



The Apocryphal Pearl: A Critical Re-evaluation of the Authorship of *al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah* and the Reconstruction of the Corpus of Abū al-Mu'ayyad al-'Antarī

Hamed Arezaei¹ 

1. Institute for Studies in Medical History, Persian and Complementary Medicine, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran..

E-mail: HamedArezaei@yahoo.com

Article Info

Article type:
Research Article

Article history:
Received 2025/12/30
Received in revised
2026/02/03
Accepted 2026/02/05
Published online
2026/03/21

Keywords:

Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā), al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah, Abū al-Mu'ayyad al-'Antarī, Pseudepigraphy, Urjūzah, Textual Criticism, Arabic Didactic Poetry, Manuscript Studies.

ABSTRACT

The philosophical poem *al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah fī al-Tawhīd* (The Divine Pearl on Oneness) has long occupied a liminal space in the Avicennian corpus. Attributed to Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā, d. 428/1037) in several late manuscripts and modern bibliographies, the text presents a versified summary of Peripatetic metaphysics, psychology, and natural philosophy. This study challenges that attribution through a rigorous application of higher textual criticism, bifurcated into external and internal analyses. Externally, the investigation relies on the bio-bibliographical silence of Avicenna's direct circle—most notably his student al-Jūzjānī—and the explicit testimony of 6th/12th and 7th/13th-century historians like Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ah and al-Ṣafādī, who attribute the work to the physician-philosopher Abū al-Mu'ayyad Muḥammad b. al-Mujallī al-'Antarī (d. c. 570/1174). Internally, the article demonstrates irreconcilable doctrinal divergences between the poem and Avicenna's established metaphysics. These include a distinctively theological (*kalām*) conceptualization of the Creator-creature distinction (the "builder" analogy), a positive metaphorical invocation of alchemy that contradicts Avicenna's known scientific skepticism regarding transmutation, and a lack of the syllogistic rigor characteristic of Avicenna's epistemology. Furthermore, the study contextualizes the misattribution within the popularity of the *Urjūzah* didactic poem genre, utilizing lexicographical definitions to frame the literary environment that facilitated such pseudepigraphy. By reassigning the text to its proper author and analyzing al-'Antarī's extant poetry, this article not only purifies the Avicennian canon but also recovers a significant pedagogical text of the post-Avicennian period.

Cite this article: Arezaei, H (2026). The Apocryphal Pearl: A Critical Re-evaluation of the Authorship of *al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah* and the Reconstruction of the Corpus of Abū al-Mu'ayyad al-'Antarī, *History of Islamic Philosophy*, 4 (1), 139-152. <https://doi.org/10.22034/hpi.2026.569652.1194>



© The Author(s). **Publisher:** Ale-Taha Institute of Higher Education Institute.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/hpi.2026.569652.1194>

Introduction

The historiography of Islamic philosophy faces a persistent challenge in distinguishing between the historical Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā, d. 428/1037)—the rigorous Peripatetic systematizer—and the “Avicenna of tradition,” a figure onto whom later generations projected a variety of mystical, occult, and poetic works. This accretion of pseudepigrapha is not merely a bibliographic nuisance; it fundamentally distorts our understanding of the development of philosophy in the Islamic world. Among the works floating on the periphery of the Avicennian corpus is a philosophical poem titled *al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah* (“The Divine Pearl”). Written in the *Rajaz* meter, this didactic poem covers theology (*ilāhiyyāt*), psychology (*ilm al-nafs*), and cosmology. While included in some modern catalogues, such as those by Mahdavī and Anawati, as a potentially authentic work, a closer inspection reveals deep fissures in this attribution.

The integrity of the history of philosophy depends on the accurate attribution of texts (for a recent case study on the importance of such historical precision, see Mokhtari Khoyi & Mohammadrezayi, 2025). Misattributing a work of a 6th/12th-century synthesizer to a 5th/11th-century innovator confuses the timeline of philosophical evolution. As recent scholarship by Gutas, Reisman, and Bertolacci has emphasized, the “Avicennan tradition” must be distinguished from Avicenna himself to avoid anachronistic readings of his metaphysics. This article applies the methods of higher textual criticism to *al-Jumānah*, arguing that both historical evidence and internal philosophical analysis necessitate its removal from the authentic Avicennian corpus and its restoration to its likely author, the 6th/12th-century scholar Abū al-Mu’ayyad al-’Antarī.

1. The Genre Context: Avicenna and the Tradition of the *Urjūzah*

To understand how *al-Jumānah* came to be attributed to Avicenna, one must first locate it within the literary ecosystem of the *Urjūzah*. The term derives from *Rajaz*, a specific meter in Arabic prosody characterized by

its rhythmic simplicity and rapid cadence. The structure consists of the repetition of the foot *mustaf'ilun* (– ˘ –) three times in each hemistich (*shaṭr*). Lexicographically, the *Loghat-nāmeḥ-ye Dehkhoda* defines the *Urjūzah* as “a poem composed in the *Rajaz* meter,” noting its historical association with improvisation on the battlefield) *al-irtijāl*, (but emphasizing its evolution into a primary vessel for didactic and mnemonic content in the Islamic period. By the 4th/10th century, the *Rajaz* had become the standard meter for scientific versification due to its flexibility and capacity to handle technical terminology.

Avicenna was indeed a practitioner of this genre, a fact that undoubtedly facilitated later misattributions. His bio-bibliographical tradition, anchored by the testimony of his disciple Abū 'Ubayd al-Jūzjānī, confirms his authorship of several didactic poems. The most famous is the *al-Urjūzah fī al-Ṭibb* (Poem on Medicine), a work of immense pedagogical popularity that attracted commentaries from luminaries such as Averroes (Ibn Rushd) and Ibn Ṭumlūs in Al-Andalus. Beyond medicine, catalogues attribute to him poems on logic (*al-Urjūzah fī al-Mantiq*, also known as *al-Qaṣīdah al-Muzdawijah*), hygiene (*fī Ḥifẓ al-Ṣiḥḥah*), anatomy (*fī al-Tashrīḥ*), and the seasons (*fī al-Fuṣūl al-Arba'a*).

To illustrate the style of Avicenna's authentic *Urjūzah* and contrast it with later imitations, we may look at the opening verses of his famous Medical Poem (*al-Urjūzah fī al-Ṭibb*). The poem begins with a traditional praising of God and a clear definition of the subject matter:

الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ الْعَلِيمِ الْوَاحِدِ *** الْمَاجِدِ الْحَقِّ الْقَدِيمِ الشَّاهِدِ

(*Al-ḥamdu li-llāhi al-'alīmi al-wāḥidi / al-mājidi al-ḥaqqi al-qadīmi al-shāhidi*)

“Praise be to God, the All-Knowing, the One / The Glorious, the Truth, the Eternal, the Witness”.

عَلَا عَنِ النَّشْبِيهِ وَالْأَعْرَاضِ *** وَمَنْ يَرْمُ إِدْرَاكَهُ بِالْمَاضِي

(*Alā 'ani al-tashbīhi wa-l-a'rāḍi / wa-man yarum idrākahu bi-l-mādī*)

“ He is exalted above resemblance and accidents / And whoever seeks to grasp Him through the past... ”

فَالطَّبُّ حِفْظُ صِحَّةِ بُرْءٍ مَرَضٌ *** مِنْ سَبَبٍ فِي بَدَنِ عَنْهُ عَرَضٌ

(*Fa-l-tibbu ḥifẓu ṣiḥḥatin bur'u maraḍ / min sababin fī badanin 'anhu 'araḍ*)

“ Medicine is the preservation of health and the cure of disease / Arising from a cause in the body which has occurred”.

This prolific output in the genre created a powerful gravitational pull. Scribes and later scholars, aware of Avicenna's penchant for versifying complex scientific subjects, naturally assumed that a high-quality philosophical poem like *al-Jumānah* must also flow from his pen. The logic of the misattribution is essentially genre-based: “Avicenna wrote the great medical *Urjūzah*; therefore, this theological *Urjūzah* is likely his.” However, acknowledging Avicenna's contribution to the genre does not validate every specimen found within it. On the contrary, the existence of a standardized genre made pseudepigraphy easier, as imitators adopted the forms and meters associated with the master. Thus, the form of *al-Jumānah* makes Avicenna a plausible candidate only on the surface; deep analysis proves otherwise.

2. External Criticism: The Silence of the Disciples and the Testimony of Historians

The primary criterion for authenticating Avicenna's works remains the bibliography compiled by his closest disciple and constant companion, Abū 'Ubayd al-Jūzjānī.

2.1. The Argument from Silence

A systematic review of the manuscript tradition of the *Sīrat al-Shaykh al-Ra'īs* (The Life of Avicenna)—including the critical edition by Gohlman—reveals no mention of *al-Jumānah*. Gohlman's edition, based on multiple manuscripts (including Ayasofya 4852 and Ahmet III 3447), lists major summae like *The Cure (al-Shifā')* and *The Salvation (al-*

Najāt), as well as minor treatises and the known *Urjūzah* on medicine. The absence of *al-Jumānah* is glaring. Al-Jūzjānī was not merely a passive scribe; he was deeply involved in the production of Avicenna's texts, urging him to complete *The Cure* and compiling the *Salvation* from scattered notes. It is inconceivable that a substantial poem on theology—a subject central to Avicenna's system—would escape his notice. Furthermore, later bibliographers who relied on early sources, such as al-Qifṭī (d. 646/1248) and al-Bayhaqī (d. 565/1169), also fail to list *al-Jumānah* under Avicenna's name. The attribution appears only in later manuscript collections, a classic sign of pseudepigraphal drift.

2.2. Identifying the True Author: The Testimony of al-Ṣafadī and Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ah

The solution to the authorship enigma is found in the bio-bibliographical literature of the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries. Khalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363), in his monumental biographical dictionary *al-Wāfi bi-l-Wafayāt*, provides a biography of a physician-philosopher named Al-'Antarī – that is, Abū l-Mu'ayyad Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Mujallī ibn al-Ṣā'igh al-Jazarī –, known as “al-'Antarī” (d. c. 570/1174). Al-Ṣafadī writes: “The Physician al-'Antarī, Muḥammad b. al-Mujallī b. al-Ṣā'igh Abū al-Mu'ayyad al-Jazarī, known as al-'Antarī because in the beginning of his career he used to write the *Sīrah of 'Antar* ... He was a famous doctor, a noted scholar, excellent in treatment, a philosopher distinguished in literature. He had fine poetry... He is the author of the book *al-Jumānah* on Natural Science and Theology (*fī al-ṭabī'ī wa-l-ilāhī*) and a Pharmacopoeia... He died approximately in the year 560 [Hijri].” (al-Ṣafadī, 2000, vol. 4, p. 276). This entry provides the missing link. The title *al-Jumānah* matches perfectly. Moreover, the description of the work as covering both “Natural Science and Theology” explains the contents of the extant manuscripts of the so-called *al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah*. The text attributed to Avicenna is actually just the second half (Theology) of al-'Antarī's larger bipartite poem. This identification is

corroborated by Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘ah (d. 668/1270) in *‘Uyūn al-Anbā’ fī Ṭabaqāt al-Aṭibbā’*. He explicitly notes that al-’Antarī composed a medical poem beginning with “Preserve, my son, my advice and act upon it,” which was frequently misattributed to Avicenna (*yunsabu ayḍan ilā al-Shaykh al-Ra’īs*). This establishes a clear pattern: al-’Antarī’s poems were of high enough quality to be confused with Avicenna’s, and the gravity of Avicenna’s name pulled these works into his orbit.

2.3. The Persona of al-’Antarī

To further solidify al-’Antarī’s authorship, it is necessary to examine his intellectual profile as preserved in the sources. Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘ah describes him as a man of “abundant merit” (*wāfir al-faḍl*), a “philosopher” (*faylasūf*), and “distinguished in the science of literature” (*mutamayyiz fī ‘ilm al-adab*). He quotes several verses of al-’Antarī which demonstrate a deep engagement with philosophical concepts, often blending Peripatetic terminology with poetic imagery. For instance, al-’Antarī writes on the duality of human nature:

وُجُودِي بِهِ مِنْ كُلِّ نَوْعٍ مُرَكَّبٍ *** مِنْ الْعَالَمِ الْمَعْقُولِ وَالْمُرَكَّبِ

(*Wujūdī bihi min kulli naw‘in murakkabun / min al-‘ālamī al-ma‘qūli wa-l-mutarakkibi*)

“My existence is composed of every kind / Of the intelligible world and the composite [sensible] world”.

فَذِهْنِي مِشْكَاهٌ وَنَفْسِي رُجَاجَةٌ *** تُضِيءُ بِمِضْبَاحِ الْحِجَا الْمُتَلَهَّبِ

(*Fa-dhihnī mishkāhun wa-nafsī rujājātun / tuḍī‘u bi-miṣbāḥi al-ḥijā al-mutalahhibi*)

“My mind is a niche, and my soul is a glass / Illuminating with the flaming lamp of intelligence”.

Here, al-’Antarī explicitly uses Qur’anic imagery (the Verse of Light) to describe the intellect, a common trope in Islamic philosophy (notably in Avicenna and al-Ghazālī), but renders it in verse. In another passage, he emphasizes the necessity of wisdom (*ḥikmah*) for the soul:

بُيِّ تَعَلَّمَ حِكْمَةَ النَّفْسِ إِنَّهَا *** طَرِيقٌ إِلَى رُشْدِ الْقَتَى وَدَلِيلٌ

(*Bunayya ta'allam hikmata al-nafsi innahā / ṭarīqun ilā rushdi al-fatā wa-dalīlu*)

“My son, learn the wisdom of the soul, for it is / A path to the guidance of the youth and a proof”.

These verses reveal a poet-philosopher deeply immersed in the very themes found in *al-Jumānah*: the intelligible vs. the sensible, the nature of the soul, and the pursuit of wisdom. The stylistic continuity between these fragments and the poem *al-Jumānah* is undeniable.

3. Internal Criticism: Doctrinal Inconsistencies and Stylistic Anomalies

While external evidence points away from Avicenna, internal evidence makes his authorship philosophically untenable. A close reading of *al-Jumānah* reveals doctrines and metaphors that conflict with Avicenna's mature metaphysics and natural philosophy.

3.1. The “Builder” Analogy and the Denial of Resemblance

The poem opens with a couplet that immediately raises theological red flags for the student of Avicenna:

يَا ظَالِبًا صِفَةَ الْإِلَهِ وَخَلْقِهِ *** بِتَصَوُّرٍ يَهْدِي إِلَى الْأَعْيَانِ

(*Yā ṭaliban ṣifata al-ilāhi wa-khalqihī / bi-taṣawwurin yahdī ilā al-a'yāni*)

“O seeker of the description of God and His creation / With a conception that guides to the realities”.

اللَّهُ شَيْءٌ لَيْسَ يُشْبِهُ خَلْقَهُ *** وَكَذَا الْبِنَاءُ خِلَافُ طَبْعِ الْبَانِي

(*Allāhu shay'un laysa yushbihu khalqahu / wa-kadhā al-binā'u khilāfu ṭab'i al-bānī*)

“God is a thing resembling not His creation / Just as the building differs from the nature of the builder”.

This analogy of the builder (*bānī*) and the building (*binā'*) is a standard trope in *Kalām* (Islamic theology) used to assert the absolute distinction (*mukhālafah*) between the Agent and the artifact, implying a

voluntary, temporal agency where the agent remains external to the act . This stands in stark contrast to Avicenna’s metaphysics of Emanation (*fayḍ*). For Avicenna, the relationship between the Necessary Existent (*Wājib al-Wujūd*) and the world is one of essential necessity. The effect (the world) must bear a resemblance (*sunūkh*) to its cause to proceed from it. As Gutas explains, Avicenna synthesizes the Aristotelian and Neoplatonic traditions to show that the universe flows from the First Principle’s self-knowledge. To categorically deny resemblance at the outset contradicts the core Avicennian tenet that existence is modulated (*mashakkak*) and derived from the First. In Avicenna’s view, God is not a builder standing apart from a brick wall; He is the sustainer of existence, and the universe is the necessary radiance of His essence.

3.2. The Metaphor of Alchemy

Perhaps the most damaging evidence against Avicennian authorship is the poem’s use of alchemy as a positive theological metaphor:

وَاللَّهُ مِثْلُ الْكِيمِيَا يَمُدُّ فِي الْكُلِّ *** جُودًا وَهُوَ لَيْسَ بِفَانٍ

(*Wa-Allāhu mithlu al-kīmiyā yamuddu fī al-kull / jūdan wa-huwa laysa bi-fāni*)

“ And God is like Alchemy [the Elixir], extending generosity into all / While He Himself does not perish”.

Avicenna is historically renowned for his staunch opposition to the possibility of alchemical transmutation. In *The Cure (al-Shifā’)*, specifically the section on minerals (*al-Ma’ādin*), Avicenna writes“ :As to the claims of the alchemists, it must be understood that it is not in their power to bring about any true change of species of one metal into another... The possibility of eliminating or imparting the specific difference of any given metal has never been clear to me. On the contrary, I regard it as impossible...”

For Avicenna, scientific method relies on the observation of specific differences (*faṣl*). He viewed alchemy as merely changing the accidents (color, weight) without changing the substance. It is highly improbable

that a philosopher who spent considerable energy debunking alchemy as scientifically impossible would then use it as the primary metaphor for Divine generosity in a theological text. The metaphor belongs to a different intellectual milieu—likely the 11th century, where alchemical language began to permeate Sufi and poetic discourse as a symbol of spiritual transformation.

3.3. The Unity of Intellect and Intelligible

The poem asserts:

وَالْعِلْمُ إِذْرَاكُ الْحَقِيقَةِ ذَاتِهَا *** فَالْعَقْلُ وَالْمَعْقُولُ مُتَّحِدَانِ

(*Wa-l-‘ilmu idrāku al-ḥaqīqati dhātihā / fa-l-‘aqlu wa-l-ma‘qūlu muttahiḍāni*)

“Knowledge is the perception of the reality itself / Thus, the intellect and the intelligible are united”.

The issue of the unity of the intellect and the intelligible (*ittiḥād al-‘āqil wa-l-ma‘qūl*) is complex in Avicenna. While he accepts it regarding God’s self-knowledge, he is famously critical of it regarding human intellection in his mature works like *al-Ishārāt* (Pointers and Reminders), dismissing the Porphyrian tradition of union as “poetic nonsense” (*shā‘iriyyah*) in certain contexts. While there is nuance in his position (as he seems to allow a form of union in the *Mabda’ wa-l-Ma‘ād*), the poem’s flat, unqualified assertion lacks the rigorous distinctions between the potential, habitual, and acquired intellects that characterize Avicenna’s authentic treatment. It reflects a simplified, textbook summarization rather than the master’s analytical struggle.

3.4. Stylistic Anomaly: The Missing Proem

A striking feature of the text is the absence of a traditional *Khuṭbah* or *Barā‘at al-Istihlāl* (proem/skilful opening). Avicenna’s authentic works invariably begin with praise of God and a statement of purpose. *Al-Jumānah* begins abruptly with the line *Yā ṭāliban ṣifata al-ilāhi ...* (O seeker of the description of God...). This abruptness strongly suggests

that the extant text is a fragment—specifically, the second half of al-'Antarī's larger work which, as al-Şafadī noted, covered Natural Science first. The missing introduction likely resided at the start of the lost Physics section.

4. Description of the Work and Manuscripts

Having established that the work is likely by al-'Antarī, it remains a valuable text for the history of Islamic philosophy in the 12th century. The text, titled in manuscripts variously as *al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah*, consists of approximately 334 verses in the *Rajaz* meter.

Philological Note on the Title:

The word *Jumānah* (plural *Jumān*) is defined by Ibn Manẓūr in *Lisān al-'Arab* as “beads made of silver in the shape of a pearl,” or simply pearls. Ibn Manẓūr quotes al-Jawharī: “*Al-Jumānah* is a bead made of silver like a pearl.” The title implies a “Precious Pearl of Theology.” This fits the genre of didactic poetry, where knowledge is presented as a jewel to be treasured and memorized.

A Survey of the Manuscripts of *al-Jumānah*:

It is noteworthy that *al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah* is occasionally designated in the bibliographical record as *al-Qaṣīdah al-Nūniyyah* (The Poem Rhyming in *Nūn*), a title derived from the rhyme letter (*rawī*) characterizing its verses.

According to the Union Catalog of Iranian Manuscripts (*Fihristgān*), the sole witness to this text in Iran is preserved at the Central Library of the University of Tehran under shelfmark 1149/30. Dated 962 AH (1555 CE), this manuscript is fragmentary, containing only 42 verses of the total 334 that comprise the complete *al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah*.

In Turkey, the manuscript tradition is more robust. The Ahmed III collection at the Topkapı Palace Museum in Istanbul houses two copies (MS 3355 and MS 3447). Similarly, the Nuruosmaniye Library possesses two manuscripts of *al-Jumānah*, cataloged under numbers 3427 and 4894. Additional witnesses include MS Ayasofya 4829 and MS Hamidiye 1448.

A manuscript has also been reported in Cairo, preserved in the Muṣṭafā Fāḍil collection under shelfmark 142 *Majāmi'*, although Georges Anawati cites it as 627/7.

These manuscripts were listed by Georges Anawati in his *Mu'allafāt Ibn Sīnā*. Yaḥyā Maḥdāvī, in his *Fihrist-i Muṣannafāt-i Ibn Sīnā*, records these same manuscripts but notably fails to report the Tehran University copy. Conversely, Dimitri Gutas, in *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition* (p. 484), explicitly includes the Tehran manuscript; the remainder of his list corresponds exactly to the witnesses cited above.

It is crucial to observe that every one of these manuscripts bears an attribution to Avicenna, and none contains the section on Natural Philosophy (*al-Ḥikmah al-Ṭabī'iyyah*). Textual variance is significant regarding length: the maximum count is 334 verses (e.g., MS Ahmed III), while others are considerably shorter (e.g., the fragmentary Tehran MS). Furthermore, certain manuscripts, such as Ahmed III and Ayasofya, include specific rubrics serving as chapter titles for various sections of the poem. Another manuscript reported at the library of the Iraqi Academy of Sciences (*al-Majma' al-'Ilmī al-'Irāqī*) appears to be merely a photographic reproduction of one of the Turkish codices.

Nevertheless, a comprehensive survey of available manuscript catalogs—including the Union Catalog of Iran Manuscripts (FANKHA and DENA), the National Library of Iran database, *Mu'jam al-Makḥṭū'āt al-'Irāqīyyah*, the Qalamos portal (for collections in Germany), Al-Fihrist (for collections in the UK), and the catalog of Karabulut (for collections in Turkey)—has yielded no extant copy of a work explicitly titled *al-Jumānah al-Ṭabī'iyyah wa-l-Ilāhiyyah* attributed to Ibn al-Mujallī al-'Antarī. It is hoped that future codicological research may uncover a more complete witness of *al-Jumānah* containing the lost Physics section.

The Conclusion of the Poem:

The poem concludes with a self-referential flourish typical of the genre, where the author names the work and praises its utility:

فَجُمَانَةُ الْإِسْلَامِ فِي الْإِسْلَامِ *** قَدْ جَمَعَتْ لِمَا فِي الْكُلِّ بِالْبُرْهَانِ

(*Fa-jumānātu al-islāmi fī al-islāmi / qad jama‘at li-mā fī al-kulli bi-l-burhāni*)

“Thus the Pearl of Islam, within Islam / Has gathered what is in the Whole through demonstration”.

تَمَّتِ الْجَمَانَةُ الْإِلَهِيَّةُ وَالْحَمْدُ لِمُنَوِّرِ الْأَلْبَابِ وَالْهَادِي إِلَى سَبِيلِ الصَّوَابِ

(*Tammāt al-Jumānātu al-Ilāhiyyatu wa-l-ḥamdu li-munawwiri al-albābi wa-l-hādī ilā sabīli al-ṣawābi*)

“The Divine Pearl is completed, and praise be to the Illuminator of minds and the Guide to the path of rectitude”.

Conclusion

The attribution of *al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah* to Avicenna is a case study in the dynamics of manuscript transmission and authority in the medieval Islamic world. The magnetic pull of Avicenna’s name, combined with his genuine cultivation of the *Urjūzah* genre, created the perfect conditions for the absorption of works by lesser-known authors like al-’Antarī. However, the cumulative weight of evidence demands a correction of the historical record. The external evidence—the silence of al-Jūzjānī versus the explicit attributions by al-Ṣafadī and Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘ah—is decisive. The internal evidence reinforces this: the theological metaphors of the “builder,” the uncritical acceptance of alchemical imagery, and the simplified epistemology are alien to Avicenna’s system. Furthermore, the recovery of al-’Antarī’s biography and poetry reveals a scholar fully capable of composing such a work, one whose literary output was explicitly noted for being confused with Avicenna’s. By recognizing Abū al-Mu’ayyad al-’Antarī as the true author, we do not diminish the poem but contextualize it correctly. It stands as a testament to the reception and popularization of philosophy in the 12th century, a period when Avicennian thought was being digested, simplified, and versified for a broader audience. Correct attribution is essential for the historian of philosophy to distinguish between the innovator (Avicenna) and the interpreter (al-’Antarī), ensuring that the rigor of the former is not diluted by the pedagogical simplifications of the latter.

References

Primary Sources

1. Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā). (1983). *al-Shifā': al-Ṭabī'īyyāt* (The Healing: Physics). Ed. A. Montaser et al. Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organization.
2. Avicenna. (1954). *al-Shifā': al-Ma'ādīn wa-l-āthār al-'ulwiyya* (The Healing: Minerals and Meteorology). Ed. I. Madkour et al. Cairo.
3. Avicenna. (2014). *al-Ishārāt wa-l-Tanbīhāt* (Pointers and Reminders). Ed. M. Zarei. Qom: Bustan-e Ketab.
4. Avicenna. (1999). *al-Urjūzah fī al-Ṭibb*. Ed. H. Jahier & A. Nouredine. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
5. Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ah. (1882). *'Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*. Ed. A. Müller. Cairo.
6. Ibn Manẓūr. (n.d.). *Lisān al-'Arab*. Beirut: Dar Sader.
7. al-Jūzjānī, Abū 'Ubayd. (1974). *Sīrat al-Shaykh al-Ra'īs*. Ed. W. Gohlman. Albany: SUNY Press.
8. [Rezaei, A. (Ed.)]. (2021). *Risālah al-Jumānah al-Ilāhiyyah Mansūb bi Ibn Sīnā*. Tehran: Safir Ardehal.
9. al-Ṣafādī, Khalīl b. Aybak. (2000). *al-Wāfī bi-l-Wafayāt*. Ed. A. Arnaut. Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath.

Secondary Sources

10. Bertolacci, A. (2006). *The Reception of Aristotle's Metaphysics in Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā'*. Leiden: Brill.
11. Gohlman, W. E. (1974). *The Life of Ibn Sina: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
12. Gutas, D. (2014). *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition: Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works* (2nd ed.). Leiden: Brill.
13. Gutas, D. (2012). The Empiricism of Avicenna. *Oriens*, 40, 391–436.
14. Hasse, D. N. (2013). Avicenna's 'Giver of Forms' in Latin Philosophy. In Dag Nikolaus Hasse & Amos Bertolacci (Eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
15. McGinnis, J. (2010). *Avicenna*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Mokhtari Khoyi, R., & Mohammadrezayi, M. (2025). The rationale behind the composition of the treatise "Al-Jam" by Al-Farabi: a historical mistake or a greater idea? *History of Islamic Philosophy*, 4(16), 37-72.

doi: 10.22034/hpi.2025.517371.1144

17. Reisman, D. C. (2002). *The Making of the Avicennan Tradition*. Leiden: Brill.
18. Ullmann, M. (1970). *Die Medizin im Islam*. Leiden: Brill.
19. Wisnovsky, R. (2003). *Avicenna's Metaphysics in Context*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
20. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. (2016). Ibn Sina [Avicenna]. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ibn-sina/>