



'AẒOD-AL-DĪN ĪJĪ

'AẒOD-AL-DĪN ĪJĪ, QĀZĪ ABU'L-FAẒL 'ABD-AL-RAḤMĀN B. ROKN-AL-DĪN AḤMAD B. 'ABD-AL-ĠAFFĀR B. AḤMAD BAKRĪ MOṬARREZĪ ŠABĀNKĀRĪ ŠĪRĀZĪ, famous Shafé'ite jurist and Ash'arite theologian. He was born at Īj (Īg or Īk), then the chief town of the district Šabānkāra in Fārs, in 680/1281 or shortly afterwards. (The later dates 708 or "after 700" given by such Arab biographers as Ebn al-'Emād, Ebn Ḥajar, Soyūṭī, and others, are plainly erroneous.) He was a descendant of a family which traced its genealogy back to the caliph Abū Bakr. Although he may have been sure of inheriting the office of his father, who had already been *qāzī* of the same place, he tried to make his fortune with K̄vāja Rašīd-al-dīn Faẓlallāh, the influential vizier of the Il-khanids Ġāzān Khan (694-703/1295-1304) and Öljeitü (Oljāytü) (703-16/1304-16). In 706/1306 he arrived in Solṭānīya, which had just been chosen as the new capital of the Il-khanid empire by Öljeitü. His older contemporary, Ebn al-Fowaṭī (642-723/1244-1323) reports in his *Majma' al-ādāb fī mo'jam al-alqāb* (ed. Moṣṭafā Jawād, Damascus, 1962, IV, 1, pp. 444f. no. 634) some gossip about his licentious behavior and about his eventual removal from the court to Kermān. But he is mentioned together with his brother 'Emād-al-dīn, his teacher Faḵr-al-dīn Aḥmad b. Ḥasan Čahārbartī (Jārabardī in Arabic sources, d. 746/1345), and the doyen of the Iranian '*olamā'* at the time, 'Abdallāh b. 'Omar Bayzāwī (d. 716/1316), in a list of fifty-one scholars whom Rašīd-al-dīn asked his son (Amīr 'Alī, the governor of Baghdad) to present with copious donations; he himself was far away in Syria, obviously in 712/1312-13, during Öljeitü's only campaign against the Mamluks (cf. *Mokātabāt-e rašīdī* [Letters of Rašīd-al-dīn Faẓlallāh], ed. M. Šafī', Lahore, 1947, p. 59; Russ. tr. A. I.



Falina, *Rashid ad-din. Perepiska*, Moscow, 1971, p. 126). The sequence of names in the latter seems to indicate that Ījī lived at that time in Tabrīz where his teacher Čahārbartī was acknowledged as the best authority in grammar and the religious sciences (Brockelmann, *GAL* II, p. 246, S. II, p. 257). We know however, through a passage in Ḥāfez-e Abrū’s *Majma‘ al-tawārīk*, that during Öljeitü’s reign he also belonged to the teaching staff of a mobile *madrasa* (*madrasa-ye sayyāra*) which had been established by the il-khan at the suggestion of Rašīd-al-dīn and which accompanied the army (*Dayl-e Jāme‘ al-tawārīk-e rašīdī*, ed. K. Bayānī, 1st ed., Tehran, 1317 Š./1938, p. 48 n. 1 [on p. 53]; 2nd ed., Tehran, 1350 Š./1971, p. 101 n. 1 [on p. 104]: read *Ījī* instead of *Avajī*). The vizier mentions him again a few years later in his will (in 719/1319 or shortly before), in connection with two *madrasas* in Šabānkāra whose considerable endowment (*waqf*) income went to Ījī and his sons (*Mokātabāt*, p. 232, Russ. tr., p. 271).

At that time, however, the founder of the Muzaffarid dynasty, Mobārez-al-dīn Moḥammad, had already started to make himself master of Šabānkāra. This may have added to Ījī’s readiness to return to the capital when Öljeitü’s son [Abū Sa‘īd Bahādor Khan](#) (r. 716-36/1316-35) nominated him supreme judge of the Il-khanid empire (*qāzī al-mamālek*). He owed this promotion to the fact that Abū Sa‘īd, in contrast to his father, no longer adhered to the Shi‘ite creed; Shi‘ite sources like Šūštārī’s *Majāles al-mo‘menīn* or K̄vānsārī’s *Rawzāt al-jannāt* leave no doubt that Ījī always defended the Sunnite cause. He attached himself to Ġiāṭ-al-dīn Moḥammad, the son of Rašīd-al-dīn, who became vizier in 727/1327; in the following years, until Ġiāṭ-al-dīn’s execution in 736/1336, he dedicated several works to him. His scholarly reputation spread far beyond the borders of Iran: he is called *pādešāh-e ‘olamā’wa kosrow-e dānešmandān* in the *Tārīk-egozīda* (p. 654); he is also mentioned in the biographical dictionaries of the Mamluk empire (e.g., Ebn Ḥajar ‘Asqalānī and Ebn Taġrīberdī, and Moḥammad b. Toġloq, sultan of Delhi (r. 725-52/1325-51), sent him a donation without having ever met him (Ebn Baṭṭūṭa [Paris] III, p. 254; tr. Gibb, p. 677). Ījī’s relations with his former teacher Čahārbartī deteriorated; he had asked him for an explanation of Zamaḳšarī’s commentary on Sūra 2:23 in *Kaššāf* (for the transmission of which Čahārbartī was the best authority at that time); receiving a rather condescending answer, he had attacked him in a lengthy reply (cf. Sobkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-šāfe‘īya* IV, p. 108).

With Abū Sa‘īd’s death in 736/1335 and Ġiāṭ-al-dīn’s ensuing execution, Ījī lost his position as *qāzī al-mamālek*. After some years, which he seems to have



spent in Šabānkāra, he joined the court of the Īnjū Abū Eshāq at Shiraz, where he became a *qāzī al-qożāt*. It was here that he met Ḥāfeẓ and ‘Obayd Zākānī; Ḥāfeẓ praised him, in retrospect, as one of the five most important people of his time in Fārs (*Dīvān*, ed. M. Qazvīnī and Q. Ġanī, Tehran, 1320 Š./1941, pp. 363-67), whereas ‘Obayd Zākānī tells some facetious anecdotes about him in his *Ḥekāyāt-e fārsī (Kollīyāt-e ‘Obayd-e Zākānī*, ed. P. Atābakī, Tehran, 1321 Š./1942, pp. 311ff.). When after 750/1350, Abū Eshāq found himself increasingly confined by Mobārez-al-dīn’s expansion, he sent Ījī to negotiate with him. Ījī was received with great respect but the political mission was a complete failure; Mobārez-al-dīn was apparently too sure of his success to give in. Ījī seems to have adjusted himself to the new situation; before returning to Abū Eshāq he received Mobārez-al-dīn as his guest in Šabānkāra; and when Shiraz was besieged by the Muzaffarid army in 754/1353, he managed to leave the town secretly. He retired to Šabānkāra where Mobārez-al-dīn’s son Shah Šojā’ visited him one year later, after having subdued a rebellion initiated by a certain ‘Emād-al-dīn Maḥmūd Kermānī in favor of Abū Eshāq. Either this rebel or Malek Ardašīr, the last *atābak* of Šabānkāra (who, according to *EI*¹ IV, p. 242 rose against the Muzaffarids in 755/1355 or 756/1356, but who is reported to have lived much earlier according to other sources, cf. B. Spuler, *Mongolen*³, p. 147), imprisoned Ījī in the fortress of Deraymīān at Īj, where he died in 756/1356.

Ījī’s works, intended as systematic handbooks for teaching in *madrasas*, have no claim to originality, but they were well-organized and had profited from the long scholarly tradition which had survived the Mongol invasion. Their popularity is evident from the great number of commentaries. Most have not yet been intensively studied; the best bibliographical surveys are those by C. Brockelmann (*GAL* II, pp. 267ff., S. II, pp. 287ff.) and by A. Ateş, (“Īcī,” *IA* V, pp. 921ff.). They deal with the following disciplines:

A. Theology: (1) *al-Mawāqef fī ‘elm al-kalām*, Ījī’s most famous work, probably composed before 730/1330 (it is mentioned in the *Tārīk-egozīda* [p. 808.15], which was written in that year) for Ġiāṭ-al-dīn Moḥammad b. Fażlallāh (*Kašf al-ẓonūn* [Istanbul], p. 1891), but subsequently dedicated to Abū Eshāq. The book sets out in the style of a *summa theologica*, in concise language, the traditional ideas of late Ash‘arite theology; it is based mainly on the *Moḥaṣṣal* of Faḵr-al-dīn Rāzī (d. 606/1209) and the *Abkār al-afkār* of Sayf al-dīn Āmedī (d. 631/1233), in places also on the former’s *Nehāyat al-‘oqūl fī derāyat al-oṣūl*. The oldest commentary was written by Ījī’s disciple, Šams-al-dīn Kermānī (d.



786/1384), but the commentary which always enjoyed the highest popularity was the one written by Šarīf Jorjānī and finished in 807/1404-05 at Samarkand (*GAL* II, p. 269; Ateş, op. cit., pp. 923ff.; L. Gardet and M.-M. Anawati, *Introduction à la théologie musulmane*, Paris, 1948, pp. 165ff., 370ff.). (2) *Jawāher al-(‘olūm fi’l-)kalām*, dedicated to Ġiāt-al-dīn Moḥammad and commented upon for the first time as early as 770/1368, for the Muzaffarid ruler Qoṭb-al-dīn Shah Maḥmūd, the brother of Shah Šojā‘ (*GAL* II, p. 270; ed. Abu’l-‘Alā’ ‘Afifī, *Majallat kollīat al-ādāb* [Jāme‘a Meşriya] II, 1934, pp. 133ff.). The exact relationship between the *Mawāqef* and the *Jawāher* has still to be investigated. Both works are structured after the same pattern and contain almost the same material, but the *Jawāher* is shorter. The commentary by ‘Abd-al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd-al-Qāder Fāsī (d. 1096/1685) mentioned by Esmā‘il Pasha (*İzāḥ al-maknūn*, Istanbul, 1945-47, p. 378) as having been finished on 18 Ša‘ban 1078/2 February 1668, is preserved in a manuscript at Medina. (3) *Al-‘Aqā’ed al-‘azodiya*, a short catechism which Ījī finished immediately before his death (cf. *GAL* II, p. 270; the last edition of the text together with the commentaries of Dav(v)ānī (d. 907/1501) and Moḥammad ‘Abdoh [d. 1323/1905] is by Solaymān Donyā, *al-Šayḫ Moḥammad ‘Abdoh bayn al-falāsefa wa’l-kalāmīyīn*, Cairo, 1377/1958).

B. Jurisprudence: (1) A commentary to Ebn al-Ḥājeb’s (d. 646/1249) abridgement (*Moktaşar*) of his own *Montaha ’l-so’ul (sūl) wa’l-amal fi ’elmay al-oşul wa’l-jadal*, on *oşul al-feqh* and dialectics, finished 26 Ša‘bān 734/2 May 1334 (*Kaşf al-zonūn* [Istanbul], p. 1853; *GAL* I, p. 372, S. I, p. 537; Ateş, op. cit., p. 922). Ebn al-Ḥājeb had based himself on Āmedī’s *Eḥkām fi oşul al-aḥkām* (cf. *GAL* I, p. 494, S. I, p. 678); both of them were Malekites. Ījī, on the contrary, was a Shafe’ite; in *oşul al-feqh* the difference of *madḥab* did not matter very much. (2) *Resāla fi ādāb al-baḥṭ*, which may be subsumed here insofar as it treats the art of dialectics like the former work (cf. *GAL* II, p. 267). It seems noteworthy that Ījī, in spite of his being supreme judge, did not write anything on *forū’*. The intellectual climate of the later Il-khanid empire with its mixture of Mongol and Muslim law may have suggested a certain reserve.

C. *Tafsīr*: A commentary on Bayzāwī’s *Anwār al-tanzīl wa asrār al-ta’wīl* entitled *Taḥqīq al-tafsīr fi takṭīr al-tanwīr* (cf. *GAL* II, p. 267; Ateş, op. cit., p. 922).

D. Ethics: *al-Resāla al-šāhīya fi ’elm al-aqlāq* (dedicated to Abū Eşḥāq Īnjū, who had the title Shah?). Cf. *GAL* II, p. 270. The work takes up a specific Iranian tradition represented, e.g., by Naşīr-al-dīn Ṭūsī’s *Aqlāq-e nāşerī* (completed



33/1235) and later by Davānī's (d. 907/1501) *Aḳlāq-e jalālī*. It treats, in concordance with the Greek pattern, the basic elements of the three branches of practical philosophy: individual ethics, economics, politics. The earliest commentary was written by Šams-al-dīn Kermānī (d. 786/1384; *Kašf al-ẓonūn* [Istanbul], p. 37). There is a Turkish translation by Moḥammad Amīn b. Moḥammad As'ad (Istanbul, 1281/1864; cf. Ateş, op. cit., p. 923).

E. Rhetoric and linguistics: (1) *al-Fawā'ed al-ḡiāṭīya*, an abridgement of the section on rhetoric (i.e., part III) from Sakkākī's encyclopedic *Meftāḥ al-'olūm*, and dedicated to Ḡiāṭ-al-dīn Moḥammad (cf. *GAL* II, p. 271). The oldest commentary was written for Shah Šojā' by Moḥammad b. Ḥājjī b. Moḥammad Bokārī Sa'idī and finished in 760/1359 (*Kašf al-ẓonūn* [Istanbul], p. 1299); another one was composed shortly afterwards by Šams-al-dīn Kermānī (d. 786/1384). (2) *Al-Modḳel fī 'elm al-ma'ānī wa'l-bayān wa'l-baddā'e'* (cf. *GAL* II, p. 270). (3) *Al-Resāla al-waḳ'īya al-'azodīya*, a short treatise with numerous commentaries, on 'elm al-waḳ', the reflection about the relation between expression and meaning, especially with regard to technical terms (cf. *ibid.*, p. 268).

F. Historiography: *Ešrāq al-tawārīk*, a short survey of the historical facts relevant for a theologian, consisting of an introduction (on the lives of the prophets from Adam to Jesus) and three main chapters (on Moḥammad, on the 'ašara al-mobaššara, and on the most important religious personalities from the Companions until Ḡazālī). The work was translated in a slightly different form, under the title *Zobdat al-tawārīk*, into Turkish by the poet 'Alī Čelebī (d. 1008/1600; cf. *ET*² I, p. 380; cf. *GAL* II, p. 271; Ateş, op. cit., pp. 922f).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

See also Mo'īn-al-dīn Yazdī, *Mawāheb-e elāhī dar tārik-e Āl-e Moẓaffar*, ed. S. Nafisī, Tehran, 1326 Š./1947, I, pp. 92f., 241ff., 257.

Maḥmūd Kotobī, continuation of *Tārik-egozīda*, ed. E. G. Browne, London, 1910, pp. 654ff., 663.



Mīrkvānd (Tehran), IV, pp. 484, 487, 494.

Habīb al-sīar (Tehran) III, pp. 197, 221, 224, 286, 288.

Nūrallāh Šūstari, *Majāles al-mo'menīn*, Tehran, 1375/1955, II, p. 214.

Moḥammad-Bāqer K̄vānsārī, *Rawzāt al-jannāt*, lith., Tehran, 1263/1846-47, pp. 414f.

Sobkī, *Ṭabaqāt*¹ VI, pp. 108ff., *Ṭabaqāt*² X, pp. 46ff. Asnavī, *Ṭabaqāt al-šāfe'īya*, ed. 'A. Jobūrī, Baghdad, 1391/1971, II, p. 238 no. 857.

Ebn Ḥajar 'Asqalānī, *al-Dorar al-kāmena*, ed. M. S. Jād-al-ḥaqq, Cairo, 1385/1966, II, pp. 429f. no. 2278.

Abu'l-Faẓl 'Abd-al-Raḥmān Soyūṭī, *Boḡyat al-wo'āt*, ed. M. Abu'l-Faẓl Ebrāhīm, Cairo, 1384/1964, II, pp. 75f. no. 1476.

Abu'l-'Abbās Aḥmad Maqrīzī, *al-Solūk le-ma'refat dowl al-molūk*, ed. M. Moṣṭafā Zīāda, Cairo, 1956-, II, p. 885.10f. (s.a. 753); III, p. 16.7ff. (s.a. 755).

Ebn Taḡrīberdī, *al-Nojūm al-zāhera* X, p. 288.4ff.

Idem, *al-Manhal al-šāfī* (ms.). Ebn al-'Emād, *Šaḍarāt al-dahab*, Cairo, 1350-51/1931-32, VI, pp. 174f.

Šawkānī, *al-Badr al-ṭale'*, Cairo, 1348/1929-30, I, pp. 326f. no. 225.

Qannawjī, *al-Tāj al-mokallal*, ed. 'A. Šaraf al-dīn, Bombay, 1383/1963, pp. 379f. no. 408.

Šehāb-al-dīn Aḥmad b. Qāzī, *Dorrat al-ḥejāl: Répertoire bibliographique d'Ahmad Ibn al-Qadi*, ed. I. S. Allouche, Rabat, 1934-, p. 365 no. 1019.

Taşköprüzade, *Meftāḥ al-sa'āda*, Cairo, 1968, I, pp. 169f.

Zereklī, *A'lām*, Cairo, 1954-59, IV, p. 66.

Kaḥḥāla, *Mo'jam al-mo'allefīn*, V, pp. 119f.

Q. Ġanī, *Baḥṭ dar āṭār o afkār o aḥwāl-e Ḥāfez*, Tehran, 1321 Š./1942, I, pp. 29, 31, 75, 99ff.



M. 'A. Modarres, *Rayhānat al-adab*, Tehran, 1967-, IV, pp. 142ff.

H. Halm, *Die Ausbreitung der šāfi'itischen Rechtsschule*, Wiesbaden, 1974, p. 152.

J. van Ess, *Die Erkenntnislehre 'Aḍudādīn al-Īcī*, Wiesbaden, 1966.

Idem, "Neue Materialien zur Biographie des 'Aḍudaddīn al-Īḡī," *Welt des Orients* 9, 1978, pp. 270ff.

Search terms:

□□□□ □□□□□ □□□ azol al din iji azod al din iji azod al din ejee