not *Tabṣerat al-mobtadī* or *Maṭāle‘-e-īmān*, both of which have been printed in his name (Chittick, 1992b, pp. 255-59). However, from at least 643/1245 he taught the *Tā‘īya* of Ebn al-Fāreż in Persian, and his lectures were put together as a systematic commentary on the poem by his student Sa‘īd-al-Dīn Farḡānī (d. 695/1296) as *Mašāreq al-darārī* (ed. S. J. Āštīānī, Mašhad, 1398/1978). This work was extremely popular, but even more so was his much expanded Arabic version of the same work, *Montaha’l-madārek* (Cairo, 1293/1876).

The most widely read Persian work by Qūnawī’s students was no doubt the *Lama‘āt* of Faḵr-al-Dīn ‘Erāqī (d. 688/1289), which is based on Qūnawī’s lectures on Ebn al-‘Arabī’s *Foṣūṣ* (Chittick and Wilson). Mo‘ayyed-al-Dīn Jandī (d. ca. 700/1300), who was initiated into Sufism by Qūnawī, wrote in Arabic the first detailed commentary on the *Foṣūṣ* (ed. Āštīānī, Mašhad, 1361 Š./1982) as well as a number of Persian works, including *Nafḥat al-rūḥ* (ed. N. Māyel Heravī, Tehran, 1362 Š./1983; despite the editor’s claim of a unique Tehran manuscript, there are at least two other copies in Istanbul [Şehit Ali Paşa 1439, Hacı Mahmud Efendi 2447], the first an expanded version).

Jandī taught the *Foṣūṣ* to ‘Abd-al-Razzāq Kāšānī (d. 730/1330), who wrote one of the most widely disseminated commentaries (Cairo, 1386/1966); it often summarizes or paraphrases Jandī’s text. Kāšānī wrote several other important works, both in Arabic and Persian, all of which are rooted in Ebn al-‘Arabī’s universe of discourse. His *Ta‘wīl al-Qor‘ān* has been published in Ebn al-‘Arabī’s name (Beirut, 1968; for passages in English, see Murata); although permeated with Ebn al-‘Arabī’s basic world view, there are important differences of perspective that mark Kāšānī as an independent thinker (Lory; Morris, 1987, pp. 101-06). A Persian work on *fotoḡwat* (*fotoḡwa*) has also been published (*Toḡfat al-eḵwān fī ḵaṣā‘eṣ al-fetyān*, ed. M. Şarrāf in *Rasā‘el-e javānmardān*, Tehran, 1973).

Persian commentaries on the *Foṣūṣ* are frequently based on the Arabic commentary of Kāšānī’s student, Dāwūd Qaysarī (d. 751/1350), author of a

dozen other Arabic works. His systematic philosophical introduction to *Şarḥ al-Foṣūṣ* (Tehran, 1299/1882; Bombay, 1300/1883) itself became the object of commentaries (for the latest, see Āštīānī, 1385/1966). Certainly, Qaysarī’s influence is obvious and acknowledged in the first Persian commentary on the *Foṣūṣ*, *Noṣūṣ al-ḵoṣūṣ* (partly edited by R. Mażlūmī, Tehran, 1359 Š./1980), written by his student Bābā Rokn-al-Dīn Şīrāzī (d. 769/1367). The Persian commentary by Tāj-al-Dīn Ḥosayn b. Ḥasan Ḵ‘ārazmī (d. ca. 835/1432; ed. N. Māyel Heravī, Tehran, 1364 Š./1985) is almost a verbatim translation of Qaysarī. Other Persian commentaries include *Ḥall-e Foṣūṣ* by Sayyed ‘Alī Hamadānī (d. 786/1385); this work has been wrongly attributed to Ḵ‘āja Pārsā in its printed edition (ed. J. Mesgarneżād, Tehran, 1366 Š./1987; see Māyel Heravī, 1988, pp. xxi-xxvii). In his comprehensive list of the more than one hundred commentaries on the *Foṣūṣ*, Osman Yahia mentions ten in Persian, some of which, however, may be repeats (introduction to Āmolī, pp. 16-36). Persian commentaries that he does not mention include the following: 1. *Ḵātam al-Foṣūṣ*, attributed to Shah Ne‘mat-Allāh Walī (d. 834/1437); this is much longer than any of Shah Ne‘mat-Allāh’s printed *rasā‘el* (manuscripts include Nadwat al-‘Olamā’ 35; Andhra Pradesh State Oriental Manuscript Library, *Taşawwof* 254, *Jadīd* 715; Ḵodābakš, Fārsī 1371). 2. Another long commentary is also attributed to Shah Ne‘mat-Allāh (Andhra Pradesh, *Taşawwof* 185). 3. Shaikh Moḥebb-Allāh Mobārez Elāḥābādī (d. 1048/1648), Ebn al-‘Arabī’s most faithful Indian follower, wrote a lengthy Persian commentary and a shorter Arabic commentary. 4. Ḥāfez Ḡolām-Moṣṭafā b. Moḥammad-Akbar from Thanesar wrote *Şokūṣ al-hemam fī şarḥ Foṣūṣ al-ḥekam*, a commentary of 1024 pages in the Andhra Pradesh copy (*Taşawwof* 296), apparently in the 11th/18th century. The last Persian commentary on the *Foṣūṣ* in India seems to be *al-Ta‘wīl al-moḥkam fī motāşabah Foṣūṣ al-ḥekam* by Mawlawī Moḥammad-Ḥasan Şāḥeb Amrūhawī; he was living in Hyderabad (Deccan) when this 500-page work was published in Lucknow in 1893.

A number of Qūnawī’s contemporaries not directly connected to his circle were important in making at least some of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s teachings available to Persian speakers. Sa‘d-al-Dīn Ḥamūya (d. 649/1252), a Persian disciple of Najm-al-Dīn Kobrā, corresponded with Ebn al-‘Arabī and spent several years in Damascus, where he met both Ebn al-‘Arabī and Qūnawī. He wrote works in both Arabic and Persian; these are often extremely difficult, especially because the author delighted in letter symbolism (for a Persian work, see *al-Meşbāḥ fī l-taşawwof*, ed. N. Māyel Heravī, Tehran, 1362 Š./1983). His disciple ‘Azīz-al-Dīn Nasafī (d. before 700/1300) was responsible for making some of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s terminology well-known in Persian; his popularizing works can hardly be compared in sophistication to those of

‘Erāqī or Farġānī (see, e.g., his *Ensān-e kāmēl*, ed. M. Molé, Tehran, 1962; an English paraphrase of his *Maqṣad-e aqṣā* was published by E. H. Palmer as *Oriental Mysticism*, London, 1867; see also Morris, pp. 745-51). Šams-al-Dīn Ebrāhīm Abarqūhī began to write *Majma‘ al-baḥrayn* (ed. N. Māyel Heravī, Tehran, 1364 Š./1985) in 714/1314. The work represents an early effort to integrate Ebn al-‘Arabī’s teachings into Persian Sufism; more sophisticated than Nasafī, the author does not have the strong philosophical orientation typical of Qūnawī and his circle.

Among early Persian poets influenced by Ebn al-‘Arabī’s teachings and terminology were ‘Erāqī, Maġrebī, and Maḥmūd Šabestarī (d. ca. 720/1320). Moḥammad Lāhijī (d. 912/1506) commented on Šabestarī’s thousand-verse *Golšan-e rāz* in *Šarḥ-e Golšan-e rāz*, a long Persian work rooted in the writings of Kāšānī and Qayṣarī. One of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s most learned and successful popularizers was the poet ‘Abd-al-Rahmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492), especially through his *ġazals* and *maṭnawīs*; about 1,000 verses of his *Selselet al-ḡahab* carefully follow the text of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s *Ḥelyat al-abdāl* (Māyel Heravī, 1988, pp. xxxvii-xl). Jāmī’s Persian prose works dealing with Ebn al-‘Arabī’s teachings—the *Lawā‘eh*, *Lawāme‘*, *Aṣe‘at al-lama‘āt*, and *Naqd al-noṣūṣ fī šarḥ Naqṣ al-Foṣūṣ*—as well as his Arabic commentary on the *Foṣūṣ*, were also widely read (see introduction to Jāmī, 1977). Jāmī was especially popular in India, and most of the numerous followers of Ebn al-‘Arabī in the subcontinent—who were much more likely to write in Persian than in Arabic—are indebted to his explications of the Shaikh’s works (Chittick, 1992d). Moḥammad b. Moḥammad, who was known as Shaikh-e Makkī (d. 926/1020) and considered himself a disciple of Jāmī, defended Ebn al-‘Arabī against attacks by narrow-minded critics in his Persian *al-Jāneb al-ġarbī fī ḥall moṣkelāt al-šayḵ Moḥyi-al-Dīn Ebn ‘Arabī* (ed. Māyel Heravī, Tehran, 1364 Š./1985).

The poet and Sufi master Shah Ne‘mat-Allāh Walī was one of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s most fervent admirers and followed closely in the tracks of Kāšānī and Qayṣarī. He wrote over one hundred *rasālas* (treatises) on theoretical and practical Sufism that fit squarely into Ebn al-‘Arabī’s universe; four of these comment on the *Foṣūṣ* or *Naqṣ al-Foṣūṣ*, Ebn al-‘Arabī’s own treatise on the essential ideas of the *Foṣūṣ*. The Perso-Indian poet Mīrzā ‘Abd-al-Qāder Bīdel (=Bēdil, q.v.; d. 1133/1721) demonstrates an intimate knowledge of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s school in such *maṭnawīs* as *‘Erḡān*.

Even Sufi authors critical of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s teachings adopted much of his terminology and world view. Thus in Persia ‘Alā‘-al-Dawla Semnānī (d. 736/1337) and in India Shaikh Moḥammad Ḥosaynī, known as Gīṣū-Derāz (d. 825/1422), and Shaikh Aḥmad Serhendī (d. 1034/1634) do not diverge markedly from most of the teachings established by him

and his immediate followers. Most Sufis did not take the criticisms of these authors too seriously. Typical are the remarks of Sayyed Ašraf Jahāngīr Semnānī (d. probably in 829/1425), who studied with ‘Alā‘-al-Dawla Semnānī but sided with Kāšānī in his defense of Ebn al-‘Arabī against Semnānī’s criticisms (see Landolt, 1973). After providing the views of the participants in this debate and those of a number of observers, Sayyed Ašraf tells us that Semnānī had not understood what Ebn al-‘Arabī was saying and that he had retracted his criticisms before the end of his life (Yamanī, *Laṭā‘ef-e ašrafī*, *laṭīfa* 28, pp. 139-45; Māyel Heravī, 1367, pp. xxxi-xxxv). In a similar manner, Shah Walī-Allāh Dehlawī (d. 1176/1762) wrote a work showing that there was no fundamental difference between Ebn al-‘Arabī’s *waḥdat al-wojūd* and Serhendī’s *waḥdat al-šohūd*.

From the 8th/14th century onward Ebn al-‘Arabī’s influence is clearly present in many works written by authors known primarily as theologians or philosophers. Among Shi‘ites, Sayyed Ḥaydar Āmolī (d. 787/1385) was especially important in bringing Ebn al-‘Arabī into the mainstream of Shi‘ite thought. He wrote an enormous commentary on the *Foṣūṣ*, *Naqṣ al-noṣūṣ*, the 500-page introduction of which has been published (representing about 10 percent of the text). Āmolī investigates the meaning of the *Foṣūṣ* on three levels: *naql* (the Koran and Hadith, making special use here of Shi‘ite sources), *‘aql* (meaning *kalām* and *falsafa*), and *kašf* (referring both to his own experience and the writings of major members of Ebn al-‘Arabī’s school). Āmolī also wrote several Arabic works on metaphysics; especially significant is *Jāme‘ al-asrār* (ed. Corbin and Yahia, Tehran, 1347 Š./1969; see Morris, 106-08), which was written in his youth during his initial movement into Ebn al-‘Arabī’s universe.

Šā‘en-al-Dīn ‘Alī Torka Ešfahānī (d. 835/1432) completed a commentary on the *Foṣūṣ* in 831/1427; his treatise on *wojūd* “being,” *Tamhīd al-qawā‘ed* (ed. S. J. Āštīnānī, Tehran, 1396/1976), frequently paraphrases Jandī’s *Foṣūṣ* commentary. A number of Torka’s Persian treatises (*Čahārdah rasā‘el*, eds. S. ‘A. Mūsawī Behbahānī and S. E. Dībājī, Tehran, 1351 Š./1972) make explicit or implicit reference to Ebn al-‘Arabī’s teachings. Mollā Šadrā (d. 1050/1641) frequently quotes at length from the *Fotūḥāt* in his *Asfār*. His student Mollā Moḥsen Fayz Kāšānī (d. 1090/1679) wrote an epitome of the *Fotūḥāt* and frequently quotes from Ebn al-‘Arabī in his works (*EI*² V, p. 476). Even Mollā Moḥammad-Bāqer Majlesī (d. 1110/1669), well-known as a critic of Sufis in general and Ebn al-‘Arabī in particular, quotes on occasion from Ebn al-‘Arabī in his monumental *Behār al-anwār* (Beirut, 1983; e.g., *ba‘z ahl al-ma‘refa* in vol. 67, p. 339, refers to Ebn al-‘Arabī in the *Fotūḥāt*, Cairo, 1911, vol. 2, p. 328.15). In the modern period, Āyat-Allāh Khomeīnī differentiated himself from many other influential ‘olamā’ by his intense interest in Ebn al-‘Arabī (Knysh, 1992b).

The first of Ebn al-'Arabī's works to be translated into Persian was the *Foṣūṣ*, not as an independent work, but rather in the midst of the commentaries by Bābā Rokn-al-Dīn and others. A translation without commentary was made by 'Abd-al-Ġaffār b. Moḥammad-'Alī; an autograph version, written in 1008/1685, is found in the Salar Jung Library in Hyderabad (Deccan) (*Taṣawwof* 33; other copies are found in the Andhra Pradesh State Library, *Taṣawwof* 464 and *Jadīd* 4248). Several short works by Ebn al-'Arabī on Sufi practice, including *al-Anwār*, *Asrār al-ḳalwa*, *Ḥaḳīqat al-ḥaḳā'eq*, and *Ḥelyat al-awlā'* were translated in the 8-9th/14-15th centuries (for the Persian text of these and other minor works, see Māyel Heravī, 1988). A manuscript (Andhra Pradesh, *Jadīd* 1461) called *Šarḥ-e Fotūḥāt*, probably by Shaikh Moḥebb-Allāh Elāhābādī, is the second volume (fols. 357-747) of a work that includes translations of and commentary on long passages from the *Fotūḥāt*. Several of Elāhābādī's long Persian works provide extensive translations from the *Fotūḥāt*.

Among Persian Sufis who were especially influential in the Arabic-speaking countries of Islam, one can mention 'Abd-al-Karīm Jīlī (d. 832/1428), author of numerous independently-minded works, who settled in the Yemen and contributed to the widespread interest in Ebn al-'Arabī's writings there (see Knysh, 1992a). Finally, it is worth noting that most followers of Ebn al-'Arabī in Persia wrote their theoretical works in Arabic. In contrast, the Indian subcontinent witnessed an enormous outpouring of Persian writing pertaining to this school of thought, a legacy largely ignored by modern scholars, even in the subcontinent itself (Chittick, 1992d).

Bibliography: (For cited works not given in detail, see "Short References.") The most comprehensive and best documented account of Ebn al-'Arabī's life is C. Addas, *Ibn 'Arabī ou La quête du Soufre Rouge*, Paris, 1989; tr. as *Quest for the Red Sulphur*, Cambridge, 1993. N. Z. Abū Zayd, *Falsafat al-ta'wīl*, Cairo, 1983. H. Algar, "Reflections of Ibn 'Arabī in Early Naqshbandī Tradition," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* 10, 1991, pp. 45-66. Sayyed Ḥaydar Āmolī, *al-Moqaddemāt men naṣṣ al-noṣūṣ*, eds. H. Corbin and O. Yahia, Tehran, 1975. M. Asin Palacios, *El Islam cristianizado*, Madrid, 1931. S. J. Āstīfānī, *Šarḥ-e moqaddema-ye Qayṣarī bar Foṣūṣ al-ḥekam*, Mašhad, 1385/1966. Idem, *Rasā'el-e Qayṣarī*, Mašhad, 1357 Š./1978. A. Badawi, "Autobiografía de Ibn 'Arabī," *al-Andalus* 20, 1955, pp. 107-28. Awḥad-al-Dīn Balyanī, *Épître sur l'unicité absolue*, tr. M. Chodkiewicz, Paris, 1982. M. Bayrakdar, *La philosophie mystique chez Dawūd de Kayseri*, Ankara, 1990. W. C. Chittick, "The Last Will and Testament of Ibn 'Arabī's Foremost Disciple and Some Notes on its Author," *The Sophia Perennis* 4/1, 1978, pp. 43-58. Idem, "The Sophia Perennis as the Prototype of the Self in the Perfect Man as the Sufism of Jāmī," *Stud. Isl.* 49, 1979, pp. 135-57.

Idem, "The Five Divine Presences. From al-Qūnawī to al-Qayṣarī," *Muslim World* 72, 1982a, pp. 107-28. Idem, "Ibn 'Arabī's own Summary of the *Foṣūṣ*. 'The Imprint of the Bezels of Wisdom'," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* 1, 1982b, pp. 30-93. Idem, "The Chapter Headings of the *Foṣūṣ*," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* 2, 1984, pp. 41-94. Idem, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge. Ibn al-'Arabī's Metaphysics of Imagination*, Albany, 1989. Idem, "Ibn al-'Arabī and his School," in *Islamic Spirituality. Manifestations*, ed. S. H. Nasr, New York, 1991, pp. 49-79. Idem, "The Circle of Spiritual Ascent According to al-Qūnawī," *Neoplatonism and Islamic Thought*, ed. P. Morewedge, Albany, 1992a, pp. 179-209. Idem, *Faith and Practice of Islam. Three Thirteenth Century Sufi Texts*, Albany, 1992b. Idem, "Spectrums of Islamic Thought. Sa'īd al-Dīn Farghānī on the Implications of Oneness and Manyness," in *The Legacy of Medieval Persian Sufism*, ed. L. Lewisohn, London, 1992c, pp. 203-17. Idem, "Notes on Ibn al-'Arabī's Influence in India," *Muslim World* 82, 1992d, pp. 218-41. Idem, "Rumi and Waḥdat al-Wujūd," in *The Heritage of Rumi*, ed. A. Banani and G. Sabagh, Cambridge, forthcoming. Idem and P. L. Wilson, *Fakhriddin 'Iraqi. Divine Flashes*, New York, 1982. M. Chodkiewicz, *Le sceau des saints. Prophétie et sainteté dans la doctrine d'Ibn Arabī*, Paris, 1986; tr. as *The Seal of the Saints*, Cambridge, 1993. Idem, "The Diffusion of Ibn 'Arabī's Doctrine," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* 9, 1991a, pp. 36-57. Idem, "The *Futūḥāt Makkīya* and its Commentators. Some Unresolved Enigmas," in *The Legacy of Medieval Persian Sufism*, ed. L. Lewisohn, London, 1991b, pp. 219-32. Idem, *Un océan sans rivage. Ibn 'Arabī, le Livre et la Loi*, Paris, 1992; tr. as *An Ocean without Shore*, Albany, 1993. M. Chodkiewicz et al., *Les Illuminations de la Mecque. The Meccan Illuminations. Textes choisis/Selected Texts*, Paris, 1988. H. Corbin, *Creative Imagination in the Šūfism of Ibn 'Arabī*, Princeton, 1969. Idem, *En Islam iranien*, III, Paris, 1973. Idem, *Spiritual Body and Celestial Earth*, Princeton, 1977. B. Forūzānfar, ed., *Manāqeb-e Awḥad-al-Dīn ... Kermānī*, Tehran, 1347 Š./1968. Y. Friedmann, *Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī. An Outline of His Thought and a Study of His Image in the Eyes of Posterity*, Montreal, 1971. S. Ḥakīm, *al-Mo'jam al-šūfī*, Beirut, 1981. N. L. Heer, *The Precious Pearl. al-Jamī's al-Durrat al-Fakhrāh*, Albany, 1979. S. Hirtenstein and M. Notcutt, eds., *Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi. A Commemorative Volume*, Shaftesbury, Dorset, 1993. T. Izutsu, *Sufism and Taoism*, Los Angeles, 1983. M. Jahāngīrī, *Mohyī-al-Dīn Ebn al-'Arabī*, Tehran, 1361 Š./1982. 'Abd-al-Raḥmān Jāmī, *Naqd al-noṣūṣ fī šarḥ Naṣṣ al-Foṣūṣ*, ed. W. C. Chittick, Tehran, 1977. Idem, *Lawā'eh*, text and French tr. Y. Richard, *Les jaillissements de lumière*, Paris, 1982; text and English tr. E. H. Whinfield

and M. M. Kazwīnī, London, 1906. A. Knysh, "Ibn 'Arabī in the Yemen. His Admirers and Detractors," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* 11, 1992a, pp. 38-63. Idem, "Irfan Revisited. Khomeini and the Legacy of Islamic Mystical Philosophy," *Middle East Journal* 46, 1992b, pp. 631-53. H. Landolt, "Der Briefwechsel zwischen Kāshānī und Simnānī über Waḥdat al-Wuḡūd," *Der Islam* 50, 1973, pp. 29-81. Idem, "Simnānī on Waḥdat al-Wojūd," in *Majmū'a-ye soḵanrānīhā wa maqālahā*, ed. M. Moḥaqqueq and H. Landolt, Tehran, 1971, pp. 91-111. L. Lewisohn, *A Critical Edition of the Divan of Muhammad Shirin Maghribi*, Tehran and London, 1993. P. Lory, *Les Commentaires ésotériques du Coran d'après 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Qāshānī*, Paris, 1981. N. Māyel Heravī, *Rasā'el-e Ebn-e 'Arabī. Dah resāla-ye fārsī-šoda*, Tehran, 1367 Š./1988. A. Mīr-'Ābedīnī, *Divān-e kāmel-e Šams-e Maḡrebī ... be enẓemām-e Resāla-ye jām-e jahānomā*, Tehran, 1358 Š./1979. J. Morris, "Ibn 'Arabī and his Interpreters. Part I: Recent French Translations," *JAOS* 106, 1986, pp. 539-51; "Part II. Influences and Interpretations," *JAOS* 106, 1986, pp. 733-56; 107, 1987, pp. 101-19. S. Murata, *The Tao of Islam. A Sourcebook on Gender Relationships in Islamic Thought*, Albany, 1992. S. 'A. Mūsawī Behbahānī, "Aḥwāl wa āṭār-e Šā'en-al-Dīn Torka Eşfahānī," in *Majmū'a-ye soḵanrānīhā wa maqālahā*, ed. M. Moḥaqqueq and H. Landolt, Tehran, 1971, pp. 97-145. S. Nafīsī, *Kollīyāt-e 'Erāqī*, Tehran, 1338 Š./1959. I. R. Netton, *Allah Transcendent. Studies in the Structure and Semiotics of Islamic Philosophy, Theology, and Cosmology*, London, 1989. R. A. Nicholson, *The tarjumān al-ashwāq. A Collection of Mystical Odes by Muḥyi'ddīn ibn al-'Arabī*, London, 1911. H. S. Nyberg, *Kleinere Schriften des Ibn al-'Arabī*, Leiden, 1919. F. Rosenthal, "Ibn 'Arabī between 'Philosophy' and 'Mysticism,'" *Oriens* 31, 1988, pp. 1-35. A. Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, Chapel Hill, 1975, pp. 263-86 and passim. M. Takeshita, *Ibn 'Arabī's Theory of the Perfect Man and its Place in the History of Islamic Thought*, Tokyo, 1987. O. Yahia, *Histoire et classification de l'oeuvre d'Ibn 'Arabī*, Damascus, 1964. Neẓām-al-Dīn Yamanī, *Latā'ef-e ašrafī*, Delhi, 1219/1804. 'A. Zarrīnkūb, *Donbāla-ye jostojū dar taşawwof-e īrānī*, Tehran, 1362 Š./1983.

(WILLIAM C. CHITTICK)

EBN 'ARABŠĀH, ŠEHĀB-AL-DĪN ABU'L-'ABBĀS AḤMAD b. Moḥammad ... Ḥanafī 'Ajamī (b. Damascus, 791/1389, d. Cairo, 854/1450), literary scholar and biographer of Tamerlane (Tīmūr). According to the autobiography quoted by Ebn Taḡrībērdī, when Tīmūr conquered Damascus in 803/1401, Ebn 'Arabšāh and his family were transported to Tīmūr's capital, Samarkand. He spent the next eight years in

Transoxiana and Chinese Turkestan, where he learned Persian and Mongolian and studied with Sayyed Šarīf Moḥammad Jorjānī, Sa'd-al-Dīn Mas'ūd Taftāzānī, and Šams-al-Dīn Moḥammad Jazarī. Later, in K'ārazm, Sarāy, Astrakhan, and the Crimea, he associated with the ruling elite, scholars, and litterateurs. Around 815/1412, he entered the service of the Ottoman sultan Moḥammad I, holding the office of confidential secretary (*kāteb al-serr*). At this time, he translated several religious works from Arabic into Turkish and 'Awfī's *Jāme' al-ḥekāyāt wa lāme' al-rewāyāt* from Persian into Turkish. Ebn 'Arabšāh returned to Syria and reentered Damascus in 825/1422 after the death of Moḥammad I. There he occupied several minor religious posts and completed his celebrated biography of Tīmūr, *'Ajā'eb al-maḡdūr fī nawā'eb Tīmūr* (q.v.). Sometime after 841/1438, he settled in Cairo, where he became acquainted with the historians Ebn Taḡrībērdī and Saḳāwī (Saḳāwī, II, pp. 128-29, 130-31). He initially secured the favor of the Mamlūk sultan Jaqmaq and composed several works in his name, including an adaptation of the *Marzbān-nāma* entitled *Fākehat al-ḳolafā' wa mofākahat al-ẓorafā'*, written in 852/1448. In 854/1450, Jaqmaq imprisoned him for a few days as the result of a rival's complaint. Ebn 'Arabšāh died twelve years after his release.

Bibliography: (For cited works not given in detail, see "Short References.") For his life, see the notices in Ebn Taḡrībērdī, *al-Manhal al-šāfī wa l-mostawfī ba'd al-wāfī* II, ed. M. M. Amīn, Cairo, 1984-90, pp. 131-45, and 'Abd-al-Raḥmān Saḳāwī, *al-Żaw' al-lāme' le ahl al-qarn al-tāse'* II, Cairo, 1353-55/1934-36, pp. 126-31, from which other accounts are derived. Secondary accounts include: Browne, *Lit. Hist. Persia* III, pp. 181, 183, 185, 197 n., 198, 203, 321 n., 355-56; İ. Kafesoglu, *İA* II, pp. 698-701; J. Pedersen, *EP* III, pp. 711-12; and *DMBE* IV, pp. 221-23. For his works, see *Kaşf al-ẓonūn*, ed. Flügel, II, pp. 128, 352, 510; IV, pp. 190-91, 345; VI, p. 544; and Brockelmann, *GAL* II, pp. 28-30; SII, p. 25. Published texts include: *'Ajā'eb al-maḡdūr fī nawā'eb* (or *akḥbār*) *Tīmūr* (ed. most recently by 'A. M. 'Omar, Cairo, 1979, and A. F. al-Ḥemsī, Beirut, 1986; *Fākehat al-ḳolafā' wa mafākahat al-ẓorafā'*, ed. G. W. Freytag, *Fructus imperatorum et jociatio ingeniosorum* ... 2 vols., Bonn, 1832-52; and *al-Ta'rif al-fāher fī šīam Šayḳ al-Malek al-Zāher al-qā'em be noşrat al-ḥaqq Abī Sa'īd Jaqmaq*, partially ed. S.A. Strong, *JRAS*, 1907, pp. 395-96; Arabic text, pp. 1-27.

(JOHN E. WOODS)

EBN AŞDAQ, MĪRZĀ 'ALĪ-MOḤAMMAD (b. Mašhad 1267/1850; d. Tehran, 1347/1928), prominent Bahai missionary. He was given the honorific designation Ebn(-e) Aşdaq in certain Bahai scriptural writings. Toward the end of his life Bahā'-Allāh counted him a living martyr and referred to him as *Šahīd ebn-e*