

## ON FAKHR AL-DĪN AL-RĀZĪ'S LIFE AND THE PATRONAGE HE RECEIVED

FRANK GRIFFEL\*  
*Yale University*

Despite his importance for the development of post-classical Islamic theology, we still know comparatively little about the life and work of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210). While the role of *falsafa* for the expansion of Ash'arism after al-Juwaynī (d. 478/1085) becomes ever more clear, there is still much confusion about the relationship between rationalist Ash'arism and the political authorities of the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries. In his seminal 1912 article on the theology of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Ignaz Goldziher suggested that the rationalism represented by Fakhr al-Dīn could only flourish in the eastern Muslim provinces and not in Iraq, the centre of the 'Abbasid caliphate, where 'an orthodoxy entrenched in the spirit of persecution terrorized all free intellectual thinking'.<sup>1</sup> Goldziher, who drew this conclusion from an earlier study on the history of Hanbalism in Baghdad,<sup>2</sup> assumed that by the time of Fakhr al-Dīn, the authority of the 'Abbasid caliphate no longer reached Jibal, Khurasan, Transoxania, and other places where he was active. Goldziher's view was influenced by the active part caliph al-Qādir (r. 381–422/991–1031) and his son al-Qā'im (r. 422–467/1031–1075) played in the Sunni Revival in Baghdad during the first half of the fifth/eleventh century.<sup>3</sup> During this period, the 'Abbasid caliphate pursued a religious policy that actively supported the emerging Hanbali groups in Baghdad and challenged the religious authority of rationalist groups such as Mu'tazilis and even Ash'aris.

\* I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Matthew Ingalls, Mehmet Kaya, and Yasir Kazi in locating and interpreting some of the primary sources used in this study, and of Tariq Jaffer and Ayman Shihadeh, who commented on earlier drafts.

<sup>1</sup> Ignaz Goldziher, 'Aus der Theologie des Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī', *Der Islam* 3 (1912): 213–47, at 213. Reprinted in id. *Gesammelte Schriften* (ed. J. Desomogyi, Hildesheim: Olms, 6 vols., 1967–73), v. 237–71.

<sup>2</sup> Ignaz Goldziher, 'Zur Geschichte der hanbalitischen Bewegungen', *ZDMG* 62 (1908): 1–28 (= *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. 135–62).

<sup>3</sup> Goldziher, 'Aus der Theologie des Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī', 214–18.

This policy aimed at limiting the public space in which the rationalists were acting.

At the turn of the seventh/thirteenth century the caliph in Baghdad was in theory still the focal point of Sunni religious authority. Yet, during the second half of the sixth/twelfth century the weakness of the Saljuq authorities allowed the 'Abbasid caliphs to extend their political power beyond the walls of their palace and become territorial rulers like the sultans and kings who surrounded them. During the long reign of the 'Abbasid caliph al-Nāṣir (r. 575–622/1180–1225), who ruled independently over most of Iraq, gaining real political power also meant that he could not pursue an expansionist religious policy of traditionalism like the one practised at the beginning of the fifth/eleventh century by al-Qādir and al-Qā'im.<sup>4</sup>

These two distinctly Hanbali caliphs, who had no territorial power, tried to achieve their goal of supporting the more traditionalist Sunni groups against the non-Sunnis and the rationalists by means of alliances and—most effectively—by exercising the role of religious principals and standard-bearers for the emerging Turkish dynasties of the Ghaznavids and Saljuqs. This role was executed by diplomatic means through correspondence and letters of investiture. These letters would spell out the religious duty to rein in heterodox groups (*mulḥidūn*) and to fight the enemies of the Sunni caliphate.<sup>5</sup> In the days of al-Nāṣir, letters of investiture still existed but did not include such stipulations. The caliph's role as the ruler over Iraq put new limitations on his religious policy. Like al-Qādir and al-Qā'im, al-Nāṣir personally favoured traditionalist Hanbalism over other Sunni groups and rejected rationalist and philosophical scholarship. However, he did not practise an aggressive policy like these two and built his legitimacy on a much broader basis that included various religious groups – among them Sufis and even Shi'is. Still, al-Nāṣir's religious policy included an element of the suppression of philosophic scholarship under his reign.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Angelika Hartmann in *EI*<sup>2</sup>. (Leiden: Brill, 11 vols. 1954–2002), vii. 996–1003, and id. *an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (1180–1225). Politik, Religion, Kultur in der späten 'Abbāsidenzeit* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 70–91.

<sup>5</sup> These were the words chosen by al-Qā'im in the letter of investiture for the Ghaznavid sultan Mas'ūd I ibn Maḥmūd (r. 421–432/1031–1041); see Muḥammad ibn al-Husayn al-Bayhaqī (d. 470/1077), *Ta'rikh-i Mas'ūdi-yi mā'rūf bi-Ta'rikh-i Bayhaqī* (ed. S. Nafisī, Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tih-rān, 3 vols., 1324–26/1945–47), i. 301.

<sup>6</sup> Hartmann, *an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh*, 171f., 196, 255–62, 266f.; Herbert W. Mason, *Two Statesmen of Medieval Islam. Vizier Ibn Hubayra (499–560*

Goldziher's broad assumptions about the caliphs' anti-philosophical religious policy may not be entirely correct but he was right in saying that it had no effect on Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī. In his day, around the turn of the seventh/thirteenth century, rationalist Ash'arism was supported from many sides, most importantly by the sultans in the eastern Muslim lands. Looking at the early sources on his life, it is startling to see that Fakhr al-Dīn received the full backing of the two major military and political forces in the Muslim east—the Khwarazmshahs and the Ghurids—despite the fact that these two dynasties were engaged in a war with each other. The leaders of the Ghurid family pursued a religious policy in which Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī played an active role. This may also be true for the Khwarazmshahs although the sources are much more scarce in their case. This religious policy was to a large extent directed against the sentiments and sympathies of the religious establishment and the populace in the Muslim east. Thus, at the turn of the seventh/thirteenth century, rationalist theology in the Muslim east did not exist in an atmosphere of religious persecution by the political authorities but enjoyed their support. A closer look into Fakhr al-Dīn's life may help us understand why Ash'arism became the dominant theological direction of Sunnism despite the fact that the caliphs never had much to do with it and often openly opposed it.

## FAKHR AL-DĪN'S EDUCATION AND EARLY CAREER

Right from the beginning of the historiography on Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's life, there was confusion about who his major patrons were. The historian Ibn al-Qifṭī (d. 646/1248) of Aleppo was one of the first to provide a biographical entry (*tarjama*) on Fakhr al-Dīn in his *Ta'rikh al-ḥukamā'*.<sup>7</sup> He has only scarce information on Fakhr al-Dīn's life, and does not mention his family background. He was apparently unaware of the information about his year of birth—543/1149 or 544/1150, which is provided by his contemporary historian-colleagues

AH/1105–1165 AD) and *Caliph an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh* (553–622 AH/1158–1225 AD) (The Hague: Mouton, 1972), 93, 127.

<sup>7</sup> Ibn al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh al-ḥukamā'* (ed. J. Lippert, Leipzig: Dietrichische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903), 291–3. We must remind ourselves that this text is only an abridgment of what Ibn al-Qifṭī initially published. Only Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Abī al-Dam (d. 642/1244) in his *Ta'rikh al-Muẓaffarī* offer earlier information. The latter has not been edited and was not available to me.

Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233) and al-Mundhirī (d. 656/1258).<sup>8</sup> Ibn al-Qiftī says little on Fakhr al-Dīn's education and reports that he went to Khurasan for training where he became familiar with the writings of Ibn Sīnā and started studying them. Later in his life, he turned towards Transoxania in search of patronage from the side of the Banū Māza, a prominent family of Hanafi scholars in Bukhara. Unsuccessful, he suffered from poverty, was ill, and had to rely on charitable donations from the community of foreign merchants in Bukhara. But his fortunes were about to change. Ibn al-Qiftī reports:

So he left Bukhara and directed his path towards Khurasan where his meeting with the Khwarazmshah Muḥammad ibn Tekish took place. The Khwarazmshah made him stay with him and be close to him. He improved Fakhr al-Dīn's status (*manzil*) and gave him a steady income (*asnā rizqa-hu*). Fakhr al-Dīn settled in Herat, owned property there, and fathered children. He stayed there until he died.<sup>9</sup>

Ibn al-Qiftī's failure to mention any patron other than the Khwarazmshah 'Alā' l-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Tekish, who came to power only in 596/1200, suggests that Fakhr al-Dīn had to wait a long time before he was able to reap the benefits of patronage—no earlier than ten years before his death in 606/1210. The fact that the Khwarazmshah did not rule over Herat before 603/1206, which is three years before Fakhr al-Dīn's death, poses another difficulty with Ibn al-Qiftī's report. It seems that Ibn al-Qiftī was unfamiliar with the political realities in the eastern Muslim lands during Fakhr al-Dīn's lifetime.

When Ibn al-Qiftī wrote these lines less than four decades after Fakhr al-Dīn's death, the Muslim east had been devastated by the first invasion of the Mongols under the leadership of Chingiz Khān and his sons Jöchi, Ögedey, Chaghatay, and Toluy. During the ten years before the Mongols' arrival in 616/1219 these lands had been dominated by the rise of the Khwarazmshahs whose centre of power lay in the fertile region of

<sup>8</sup> Ibn al-Athīr *al-Kāmil fī l-ta'rikh* = *Chronicon quod perfectissimus inscribitur* (ed. C. J. Tornberg, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 14 vols., 1851–76), xii. 190.5 (*sub anno* 606). He notes the date 543 with some reservation: *balaghani'anna...* The Syrian historian al-Mundhirī, *al-Takmila li-wafayāt al-naqala* (ed. B. 'A. Ma'rūf, Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 4 vols., 1981), ii. 187.2 repeats Ibn al-Athīr's date of 543 but adds: '...and some say 544 but this is more doubtful (*ashbah*)'. Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282), *Wafayāt al-a'yān wa-anbā' abnā' al-zamān* (ed. I. 'Abbās, Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 8 vols., 1968–77), iv. 252.15 adds that Fakhr al-Dīn's birth was in the month of Ramaḍān of either 543 or 544.

<sup>9</sup> Ibn al-Qiftī, *Ta'rikh al-ḥukamā'*, 291.12–15.

Khwarazm on the southern side of the Aral lake, where the Oxus spread out in a river delta. 'Alā' l-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Tekish (r. 596–617/1200–1220) was the next to last and most powerful Khwarazmshah, whose undiplomatic attitude towards the Mongols prompted his own downfall and the violent collapse of his dynasty. At the height of his power, which coincided with Fakhr al-Dīn's death in 606/1210, he reigned over an empire that stretched from the borders of India to those of Anatolia. It must have been obvious for Ibn al-Qiftī and his sources to connect Fakhr al-Dīn's name with this powerful, yet tragic ruler who found such a memorable end on an offshore island in the Caspian Sea.<sup>10</sup> Yet, before 'Alā' l-Dīn Muḥammad was able to expand his reign to these borders, he had to defeat the Ghurid dynasty with its centre of power in eastern Khurasan and Afghanistan. The Ghurids competed with the Khwarazmshahs over political dominance in the Muslim east during most of Fakhr al-Dīn's lifetime and it appears that they also competed to become his patrons.

A clearer and much more complete picture than in Ibn al-Qiftī's *tarjama* about Fakhr al-Dīn's life is gained one generation later from Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a's (d. 668/1270) dictionary of physicians and philosophers.<sup>11</sup> Like his predecessor, Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a writes in Syria and he finds it difficult to disentangle the relationships of patronage that Fakhr al-Dīn benefited from. Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a informs us about Fakhr al-Dīn's family and his education. Fakhr al-Dīn was the younger of two sons of the well-known 'preacher' (*khaṭīb*) of Rayy, Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Abū l-Qāsim 'Umar ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Rāzī.<sup>12</sup> He had studied theology in Nishapur with Abū l-Qāsim al-Anṣārī (d. 512/1118),<sup>13</sup> one of the prominent theologians of his time and, like al-Ghazālī, a student of al-Juwaynī. During his lifetime al-Anṣārī held various teachings positions in Nishapur and may have been al-Ghazālī's successor at the Nizāmiyya

<sup>10</sup> 'Aṭā-Malik-i Juwaynī (d. 681/1283), *Ta'rikh-i Jahāngushāy* (ed. .M. ibn 'A. Qazwīnī, Leiden: Brill, 3 vols., 1912–37), ii. 94–121; English trans. J. A. Boyle, *Ghenghis Khan. The History of the World-Conqueror* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2nd edn., 1997), 362–90; John A. Boyle, 'Dynastic and Political History of the Il-Khāns,' in J. A. Boyle (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Iran. Volume 5: The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 302–411, at 304–10.

<sup>11</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭībā'* (ed. A. Müller, Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Wahbiyya, 1299/1882), ii. 27–33.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 25.19–20.

<sup>13</sup> This was first mentioned by Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, iv. 252.5.

*madrasa* there.<sup>14</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn's father wrote a book on Islamic law or theology, *Ghāyat al-marām* in two volumes, which is lost;<sup>15</sup> his date of death is unknown.<sup>16</sup>

Fakhr al-Dīn studied with his father until his death. After that Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a mentions two teachers with whom Fakhr al-Dīn continued his education, Kamāl al-Dīn al-Simnānī (d. 575/1179–80) and Majd al-Dīn al-Jīlī. Al-Simnānī was a teacher in Nishapur and a student of Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Janẓī (d. 549/1154–55), who was himself a student of al-Ghazālī.<sup>17</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn's relocation to Nishapur for studies had already been mentioned by Ibn al-Qiftī—who adds that he discovered Ibn Sīnā's work there. After studying with al-Simnānī, Fakhr al-Dīn returned to Rayy.<sup>18</sup>

His second teacher Majd al-Dīn 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Jīlī is even more closely connected with the study of *falsafa*. Ibn al-Sha'ār (d. 644/1256–7), an early chronicler of Fakhr al-Dīn's life who wrote before Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a, tells us that Fakhr al-Dīn 'studied with al-Jīlī the sciences of the ancients when God provided him with great insight and he started to compose books.'<sup>19</sup> Although we still know very little about this

<sup>14</sup> On Abū l-Qāsim Salmān ibn Nāṣir al-Anṣārī see 'Abd al-Ghāfir al-Fārisī, *al-Siyāq li-ta'rikh Nisābūr* in Richard Frye, *The Histories of Nishapur* (London: Mouton. 1965) text 2, fos. 29<sup>b</sup>–30<sup>a</sup>; Ibn 'Asākir, *Tabyīn kadhīb al-muftarī fī-mā nusiba ilā al-Imām Abī l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī* (Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Tawfiq, 1347/1928), 307; al-Subkī (d. 771/1370), *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyya al-kubrā* (ed. M. M. al-Ṭanāhī and 'A. M. al-Ḥilw, (Cairo: 'Isā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 10 vols., 1964–76), vii. 96–99.

<sup>15</sup> There is a *tarjama* on Ḍiyā' al-Dīn 'Umar in al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vii. 242. Later, Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī (d. 631/1233) would publish a book with the same title on a similar subject (it is the abridgment of his *Abkār al-afkār*) and this may be in reference to Ḍiyā' al-Dīn 'Umar's earlier work.

<sup>16</sup> Ismā'il Bāshā Bābānī al-Baghdādī (d. 1339/1920–1), *Hadiyyat al-'arifīn: Asmā' al-mu'allifīn wa-āthār al-muṣannifīn min Kashf al-zunūn* (Istanbul: Wikālat al-Ma'ārif, 2 vols. 1951–55), i. 784, notes that he died in 559/1163–4. This information, however, does not exist in earlier sources that I checked.

<sup>17</sup> On Aḥmad ibn Zirr ibn 'Aqīl al-Kamāl al-Simnānī, see al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vi. 16f. On his teacher Abū Sa'id Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Janẓī, see al-Sam'ānī, *al-Taḥbīr fī l-mu'jam al-kabīr* (ed. M. N. Sālim, Baghdad: Ri'āsat Dīwān al-Awqāf, 2 vols. 1395/1975), ii. 252f.; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, iv. 223f.; al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vii. 25–8.

<sup>18</sup> Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, iv. 250.4.

<sup>19</sup> 'qara'a 'alayhi [...] fī l-'ulūm al-awā'il thumma fataḥa Llah 'alayhi faṭḥan kabīran wa-akhadha fī l-kutub,' Ibn al-Sha'ār, F. Sezgin (ed.) [as facsimile of MS Istanbul, Esad Efendi 2327 under the title *Qalā'id al-jumān...*], '*Uqud al-jumān fī*

philosopher and his teachings, al-Jilī appears to have been an instructor in Maragha in Azerbaijan at the Mujāhidiyya *madrasa*.<sup>20</sup> He was also the teacher of Shihab al-Dīn Yahyā al-Suhrawardī (d. 587/1191), the founder of the Ishraqī school.<sup>21</sup> Ibn al-Sha‘‘ār and Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a give us the impression that Fakhr al-Dīn went to Maragha and met al-Jilī there. Yet, Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282), who wrote after these two and who knew at least Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a’s report, makes it clear that Fakhr al-Dīn worked with Majd al-Dīn al-Jilī first in Rayy and went with him to Maragha when al-Jilī received an invitation to teach there.<sup>22</sup>

After having studied in Maragha, Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a reports Fakhr al-Dīn’s presence at *madrasas* in Marand (Azerbaijan) and Hamadan.<sup>23</sup> He adds that ‘Fakhr al-Dīn resided in many places and he also directed his path to Khwarazm where he became ill.’<sup>24</sup> Al-Rāzī’s travels in

*farā'id shu'arā' bādhā al-zamān* (Frankfurt: Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Sciences, 9 vols., 1990), vi. 107.11–2. Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, ‘*Uyūn al-anbā'*, ii. 23.16 writes: ‘Fakhr al-Dīn studied philosophy (*ḥikma*) with Majd al-Dīn al-Jilī in Maragha. This Majd al-Dīn was one of the finest scholars of his time.’

<sup>20</sup> The only known work of al-Jilī is a brief text on logic, *al-Lāmi' fi l-shakl al-rābi'*, which is included in the so-called Maragha MS of philosophical and theological texts, which was probably produced at the Mujāhidiyya *madrasa* during his lifetime. See Naṣrallah Pūrjavādī (ed.), *Majmū'ah-ye falsafī-e Marāghah. A Philosophical Anthology from Maraghab. Facsimile Edition with Introduction in Persian and English* (Tehran: Markaz-i Nashr-i Dānishgāh, 1380/2002), 325–62 and the notes in Pūrjavādī’s introduction. In this MS, the author is called Majd al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Jilī. He should not be confused with a contemporary of the same name, Abū Bakr ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Jilī (d. 603/1207), who was the son of the famous Hanbali Sufi ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilī (d. 561/1166) and who was born and died in Baghdad. On Abū Bakr al-Jilī see Hartmann, *an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh*, 194 and al-Mundhirī, *al-Takmila li-wafayāt al-naqala*, ii. 116f.

<sup>21</sup> al-Shahrazūrī, *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ wa-rawḍat al-afrāḥ* (ed. M. ‘A. Abū Rayyān, Alexandria: Dār al-Ma‘rifa al-Jāmi‘iyya, 1414/1993), 603.14. Fakhr al-Dīn’s later correspondence with the anti-philosophical Sufi Shihāb al-Dīn ‘Umar al-Suhrawardī (d. 632/1234) should not be confused with this al-Suhrawardī ‘*al-maqtūl*’. On this correspondence cf. Hartmann, *an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh*, 237f. and Helmut Ritter, ‘Philologika IX (Die vier Suhrawardī)’, *Der Islam* 24 (1937): 270–86 and 25 (1939): 35–86, at 38. An Arabic letter of ‘Umar al-Suhrawardī to Fakhr al-Dīn is edited by Naṣrallāh Pūrjavādī in his *Dū mujaddid: Pizbūhishhā-yi darbāra-yi Muḥammad-i Ghazzālī va-Fakhr-i Rāzī/Two Renewers of Faith: Studies on Muḥammad-i Ghazzālī and Fakhrud-dīn-i Rāzī* (Tehran: Markaz-i Nashr-i Dānishgāh-i Tih-rān, 1381 [2002]), 515–17.

<sup>22</sup> Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a‘yān*, iv. 250.4–6.

<sup>23</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, ‘*Uyūn al-anbā'*, ii. 23.19–22.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.30–1.

Khwarazm and particularly in Transoxania are a prominent motif in later historians' report of his life. The fact that Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a had apparently no knowledge of his sojourn in Transoxania suggests that the prominence of this country is mainly due to Fakhr al-Dīn's autobiographical book about disputes with scholars there.<sup>25</sup> For his earlier biographers, Transoxania is just one of the many places where Fakhr al-Dīn resided. Ibn al-Sha'ar tries to put these in order:

(After studying in Maragha), Fakhr al-Dīn travelled to Khwarazm and Transoxania. Then he returned to Khwarazm and to the Khurasanian lands and reached Bamiyan and that is in the land of Ghur.<sup>26</sup>

There are only a few dateable events in Fakhr al-Dīn's early life and among them is the fact that on his way to Transoxania, he passed through the city of Sarakhs in northern Khurasan in the year 580/1187–88 where he conversed with one of its scholars on issues of medicine and started to write a commentary on Ibn Sīnā's *al-Qānūn fī l-ṭibb*.<sup>27</sup> The autobiographic report about his discussions with scholars in Transoxania mentions only one date, namely the year of the great astronomical conjunction 582/1186, when Fakhr al-Dīn had a dispute with the philosopher and astronomer Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mas'ūdī.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Munāẓarāt fī bilād mā warā'a l-nahr*, in Fathalla Kholeif, *A Study on Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī and His Controversies in Transoxiana* (Beirut: Dar El-Machreq, [1966] 3rd edn., 1987), 3–64.

<sup>26</sup> Ibn al-Sha'ar, *Uqūd al-jumān*, vi. 107–8.

<sup>27</sup> Ibn al-Qiftī, *Ta'riḫ al-ḥukamā*, 227 reports that Ibn 'Abd al-Karīm al-Sarakhsī honoured Fakhr al-Dīn while he passed through Sarakhs 'on his way to Transoxania to reach the Banū Māza in Bukhara from whom he would request a certain matter (*ṭāliban minhum mā yaqūmu bi-amrihi*), but which he did not get from them.' This, however, may be Ibn al-Qiftī's own conclusion drawn from the fact that he mentions Fakhr al-Dīn's unsuccessful plea to the Banū Māza in his vita of Fakhr al-Dīn. The first part of Fakhr al-Dīn's unfinished commentary on the *Qānūn* is preserved in the Judeo-Arabic MS Paris, Hebr. 1208; see Moritz Steinschneider, 'Schriften der Araber in hebräischen Handschriften', *ZDMG* 47 (1893): 335–84, at 343.

<sup>28</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Munāẓarāt*, 32.6. The great astronomical conjunction happened on 29 Jumāda II 582/14 September 1186. See Dorethea Weltecke, 'Die Konjunktion der Planeten im September 1086', *Saeculum* 54 (2003), 179–212. On Sharaf al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Mas'ūd al-Mas'ūdī see *GAL* i. 474 no. 11 (only in the first edition) and Ayman Shihadeh, 'From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī: 6th/12th Century Developments in Muslim Philosophical Theology', *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy*, 15 (2005): 141–79, at 153–8.

Ibn Khallikān, who makes the most serious attempt among the early historians to provide a chronology for events in Fakhr al-Dīn's life, has him travel to Khwarazm and Transoxania where he disputes with its scholars about religious teachings and doctrine (*al-madhhab wa-l-ī' tiqād*). On account of these disputes, Fakhr al-Dīn was 'driven out' (*ukbrija*) first from Khwarazm and then from Transoxania. He returned to Rayy where he married his two sons to the two daughters of a rich but ailing physician. Al-Rāzī inherited his fortune after the latter's death.<sup>29</sup> This story of high anecdotal value—later scholars would discuss whether inheriting in such an unusual way is legally possible—does not tally with Ibn al-Qiftī's information that he fathered children in Herat, which is confirmed by Fakhr al-Dīn's own admissions about his children gathered from remarks in his *Tafsīr al-kabīr* and the testament at the end of his life. In the concluding notes to the commentary on Sūra 11, which is dated to Rajab 601/March 1205, Fakhr al-Dīn bemoans the death of his son Muḥammad who died 'in the prime of his youth'.<sup>30</sup> This was Fakhr al-Dīn's oldest son for whose education he had written the *Kitāb al-Arbā'in fī uṣūl al-dīn*.<sup>31</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a says that at his death Fakhr al-Dīn left two sons, Ḍiyā' al-Dīn and Shams al-Dīn, and at least one daughter, all of whom continued to live in Herat. One of his sons was still receiving an education when Fakhr al-Dīn died.<sup>32</sup> Abū Shāma (d. 665/1267), who probably wrote

<sup>29</sup> Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, iv. 50.7–14.

<sup>30</sup> Jacques Jomier, 'Les *Mafatih al-ghayb* de l'imam Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī: quelques dates, lieux, manuscrits', *MIDEO* 13 (1977): 253–90, at 266. This note is in an Istanbul MS studied by Jomier. There are two references to the death of Muḥammad in the printed edition of the *Tafsīr al-kabīr* at the end of Sura 10 and Sura 12: Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Tafsīr al-kabīr aw Mafatih al-ghayb* (Cairo: al-Maṭbā'a al-Bahiyya al-Miṣriyya, 1353–[1384]/1934–[1964], 32 vols.), xvii. 176 and xviii. 229. The first note is also dated to Rajab 601 and says that Muḥammad died 'far away from his brothers, his father, and his mother.'

<sup>31</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Arbā'in fī uṣūl al-dīn* (Hyderabad: Maṭbā'at Majlis Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Uthmāniyya, 1353 [1934 or 1935]), 3.3–5: 'I decided to write this book for my oldest son, who is the dearest to me, Muḥammad, may God lead him to the secrets of what is known through philosophy and through [other] judgments [...].'

<sup>32</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a, *Uyūn al-ambā'*, ii. 26.7; the daughter is mentioned, ii. 26.13 and 26.27. In his testament (ibid, 28.12), Fakhr al-Dīn makes provisions for the education of his son Abū Bakr, 'who shows the signs of intelligence and acumen'. He seems to be identical with the younger son Shams al-Dīn, who, according to Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a, 'Fakhr al-Dīn describes as having intelligence' (ibid, 26.8).

before Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, also mentioned two sons and reports that Fakhr al-Dīn’s eldest son served some time in the army of the Khwarazmshah ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad.<sup>33</sup> Since the latter came to power in 596/1200 this refers most probably to the second period of Fakhr al-Dīn’s engagement with the family of the Khwarazmshah, after 605/1208, on which more below. Abū Shāma must mean Fakhr al-Dīn’s eldest surviving son Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn, who unlike the younger, was not a scholar.

Ibn Khallikān’s story about Fakhr al-Dīn’s apparent usurpation of a rich man’s inheritance does not fit well with other sources and may be no more than a malign anecdote that tries to explain the exuberant riches during his later lifetime. If Fakhr al-Dīn really was in Rayy during these years, a fact not mentioned by any other of the early historians, nor by Fakhr al-Dīn himself, he was probably too young to have children old enough to marry.<sup>34</sup> A rumour about this kind of innovative use of inheritance laws could have circulated among people in Rayy or elsewhere and became connected to Fakhr al-Dīn simply because it fitted the impression some of his contemporaries had formed about his personality.

During these years, Fakhr al-Dīn was already publishing books. In his autobiographic report about his discussions with scholars in Transoxania, he brags that one of those scholars who was much more senior than him, Ibn Ghaylān al-Balkhī,<sup>35</sup> used to read three books of Fakhr al-Dīn with his students: *al-Mabāḥith al-mashriqiyya*, *al-Mulakḥkhaṣ fī l-ḥikma wa-l-mantiq*, and the commentary on Ibn

<sup>33</sup> Abū Shāma, *al-Dhayl ‘alā l-Rawḍatayn* [ed. under the title *Tarājim rijāl al-qarnayn al-sādis wa-sābi‘*] M. Z. al-Kawtharī, Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Mālikiyya, 1366/1947), 68.11–12. Cf. al-Ṣafadī, (d. 766/1363), *al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt* (ed. H. Ritter *et al.*, Istanbul/Beirut/Wiesbaden: Orient Institut der DMG, 1931–), iv. 252.12–14.

<sup>34</sup> Jacques Jomier, ‘The Qur’anic Commentary of Imām Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī: Its Sources and its Originality,’ in A. A. Johns (ed.) *International Congress for the Study of Qur’ān. Australian National University Canberra. 3–13 May 1980* (Canberra: Southeast Asia Centre, Faculty of Asian Studies, Australian National University, 1980), 92–111, at 96 puts the double marriage of his sons in the years 585–90/1189–94, when Fakhr al-Dīn was about 42 to 47 years of age. Jomier, ‘*Les Mafatih al-ghayb*’, 269, discusses the problems posed by this dating.

<sup>35</sup> On Ibn Ghaylān al-Balkhī, see Shihadeh, ‘From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī’, 151–3; Jean R. Michot, ‘La pandémie Avicennienne au VIe/XIIe siècle. *Kitāb ḥudūth al-‘ālam* d’Ibn Ghaylan al-Balkhī’, *Arabica* 40 (1993): 287–344, and Michot’s French introduction to the edition of Ibn Ghaylān’s *Ḥudūth al-‘ālam* by M. Moḥaqiq (Tehran: Mu’assasat-i Muṭāla‘āt-i Islāmī, 1377 [1998]).

Sīnā's *al-Ishārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt*.<sup>36</sup> Thus far, the *terminus ante quem* for Fakhr al-Dīn's sojourn in Khwarazm is Šafar 597/December 1200.<sup>37</sup> We will see that he probably left about five to ten years earlier. Only one of these three books can be properly dated: according to a note in one of its manuscripts, the *Mulakḥkhaṣ* was completed in Shawwāl 579/January 1184.<sup>38</sup>

One other work should be dated to this period: al-Rāzī's most successful textbook of *kalām*, *Muḥaṣṣal afkār al-mutaqaddimīn wa-l-muta'akbkhirīn min al-'ulāmā' wa-l-ḥukamā' wa-l-mutakallimīn*. Josef van Ess suggested it is one of al-Rāzī's earliest works. Yet a recent critical edition reveals that it mentions the commentary on the *Ishārāt* and al-Rāzī's *Nihāyat al-'uqūl* in its pages.<sup>39</sup> It can also not belong to Fakhr al-Dīn's last period—as suggested by Paul Kraus—since the book refers to Ibn Ghaylān al-Balkhī as a living person.<sup>40</sup> While we do not know when Ibn Ghaylān died, the fact that he entered the Niẓāmiyya *madrasa*

<sup>36</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Munāẓarāt fī bilād mā wara'a l-nahr*, 60.1–2. This is the chronological order of the three books; see Shihadeh, 'From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī', 170f. They are also mentioned (in this order) together with the even earlier *Nihāyat al-'uqūl fī dirāyat al-uṣūl* in Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *I'tiqādāt firaq al-muslimīn wa-l-mushrikīn* (ed. T. 'A. Sa'd, Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyyāt al-Azhariyya, 1978), 146.5–9. This list continues with some other titles and still needs to be fully analysed.

<sup>37</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn's *al-Munāẓarāt* is not dated and the only *terminus post quem* for the book is the date of the great conjunction 582/1186 mentioned in it. Paul Kraus, 'Les "Controverses" de Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī', *Bulletin d'Institut d'Égypte* 19 (1937): 187–214, at 188 quotes from Fakhr al-Dīn's *Manāqib al-Imām al-Shāfi'ī* the sentence: 'a group of Mu'tazilis in Khwarazm had asked me [...].' This book was completed on 27 Šafar 597/2 December 1200; see al-Rāzī, *Manāqib al-Imām al-Shāfi'ī* (ed. A. Ḥ. al-Saqqā, Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyyāt al-Azhariyya, 1986), 538.

<sup>38</sup> The dated note is in MS Leiden 1510; see the comprehensive description and study of the Berlin MS (Or. oct. 623) of the *Mulakḥkhaṣ* in Rudolph Sellheim, *Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. Band XVII. Reihe 4. Arabische Handschriften. Materialien zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte* (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1976), 140–7.

<sup>39</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Kitāb al-Muḥaṣṣal wa-huwa Muḥaṣṣal afkār al-mutaqaddimīn wa-l-muta'akbkhirīn min al-ḥukamā' wa-l-mutakallimīn* (ed. H. Atāy, Cairo: Maktabat Dār al-Turāth, 1411/1991), 478.11, 492.6, 602.4. Josef van Ess, *Die Erkenntnislehre des 'Aḍudaddīn al-Īcī* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1966), 61, 147f.

<sup>40</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Kitāb al-Muḥaṣṣal*, 228.5; Kraus, 'Les "Controverses" de Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī', 193f.

in Merv as a student in 523/1129<sup>41</sup> means that he was quite old when Fakhr al-Dīn met him around 580/1184–85 and that he hardly made it into the seventh/thirteenth century. Van Ess and Kraus proposed their dates mostly because of the great number of doctrinal differences between the *Muḥaṣṣal* and other of al-Rāzī's works. Yet, these often puzzling variations may be due to the character of the work as a 'report' (*riwāya*), and the writing of this book during the period of al-Rāzī's sojourn in Khwarazm and Transoxania or shortly after is most likely.<sup>42</sup>

The early sources on Fakhr al-Dīn's life do not mention that his motive for going to Khwarazm and Transoxania was to battle with the Mu'tazilis or the Karramis, nor that it was the prominence of these groups there that led to his expulsion. This becomes a popular theme only in later accounts.<sup>43</sup> The 16 disputes reported in Fakhr al-Dīn's autobiographical book about this period do not allow that conclusion. The subjects discussed are mostly points of disagreement between Ash'aris and Maturidis and disputed questions among philosophically educated scholars. Among those 16 questions, only the one on the possibility of seeing God in the afterlife (2nd question) and the one on the nature of God's speech (14th question) can be identified as disputes with Mu'tazilis.

## FAKHR AL-DĪN'S MATURE CAREER AND HIS DEATH

Starting with the year 595/1199, the information about Fakhr al-Dīn's whereabouts and his life circumstances becomes much more abundant.

<sup>41</sup> Ibn Ghaylān, *Hudūth al-'ālam*, 10.14.

<sup>42</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Kitāb al-Muḥaṣṣal*, 80.8. Daniel Gimaret, *Théories de l'acte humain en théologie musulmane* (Paris: Vrin, 1980), 137 comes to a similar conclusion based on the criterion of al-Rāzī's interest in certain subjects, here particularly a point of contention between Ash'aris and Maturidis. Shihadeh, 'From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī', 171f., also dates it to this period at the 'heights of al-Rāzī's experimentalism'.

<sup>43</sup> This goes back to al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vii. 86.8. Neither his contemporary al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt*, iv. 249.11, nor his teacher al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1347), *Ta'rikh al-Islām* (ed. 'U. 'A. Tadmurī, Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1407–/1987–), vol. for 601–610 AH. (no. 43), 214.20–22, mention the Mu'tazila in this context and simply repeat Ibn Khallikān's words. Fakhr al-Dīn's *al-Munāzarāt* were anecdotally popularized in a passage in al-Qazwīnī (d. 682/1283), *Athār al-bilād wa-akhbār al-'ibād* (ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen: Dieterichsche Buchhandlung, 1848), 252.11–253.24.

Fortunately for us, Fakhr al-Dīn dated the completion of certain sections in his *Tafsīr al-kabīr* and his most important theological work *al-Maṭālib al-ʿāliya*. These colophons sometimes mention where the passages were completed. In addition, Ibn al-Athīr notes a few political events in the Ghurid empire in which Fakhr al-Dīn played a role. The evidence in the *Tafsīr al-kabīr* was gathered by Michel Lagarde, Jacques Jomier, and Richard Gramlich.<sup>44</sup> The work began with the smaller sūras but this period is largely undated.<sup>45</sup> The earliest dated reference is in the commentary on Sūra 3, which was completed on 1 Rabīʿ II 595/31 January 1199. Sūra 4 was completed three months later and mentions a town written with the consonants ʾ-r-ṣ-f on the edge of Khurasan.<sup>46</sup> Then follows a break of five years and the work is continued around 601/1204 on Sūra 5 amid complaints about being far from home. This second period of dateable work on the *Tafsīr* lasts until Sūra 18, which was completed in Dhū l-Hijja 603/July 1207. Here, Fakhr al-Dīn mentions Baghlan (in northern Afghanistan), Ghazna, and in a note from the end of this period, Herat, as places that he worked in.<sup>47</sup> There are no dates and place-references in the commentary on Sūras 19–36, those that follow 48, and on the first two sūras. The latter are, according to Lagarde's analysis, the parts that were completed last.<sup>48</sup> The work on the *Tafsīr al-kabīr* did not proceed following the order of sūras nor is it clear that Fakhr al-Dīn finished it.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Michel Lagarde, *Index du Grand Commentaire de Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 56–7; Jomier, 'Les *Mafatih al-ghayb*'; id. 'The Qur'anic Commentary of Imām Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī: Its Sources and its Originality'; and Richard Gramlich, 'Fakhr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzīs Kommentar zu Sure 18, 9–12', *Asiatische Studien* (Zurich) 1 (1979): 99–152.

<sup>45</sup> Lagarde, *Index du Grand Commentaire*, 51–5 shows that the commentaries on Sūras 104, 94, 87, 78, and 67 were completed before the dated work on the longer sūras (3 to 18 and 37 to 48) started. Jomier, 'Les *Mafatih al-ghayb*' 254f. notes that according to one MS in Istanbul the commentary on Sūra 114 had already been completed in 592/1196.

<sup>46</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Tafsīr al-kabīr*, ix. 157 and xi. 122 (Jumāda II 595). Cf. Jomier, 'Les *Mafatih al-ghayb*' 255, and id. 'The Qur'anic Commentary', 96.

<sup>47</sup> Baghlān (variously misspelled) is mentioned in Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Tafsīr al-kabīr*, xv. 214, xix.150; Ghazna is at xxi. 72, xxi. 177; and Herat is at xxvii. 92. Gramlich, 'Fakhr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzīs Kommentar', 105 suggests amending the date on xxi. 72 from 601 to 602, and that makes perfect sense. Cf. also Jomier, 'Les *Mafatih al-ghayb*' 254–61 and id. 'The Qur'anic Commentary', 96.

<sup>48</sup> Lagarde, *Index du Grand Commentaire*, 51–5.

<sup>49</sup> Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, iv. 249.4; Jomier, 'Les *Mafatih al-ghayb*', 259–63, 272–77; id. 'Qui a commenté l'ensemble des sourates *al-ʿAnkabūt* à

The *Maṭālib al-‘āliya* was composed right after the second period of dateable work on the commentary. Most of the nine parts of this book carry a date of completion.<sup>50</sup> The first part was completed in Dhū l-Qa‘da 603/June 1207. It took Fakhr al-Dīn more than 15 months to complete the second part in Rabī‘ I 605/November 1208. The eastern Muslim lands and in particular Herat went through a volatile period between 603 and 605/1206–08. Fakhr al-Dīn might have also worked at the same time on the commentary of the first two sūras of the Qur’ān. From part two on, the work on the *Maṭālib al-‘āliya* proceeded very fast. Parts two to seven were finished in the four months of fall and winter of 605/1208–09. The book was probably never fully completed. The ninth and last part bears a note of conclusion that is dated to the final days of Muḥarram 606/end of July 1209, the very days when Fakhr al-Dīn dictated his testament while lying terminally ill. Only two of the eight dates in this book mention a place: the completion of part two and three happened in ‘*Jurjāniyyat Khwārazm*’ in a house Fakhr al-Dīn owned there. This refers to Gurganj, the capital of Khwarazm.<sup>51</sup> If these two notes are correct, we must assume that right after the Khwarazmshah secured the conquest of Herat in early 605/summer 1208, Fakhr al-Dīn accompanied him to Khwarazm, only to return to Herat and die there.<sup>52</sup>

*Yāsīn* (29–36) dans “*le Tafsīr al-kabīr*” de l’imām Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī?’ *IJMES* 11 (1980): 467–85; Gramlich, ‘Fakhr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzīs Kommentar zu Sure 18. 9–12’, 108–12.

<sup>50</sup> These dates can be easily located at the end of the nine parts in Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Maṭālib al-‘āliya min al-‘ilm al-ilāhī* (ed. A. Ḥ. al-Saqqā, Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 9 parts in 5 vols., 1987). There is no colophon for part 3 in the printed edition. Yet MS Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ar 3114, fol. 147<sup>a</sup> says part 3 was completed on 6 Rabī‘ II 605 (18. Oct. 1208) in *Jurjāniyyat Khwārazm* ‘in the house owned by me in the street [illegible]’. I am grateful to Ayman Shihadeh for this information. Part 8 has no date. Within the text of part 8, there is a vague date (xiii. 155.19): ‘[...] such as in the times that we find ourselves in, which is the beginning of the 600s.’

<sup>51</sup> Referred to in Arabic as *Jurjāniyya*, see Bertold Spuler in *El<sup>2</sup>*, ii. 1141b.

<sup>52</sup> The evidence on the dating of the *Maṭālib* had already been gathered by Ṭāshkōbrizāda (d. 980/1561), *Miftāḥ al-sā‘āda wa-miṣbāḥ al-siyāda fī mawḍū‘āt al-‘ulūm*, (Hyderabad: Maṭba‘at Majlis Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif al-Nizāmiyya, 3 vols., 1328–56 [1910–1937]), i. 447–8. Ṭāshkōbrizāda also provides a date for the third part (second half of Rabī‘ I, 605) and he already noted the appearance of *Jurjāniyya* in Khwarazm. On Ṭāshkōbrizāda’s list, cf. Jomier, ‘*Les Mafatih al-ghayb*’, 262.

All the early chroniclers of Fakhr al-Dīn's life mention his move either to eastern Khurasan or Ghur. Ibn al-Sha'ār makes the motives for this move clear. He writes that after Khwarazm and Transoxania, Fakhr al-Dīn settled in Bamiyan in Ghur. 'Its ruler was Bahā' al-Dīn Sām and Fakhr al-Dīn stayed with him many years and acquired from him much wealth'.<sup>53</sup> Bahā' al-Dīn Sām (d. 602/1206) was a member of the minor branch of the Ghurid family that resided in Bamiyan. Much more powerful were the two other branches represented by his two great-cousins Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 599/1203), who resided mostly in Fīrūzkūh (the modern town of Jam in central Afghanistan), and Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 602/1206), who had his residence in Ghazna. The two brothers Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Mu'izz al-Dīn had come to power in 558/1163 and together they had expanded what was initially a local fiefdom in the northern ranges of the Hindu Kush to a sultanate that stretched from Delhi in India to Nishapur in Khurasan.<sup>54</sup>

According to Ibn Khallikān, it was the much more powerful Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad who initially attracted Fakhr al-Dīn to the Ghurid empire. He describes their relationship in terms of a business transaction:

Fakhr al-Dīn had a business dealing (*mu'āmala*) with Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad, the ruler of Ghazna, involving a sum of money. Fakhr al-Dīn made his way to him in order to get from him his full due (*ḥaqq*) and Mu'izz al-Dīn exceeded in honouring him and bestowing gifts upon him. Fakhr al-Dīn received huge wealth from him. Then he returned to Khurasan.<sup>55</sup>

Khurasan probably refers to Herat, where Fakhr al-Dīn lived under the patronage of Mu'izz al-Dīn's brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn. The nature of Fakhr al-Dīn's initial business with Mu'izz al-Dīn is left unclear. It may be a book that the ruler had commissioned, or maybe even the mission to India that is mentioned by some biographers.<sup>56</sup> At the beginning of his

<sup>53</sup> Ibn al-Sha'ār, *Uqūd al-jumān*, vi. 108.1–3.

<sup>54</sup> Mu'izz al-Dīn is also referred to as Shihāb al-Dīn. We use the names established by C. Edmund Bosworth, 'The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (AD 1000–1217)', in J. A. Boyle (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Iran. Volume 5*, 200–1. On the Ghūrids cf. also Bosworth in *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (ed. Ehsan Yarshater, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982–), x. 586–90, and his *The New Islamic Dynasties. A Chronological and Genealogical Manual* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 298f.

<sup>55</sup> Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, iv. 250.13–14.

<sup>56</sup> al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī bi-l-wafayāt*, iv. 249.16 says that the Khwarazmshah 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad had sent him on a mission to India.

autobiography about the disputes in Transoxania, Fakhr al-Dīn refers to this period of his life:

When I entered Transoxania I first arrived in Bukhara, then in Samarkand. Then I moved from these places to Khujand and then to a town called Banakath, then to Ghazna and India.<sup>57</sup>

Khujand (today's Khojent in Tajikistan's part of the Ferghana valley) and Banakath (today close to Tashkent in Uzbekistan) are both in Transoxania north of Bukhara. So we have Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī move from there to Afghanistan and probably India, from where he goes to Herat where he settled around 595/1199. Yet, his travels and sojourns may not be as straightforward as these words suggest. The references that appear in the *Tafsīr al-kabīr* also mention other places.

During all these years, the Ghurids were in an open war with the Khwarazmshahs over the possession of the rich province of Khurasan. The conflict of interest between them began in 571/1175 when Ghiyāth al-Dīn took control of Herat. It thus stretched through almost the whole of Fakhr al-Dīn's adult lifetime. The Qara Khitai, a non-Muslim dynasty of Turks that had come under Chinese cultural influence, also played a role in this struggle. Their centre of power lay in upper Transoxania, in cities like Khujand and Banakath, which Fakhr al-Dīn had visited. Yet the Qara Khitai also ruled over Bukhara and Samarkand and even had a foothold south of the Oxus in Ṭukhāristān around Tirmidh (northern Afghanistan), which lay in the Ghurids' zone of interest.<sup>58</sup>

After the Saljuqs had disappeared from the political map in the 580s/1180s, eastern Khurasan with its capital at Herat was ruled by the Ghurids and northern and central Khurasan by the Khwarazmshahs. The Khwarazmshah Tekish (r. 567–596/1172–1200) had installed his eldest son Nāṣir al-Dīn Malikshāh (d. 593/1196–97) as governor in Khurasan. War with the Ghurids began in 590/1194 when the Ghurid Ghiyāth al-Dīn attacked the Khwarazmshah's territory. By the time of Tekish's death (596/1200) the Ghurids had managed to gain control of almost the whole of Khurasan. However, Tekish's son and successor 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad (r. 596–617/1200–1220) managed to turn the fortunes of the Khwarazmshahs around: after Ghiyāth al-Dīn's death

<sup>57</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Munāẓarāt*, 7.3–4; Kraus, 'Les "Controverses" de Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī', 192.

<sup>58</sup> Michal Biran, *The Empire of the Qara Khitai in Eurasian History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 60–86. The Qara Khitai are also known as the Xi Liao or Western Liao.

(599/1202) he besieged Herat for two months between Rajab and Shaʿbān 600/spring 1204. The siege was unsuccessful and ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad returned to his lands. Meanwhile, the Ghurid Muʿizz al-Dīn, who had campaigned in India, prepared himself to pursue ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad and his army. In Ramaḍān 600/May 1204, he invaded his enemy's lands and drove him back into Khwarazm. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad now forged an alliance with the Qara Khitai and in a great battle at Andkhuy near the Oxus in Ṣafar 601/September 1204, the Qara Khitai routed the Ghurid army, almost capturing Muʿizz al-Dīn himself. Of their former lands in Khurasan, only Herat remained with the Ghurids.<sup>59</sup>

In his *Tafsīr al-kabīr*, Fakhr al-Dīn mentions in a comment on Sūra 5 that he is sad and anxious because of a victory of the unbelievers against the Muslim armies. This should be understood as a reference to the battle of Andkhuy and the catastrophic defeat of Muʿizz al-Dīn. Fakhr al-Dīn is writing far from his library, he complains, with few books at his disposal.<sup>60</sup> During the years between 595/1199 and 605/1208, or even earlier, Fakhr al-Dīn was very close to the highest Ghurid leadership, who honoured and enriched him. Ghiyāth al-Dīn is said to have built a *madrasa* for Fakhr al-Dīn in Herat close to the main mosque.<sup>61</sup>

After Ghiyāth al-Dīn's death, his successors continued to honour Fakhr al-Dīn. One of those was the last Ghurid governor of Herat, ʿIzz al-Dīn ibn Kharmīl, who in late 602/summer 1206 changed sides in favour of the Khwarazmshah.<sup>62</sup> He invited Khwarazmian troops into the city and promised to submit to the Khwarazmshah once he

<sup>59</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī l-taʾrīkh*, xii. 121–4; Bosworth, 'The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (AD 1000–1217)', 163–5; Biran, *Empire of the Qara Khitai*, 66–70.

<sup>60</sup> Jomier, 'Qurʾanic Commentary', 96, 98.

<sup>61</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī l-taʾrīkh*, xii. 99.15. Ibn al-Sāʿī (d. 674/1276), *al-Jāmiʿ al-mukhtaṣar fī ʿunwān al-tawārīkh wa-ʿuyūn al-siyar* (ed. M. Jawād, Baghdad: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Suryāniyya al-Kāthūlikiyya, 1934), part 9, 307.5 says: 'several *madrasas* were built for Fakhr al-Dīn.' Ghiyāth al-Dīn was, of course, also the one who built the existing monumental Friday mosque in Herat, work on which started in 597/1200–01 after the earlier one had burnt down.

<sup>62</sup> ʿIzz al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn ibn Kharmīl of Gurzumān (d. 604/1207) who was from 601/1204 the *amīr ḥājīb* (chief-chamberlain) of the Ghurid empire and from 602/1206 the governor of Herat. On his honouring Fakhr al-Dīn, see p. 335 and n. 82 below.

arrived in Herat. The Shāh was, however, engaged elsewhere and could not secure his new possession. He first appeared in Herat in Jumāda I 603/December 1206 but had to leave soon after and resume his campaign, which suffered a temporary setback caused by the Qara Khitai. In the meantime, anti-Khwarazmian forces in Herat took control of the city and expelled Ibn Kharmīl. During a period of more than two years, Herat suffered from political instability and internal unrest until, at the beginning of 605/summer 1208, the Khwarazmshah came to Herat, besieged the city, and conquered it.<sup>63</sup>

When ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad finally took possession of Herat, Fakhr al-Dīn’s fortunes did not change. Ibn al-Qiftī was the first to note Fakhr al-Dīn’s beneficial relationship with ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad. Ibn Abī Uṣaybī’a’s report gives the impression that Fakhr al-Dīn’s personal situation improved on the already high standard he had enjoyed under the Ghurids. He says that Fakhr al-Dīn became a government official, entrusted with the religious endowments and schools not only in Herat but ‘in all the regions of the Sultan and that [comprises] many cities.’<sup>64</sup> The Khwarazmshah gave Fakhr al-Dīn the Ghurid palace in Herat as a residence, where his family continued to live even after his death.<sup>65</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn’s daughter was married to a vizier of the Khwarazmshah, who managed to stay in an influential position under the Mongols. When Chingiz Khān’s son Toluy captured Herat in 618/1221, the vizier arranged for Fakhr al-Dīn’s family a promise of safety (*amān*) for their house, the former Ghurid palace. Once this news spread, people flocked to the palace to benefit from the *amān*. But when the Mongols entered the city and saw the situation, they singled out Fakhr al-Dīn’s two

<sup>63</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī l-ta’rīkh*, xii. 149–52, 162, 172–6; Juwaynī, *Ta’rīkh-i Jahāngushāy*, ii. 62–9, trans. 328–36; Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāširī*, Engl. transl. H. G. Raverty, 2 vols. (London: Gilbert & Rivington, 1881; repr. New Delhi: Oriental Book Reprint Corporation, 2 vols., 1970), i. 255–60; Peter Jackson, ‘The Fall of the Ghurid Dynasty’, in C. Hillenbrand (ed.) *Studies in Honour of Clifford Edmund Bosworth. Volume II. The Sultan’s Turret: Studies in Persian and Turkish Culture* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 208–36, at 221–4; and Biran, *Empire of the Qara Khitai*, 70–4.

<sup>64</sup> August Müller, *Nachträgliche Verbesserungen zu Ibn Abi Useibia* (Königsberg: Selbstverlag, 1884), 76 adds a line to the text of his printed edition of Ibn Abī Uṣaybī’a, ‘*Uyūn al-anbā*’. 2:24.24. Following the word ‘Herāt’, the Cairene printer skipped the line: ‘fī-hā bi-kawn al-sulṭān Muḥammad Khwārazmshāh wa-lahu umūr al-wuqūf wa-l-madāris fī sār bilād al-sulṭān wa-hiya mudun kathīra.’

<sup>65</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybī’a, ‘*Uyūn al-anbā*’, ii. 26.20.

sons and daughter and killed the rest of the people. Out of fear of retaliation, Fakhr al-Dīn's family moved to Samarkand, where Chingiz Khān resided, in order to benefit from the direct protection of the former vizier.<sup>66</sup>

Fakhr al-Dīn himself died in Herat either on the day of 'Īd al-ḥijra 606/29 March 1210 or—less likely—in the month of Dhū l-Ḥijja 606/May 1210.<sup>67</sup> In Western literature, Fakhr al-Dīn's date of death often appears as 1209. But this is a mistake since both reported dates for al-Rāzī's death fall in 1210. The error was most probably prompted by a misinterpretation of the passage in Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a.<sup>68</sup> Some months earlier Fakhr al-Dīn had fallen ill and, knowing that his end was near, dictated his testament (*waṣīyya*) to one of his disciples on 21 Muḥarram 606/26 July 1209, a date that coincides with the last work on *al-Maṭālib al-ʿāliya*.<sup>69</sup> The testament mentions the Khwarazmshah 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad as 'God's deputy [on earth]' and the 'supreme sultan'. Fakhr al-Dīn expresses his hope that the close

<sup>66</sup> Ibid, 26. 12–29.

<sup>67</sup> Among the earliest historians, al-Mundhirī, *al-Takmila li-wafayāt al-naqala*, ii. 176.ult. has the 'Īd al-ḥijra date and Ibn al-Qiftī, *Ta'rikh al-ḥukamā'*, 292.9 the Dhū l-Ḥijja date. The latter may actually be a misunderstanding due to a confusion of the two major Muslim festivals. Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a and Ibn Khallikān both follow al-Mundhirī although they certainly knew Ibn al-Qiftī's text. Among the early historians, Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī (d. 654/1256), *Mir'āt al-zamān fī ta'rikh al-a'yān* (Hyderabad: Maṭba'at Majlis Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-ʿUthmāniyya, 1370–77/1951–52, part 8, 2 vols.), i. 542.13, and, following his information, Abū Shāma, *al-Dhayl 'alā l-Rawḍatayn*, 68.5, also have the Dhū l-Ḥijja date. Ibn al-Sā'ī, *al-Jāmi' al-mukhtaṣar*, 307.11 has the 25th of Ramaḍān 609, four days before the 'Īd al-ḥijra.

<sup>68</sup> Carl Brockelmann's date '606/1209' in his influential *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, (Weimar: E. Felber, 2 vols., 1898–1902), i. 506 is not wrong as it means that Fakhr al-Dīn died in 606 AH or 1209–10 CE. Those who copied this date carelessly from Brockelmann made a mistake—including those responsible for the ambiguities on al-Rāzī's death in the current entry on him in *EI*<sup>2</sup>, ii. 752b.

<sup>69</sup> See n. 50. The *waṣīyya* is extant in Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a, '*Uyūn al-anbā'*', ii. 27.2–28.17 and in an independent manuscript tradition like, for instance, MS Berlin, Wetzstein II 1537, fos. 79<sup>b</sup>–80<sup>a</sup> (Ahlwardt 3989). English translation in Tony Street, 'Concerning the Life and Works of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī' in P. G. Riddell and T. Street (eds.), *Islam. Essays on Scripture, Thought and Society. A Festschrift in Honour of Anthony H. Johns* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 135–46.

link (*qarīn*) to the family might continue after his death.<sup>70</sup> A century later, Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) wrote about their relationship:

Al-Rāzī had a brotherly connection to ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad, to the extent that he entrusted (*waṣā*) his children to him, and he wrote for him a book called *al-Risāla al-‘Alā’iyya fī l-ikhtiyārāt al-samāwiyya*.<sup>71</sup>

A group of less sympathetic scholars among Fakhr al-Dīn’s early biographers report that his death led to celebrations among the Karramis in Herat and that those people had, in fact, poisoned him. These traditionalist historians also know that at his death Fakhr al-Dīn left 80,000 gold dinars—many millions in today’s money—in addition to a great number of precious robes, and movable as well as immovable property.<sup>72</sup>

### FAKHR AL-DĪN’S PATRONS

The early sources on Fakhr al-Dīn’s life make it clear that during his lifetime he received very generous patronage from both the Khwarazmshahs and from the Ghurid family. This is astonishing given that the two dynasties were openly hostile to one another. But did Fakhr al-Dīn’s close relationship with the Khwarazmshah start only after the latter conquered Herat in 605/1208 or already when Fakhr al-Dīn was travelling in his lands in Khwarazm, Transoxania, and Khurasan? After all, Ibn al-Qiftī writes that it was the Khwarazmshah who first made Fakhr al-Dīn a rich man. While the biographical tradition offers no clear evidence of patronage from the Khwarazmshah before 605/1208,

<sup>70</sup> ‘*nā’ib Allāh Muḥammad*’, and ‘*al-sultān al-‘azam*’, Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, ‘*Uyūn al-anbā*’, 2:28.9–10.

<sup>71</sup> Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Furqān bayna l-ḥaqq wa-l-bāṭil* in *Majmū‘at al-rasā’il al-kubrā*, (Cairo: Muḥammad ‘Alī Ṣubayḥ, 2 vols., 1966), i. 5–172, at 135.14–15. This is the Persian *al-Ikhtiyārāt al-‘Alā’iyya*, and more on it on the next page. Ibn Taymiyya is very critical of this work, as he is of a second Arabic work of Fakhr al-Dīn, *al-Sirr al-maktūm* on astrology, which, he says, was written for ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad’s mother. This was Terken Khātūn (d. 630/1232–3), a Qipchaq-Turk princess, who held her own court, and a commission of an Arabic book is somehow unlikely and not mentioned in *al-Sirr al-maktūm*, MS Istanbul, Carullah Effendi 1480. On the authenticity of *al-Sirr al-maktūm*, which al-Subkī (*Ṭabaqāt*, vii. 87.13) denies, cf. Ritter, ‘Philologika IX (Die vier Suhrawardī)’, 285.

<sup>72</sup> Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, *Mir’āt al-zamān*, i. 542. 12; Abū Shāma, *al-Dhayl ‘alā l-Rawḍatayn*, 68.4 and 68.10.

Fakhr al-Dīn wrote a didactic poem in Persian and dedicated it to Nāṣir al-Dīn Malikshāh, the Khwarazmian crown prince, who was from 583/1187 governor in Nishapur and who moved to Merv in 589/1193.<sup>73</sup> Nāṣir al-Dīn was the eldest son of Tekish and died before his father in 593/1196–97, which led to the second son Muḥammad becoming Tekish's successor.

Two other works should be connected to the first period of the Khwarazmshahs' patronage of Fakhr al-Dīn. First, there is the Persian historical work *Hadā'iq al-anwār fī ḥaqā'iq al-asrār* whose ninth and last chapter is a history of the Khwarazmshah Tekish.<sup>74</sup> The second work is the Persian *al-Ikhtiyārāt al-'Alā'iyya*. Ibn Taymiyya claimed that it was written for 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad. This seems evident from the title of the work. Yet, the book bears a dedication to Tekish, not to his son 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad.<sup>75</sup> In fact, the *laqab* 'Alā' al-Dīn ran in the family. Tekish adopted it when he came to power in 567/1172 and his son Muḥammad did the same when his father died in 596/1200.<sup>76</sup> Before becoming the Khwarazmshah, Muḥammad was known as Quṭb al-Dīn. Thus, the 'Alā' al-Dīn referred to in the title of *al-Ikhtiyārāt al-'Alā'iyya* was Tekish and not his son Muḥammad. Yet the latter may be connected to a much greater work than the *Ikhtiyārāt*. Given that all parts of Fakhr al-Dīn's *al-Maṭālib al-'āliya* were completed under the reign of 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad one might, in fact, conjecture that this title is an allusion to him. Certainly Fakhr al-Dīn did not dedicate it openly to 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad. In the book he mentions the Ghurid Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad as a deceased 'great king',

<sup>73</sup> The poem consists of four parts: on logics, on the natural sciences, on metaphysics, and 'on the sultan's praise' (*madḥ-i sulṭān*). At the beginning of the last part Nāṣir al-Dīn Malikshāh ibn Tekish is mentioned. The poem is critically edited by Naṣrallāh Pūrjavādī in his *Dū mujaddid: Pizhūhishbā-yi darbāra-yi Muḥammad-i Ghazzālī ve-Fakhr-i Rāzī*, 560–4. On Nāṣir al-Dīn Malikshāh, cf. Juwaynī, *Ta'rikh-i Jahāngushāy*, ii. 25, 30, 34–5, 39, trans. 297, 301–2, 304–5, 308–9; and Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, trans. i. 250f., who says that Nāṣir al-Dīn was himself a scholar and that 'a great number of eminent men assembled at his court'.

<sup>74</sup> Franz Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1968, 2nd edn.), 39f., 540f.

<sup>75</sup> 'sulṭān-i a'zam ve-shāh-i banū ādam Abū l-Muzaffar Tekish ibn al-malik al-a'zam ʿĪl Arslān ibn al-malik al-mu'azzam Atsiz [...],' Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Ikhtiyārāt al-'Alā'iyya*, MS Istanbul, Ayasofya 2689, fos. 2<sup>a</sup>–2<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī l-ta'rikh*, xi. 247.12 (*sub anno* 568); xii. 103.17–20 (*sub anno* 596); Juwaynī, *Ta'rikh-i Jahāngushāy*, ii. 46–8, trans. 314–6; Bosworth, 'The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World', 192.

with whom he had discussed subjects treated in *al-Maṭālib al-‘āliya*, and he praises his virtue and generosity towards scholars.<sup>77</sup>

Since there is good evidence for a close relationship between Fakhr al-Dīn and the family of the Khwarazmshah early during the scholar's life, the story about his insulting brother, as reported by Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, might have some credibility. Fakhr al-Dīn's older brother Rukn al-Dīn is said to have become jealous of the success of his famous sibling. Rukn al-Dīn was himself a scholar in the fields of law and theology and started to express his opposition to the positions taken by his brother. Rukn al-Dīn followed Fakhr al-Dīn wherever he went. He would slander and defame him and ridicule those reading his books. He asked people to acknowledge that he was greater and more learned than his brother. They however, would only repeat Fakhr al-Dīn's name and never mention his. Rukn al-Dīn went so far as to pass off some poor compositions under the name of his brother. Fakhr al-Dīn, who was initially friendly to his brother, became angry when he heard about the falsifications and demanded from his brother that he stop. Finally, he asked the Khwarazmshah to send his brother to some remote outpost and order him to stay there. The Khwarazmshah fulfilled Fakhr al-Dīn's wish and sent Rukn al-Dīn to a distant castle with feudal lands (*iqṭā‘*) attached to it that would generate a thousand dinars annually. Here Rukn al-Dīn stayed until he died.<sup>78</sup>

But if Fakhr al-Dīn was so well accommodated under the Khwarazmshah, why did he leave his service and engage in the risky business of changing sides to join the Ghurids? There is no clear answer other than the numerous hints of the financial dealings and the very generous rewards he received from the Ghurids. These indicate that the Ghurids competed with the Khwarazmshahs to be patrons of Fakhr al-Dīn. The Ghurids' motivation for offering better conditions than the Khwarazmshahs seems to be rooted in their religious policy. This is evident from a political scandal in the Ghurid empire that Fakhr al-Dīn became involved in. It happened in the year 595/1198–99 at a time when Fakhr al-Dīn's relationship with the Ghurids had probably just begun. Ibn al-Athīr reports that in that year Fakhr al-Dīn arrived at Ghiyāth al-Dīn's court in Firuzkuh. He had parted from Bahā' al-Dīn Sām who, according to Ibn al-Sha‘‘ār's information, had initially invited Fakhr al-Dīn to come to the Ghurid lands. The historian Minhāj-i Sirāj Jūzjānī (d. ca. 664/1265), who chronicled the Ghurid dynasty, confirms that Bahā' al-Dīn had hosted Fakhr al-Dīn at his court 'for a

<sup>77</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Maṭālib al-‘āliya*, vii. 275.

<sup>78</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, *‘Uyūn al-anbā’*, ii. 25.20–26.1.

considerable time'.<sup>79</sup> There may have developed a rift between Bahā' al-Dīn Sām and Fakhr al-Dīn as we know that, later, after the death of Mu'izz al-Dīn in 602/1206, Bahā' al-Dīn was behind the accusations against Fakhr al-Dīn of having had a hand in Mu'izz al-Dīn's violent end. In that year, Fakhr al-Dīn had taken up residence at Mu'izz al-Dīn's court at Ghazna.<sup>80</sup> After the murder, he was accused of complicity in it and of being an agent in the service of the Khwarazmshah, with whom he apparently never broke. Fakhr al-Dīn escaped through the help of Mu'izz al-Dīn's vizier.<sup>81</sup> His arrival at Herat was a moment of great honour when the local Ghurid dignitaries, among them the city's governor 'Izz al-Dīn ibn Kharmīl, who would later try to hand it to the Khwarazmshah, showed much respect to Fakhr al-Dīn. The Ghurids in Herat were the direct successors of Ghiyāth al-Dīn and they had come to oppose Bahā' al-Dīn in Bamiyan. Fakhr al-Dīn's arrival in Herat was witnessed by a scholar who is quoted by Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a. The report points out that while stepping up to the main *iwān* of the Great Mosque in Herat, it was Fakhr al-Dīn who asked the Ghurid luminaries to be seated—and not the other way round.<sup>82</sup>

For now the open conflict with the Bamiyan branch of the Ghurid family clan lay in the future. In 595/1098–99 Fakhr al-Dīn's arrival from Bahā' al-Dīn was welcomed by Ghiyāth al-Dīn and he honoured him greatly and built a *madrassa* for him in Herat. The local party of the Karramis, who were the majority in Herat, did not welcome Fakhr al-Dīn and dreaded the sultan's support of him. Ibn al-Athīr informs us that the family of the Ghurids (*al-ghūriyya*) were also Karramis and loathed Fakhr al-Dīn. The leader of the opposing party within the

<sup>79</sup> Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāširi*, Engl. transl. 1:419. He says Fakhr al-Dīn composed a 'Risālah-yi Bahā'iyya' for him.

<sup>80</sup> In his *Tafsīr al-kabīr* the two notes at the end of the 17th and 18th sūras refer to Ghazna. They were written on 20 Muḥarram 602 (cf. n. 47) and 17 Ṣafar 602, six and five months before Mu'izz al-Dīn's murder on 1 Sha'bān 602/13 March 1206 on the road from Lahore to Ghazna. Before his residence in Ghazna, Fakhr al-Dīn was in Baghlan, where the last note is dated Ramaḍān 601/May 1205.

<sup>81</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī l-ta'rīkh*, xii. 140.18–20; Ibn al-Sā'ī, *al-Jāmi' al-mukhtaṣar*, 172. Cf. Jackson, 'The Fall of the Ghurid Dynasty', 217; Jomier, 'Les *Mafatih al-ghayb*', 270f. and id. 'The Qur'anic Commentary', 98f.

<sup>82</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, 'Uyūn al-anbā', ii. 23.26–24.4. The report claims that Fakhr al-Dīn came from Bamiyan at some time after 600/1204. The two Ghurids present were 'Izz al-Dīn ibn Kharmīl and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Maḥmūd (d. 609/1212), who became Sultan of Isfizār (Shindand) and Bust after the death of his father Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad in 599/1203.

Ghurid leadership was Ḍiyā' al-Dīn, a cousin of Ghiyāth al-Dīn and married to his daughter.<sup>83</sup> He initiated a disputation between legal scholars from the Hanafis (both Karramis as well as non-Karramis) and the Shafi'is, who all opposed Fakhr al-Dīn. The scholars appeared at Ghiyāth al-Dīn's court in Firuzkuh as did Fakhr al-Dīn. The first disputation was between him and Majd al-Dīn Ibn al-Qudwa, a Karrami of great prestige.<sup>84</sup> The exchange became lengthy and when Ghiyāth al-Dīn rose in order to leave the room, Fakhr al-Dīn turned arrogantly against Ibn al-Qudwa, slandered him and abused him. Ibn al-Qudwa remained calm and did not return the insult. Now, Ḍiyā' al-Dīn complained about Fakhr al-Dīn's behaviour and blamed him for his disrespect. He accused him of clandestine apostasy (*zandaqa*) and of being one of the *falāsifa*. But Ghiyath al-Dīn was not taken in by this and remained loyal to Fakhr al-Dīn.

The next day, Ibn al-Qudwa's cousin walked up the *minbar* of a mosque in Firuzkuh and gave the following speech:

O people: We only say what are in our opinion the true teachings of God's Messenger. We do not know Aristotle's science or the unbelieving things of Ibn Sīnā or al-Fārābī's philosophy. Why has yesterday one of the shaykhs of Islam been vilified while he was defending God's religion and the *sunna* of His Prophet?<sup>85</sup>

The people in the gathering started crying while he was saying these words and the Karramis among them became agitated. They walked out and demanded Fakhr al-Dīn's removal from Ghiyāth al-Dīn's court. Violent hostilities (*fitna*) began to shake Firuzkuh which was, as Ibn al-Athīr informs us elsewhere, largely a Shafi'i town.<sup>86</sup> Ghiyāth al-Dīn's troops were unable to still the unrest and peace was restored only when he promised to expel Fakhr al-Dīn from Firuzkuh.<sup>87</sup> Ghiyāth al-Dīn ordered Fakhr al-Dīn to return to Herat.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>83</sup> Ḍiyā' al-Dīn (later 'Alā' al-Dīn) Muḥammad ibn Abī 'Alī (d. 616/1219–20) who is known to have had Karrami sympathies and who succeeded Ghiyāth al-Dīn as the Sultan of Firuzkuh. Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, xii. 146–8; Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāširī*, trans. i. 397; Bosworth in *EI*<sup>2</sup>, ii. 1103a, and Jackson, 'The Fall of the Ghurid Dynasty', 217.

<sup>84</sup> Or al-Qudawwa(?) His full name is Majd al-Dīn 'Abd al-Majīd ibn 'Umar and he is otherwise unknown. Ibn al-Athīr says that he was '*min al-Karrāmiyya al-haṣamiyya*'.

<sup>85</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī l-ta'rikh*, xii. 100.4–7.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid, xii. 147.4 (*sub anno* 602).

<sup>87</sup> Ibid, xii. 100.10. 'wa'ada-hum bi-ikhrāj Fakhr al-Dīn min 'indi-him'.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid, xii. 99.10–100.11. Ibn al-Sā'ī, *al-Jāmi' al-mukhtaṣar*, ix. 4–6. Jomier, 'Les *Mafatih al-ghayb*', 256, and id. 'The Qur'anic Commentary',

Other historians inform us that Fakhr al-Dīn lived under the constant watch of bodyguards and had his own group of military slaves (*mamlūks*).<sup>89</sup> Ibn al-Qiftī reports that his relationship with Herat's populace (*al-ʿawāmm*) was so poor that, after his death, his family and students held a mock-funeral at a nearby hill, while his body was in fact buried in his house out of fear of mutilation.<sup>90</sup> The high degree of resistance to Fakhr al-Dīn's presence in the Ghurid empire both among established scholars and the ruling family calls for an explanation. Why did Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Muʿizz al-Dīn continue to support him? The only answer that is consistent with all these circumstances lies in the nature of Fakhr al-Dīn's scholarship. Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Muʿizz al-Dīn were impressed by al-Rāzī's rationalist theology and his competence in the Greek sciences. And they favoured his religious *madhhab*. 'Because of him,' Ibn Khallikān says, 'many people converted from the Karrami group and others to the teachings of the Sunnis'.<sup>91</sup>

Ghiyāth al-Dīn's support for Fakhr al-Dīn despite the Karrami and Hanafī opposition constituted a religious policy that was effectively directed against these two parties. In the Muslim east, Hanafism in *fiqh* was frequently combined with Karramism in theology, a direction that is often portrayed as simplistic and anthropomorphist.<sup>92</sup> The historian Jūzjānī informs us that the brothers Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Muʿizz al-Dīn grew up as Karramis and at the outset of their career followed the tenets of that group. When Ghiyāth al-Dīn saw in a dream al-Shāfiʿī addressing him from the pulpit, he changed his *madhhab*.<sup>93</sup>

Shams al-Dīn al-Shahrazūri (fl. 680/1282) informs us about Ghiyāth al-Dīn's stand regarding Fakhr al-Dīn's Ashʿarism. Al-Shahrazūri,

96 attributes the disruption of five years during the work on the *Tafsīr al-kabīr* to this event.

<sup>89</sup> Ibn al-Qiftī, *Taʾrikh al-ḥukamāʾ*, 292.5–6; Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, 'Uyūn al-anbāʾ', ii. 24.1. Ibn al-Sāʿī, *al-Jāmiʿ al-mukhtaṣar*, 307.5 says, he had more than 50 *mamlūks*. Some kind of security was certainly a necessity for a person of Fakhr al-Dīn's wealth.

<sup>90</sup> Ibn al-Qiftī, *Taʾrikh al-ḥukamāʾ*, 291.14–5.

<sup>91</sup> Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-aʿyān*, 4:250.1.

<sup>92</sup> On Karrāmi theology see C. E. Bosworth in *EP*<sup>2</sup>, iv. 667–9; Louis Massignon, *Essay on the Origins of the Technical Language of Islamic Mysticism*, transl. B. Clark (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1997), 174–83; Ulrich Rudolph, *al-Māturīdī und die sunnitische Theologie in Samarkand* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), index; Josef van Ess, *Ungenützte Texte zur Karrāmīya. Eine Materialsammlung* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1980) and Aron Zysow, 'Two Unrecognized Karrāmi Texts', *JOAS* 108 (1988), 577–87.

<sup>93</sup> Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāshiri*, trans. i. 384f.

about whose life we know next to nothing, was a sharp critic of Fakhr al-Dīn's attempt to reconcile Ash'arism with *falsafa*. Being himself a follower of Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī and his *ishrāqī* philosophy, al-Shahrazūrī writes that Fakhr al-Dīn 'understood nothing about the secrets of the philosophers and the metaphysicians'. Fakhr al-Dīn 'was focused on the teachings of al-Ash'arī, the *mutakallim* who didn't know x from z because he was devoid of the two wisdoms, the one of research and the one of immediate insight (*dhawq*)'.<sup>94</sup> Like his contemporary Ibn Khallikān, al-Shahrazūrī made an effort to present a consistent chronology of Fakhr al-Dīn's life. Yet his result differs from all other historians, as he has him travel to Khurasan and Maragha for his education, but already after that al-Shahrazūrī reports that Fakhr al-Dīn went to the Ghurids Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Mu'izz al-Dīn. Being aware of the incident in Firuzkuh and other problems in the Ghurid lands, al-Shahrazūrī sees Fakhr al-Dīn in despair contacting the Khwarazmshah Tekish. He goes to him and becomes the teacher of his son Muḥammad. But this relationship too does not last and after Tekish treats Fakhr al-Dīn harshly, he returns to Herat, 'where the sultan built a *madrasa* for him and where he taught until he died'.<sup>95</sup>

From his high horse of mystically inspired philosophical scholarship, al-Shahrazūrī ponders what motivated Ghiyāth al-Dīn to support Fakhr al-Dīn?

In those regions, most of the people are anthropomorphist Karramis. Fakhr al-Dīn enjoyed the favours of Ghiyāth al-Dīn who was sitting in the midst of his students and thus somewhat distinguished himself from the teachings of the Karramis.<sup>96</sup>

Al-Shahrazūrī's choice of language leaves open whether this 'slight distinction' was the cause or the effect of Ghiyāth al-Dīn's studying with Fakhr al-Dīn. We do not know if the support of Ash'ari rationalism and the suppression of Karramism was a conscious political decision on Ghiyāth al-Dīn's part. Ibn al-Athīr says about Ghiyāth al-Dīn's religious policy that it was moderate and avoided religious partisanship. 'Yet he tended towards the Shafi'is without favouring them before the other and

<sup>94</sup> al-Shahrazūrī, *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ wa-rawḍat al-afrāḥ*, 623.20 and 624.6–7. He ridiculed al-Ash'arī, 'who didn't even know the structure of a definition nor how to cast a demonstrative argument. He was a poor master, confused in his ignorant convictions that he came up with at random'.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, 624.157–625.10.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid, 624.ult.–625.2, 'urtufī'a qalīlan 'an madhāhib al-Karrāmiyya'. On Mu'izz al-Dīn attending 'a *majlīs* of Fakhr al-Dīn', cf. Ibn al-Sā'ī, *al-Jāmi' al-mukhtaṣar*, 171.

without giving them what they did not already have.<sup>97</sup> His domestic support of Fakhr al-Dīn may, of course, also have been motivated by 'international' rivalry, namely the desire to have his reign adorned by this famous teacher. We know that the Khwarazmshah also courted Fakhr al-Dīn. Even the most powerful Muslim ruler of this time, the Ayyubid al-Malik al-Ādil (r. 596–615/1200–1218), the brother of Ṣalāh al-Dīn, who reigned over Egypt and Syria, was in contact with Fakhr al-Dīn and commissioned the writing of a book that explains the role of rationalist interpretation (*ta'wīl*) in the understanding of the holy texts.<sup>98</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn had a significant intellectual influence on Ayyubid Syria.<sup>99</sup> Other 'international' commissions may include Fakhr al-Dīn's commentary on Ibn Sīnā's *Uyūn al-ḥikma*.<sup>100</sup> Thus, it may simply have been

<sup>97</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī l-ta'rikh*, xii. 119.7–9 (*sub anno* 599).

<sup>98</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn al-anbā'*, ii. 29.ult. mentions that al-Malik al-Ādil commissioned Fakhr al-Dīn's book *Ta'sīs al-taqdīs* (also known as *Asās al-taqdīs*) for the amount of 1,000 dinars. The dedication to al-Malik al-Ādil is at the beginning of Fakhr al-Dīn's *Asās al-taqdīs* (ed. A. Ḥ. al-Saqqā, Cairo: Maktabat Kulliyāt al-Azhariyya, 1406/1986), 10.

<sup>99</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn's student Shams al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn 'Īsā al-Khusrawshāhī (d. 652/1254) instructed al-Malik al-Nāṣir Dāwūd (d. 646/1248), the sultan of Damascus and later of Kerak, in 'the rational sciences'. See Ibn Wāṣil (d. 697/1298), *Mufarrij al-kurūb fī akhbār Banī Ayyūb* (ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl *et al.* Cairo: Maṭba'at Jāmi'at Fu'ād al-Awwal and Maṭba'at Dār al-Kutub, 5 vols. 1953–[1975]), iv. 206 and Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn al-anbā'* ii. 173–4. The most distinguished Ayyubid theologian Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī was regarded as being in a lifelong competition with the works of Fakhr al-Dīn, whom he was supposed to be unable to match (Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij*, v. 36.)

<sup>100</sup> It was commissioned by Muḥammad ibn Riḍwān ibn Minūchihr, king (*malik*) of Shirwān, whom Fakhr al-Dīn calls his student. This is the name quoted in 'Abd al-Raḥmān Badawī's introduction to his edition of Ibn Sīnā, *Uyūn al-ḥikma* (Cairo: Institut Français des Études Orientales, 1954), p. yā'-bā' and in the MS of Rāzī's *Sharḥ 'Uyūn al-ḥikma* at Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscript Library, Yale University, Landberg 74, fol. 1<sup>b</sup>. The name in A. Ḥ. al-Saqqā's edition of the *Sharḥ 'Uyūn al-ḥikma* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Anjelo, n.d., 3 vols. [1986]), i. 40.6 is corrupt. The commissioner was a member of the Shirwānshāhs' family who ruled over Shirwan, a district in northern Azerbaijan, adjacent to today's Baku. He was apparently a grandson of Minūchihr ibn Afrīdūn who reigned in the first half of the sixth/twelfth century, cf. Vladimir Minorsky, *A History of Sharvān and Darband in the 10th–11th Centuries* (Cambridge: Heffer, 1958), 135. On the Shirwānshāhs see C. E. Bosworth in *EI*<sup>2</sup>, xi. 488f. Their dynastic history is not known in detail. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, xii. 264f. mentions a 'Rashīd' as Shirwānshāh in the year 619/1222–3. Fakhr al-Dīn's *Sharḥ* was written thirty years into his career as a writer (*Sharḥ 'Uyūn al-ḥikma*, i. 41.15–6), i.e. during the early 600s/1200s.

Fakhr al-Dīn's fame and reputation as a scholar that made the Ghurid leadership support him. Yet, in its effect, this motive cannot be differentiated from a conscious decision in favour of rationalist theology. In both cases it led to a spread of Ash'arism and the study of *falsafa* in the Ghurid lands. In the first case, Ghiyāth al-Dīn's policy would have been due to his own choice, and in the second it would have been due to the choices of others, whom he aspired to match.

## CONCLUSION

Fakhr al-Dīn's mobility was so confusing for historians that Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a tried to give a rough sketch about his whereabouts based on the many witnesses he had gathered in his *tarjama*:

I say that the Shaykh Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī spent most of his time in Rayy. He also directed his path to the land of Khwarazm where he became ill. He died in his miseries (*'aqābil*) in the city of Herat.<sup>101</sup>

This very brief summary of Fakhr al-Dīn's life includes the gist of the patronage he received: he had lived under the Khwarazmshahs and under the Ghurids and managed to gain patronage from both these parties, who were at war with one another. Yet in Herat, under the Ghurids and the Khwarazmshah, he was hated by the populace and could not go about openly in the street without bodyguards.

Based on the early sources on Fakhr al-Dīn's life, a more detailed chronology would look like this: Fakhr al-Dīn is born in Rayy in Ramaḍān of either 543 or 544/January 1149 or 1150. He studied there with his father and later in Nishapur. After he finished his education in Maragha we find him teaching at *madrasas* in Azerbaijan and western Iran. He teaches for some time in Rayy before he travels to Khwarazm and Transoxania (in 480/1187–8?) in search of patronage. For a while unsuccessful, he eventually earns the favours of the Khwarazmshah Tekish and his family. Next, we hear that for reasons unknown to us he is expelled first from the lands of the Khwarazmshah and later from Transoxania, which is governed by the latter's ally, the Qara Khitai.

Fakhr al-Dīn finds new patronage among the several branches of the Ghurid family. He arrives in Bamiyan at some time before 595/1198–9 and settles in Herat, where Ghiyāth al-Dīn builds a *madrasa* for him. In 601/1205 we find him in Baghlan in northern Afghanistan and in

<sup>101</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *'Uyūn al-anbā'*, ii. 26.30: 'kāna aktharu maqām al-shaykh [...] bi-Rayy'.

602/1206 in Ghazna. Fakhr al-Dīn himself informs us that he was also in India. After Mu'izz al-Dīn's murder that year, Fakhr al-Dīn returns to Herat, where he is greatly honoured by the local Ghurid dignitaries. If there ever was a rift in his relations with the Khwarazmshah's family, it does not show in our sources for the period after the Khwarazmshah's capture of Herat during the years 603–605/1206–1208. Four months after the conquest of Herat is finalized, Fakhr al-Dīn writes from Gurganj in Khwarazm, where he may have fallen ill. He returns to Herat where, in Muḥarram 606/July 1209 he dictates his testament, and where he dies nine months later, most probably on 1 Shawwāl 606/29 March 1210.

Fakhr al-Dīn's biography leads us to qualify Goldziher's thesis about the forces that supported and suppressed rationalist theology in Islam. Goldziher believed that after the Sunni Revival of the fifth/eleventh century, the Muslim rulers were largely unfavourable to the movements of rationalism.<sup>102</sup> Yet, the example of Fakhr al-Dīn shows that the opposite is true. At the turn of the seventh/thirteenth century, many state authorities in the Muslim east supported rationalist Ash'ari theology against attacks that came from the more conservative scholarly establishment and from the populace. During his lifetime, Fakhr al-Dīn received patronage not only from the two major political forces in the Muslim east but also from the Ayyubids in Syria.

In fact, a brief look at the biographies of Fakhr al-Dīn's contemporaries and colleagues in the rational sciences shows that the result established by the study of Fakhr al-Dīn's life is true on a larger scale. The rational sciences were an intrinsic part of the traditional educational curriculum in Islam during the sixth/twelfth and the seventh/thirteenth centuries.<sup>103</sup> Other influential philosophical scholars of this period benefited from the patronage of local rulers who protected them against anti-rationalist hostilities from their colleagues and the populace.

<sup>102</sup> Goldziher, 'Zur Geschichte der ḥanbalitischen Bewegungen', 5: 'Das ungünstige Verhalten der Regierenden gegenüber den Regungen des Rationalismus diente zu nicht geringer Ermutigung jenen muhammedanischen Eiferern, die durch alle Jahrhunderte die Bekämpfung der mit Kalām verbundenen Anschauungen und Formulierungen als ihre hauptsächliche theologische Aufgabe betrachteten.'

<sup>103</sup> Sonja Brentjes, 'On the Location of the Ancient or "Rational" Sciences in Muslim Educational Landscapes (AH 500–1100)', *Bulletin of the Institute for Inter-Faith Studies* (Amman) 4 (2002), 47–71. These results are opposed to the ones put forward in the works of George Makdisi, most notably his *The Rise of Colleges. Institutions of Learning in Islam and the West* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1981).

Such hostility and the protective patronage of local rulers are reported in the biographies of ‘Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī, (557–629/1162–1231),<sup>104</sup> Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī (551–631/1156–1233),<sup>105</sup> and Kamāl al-Dīn ibn Yūnus (551–639/1156–1243).<sup>106</sup> All three suffered from aggression from other religious scholars or the public, which were prompted, among other things, by the nature of their teachings. This may also be true for other philosophical scholars of the Ayyubid period like Afḍal al-Dīn al-Khunājī, (590–646/1194–1248), Athīr al-Dīn al-Abhārī (d. 663/1264), or Sirāj al-Dīn al-Urmawī, (594–682/1198–1283), whose life circumstances are less well recorded but of whom we know that they benefited from Ayyubid patronage.<sup>107</sup> There were, however, clearly exemptions to this pattern as shown by the example of Shihāb al-Dīn Yahyā al-Suhrawardī, who was put to death by Ayyubid authorities in Aleppo in 587/1191. Earlier under the Great-Saljuqs, ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt al-Ḥamadhānī had already suffered a similar fate. In 525/1131 he was crucified in Hamadhan.<sup>108</sup>

<sup>104</sup> GAL, i. 118, 481f.; Suppl. i. 880f. On ‘Abd al-Laṭīf’s life see Samuel M. Stern in *EI*<sup>2</sup>, i. 74; id. ‘A Collection of Treatises by ‘Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī’, *Islamic Studies* 1 (1962), 53–70 at 54f., 59–66; Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, ‘*Uyūn al-anbā’*’ ii. 201–13; and his autobiography in his *Kitāb al-Nāṣiḥatayn*. MS Bursa, Hüseyin Çelebi 823, fos. 62<sup>a</sup>–100<sup>b</sup>, at 88<sup>b</sup>–100<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>105</sup> GAL, i. 393; Suppl. i. 678. On his life see Gerhard Endress, ‘Die dreifache Ancilla. Hermeneutik und Logik im Werk des Sayfaddīn al-Āmidī’, in D. Perler and U. Rudolph (eds.), *Logik und Theologie. Das Organon im arabischen und im lateinischen Mittelalter*, (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 116–45.

<sup>106</sup> GAL Suppl. i. 859. On his life see Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, ‘*Uyūn al-anbā’*’ i. 306–8 and Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a‘yān*, v. 311–8 (repeated in al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt*, viii. 378–86), trans. in Heinrich Suter, ‘Beiträge zu den Beziehungen Kaiser Friedrichs II zu den zeitgenössischen Gelehrten des Ostens und Westens, insbesondere zu dem arabischen Enzyklopädisten Kemāl ed-din ibn Jūnis’, in id., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mathematik bei den Griechen und Arabern*, J. Frank (ed.) (Erlangen: Mencke, 1922), 1–8; repr. in id., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mathematik und Astronomie im Islam*, F. Sezgin (ed.) (Frankfurt: Institut für Geschichte der Arabisch-Islamischen Wissenschaften, 2 vols., 1986), ii. 542–9.

<sup>107</sup> On these three, see GAL, i. 463–5, 467; Suppl. i. 838–44, 838; art. ‘al-Abhārī’, in *Encyclopedia Iranica* i. 216 (G. C. Anawati), and Dag Nikolaus Hasse, ‘Mosul and Frederick II Hohenstaufen: Notes on Aṭīraddīn al-Abhārī and Sirāğaddīn al-Urmawī’, in I. Draelants *et al.* (eds.) *Occident et Proche-Orient: Contacts scientifiques au temps des croisades. Actes du colloque de Louvain-la-Neuve, 24 et 25 mars 1997*, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 145–63.

<sup>108</sup> GAL i. 391, 437f.; Suppl. i. 674–5, 781–3. On our scant knowledge of the circumstances of al-Suhrawardī’s life and his execution cf. Hossein Ziai in *EI*<sup>2</sup>, ix. 782–4 and id., ‘The Source and Nature of Authority: A Study of

An important key to our understanding of Fakhr al-Dīn's life and the pattern of patronage during this period is the official *madrasa* system as it was established by Nizām al-Mulk (408–485/1018–1092). He founded *madrasas* that not only enjoyed the explicit support of the Saljuq state but that must be viewed as proper state institutions and important vehicles of its religious policy. Sonja Brentjes and others have argued convincingly that it makes little sense to distinguish the curriculum of the *madrasas* from the studies that took place outside of that tradition.<sup>109</sup> Rationalist scholars employed at such state-sponsored *madrasas* enjoyed the protection of the rulers and of their military, which could shield them from anti-rationalist attacks.<sup>110</sup> Of course, such protection was not unlimited as is shown by the fact that Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī had to leave several of his posts in Ayyubid Egypt and Syria. Rationalist scholars who were not part of a *madrasa* seem to have been much more vulnerable to attacks from their opponents. It is significant that neither Shihāb al-Dīn Yahyā al-Suhrawardī nor ʿAyn al-Quḍāt al-Ḥamadhānī can be connected to the teaching activities in *madrasas*. In the case of Fakhr al-Dīn, however, the *madrasa* system was effective. Ghiyāth al-Dīn's founding of a school exclusively for him in a city where a Nizāmiyya *madrasa* already existed, was designed to shield Fakhr al-Dīn's teaching activity from the criticism of his peers inside and outside of the Ashʿari school.<sup>111</sup> In the period between the Great-Saljuqs and the Il-Khans, the study of rationalist Muslim theology and *falsafa* was protected in state-sponsored *madrasas*, which should be regarded as a major vehicle for the religious policy of local and regional rulers of this time.

al-Suhrawardī's Illuminationist Political Doctrine' in C. Butterworth (ed.) *Political Aspects of Islamic Philosophy*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 294–334. On ʿAyn al-Quḍāt al-Ḥamadhānī's life and execution see Omid Safi, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 158–200 and Hamid Dabashi, *Truth and Narrative. The Untimely Thoughts of ʿAyn al-Quḍāt al-Ḥamadhānī (d. 525/1131)* (Richmond: Curzon, 1999), 475–536.

<sup>109</sup> Brentjes, 'On the Location of the Ancient or "Rational" Sciences', 64f.; see also Jonathan Berkey, *The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

<sup>110</sup> Nizām al-Mulk began this policy of vigorously defending the rationalist scholars who taught at state-sponsored *madrasas*; see Erika Glassen, *Der Mittlere Weg. Studien zur Religionspolitik und Religiosität der späteren Abbasiden-Zeit* (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner 1981), 53–61, 72 and *passim*.

<sup>111</sup> The Nizāmiyya *madrasa* in Herat is mentioned for the year 602/1205 in Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī l-ta'rikh*, xii. 148–9.

APPENDIX: A TENTATIVE PROVISIONAL  
CHRONOLOGY OF FAKHR AL-DĪN AL-RĀZĪ'S  
MAJOR THEOLOGICAL WORKS

The ongoing efforts of studying the manuscripts of Fakhr al-Dīn's works and preparing critical editions of them will certainly provide more reliable dates for his bibliography and its chronology. Based on the research undertaken in the course of this article and based on Ayman Shihadeh, 'From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī: 6th/12th Century Developments in Muslim Philosophical Theology', *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy*, 15 (2005): 141–79, the following list represents a tentative chronology of Fakhr al-Dīn's works on Muslim theology and Qur'an commentary:

---

Early works	<i>al-Ishāra fī 'ilm al-kalām</i> <i>Nihāyat al-ʿuqūl fī dirāyat al-uṣūl</i> <i>al-Mabāḥiṭh al-mashriqiyya</i>
579/1184	<i>al-Mulakkbbaṣ fī l-ḥikma wa-l-mantiq</i> <i>Sharḥ al-Ishārāt wa-l-tanbihāt</i> <i>Muḥaṣṣal afkār al-mutaqaddimīn wa-l-mutaʿakkbirīn</i> <i>min al-ʿulāmaʾ wa-l-ḥukamāʾ wa-l-mutakallimīn</i> <i>al-Munāzarāt fī bilād mā waraʾa l-nahr (?)</i> <i>ʿItiqādāt firaq al-muslimīn wa-l-musbrikīn (?)</i>
595/1199	work on the dated parts of the <i>Tafsīr al-kabīr</i> began (the commentary on some of the smaller sūras may have been completed earlier)
596/1199–1200	<i>Taʿsīs al-taqdīs</i> <sup>112</sup>
597/1200	<i>Manāqib al-Imām al-Shāfiʿī</i> <i>Sharḥ ʿUyūn al-ḥikma</i> <i>Kitāb al-Arbāʿīn fī uṣūl al-dīn (?)</i>
601–03/1204–07	bulk of the dateable work on the <i>Tafsīr al-kabīr</i> (Sūras 3–19 and 37–48)
603–06/1207–09	<i>al-Maṭālib al-ʿāliya min al-ʿilm al-ilāhī.</i>

---

E-mail: frank.griffel@yale.edu

<sup>112</sup> Ramazan Şeşen, *Mukhtārāt min al-makḥḥūṭāt al-ʿarabiyya al-nādira fī maktabāt Turkiyā*, E. İhsanoğlu (ed.) (Istanbul: İSAR, 1997), 658.