

---

# Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa

Classe di Lettere e Filosofia



serie 5  
2018, 10/2



EDIZIONI  
DELLA  
NORMALE



---

# Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa

## Classe di Lettere e Filosofia

serie 5  
2018, 10/2



EDIZIONI  
DELLA  
NORMALE

Pubblicazione semestrale  
Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Pisa n. 7 del 1964  
Direttore responsabile: Massimo Ferretti

ISSN 0392-095x

# Indice

## STUDI E RICERCHE

- What laws applied to guarantors? Epigraphic evidence for legal procedure affecting personal security in Athens and beyond  
DONATELLA ERDAS 333
- Variations on a theme by Avicenna in al-Ġazālī's *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*  
MARCO SIGNORI 359
- La firma ritrovata: Bonanno e la Torre di Pisa  
GIULIA AMMANNATI 383
- When did clerics start investing? Abbot Uberto and the economics of the monastery of S. Michele di Passignano (c. 1190-c. 1210)  
LORENZO TABARRINI 399
- Sulle ultime ricerche in merito alla santità femminile d'età medievale e della prima età moderna. Studi storico-letterari e linguistici  
MATTIA ZANGARI 435
- La *divisio entis* fra Cusano e Pico. Note sulla traduzione del concetto di *ens*  
LUCA BURZELLI 467
- Per una nuova edizione dell'*Epistolario* di Leonardo Bruni  
ILARIA MORRESI 495
- Fra Tiziano, Simone Bianco e Pietro Aretino. Intorno a tre sonetti di Girolamo Molin  
MARCELLO CALOGERO, MARTINA DAL CENGIO 519
- Sul metodo analitico. Jacopo Aconcio e René Descartes: un possibile confronto  
PAOLA GIACOMONI 559

Note sull'abisso di Leopardi  
VINCENZO ALLEGRINI 593

Il più grande evento dopo la Conciliazione. Scenari e  
retroscena della fedeltà dell'episcopato italiano al fascismo  
TAKASHI ARAYA 611

#### NOTE E DISCUSSIONI

In margine a un'indagine sul *De vulgari eloquentia*  
NICOLÒ MAGNANI 647

Teorie e pratiche della secolarizzazione. A proposito di un  
libro recente  
LUCIO BIASIORI 657

Su una recente edizione goldoniana  
ANDREA MENOZZI 667

Una famiglia di ebrei-italiani tra esilio e persecuzione  
FRANCESCO TORCHIANI 675

English summaries 681

Autrici e autori 687

Hanno collaborato a questo volume 693

Notizie degli allievi della Classe di Lettere e Filosofia 695

ILLUSTRAZIONI 703

# Variations on a theme by Avicenna in al-Ġazālī's *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*

Marco Signori

## 1. Introduction

Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ġazālī is considered one of the most important representatives of the Islamic theology of aś'arite school, and one of the finest Arabic-speaking thinkers of the Middle Ages. His theoretical and literary output, however, is not limited to the systematic theology alone (*kalām*), but it incorporates the Aristotelian philosophy (*falsafa*) as well, towards which al-Ġazālī assumes a twofold, perhaps even ambiguous, attitude.

To this end, a careful study of the most 'philosophical' of the Ġazālīan works, the *Intentions of the philosophers* [*Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*, MF]<sup>1</sup>, could certainly give us valuable information and insights. The MF are somehow linked with the more famous *Incoherence of the philosophers* [*Tahāfut al-falāsifa*, TF]<sup>2</sup>, in which Ġazālī takes a harshly critical position against philosophy; but the real nature of the relationship between

I wish to warmly thank Prof. Amos Bertolacci for his constant help and patient revision of my work, and for his careful reading on a previous draft of this paper. All the translations in this paper are mine, unless otherwise specified. I am grateful to Dr Ivana Panzeca for her kind and much-needed assistance with the Persian translations, and to the anonymous referees for their useful comments.

<sup>1</sup> The most recent edition of the Arabic text is DUNYĀ 1961, which I have compared where necessary with AL-KURDĪ 1936 in the reprint by BİĠŪ 2000. For the Latin text the only available edition for a long time has been MUCKLE 1933, now complemented by LOHR 1965, for the logical section, and by ST. CLAIR 2005 for the fourth treatise of the *Physics*, which I shall consider more carefully in what follows. The only complete translation of the work in a modern Western language is ALONSO 1963.

<sup>2</sup> The most reliable critical edition is the one by BOUYGES 1927. A recent English translation is available in MARMURA 2000.

the two works has not yet been studied with the tools of close reading on both the *MF* and the *TF*<sup>3</sup>.

It is possible, on the one hand, to read the two works almost as a *continuum*, as two parts of the same, originally anti-philosophical, project. The exposition of the Aristotelian and Avicennan philosophy contained in the *MF* would constitute only the necessary preamble of the following refutation, which should therefore be considered as the main goal of al-Ġazālī, and the real end of his careful study of the *falsafa*<sup>4</sup>. Besides, the prologue of the *MF* expresses clearly the methodological need for providing a summary of the opponents' ideas before refuting them<sup>5</sup>.

But it is also possible, on the other hand, to think the *MF* and the *TF* as

<sup>3</sup> The relationship between the two works has indeed been studied, for instance in the papers by Reynolds and Griffel quoted *infra*, notes 17 and 18, but the works (*MF*, *TF*, and also Avicenna's *DN*) still need to be systematically analysed and compared.

<sup>4</sup> The problem arises because of the Prologue of the *MF*, which has been variously studied and translated since the time of MUNK 1857, pp. 369-72, who, basing his analysis on the Hebrew translation and on the Latin one as preserved by the ms. Paris, B.N. lat. 16096, was the first to show the 'true' nature of the work after centuries of Western misunderstanding. Other translations of the prologue can be read in: BEER 1888, pp. 21-3; ASÍN PALACIOS 1901; MACDONALD 1936, p. 11; VAJDA 1960, p. 21, note 1; ALONSO 1963, pp. 3-4; see also LOHR 1965, pp. 223-4 with the related footnotes.

<sup>5</sup> Here follows, for the reader's convenience, part of the English translation by MACDONALD 1936, p. 11: «You have desired from me a doubt-removing discourse, uncovering the falling to pieces (*tahāfut*) of the philosophers and the mutual contradictions in their views [...]. But to help you thus is not at all desirable except after first teaching you their position (*maḏhab*) and making you know their dogmatic structure. For it is absurd to consider the falsity of positions before understanding their sources; it is indeed shooting an arrow blindly and at venture. So I was of opinion that I should prefix to an exposition of how they fall to pieces a concise discourse (*kalām*) containing a reproduction (*ḥikāya*) of their meanings (*maqāsid*) as to the sciences which they cultivate, logical, physical and theological, without distinguishing between the sound and the false in them (*ḥaqq, bāṭil* = real, unreal)». A similar methodological *caveat* is to be found also in the *Munqid min al-Ḍalāl*, transl. by WATT 1964, p. 29: «I was convinced that a man cannot grasp what is defective in any of the sciences unless he has so complete a grasp of the science in question that he equals its most learned exponents in the appreciation of its fundamental principles, and even goes beyond them and surpasses them [...]. To refute a system before understanding it and becoming acquainted with its depths is blind».



having quite different origins, and a feeble mutual connection. The *TF*, in fact, does not contain any reference to the other work, and it appears, on the contrary, as a fully independent elaboration, which meets the requirements of the *MF*'s prologue<sup>6</sup> on its own. Moreover, there is a fundamental difference between the main sources of the two works: for the *MF* it is undoubtedly the Persian writing by Avicenna *Book of Science for 'Alā'-ad-Dawlā* [*Dānešnāme-ye 'Alā'i, DN*]<sup>7</sup>, whereas the source for the theories criticised in the *TF* seems to be the *Book of the Cure* [*Kitāb al-Šifā'*], and in particular its metaphysical section [*Ilāhiyyāt*]<sup>8</sup>.

Jules Janssens provided valuable contributions on both sides of the problem, helping to clarify the nature of the *MF* both as an autonomous work of its author, independent from the *TF*, and as a philosophical treatise heavily indebted to Avicenna's *DN*. A paper published in 1986, which still represents an essential starting point to understand the relationship between *MF* and *DN*, underlines many textual parallels between the two<sup>9</sup>. These parallels are deployed throughout the text, justifying therefore the definition of the *MF* as 'interpretative translation' of the *DN*<sup>10</sup>.

The constant mirroring with the Persian writing by Avicenna is already well perceivable at a macroscopic level, because of the peculiar ordering of the philosophical sciences in the *DN*: first Logic, which represents, in

<sup>6</sup> See MARMURA 2000, *Translator's Introduction*, p. xv: «in order to refute the Islamic philosophers, al-Ghazālī had to explain them. He explained them so clearly and so well that he rendered philosophical ideas accessible to nonphilosophers». See also p. xvii: «Strangely enough, in the *Tahāfut* there is never any mention of the *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*, nor any allusion to it».

<sup>7</sup> See the Persian editions of the *Logic* (*Mantiq*): MEŠKĀT 1952a [1331Š]; of the *Physics* (*Ṭabī'iyyāt*): MEŠKĀT 1952b [1331Š]; of the *Mathematics* (*Riyādiyyāt*): MĪNOVĪ 1952 [1331Š] (*sic* in GUTAS 2014<sup>2</sup>, p. 574); of the *Metaphysics* (*Ilāhiyyāt*): MO'IN 1952 [1331Š]. See also the French translation in ACHENA-MASSÉ 1955 (I), ACHENA-MASSÉ 1958 (II) [henceforth, in the tables, AM]. The *Metaphysics* of the *DN* can also be read in an English translation by MOREWEDGE 1973.

<sup>8</sup> MŪSĀ-DUNYĀ-ZĀYID 1960; QANAWĀTĪ-ZĀYID 1960.

<sup>9</sup> The connection between the *MF* and *DN* was already highlighted in ALONSO 1963, pp. XLV-LI.

<sup>10</sup> JANSSENS 1986, p. 164: «Celle-ci [la traduction] ne s'avère pas littérale, mais elle respecte néanmoins l'essentiel du contenu – ainsi la meilleure qualification nous paraît être celle de "traduction interprétative"».

accordance with the tradition, the beginning of the *iter studiorum*, then – exceptionally – Metaphysics, and finally Physics. This change of ordering is respected in al-Ġazālī, and so, broadly speaking, is the order of the single topics within the different parts of the work.

If, however, the *MF* are to be considered a faithful adaptation of the *DN*, any kind of variation and gap – although minor – assumes a particular meaning, and questions the status itself of the two works (also if they are considered in themselves and not only in their relationship). The most important variations in the order of exposition are easy to spot thanks to the recapitulatory tables offered by Janssens, where the order of the *DN*'s paragraphs is contrasted with the paging of the *MF* in Dunyā's edition<sup>11</sup>. Using this handy instrument, it is easy to realise that the aim of many of the shifts employed by Ġazālī is to reorganise the Avicennan text, for example by reuniting in a single expository line different topics of the *DN*.

In 2003 Janssens has touched again, from another angle, the problem of the nature of the *MF*, assuming this time the Ġazālīan perspective<sup>12</sup>. Here, Janssens argues for the theoretical independence of the *MF* from the *TF*, highlighting that the complete absence of backward references to the *MF* in the latter is particularly striking in the cases in which a certain philosophical doctrine could be accepted also by the theologian. If the philosophical doctrine of the soul need not be refuted, as perfectly compatible with the Muslim faith<sup>13</sup>, and if that doctrine had already been exposed with a certain precision in the *MF*, it seems licit to wonder, with Janssens, «why al-Ġazālī does not repeat, or, at least, refer to what he has already brought to the fore on these matters in the *Maqāṣid*, if the latter has been meant as an introduction to the former?»<sup>14</sup>. Moreover, Janssens studies the doctrine of the internal senses in the two works, trying to show that the *TF* relies on the *Kitāb al-Nafs* of Avicenna's *Šifā*<sup>15</sup>, whereas the *MF* depend on this topic too from the *DN*<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> See JANSSENS 1986, pp. 168-9 [Logic]; 170-1 [Metaphysics]; 172-3 [Physics].

<sup>12</sup> See JANSSENS 2003.

<sup>13</sup> See *TF*, Discussion 18, MARMURA 2000, p. 181, ll. 26-7: «There is nothing in what they have mentioned that must be denied in terms of the religious law [šarʿ]».

<sup>14</sup> JANSSENS 2003, p. 44.

<sup>15</sup> See QANAWĀTĪ-ZĀYID 1975 [1395Š] and RAHMAN 1959.

<sup>16</sup> But the doctrine of the internal senses presents actually quite scanty variations between the different works of Avicenna, and it seems rather onerous to sustain the theory

Two papers by Gabriel Reynolds and Frank Griffel also touch on the nature and the value of the *MF* for our understanding of Ġazālī's contribution to both *falsafa* and *kalām*: in his 2002's article *A Philosophical Odyssey*<sup>17</sup>, Reynolds traces the path of the *MF* as a genuine philosophical work, concluding that «we cannot understand Ghazzālī simply as an opponent of philosophy»; while Griffel's article<sup>18</sup>, published in 2006, compares the *MF* with another work by al-Ġazālī, newly discovered by Griffel in MS London, British Library Or. 3126, and provides at the same time a useful summary of the scholarship on the *MF*.

Most recently, in 2011, Ayman Shihadeh has once again brought the problem of the ambiguity of the *MF* to the fore, focusing in particular on the analysis of a newly discovered copy of the text<sup>19</sup>. MS Dublin, Chester Beatty Library Ar. 5328 preserves a copy of the *MF* which has been cut at both ends, lacking thus of both the prologue and the concluding statement, *i.e.* of the explicit references to the *TF* contained in the standard Arabic text of the work. Comparing the CBL copy to the Latin text, Shihadeh is able to show that this manuscript cannot be the representative of an earlier version of the work, later amended by Ġazālī himself, but it should rather be considered a later, already altered text<sup>20</sup>. The conclusion is that «the thesis that al-Ghazali first wrote the *Maqāṣid* and then edited it to connect it to the *Tahāfut* cannot be supported by any textual evidence from within the book itself».

This paper focuses on the fourth and fifth treatise of the *Physics* of the *MF*<sup>21</sup>, and it aims, by means of a detailed analysis of two passages of this text, to show that it is possible to discover interesting cases in which the work by Ġazālī diverges subtly, but strongly, from its Avicennan basis.

of the complete independence between *MF* and *TF* only on that supposed discrepancy of sources. For the internal senses see now the excellent monograph by DI MARTINO 2012.

<sup>17</sup> See REYNOLDS 2002. The following quotation is at p. 37.

<sup>18</sup> See GRIFFEL 2006, in particular pp. 7-12.

<sup>19</sup> See SHIHADDEH 2011. It is worth mentioning that Shihadeh suggested to translate the title of the *MF* differently from the traditional rendering. According to him (p. 90) *maqāṣid* is the plural of *maqṣad* (noun of place) and not of *maqṣūd* (past participle), and it should therefore be rendered with «doctrines», against the common translation «intentions» (as explained for instance by MACDONALD 1936, p. 9).

<sup>20</sup> SHIHADDEH 2011, pp. 80-8.

<sup>21</sup> Corresponding to the pages 346-85 of DUNYĀ 1961.

These divergences, even if they never refer directly to the theoretical point that Avicenna is time by time arguing for, outline however a certain conceptual independence of al-Ġazālī. Therefore, credit should be given for this autonomy of judgment to the great Persian theologian, even in his least original – and most heavily relying on Avicenna – work.

Moreover, even if the two main ‘variations on a theme’ which I shall consider could appear of little importance on their own right, their combination is undoubtedly remarkable, and it allows us to sketch out the unmistakable features of the mature al-Ġazālī, as we know them from his best known works, first of all the *TF*, thus substantiating with further evidence the thesis endorsed by Shihadeh. Not least, these few examples should encourage further investigation, namely a closer reading of both the *MF* and the *DN*, in order to understand the full extent of the differences between the two texts. By revealing the actual purport of al-Ġazālī’s commitment to *falsafa*, this kind of close-up reading could in fact shed new light also on his contribution to theology.

Given the general theme of intellect, the first issue or ‘variation’ introduced by al-Ġazālī has already been noticed by the scholarship<sup>22</sup>: it is the omission of the Avicennan notion of ‘holy intellect’ (*‘aql al-quḍṣī*), which is not to be found where we would expect to find it, namely at the end of the *Physics* of the *MF*. I will deal with this theme in the second paragraph [§2].

The second variation, symmetric and opposite to the first one, has never been underlined by scholars<sup>23</sup>, and it consists on the contrary in a Ġazālīan addition to the text written by Avicenna. It is one of the several examples added by Ġazālī with the aim of clarifying the difficult wording chosen by Avicenna. In this case, however, the example – which should explain the nature of the speculative propositions known by the theoretical intellect – consists in the affirmation of the thesis of the world’s origin in time. I shall analyse carefully the implications and the consequences of this rather surprising statement in the third paragraph [§3], before drawing some provisional conclusions in the fourth one [§4].

<sup>22</sup> See JANSSENS 1986, p. 167, note 6.

<sup>23</sup> Shihadeh has underlined the presence of a similar – and under a certain perspective yet more striking – addition in the introduction to the logical part of the *MF*, to which I shall refer briefly in what follows. See also BERNAND 1990, pp. 232-3.

## 2. *Holy intellect and the walī*

Texts [T<sub>1</sub>] and [T<sub>2</sub>], which immediately follow, are taken respectively from Avicenna's *DN* and al-Ġazālī's *MF*. In both works, they constitute part of the conclusion of the treatise dedicated to *Physics*, being also two of the theoretical peaks of the entire philosophical exposition. At the end of the *Physics*, Avicenna – and Ġazālī following him – abandon the role of natural philosophers, introducing an ethical and theological discussion about prophethood, the guidance of community, and the role of the highest intellectual knowledge for the prophet<sup>24</sup>.

Despite their length, it is worthwhile to quote the two passages almost in full, in order to properly appreciate the differences (and the similarities) between them.

T<sub>1</sub>. *DN*, MEŠKĀT, *Physics*, §§50-1, 143.3-144.7 + 145.4-146

[§50] Among human beings, some need a teacher for most things, [because] they are not capable of any intuition; moreover, it happens that some cannot understand, even with the aid of a teacher.

It is also possible that there is a man who seizes most things by virtue of intellectual intuition and needs a teacher for [just] a few things. It is even possible that someone, being a rare [specimen], could reach the sciences when he likes, without a teacher and in a very short time, from their beginning to their end, by way of intuition; and that [happens] thanks to his perfect conjunction with the agent intellect, so that he does not have to ponder at all and he assumes that [this knowledge] is widespread in his heart from a [certain] place – which is actually true. The principle of the learning given to human beings should come from this person. There is nothing to marvel about that, since we ourselves have met someone who was not at this degree and learnt things with reflection and effort, but was nonetheless exempt from excessive effort thanks to the power of his intellectual intuition.

<sup>24</sup> This kind of discussion in the *DN* and the *MF* is interesting both because it deals with the religious topic of prophethood within a philosophical framework, and because its position in the system of the philosophical sciences is atypical, if compared, for instance, with Avicenna's *Šifā'*. There, treatment of analogous topics is to be found at the end of metaphysics, and not at the end of physics (however, the ethical and theological discussion is steadily located at the end of the philosophical exposition as a whole). See *Ilāhiyyāt X*, in MŪSĀ-DUNYĀ-ZĀYID 1960, pp. 435-55.

[His] intuition was mostly in agreement with what is [written] in books, and so he also did not have to take the trouble of reading much into the books.

[...] [*Here follows the account of how this man – who must be identified with Avicenna himself – at the age of eighteen had already gathered all the treasures of his knowledge, mastering doctrines that would have required years of training to a normal man*].

[§51] The holy soul [*nafs qudsī*] is the rational soul of the lofty prophets, which seizes intelligible things, without a teacher nor books, through intellectual intuition and his conjunction to the world of angels, and which, both through [oneiric] vision and in the wake state, rises up to the invisible universe and there receives a revelation.

Revelation is the link between the angels and the human soul, through which they inform the soul about the different states [of things]; revelation acts upon the matter of the universe, in order to produce miracles, make the form of matter vanish, and substitute another form for it. This is the loftiest degree of humankind, linked to the angelical degree. It is in this way that such a being is God's vicar on earth. His existence is compatible with reason and it is necessary to the perpetual [existence] of human species – which has been demonstrated elsewhere. Now we have sufficiently spoken about Physics.

T2. *MF*, *DUNYĀ*, Physics V, pp. 382.7-16 + 383.4-14

The second kind [of prophecy] refers to the speculative faculty. It brightens the soul with such brightness that it is prepared to the conjunction with the agent intellect, so that it pours upon it the sciences. The souls are divided into those who need teaching and those who can do without it. Among those who need teaching, there are some upon which the act of teaching has an influence only with a long labour, whereas others learn quickly. Sometimes you can find someone who discovers things on his own, without a teacher; and indeed, all the sciences, if they were [well] contemplated, could be discovered on their own, since the first teacher has not found himself in the condition of learning from a teacher; but it is possible to climb up again this [stair] until the one who has known from his own soul.

[...] [*The following are two examples of physical and metaphysical notions which can be known autonomously by the ones who have great intellectual capacity, without the need for a teacher*].

[D383] These examples are not absurd, and if [these things] have reached the mind, then it is not absurd that one could reach the least of intelligibles, in a long or short time. The one to whom all these intelligibles were revealed in a short time

and without teaching, it would be said that he is a prophet or a friend of God [*walī*], and this fact would be called stupendous, or miracle of the prophet. This is possible and not absurd. If it is conceivable even to be impeded from understanding when starting from a learning process, it will [also] be possible to climb up again [the stair] of perfection to the point of knowing without being taught.

And how could this be impossible, since how many times of two students [learning] a same subject the one precedes [the other] about the truths of sciences, even if his dedication is lesser than the dedication of the [student who has been] surpassed, but the might of intuition and the strength of perspicacity have given this [excellence to the first student] – so that the increase in this topic belongs to the things which are possible?

The two texts provide a justification for the existence of individuals endowed with outstanding intellectual gifts, which make them capable of learning any kind of notion not from teachers or books, but directly from the agent intellect (or, here, from the ‘first soul’). In the part of text which I have not quoted Avicenna dwells more on the concrete example of the man endowed with an exceptional intellect, whom he pretends to have only met, but who is on the contrary to be identified with Ibn Sīnā himself<sup>25</sup>; al-Ġazālī, on the contrary, seems to show *e silentio* a certain degree of skepticism, or at least some more discretion, because he limits himself to state the logical possibility of the existence of such an individual, without committing to any direct testimony.

What is important, however, is not to underline the great deal of minor differences that can be spotted between the two texts, but to emphasize the major variation which divides them. If Avicenna speaks clearly of ‘holy soul’ [*naḥs qudsī*], identifying it with the soul of the prophets, the highest degree of intellectual knowledge, al-Ġazālī rephrases subtly the entire text. By doing so, he is eventually able to introduce the category of prophecy, omitting at the same time any reference to the ‘holy intellect’, potentially dangerous because of its clear theological implications.

Actually, the Avicennan wording leads to conceive some ‘holiness’ attainable by an exclusively philosophical way, *i.e.* by the intellect alone, without need of God’s direct intervention. In this perspective, al-Ġazālī may have intended to eliminate every possible kind of filo-rationalist am-

<sup>25</sup> See the perfectly coherent passage in Avicenna’s autobiography, translated by ACHENA-MASSÉ 1955 (I), *Introduction*, pp. 6-11, and by GUTAS 1988, p. 163, L10.

biguity, in order to reaffirm implicitly the priority of the religious and Koranic data on the philosophical ones.

The only word to be found in al-Ġazālī's 'translation' which could lead the reader to think about some kind of holiness, although always Islamic and theological, is the term *walī*, "friend of God". This term is generally employed to describe those individuals of overt religiosity, who – it is supposed – have enjoyed during their lives a particularly intimate relationship with Allāh. This notwithstanding, al-Ġazālī never uses here the grammar root of 'holiness' and 'saintliness' [*qds*], which remains therefore the property of Avicennan noetics alone.

The main point, moreover, is that the one provided by Avicenna is a proper definition of the holy soul, which appears therefore to be the actual and conscious topic of Avicenna's text; whereas the Ġazālīan use of *walī* seems to be mildly illustrative. The preceding 'prophet', indeed, reverberates its semantic charge on the second term too, leading it back to a frankly theological dimension, linked with Revelation.

### 3. *De aeternitate mundi?*

The second variation upon which I would like to focus attention is somewhat the mirror, and the opposite, of the first one. It is an addition, and not an omission, and its justification seems in general even clearer than the first one. Not least, it should be noticed that in this second case the Ġazālīan intervention does not insist directly on the *content* expressed by the Avicennan text – either denying or modifying it –, but it operates on a rather different, and perhaps more interesting, level.

During the first discussion on man's rational faculties, at the beginning of the *Speech on human soul* in the fourth treatise of the *Physics* of the *MF*<sup>26</sup>, al-Ġazālī is clearly translating a philosophically-based text, but such as to be possibly accepted by any theologian, even the most zealous one. In the corresponding passage of the *DN*, in fact, Avicenna is taking into

<sup>26</sup> The fourth treatise of the *Physics* is devoted to the analysis of the vegetative, sensitive and intellectual/rational soul. The main part of the treatise is occupied by discussion of the five external senses, the inner senses, and rational faculties. Much attention is also given to the various degrees of intellectual knowledge, and to the demonstration of the immaterial nature of intellect [*ʿaql*].



account the theoretical and the practical faculty of the human intellect, and he illustrates both of them with an example.

In particular, the example proposed by Avicenna regarding theoretical knowledge – that is to say, the one which involves propositions with a determinable truth value – is a simple instance of the classical Islamic theme of the *tawhīd*: «God is unique» (*Allāh<sup>u</sup> ta‘ālā wāhīd<sup>um</sup>*).

Al-Ġazālī, however, does not content himself with the single example suggested by Avicenna, although that example is by no means unsatisfying or inadequate, and chooses to complete it with a second proposition, which is inserted in the text at just the same level of the other, in quite a marked way. The added proposition is [P1] «the world has a beginning» (*al-‘ālam<sup>u</sup> ḥādīṭ<sup>um</sup>*)<sup>27</sup>.

Notwithstanding the fact that, in the Ġazālīan passage, [P1] is more interesting for its formal value of example than for its content as a statement, its sudden appearance in this place seems rather remarkable, particularly with reference to the mature outcomes of Ġazālī’s thought.

As a matter of fact, no less than two of the twenty discussions which compose the *TF* are precisely intended to refute the philosophers’ doctrine concerning the eternity of the world, in order to reaffirm its *creatio ex nihilo*<sup>28</sup> and its temporality. In these long discussions<sup>29</sup>, al-Ġazālī makes display of an extremely rich and sophisticated theoretical equipment, rebutting point by point the arguments *pro aeternitate mundi* that had been well supported by Aristotle and his followers, and targeting also the pertaining doctrine by Avicenna. But it should be remembered also that the thesis of the eternity of the world, together with God’s ignorance of particulars and the denial of the resurrection of the bodies, constitutes one of the three philosophical doctrines having the most serious religious

<sup>27</sup> See *infra*, Table 1, for a systematic comparison between the Arabic and the Latin text of the *MF*, and the French translation of the *DN*, on this specific doctrinal point.

<sup>28</sup> FRANK 1987-89, p. 282 maintains that the notion of *creatio ex nihilo* is somewhat undermined by certain doctrinal stances adopted by Ġazālī, so that his position could be better understood as linked with Rāzī’s doctrine of *creatio ex possibili*.

<sup>29</sup> Discussions 1 [*On refuting their doctrine of the world’s past eternity*] and 2 [*On refuting their statement on the post-eternity of the world, time, and motion*] occupy alone about the 20% (43 pages of English text in MARMURA 2000) of the *TF*. The other eighteen themes of discussion (including the two other theses linked with the accusation of *kufḥ*) are confined in the remaining 80%.

implications. These three doctrinal points actually imply the accusation of *kufr*, ‘unbelief’, and as such they entail the estrangement of their supporters from the community of the believers.

In this direction, it is important to remember that at the beginning of the logical part of the *MF* Ġazālī had already mentioned the three doctrines, the rejection of which is condemned in the *TF*, as examples of logical judgments (sg. *taṣḍīq*)<sup>30</sup>. These examples, however, being found in Logic, are delicate to deal with: they could actually be regarded just as dialectical examples, which are by no means necessarily true. This seems corroborated by the fact that the corresponding passage in the *DN* provides as an example of *taṣḍīq* a statement concerning the existence of fairies<sup>31</sup>. The three examples provided in the Logic of the *MF* could therefore be considered somehow less relevant than the one provided in Physics, since there the strict association with the Koranic fundamental concept of *tawḥīd* leaves no doubt that also the statement of the temporality of the world, which immediately follows, is regarded by the author as clearly true. Moreover, Avicenna himself writes in the very first pages of the *DN*’s Logic: «Exemple, en ce qui concerne le jugement. Si nous ne savons pas que *l’univers est créé*, et si quelqu’un nous le démontre et nous dit: “*L’univers est doué de forme, et tout ce qui est doué de forme est créé*”, il faut que nous y adhérons et que nous reconnaissons que le monde est doué de forme»<sup>32</sup>. The

<sup>30</sup> See DUNYĀ 1961, p. 33, ll. 12-5; p. 34, ll. 13-6. See SHIHADĒH 2011, p. 88: «None of these Ghazalian examples, which unmistakably recall the stern verdict made in the *Tahāfut*, have a place in a proper Avicennan text». Shihadeh effectively employs this reference to explain why the copyist of the Dublin MS could have decided to eliminate the introduction of the logical part together with the explicit references to the *TF* in *MF*’s preface and conclusion. BERNAND 1990, p. 232, had already mentioned the examples concerning *taṣḍīq* and *taṣawwur* in order to criticise Janssens’ thesis: «la thèse d’un parallélisme fidèle entre ces deux ouvrages, faisant des *Maqāṣid* une traduction interprétative du *Dānesh Nāmeḥ* ne résiste pas à l’analyse. [...] Les exemples choisis par Ghazālī... sont d’un tout autre ordre que les exemples avancés par Ibn Sinā». Despite the usefulness of these references (which Bernard herself provided for the first time), Bernard’s general argument goes perhaps too far, giving too strong an importance to logical examples that Ġazālī might have not believed to be true.

<sup>31</sup> See *DN*, ACHENA-MASSÉ 1955 (I), p. 23.

<sup>32</sup> «Example concerning judgment. If we did not know that *universe is created*, and if someone demonstrates it for us and tells us: “*Universe has a form, and everything which*

idea of ‘creation’ is obviously not identical to the notion of ‘temporal origination’. Nonetheless, the presence in the Avicennan text of an example drawing from the same conceptual field could have prompted al-Ġazālī to insert here his own examples concerning the world’s *ḥudūt* (and the other doctrines taken into account in the *TF*)<sup>33</sup>.

Finally, at a weaker but still significant level, instances of the “temporal origin” set of examples can be found also in other sections of the *MF*’s Logic<sup>34</sup>: here al-Ġazālī is clearly not committed to the affirmation of the truth of his statements (which are often expressed conditionally), but it is interesting, however, to notice how persistently Ġazālī changes the subject-matter of the logical examples he read in Avicenna, thus making a seemingly pointless effort of innovation. On the contrary, the theoretical

*has a form is created*”, it is incumbent that we accept [this idea] and that we acknowledge that the world has a form». See ACHENA-MASSÉ 1955 (I), p. 24, emphasis added. The theme of the contrast between *DN* and *MF* on this particular issue has already been touched by BERNAND 1990, p. 233. Concluding her brief analysis, she insisted that «les exemples choisis par Ghazālī sont empruntés au système de représentation propre aux “*uṣulayn*”».

<sup>33</sup> However, notwithstanding these reasons of caution, the examples found in Logic can probably be usefully linked with the one discovered in Physics, thus substantiating the idea of a strong relation between *MF* and *TF*, or even, as Shihadeh suggested, providing «further evidence that the *Maqāṣid* was indeed written later than the *Tahāfut*» (SHIHADÉH 2011, p. 88, note 26).

<sup>34</sup> See *MF*, Logic III, DUNYĀ 1961, p. 53, l. 8 (a); l. 19 (b); p. 54, l. 11 (c); l. 15 (d); l. 19 (e); l. 21 (f); p. 56, ll. 6-8 (g); p. 57, ll. 4-6 (h); ll. 13-5 (i). Almost irrelevant for my present goal are the examples (b), (d), (g), (h), and (i), which involve either a disjunction of the kind «the world is originated or eternal», or the conjunction of two contradictory clauses, like «the world is originated» and «the world is not originated». More interesting are cases (a), (c), (e), and (f), which involve only the affirmation of the world’s temporal origin. The most striking occurrence is, however, case (a), since here Ġazālī seems more committed to the truth of the statement than in the other cases. The context of the example is the following: «If you said: “The world has an origin”, it is possible to reply: “Indeed it is true”; but if you say: “The man is a stone”, it is [well] possible that you lie». The comparison with the apparent falsity of the statement about man being a stone could well bring one to think that the other statement is believed by al-Ġazālī to be true. The corresponding passage in the *DN* strengthens this impression. See ACHENA-MASSÉ 1955 (I), pp. 35-6: «Exemple: si quelqu’un dit: “Pour l’homme, il y a récompense et châtement”, tu peux dire: “Il en est ainsi”; et si l’on dit: “L’homme est volant”, tu peux répondre qu’il n’en est pas ainsi».

framework I am suggesting could help to make sense of this effort, showing its purpose and its implications.

As it is already evident from these few hints, the theme of the eternity or creation in time of the world assumes an undoubtedly central role in the thought of al-Ġazālī. The possibility of tracing back the path of this *Leitmotiv* up to the composition of the *MF* is indeed very fascinating. If Janssens is correct, and at the time of the translation of the *DN* al-Ġazālī was really taking part in a sort of Avicennan philosophical school, we must, however, put back into perspective the idea of a genuine acceptance of *falsafa* on his part in an early stage of his reflection. Thanks to this very short example – which can be profitably matched with the ones found in *Logic* – the *MF* are attracted, as a matter of fact, towards the *TF*: it seems therefore possible to recognise a certain closeness, rather than a deep separation, between the preparatory and the refutative work.

It could be objected that [P1], for its brevity, shares the features of a marginal or interlinear gloss, then interpolated. However, a combination of testimonies whose importance could hardly be denied exists against this hypothesis: all the critical editions of the Arabic text<sup>35</sup> do read the example as I have presented it, and so does the Latin translation, whose very early date is, in any case, a guarantee of authority and prestige<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>35</sup> DUNYĀ 1961, p. 359, l. 12; KURDĪ 1936 reprinted by BĪĠŪ 2000, p. 201, l. 8. The manuscript basis of these two semicritical editions is not clear, since it does not seem Kurdī reported it, while Dunyā only states that he has used one more manuscript in comparison to Kurdī (MS Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Azhariyya, 86/27143 *ḥikma wa-falsafa*). I have therefore checked one further codex, MS Yeni Cami, 735, listed as Y in Maurice Bouyges' edition of the *TF*. This manuscript, which seems very ancient (BOUYGES 1927, p. XII: «Terminé le lundi 21 Dou'l-Qa'dat 558 H. [Oct. 1163]») and carefully copied (BOUYGES 1927, *ibid.*: «Ce manuscrit a été copié avec soin et “revu et corrigé”») also reads our passage as proposed above: *al-‘ālam*“ ḥādīṭ”<sup>m</sup> (fol. 188r). The CBL manuscript also reads the example as I have reported it. This could in principle be explained either as an exception to the otherwise systematic tendency of the copyist to «decontextualize this Ghazālian work... and to use it simply as a compendium of Avicennan philosophy» (SHIHADĒH 2011, p. 88), or – which is perhaps more likely – as a natural consequence of the fact that only the two macroscopic *addenda* referring to the *TF* at the beginning and at the end of the *MF* have been cut in the CBL copy. I wish to warmly thank Dr Ayman Shihadeh for checking the reading of the Dublin MS.

<sup>36</sup> The critical edition provided by ST. CLAIR 2005, p. 71 reads here «quod Deus unus est

But if it is not a gloss, in the *Physics* of the *MF* we do attend to an affirmation – underground and ambiguous, but not less weighty – of a thesis contrary to the one supported by Avicenna, who always shows his philosophical belief of the eternity of the world. Were the *MF* a fully autonomous work by Ġazālī, we would marvel if such a doctrinal divergence were not mirrored in his writing; but since they are, on the contrary, a translation of Avicenna’s *DN* – and a seemingly faithful one –, it is rather striking to recognise in them the signs of a surreptitious stance against the author of the translated text. This remarkable Ġazālīan attitude towards Avicenna appears therefore a quite meaningful fact, certainly worthy of further analysis.

Tab. 1 Synoptical comparison among *DN*, *MF*, Latin and English translations of the passage on the temporal origin of the world [P1]

	<i>DN</i> [AM 65]	<i>MF</i> [D 359]	<i>Latin</i> [sc 71-2]	<i>English</i>
[1]		وَالْقُوَّةُ الْعَالِمَةُ تَنْقَسِمُ	Virtus vero sciens dividitur	The cognitive faculty is divided into
[1.1]	La connaissance théorique est telle que [par exemple] tu sais que	إِلَى الْقُوَّةِ النَّظَرِيَّةِ كَالْعِلْمِ بِأَنَّ	in virtutem speculativam, sicut est haec scientia quod	the speculative faculty, like the knowledge of the fact that
[1.1.1]	Dieu est unique.	إِلَهُ تَعَالَى وَاحِدٌ	Deus unus est	God Most High is unique,
[1.1.2]		وَالْعَالَمُ حَادِثٌ.	et mundus coepit,	and that the world has an origin,
[1.2]	La connaissance pratique est telle que [par exemple] tu sais	وَالِى الْقُوَّةِ الْعَمَلِيَّةِ وَهِيَ الَّتِي تَفِيدُ عِلْمًا يَتَعَلَّقُ بِأَعْمَالِنَا، مِثْلَ الْعِلْمِ بِأَنَّ	et in activam per quam acquirimus scientiam alligatam nostris operibus, sicut scientia quod	and into the faculty of practical reasoning, which indicates a knowledge referring to our actions, for example the knowledge of the fact that

et mundus coepit» on the basis of all the six manuscripts consulted (A = Assisi, Biblioteca comunale, 663; E = Erfurt, Universitäts- und Forschungsbibliothek, C. Amplon. F. 331; N = Paris, BNF, lat. 14700; O = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 2186; P = Paris, BNF, lat. 6443; V = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 4481). The only variant reading taken into account by St. Clair’s apparatus is the one of ms. A, whose copyist added *esse* after *coepit*. I have checked the readings of four more manuscripts (Paris, BNF, lat. 6552, lat. 6655, lat. 16096, and lat. 16605), all of which show concordantly the *lectio* «mundus coepit». This seems therefore widely attested and highly reliable.

	<i>DN</i> [AM 65]	<i>MF</i> [D 359]	<i>Latin</i> [sc 71-2]	<i>English</i>
[1.2.1]	qu'il ne faut pas commetre d'injustices	الظلم قبيح	quia iniuria turpis est	injustice is shameful
[1.2.2]		لا ينبغي أن يفعل.	ideo non est faci-enda.	and it is not acceptable to commit it.

#### 4. Conclusions

In dealing with doubtful and complex texts like the ones we examined, the only possible way to unravel the knot of kinships and discrepancies is comparison and systematic analysis. Only if one takes into account the sources of these writings it is possible to mitigate their opacity and call them to a mutual dialogue and a renewed clarity.

As for content, the psychological section of the *MF* appears surprisingly rich of information, and a very useful test bed to verify the goodness of some theories maintained by the scholarship. The provisional conclusions which I shall now draw involve in a way the historiographical picture of the development of al-Ġazālī's thought, but they also touch on the specific relationships between his works, and the complicated *liaison* between Ġazālīan and Avicennan doctrines.

The most remarkable result for all these matters seems to be the example against the eternity of the world that al-Ġazālī introduces almost clandestinely in his translation. To sum up the element of novelty which has emerged, one can argue that the *form* of the example suggested by al-Ġazālī is perfectly coherent with the Avicennan doctrine concerning the knowing part of intellect (*ālīma*), and actually corroborates it; whereas its *matter* – in other words the content of the statement which constitutes the example itself – is incompatible with a well-known philosophical thesis endorsed by Avicenna, the (already Aristotelian) doctrine of the eternity of the world.

The Ġazālīan attitude which I have now recapitulated can be successfully generalized. In only partial acceptance of Janssens' thesis, one can maintain that Ġazālī holds in the *MF* a somewhat double-edged attitude towards Avicenna. From the point of view of form, everything – the choice itself of translating an Avicennan work, the organization and ordering of topics, and then minute details like the structure of the chosen examples – seems to show an almost servile allegiance of the theologian towards the

philosopher. From the point of view of content, however, this brief analysis has shown some aspects which do not seem consistent with the idea of the young Ġazālī as a staunch and committed Avicennist. The omission of the concept of *‘aql al-qudsī* and the anti-Avicennan nature of the proposition concerning the world’s *ḥudūt* represent certainly the most significant evidence in this direction.

The notion of ‘holy intellect’ entails the idea of a solely human holiness, disregarding the necessity of a divine mediation: he who receives such an intellect can, according to Avicenna, be called ‘saint’ or ‘holy’, and this can happen in spite of any theology-flavoured hierarchy demanding the subordination of reason to pure faith. If Ġazālī omits on purpose such a notion, it is difficult not to think that he does so precisely in order to safeguard the priority of religion at the top of this hierarchy. Even more meaningful is therefore the proposition on the beginning of the world. There, Ġazālī denies explicitly an exclusively philosophical doctrine which is fundamental for Avicenna. Moreover, the problem *de aeternitate mundi* – let us consider just the polemic of John Philoponus against Proclus – has been one of the harshest subjects of debate in the controversist tradition; as such, it has seen the contrast of ‘religious’ interpreters (faithful to the Revelation) and ‘laical’ ones (distinguished by a typical anti-theological attitude).

The fact that al-Ġazālī – although not in a doctrinally relevant passage – had already taken with the *MF* a very clear position within this long-lasting debate appears therefore really noteworthy. It reveals to us the figure of a thinker with a well-defined intellectual personality, who chooses to translate, with competence and precision, a philosophical work, but who does so without renouncing to a great degree of personal analysis and critical attitude. Reaffirming, though cursorily, the temporality of the world within a work which is supposed to be frankly philosophical is undoubtedly a theological declaration of intent. Nothing to marvel, therefore, when we turn to the *TF* and find there several pages devoted to refute the eternity of the world. It is important, however, to notice that the example added by Ġazālī in the *MF* puts this work in contact with its refutative counterpart. The example contributes therefore to bridge the gap between *MF* and *TF* that scholarship has tried to establish.

Before concluding, it can be added that the two examples which I have focused upon are by no means isolated ones, and that the attitude towards Avicenna displayed there by al-Ġazālī seems quite a common feature of his doctrinal elaboration. For instance, dealing in the *Physics* of

the *MF* with the active power of the soul outside the boundaries of the physical body, al-Ġazālī once again does not hesitate to add some rather gloomy examples to the ones already provided by Avicenna (in his *Kitāb al-Nafs*)<sup>37</sup>. In particular, Ġazālī enriches the Avicennan text with the quotation of a *ḥadīth*, implying that a man in possession of an exceptional intellectual force can use it for the sake of evil instead of goodness: he can bring a camel to the cooking pot, or even kill a man, only by means of will and intellect<sup>38</sup>. It is clear that such a behaviour cannot be harmonized with the positive usage of the rational faculties represented by the Avicennan doctrine of the soul's remote action on the material world. But since this application of the intellectual power is in the substance entirely philosophical, we are once more tempted to think that Ġazālī sketches deliberately such a grim – perhaps even necromantic – picture, as an intentional strategy to discredit philosophy as a whole<sup>39</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> See DELAURENTI 2016a. The relevant passages, there quoted, are AVICENNA, *De anima* IV 4, pp. 65-6, ll. 36-59, and *MF, Phys.* V.9 (on the causes of the miracles).

<sup>38</sup> To be more accurate, it should be said that Ġazālī quotes here (DUNYĀ 1961, p. 381, ll. 24-5) two *ahādīth* one immediately after the other: the first is the one regarding the man and the camel (most recently verified as *hasan* by al-Albānī in his *Silsila al-ḥadīth al-ṣaḥīḥa*, 1249 and originally reported, as far as I know, by Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣfahānī in his *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā’ wa-Ṭabaqāt al-Aṣfiyā’*), which, however, is regarded as a mere common saying by ABU-RABIA 2005 (see in particular p. 241: «The evil eye can bring a man to his grave, and a camel to the cooking pot (Arab-Bedouin saying)»). The second one is shorter – it says only «the eye is real» – but easier to detect: see for instance *Saḥīḥ Muslim* 2188, book 39, *ḥadīth* 56 <<https://sunnah.com/muslim/39/56>> (10/2018): «Ibn ‘Abbās reported Allāh’s Messenger as saying: The influence of an evil eye is a fact; if anything would precede the destiny it would be the influence of an evil eye, and when you are asked to take bath (as a cure) from the influence of an evil eye, you should take bath». See also *Saḥīḥ al-Buḥārī* 5740, book 76, *ḥadīth* 55 <<https://sunnah.com/bukhari/76/55>> (10/2018): «Narrated Abu Huraira: The Prophet said, “The effect of an evil eye is a fact.” And he prohibited tattooing». The entry ‘*Ayn – Evil eye* prepared by MARÇAIS 1960 for the *Encyclopaedia of Islām* quotes al-Buḥārī, commentary of al-Qaṣṭallānī on the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, VIII, 390, 463. On the evil eye there is however quite a vast literature, dating from the ancient and most comprehensive study by ELWORTHY 1895.

<sup>39</sup> About this issue see in particular DELAURENTI 2016b and HASSE 2016, together with the other literature quoted in DELAURENTI 2016b, p. 395, note 42. A useful lecture also concerning, among others, this topic has been delivered by Anthony Minnema at Scuola



Moreover, it is worth noticing here that in the sole fifth treatise of the *MF*'s Physics<sup>40</sup> al-Ġazālī quotes at least five more times either the Revealed Law (*šar'*), the Prophet or directly the Koran in order to add strength to his previous philosophical (and Avicennan) argumentations<sup>41</sup>. The most striking case is probably the first one. In *Phys.* V.1 Ġazālī is actually explaining how the human soul is a sign for the existence of the agent intellect (*dalāla al-nafsi 'alā al-'aqlī al-fa'ālī*), and he pursues his aim by means of a rigorous philosophical reasoning. At the end of his explanation, however, he feels the need to add this rather surprising statement: «And the revealed Law too (*ayḍ<sup>an</sup>*) makes it clear that these pieces of knowledge are in the people and in the prophets by means of the angels». The idea of a validation of philosophy through theology and Revelation could not be expressed more clearly, especially because of the presence of that *ayḍ<sup>an</sup>*, which confirms the concurrence of the two great waves of thinking – that can be labelled for convenience's sake as *falsafa* and *kalām* – in the thought of al-Ġazālī.

It is worthwhile to notice that a partial *locus parallelus* for this Ġazālīan attitude can be found in the ninth treatise of Avicenna's *Ilāhiyyāt*<sup>42</sup>, where Ibn Sīnā distinguishes two kinds of 'return' (*ma'ād*): the first one is only known through the divine Law and the prophetic revelation; the second one, on the contrary, can be apprehended through the intellect and its syllogisms. The difference, however, is that in Avicenna the revealed *ma'ād*

Normale Superiore, Pisa, on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2016, with the title *A Hadith Condemned at Paris: al-Ghazali in the Latin Intellectual Tradition*. See also MINNEMA 2017.

<sup>40</sup> Further instances of the same attitude are to be found in other treatises. See *e.g.* the particularly striking formulation adopted in *MF*, *Met.* IV, «Discussion on the celestial bodies» (DUNYĀ 1961, p. 271, ll. 7-8): «this is called "separate intellect" in the language of the group [of the philosophers] (*bi-luġatī al-qawmī*), while in the language of Revelation (*bi-lisānī al-šar'*) [it is called] angel intimate [with God]».

<sup>41</sup> See, for *šar'*, *šarī'a*, *MF*, *Phys.* V.1 (DUNYĀ 1961, p. 372, ll. 14-5) and V.4 (DUNYĀ 1961, p. 375, l. 16); for the Prophet, (*wa-qad qāla al-nabī...*) V.4 (DUNYĀ 1961, p. 375, ll. 24-7), and the already mentioned *aḥādīṭ* in V.9 (DUNYĀ 1961, p. 381, ll. 24-5); for the Koranic quotations, see V.5 (DUNYĀ 1961, p. 376, ll. 23-4, with the concept of the «well-preserved Tablet» [*al-lawḥ al-maḥfūz*, Kor. 85.22], which should be read in connection with what al-Ġazālī writes about it in *TF*, Discussion 16, MARMURA 2000, pp. 153 ff.), and V.10 (DUNYĀ 1961, p. 384, ll. 18-9).

<sup>42</sup> See *Ilāhiyyāt* IX.7.1 in MŪSĀ-DUNYĀ-ZĀYID 1960, p. 423.

refers to the bodies, while the philosophical kind of return is linked to the souls' happiness. In al-Ġazālī's passage, on the contrary, there is no such distinction, and the *šarʿ* actually confirms what has already been established by the *ʿaql*.

An even more striking instance of the interlacement between philosophy and religion is provided by Avicenna's cursory analysis of the subdivisions of practical philosophy (politics, economics, ethics) at the beginning of his *Madḥal*<sup>43</sup>. Here, Avicenna maintains that the correctness of the 'complex' of these sciences is established through theoretical demonstration (*burhān nazārī*) and the testimony of Law (*al-šahada al-šarʿiyya*), whereas their determinations are provided, in each and every particular case, by the divine Law (*šarīʿa ilāhiyya*)<sup>44</sup>.

In conclusion, it should be made clear that the genuinely theological concern of the young al-Ġazālī contrasts sharply with the hypothesis – reaffirmed recently by Alexander Treiger<sup>45</sup>, but endorsed originally by Janssens<sup>46</sup> – of a real acceptance of *falsafa* on his part. However, it should be made clear that the text of the *MF* contains, as a matter of fact, many additions to the *DN*, in the form of illustrative examples which aim to elucidate Avicenna's dense argumentation. As we have seen, some appear

<sup>43</sup> See *Madḥal*, I.2 in ḤUḌAYRĪ-QANAWĀTĪ-AHWĀNĪ 1953, p. 14.11-8. On this fundamental chapter see MARMURA 1980, with an English translation and commentary.

<sup>44</sup> See the translation of the passage provided by MARMURA 1980, p. 247: «The general truth of all this is established by theoretical demonstration and the testimony of the revealed law, its details and measure [of application] being ascertained by the divine law». Marmura finds these Avicennan statements «of particular interest», and he then proceeds to explain that «[t]his philosophy is essentially Fārābīan, its basic tenet being that revelation expresses the same truth as that of demonstrative philosophy, but in the language of image and symbol which the non-philosopher can understand. Moreover, revealed scripture gives particular legislative details which conform with universal principles arrived at philosophically» (*ibid.*). This kind of complementarity is certainly fascinating, in particular when compared with al-Ġazālī's intellectual work, and with the attitude towards the *falsafa-kalām* relationship which he displays in the passages quoted above.

<sup>45</sup> See TREIGER 2011. Arguing for a genuine philosophical interest in al-Ġazālī, Treiger comes to state that the *TF* is just a «“pseudo-refutation”, which gives the appearance that the opponent's teachings have been refuted without intending to reject them in actuality» (p. 103).

<sup>46</sup> JANSSENS 2003, p. 48.

to demonstrate al-Ġazālī's autonomy from Avicenna's philosophical rationale, while others directly address theological – or religious – matters like the Evil Eye. Further research seems therefore needed in order to fully understand the purport of these Ġazālīan additions. A careful analysis of these examples might give us not only a better understanding of the relationship between the *MF* and the *DN*, but also a clearer insight into al-Ġazālī's career as both a theologian and a philosopher<sup>47</sup>.

A more general conclusion, which goes in a different direction from that established by Janssens' studies, can perhaps be drawn. These contributions corroborated the idea of the *MF* as a high-fidelity translation of the *DN*. This is certainly partially true, but as it has emerged from the texts themselves, this work cannot be reduced to a solely philosophical end point of Ġazālīan production. My analysis tends therefore to attract the work towards the *TF*. In this direction, the *Intentions of the philosophers* could well represent a preparatory phase of the following work, with which they share some essential doctrinal features. Or, as recent scholarship<sup>48</sup> has suggested, they could even have been written after the *TF*, bearing in this case some surreptitious signs of their link with the major work.

### Bibliography

- ABU-RABIA 2005: A. ABU-RABIA, *The Evil Eye and Cultural Beliefs among the Bedouin Tribes of the Negev, Middle East*, «Folklore», 116, 2005, pp. 241-54.
- ACHENA-MASSÉ 1955 (I): AVICENNE, *Le livre de science*, I, *Logique, Métaphysique*, trad. par M. Achena et H. Massé, Paris 1955.
- ACHENA-MASSÉ 1958 (II): AVICENNE, *Le livre de science*, II, *Physique, Mathématiques*, trad. par M. Achena et H. Massé, Paris 1958.
- ALONSO 1963: AL-ĠAZĀLĪ, *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa o Intenciones de los filosofos*, trad. por M. Alonso Alonso, Barcelona 1963.

<sup>47</sup> I am grateful to one of the anonymous referees who commented on an earlier draft of this paper for suggesting to me this way of considering the problem, which helps to clarify where (and why) further research on this topic should be done.

<sup>48</sup> SHIHADÉH 2011, p. 88, note 26; GRIFFEL 2009, p. 98: «The *Intentions of the Philosophers* may have been a text that was initially unconnected to the *Incoherence* or was one that was generated after the composition of the latter». See also GRIFFEL 2006, pp. 9-10.

- ASÍN PALACIOS 1901: M. ASÍN PALACIOS, *Algazel: Dogmática, Moral y Ascética*, Zaragoza 1901.
- BEER 1888: AL-ĠAZĀLĪ, *Maqāṣid al-Falāsifat*, I. Teil, *Die Logik*, hrsg. und übersetzt von G. Beer, Leiden 1888.
- BERNAND 1990: M. BERNAND, *Al-Ghazālī. Artisan de la fusion des systèmes de pensée*, «Journal Asiatique», 278, 1990, pp. 223-51.
- BİĞŪ 2000: AL-ĠAZĀLĪ, *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*, ed. by M.Ş. al-Kurdī, 3 parts, Cairo 1936; reprinted by M. Biğū, Damasco 2000.
- BOUYGES 1927: AL-ĠAZĀLĪ, *Tahāfut al-falāsifa*, critical edition of the Arabic text by M. Bouyges SJ, «Bibliotheca Arabica Scholasticorum», Beirut 1927.
- DELAURENTI 2016a: B. DELAURENTI, *Pratiques médiévales de réécriture. Le cas de la doctrine avicennienne du pouvoir de l'âme en dehors du corps*, «Aevum», 90/2, 2016, pp. 351-76.
- DELAURENTI 2016b: B. DELAURENTI, *Le pouvoir fascinant de l'imagination. Retour sur Lynn Thorndike et l'Anonyme du Vatican (ms. Vat. lat. 1121)*, «Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales», 83/2, 2016, pp. 385-421.
- DUNYĀ 1961: AL-ĠAZĀLĪ, *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa = Muqaddima Tahāfut al-falāsifa al-musammāt Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*, ed. by S. Dunyā, Cairo 1961.
- ELWORTHY 1895: F.T. ELWORTHY, *The Evil Eye: An Account of This Ancient and Widespread Superstition*, London 1895.
- FRANK 1987-89: R.M. FRANK, *Al-Ghazālī's Use of Avicenna's Philosophy*, «Revue des études islamiques», 55-7, 1987-89, pp. 271-85, ora in ID., *Philosophy, Theology, and Mysticism in Medieval Islam*, ed. by D. Gutas, Aldershot (UK) 2005, Text XI.
- GRIFFEL 2006: F. GRIFFEL, *Ms. London, British Library Or. 3126: An Unknown Work by al-Ghazālī on Metaphysics and Philosophical Theology*, «Journal of Islamic Studies», 17, 2006, pp. 1-42.
- GRIFFEL 2009: F. GRIFFEL, *Al-Ghazālī's Philosophical Theology*, Oxford 2009.
- GUTAS 1988: D. GUTAS, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition*, Leiden-Boston 1988 (2014<sup>2</sup>).
- HASSE 2016: D.N. HASSE, *Der Sturz des Kamels und die Befleckung des Spiegels. Fernwirkungstheorien in arabischen und lateinischen Kommentaren zu Aristoteles' De insomniis*, in *Soma [ΣΩΜΑ]. Körperkonzepte und körperliche Existenz in der antiken Philosophie und Literatur*, hrsg. von Th. Buchheim, D. Meißner und N. Wachsmann, Hamburg 2016, pp. 525-41.
- ḤUḌAYRĪ-QANAWĀTĪ-AHWĀNĪ 1953: IBN SĪNĀ, *Aṣ-Ṣifāʿ. al-Mantiq. I. al-Madḥal*, ed. by M. Ḥuḍayrī, G. Qanawātī and A.F. Ahwānī, revised and introduced by I. Madkūr, Cairo 1953.
- JANSSENS 1986: J. JANSSENS, *Le Dānesh-Nāmeḥ d'Ibn Sina: Un texte à revoir?*, «Bulletin de philosophie médiévale», 28, 1986, pp. 163-77.

- JANSSENS 2003: J. JANSSENS, *Al-Ghazzālī and his Use of Avicennian Texts*, in *Problems in Arabic Philosophy*, ed. by M. Maroth, Piliscsaba (Budapest) 2003, pp. 37-49.
- AL-KURDĪ 1936: AL-ĠAZĀLĪ, *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*, ed. by M.Ş. al-Kurdī, 3 parts, Cairo 1936.
- LOHR 1965: *Logica Algazelis*, in *Logica Algazelis. Introduction and Critical Text*, ed. by C. Lohr, «Traditio», 21, 1965, pp. 223-90.
- MACDONALD 1936: D.B. MACDONALD, *The Meanings of the Philosophers by al-Ghazzālī*, «Isis», 26, 1936, pp. 9-15.
- MARÇAIS 1960: P. MARÇAIS, 'Ayn – Evil eye, in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, ed. by H.A.R. Gibb, I, Leiden 1960, p. 786.
- MARMURA 1980: M.E. MARMURA, *Avicenna on the Divisions of the Sciences in the Isagoge of His Šifāʾ*, «Journal of the History of Arabic Science», 4, 1980, pp. 239-51.
- MARMURA 2000: AL-ĠAZĀLĪ, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, A parallel English-Arabic text translated, introduced, and annotated by M.E. Marmura, Provo (Utah) 2000.
- MEŠKĀT 1952a [1331Š]: IBN SĪNĀ, *Mantiq. Dānešnāme-ye 'Alāʾi*, ed. by M. Meškāt, Tehran 1952 [1331Š].
- MEŠKĀT 1952b [1331Š]: IBN SĪNĀ, *Ṭabīʿiyyāt. Dānešnāme-ye 'Alāʾi*, ed. by M. Meškāt, Tehran 1952 [1331Š].
- MĪNOVĪ 1952 [1331Š]: IBN SĪNĀ, *Riyāḍiyyāt. Dānešnāme-ye 'Alāʾi*, ed. by M. Mīnovī, Tehran 1952 [1331Š].
- MINNEMA 2017: A.H. MINNEMA, *A Hadith Condemned at Paris. Reactions to the Power of Impression in the Latin Translation of al-Ghazali's Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*, «Mediterranea. International journal on the transfer of knowledge», 2, 2017, pp. 145-62.
- MOʿIN 1952 [1331Š]: IBN SĪNĀ, *Ilāhiyyāt. Dānešnāme-ye 'Alāʾi*, ed. by M. Moʿin, Tehran 1952. [1331Š]
- MOREWEDGE 1973: *The Metaphysica of Avicenna (ibn Sīnā)*, transl. by P. Morewedge, London 1973.
- MUCKLE 1933: *Algazel's Metaphysics: A Mediaeval Translation*, ed. by J. Muckle, Toronto 1933.
- MUNK 1857: S. MUNK, *Mélanges de philosophie juive et arabe: al-Ghazzali*, Paris 1857 (1988<sup>2</sup>), pp. 366-83.
- MŪSĀ-DUNYĀ-ZĀYID 1960: IBN SĪNĀ, *Aš-Šifāʾ. Ilāhiyyāt (II)*, ed. by M.Y. Mūsā, S. Dunyā and S. Zāyid, Cairo 1960.
- QANAWĀTĪ-ZĀYID 1960: IBN SĪNĀ, *Aš-Šifāʾ. Ilāhiyyāt (I)*, ed. by G.C. Qanawātī and S. Zāyid, Cairo 1960.

- QANAWĀTĪ-ZĀYID 1975 [1395Ĥ]: IBN SĪNĀ, *Aš-Šifā'*. *Aṭ-Ṭabī'īyyāt, an-Nafs*, texte établi et édité par G.C. Qanawātī et Sa'īd Zāyid, Le Caire 1975 [1395Ĥ].
- RAHMAN 1959: Avicenna's *De anima*, *Being the Psychological Part of Kitāb al-Šifā'*, ed. by F. Rahman, London-New York-Toronto 1959.
- REYNOLDS 2002: G.S. REYNOLDS, *A Philosophical Odyssey: Ghazzālī's Intentions of the Philosophers*, in *Medieval Philosophy and the Classical Tradition in Islam, Judaism and Christianity*, ed. by J. Inglis, Richmond 2002, pp. 30-41.
- SHIHADĒH 2011: A. SHIHADĒH, *New Light on the Reception of al-Ghazali's Doctrines of the Philosophers (Maqāṣid al-Falāsifa)*, in *In the Age of Averroes*, ed. by P. Adamson, London 2011 (Warburg Institute Colloquia, 16), pp. 77-92.
- ST. CLAIR 2005: AL-ĠAZĀLĪ, *De anima vegetabili et animali et humana*, in *Algazel on the Soul: A Critical Edition*, ed. by E. St. Clair, «Traditio», 60, 2005, pp. 60-84.
- TREIGER 2011: A. TREIGER, *Inspired Knowledge in Islamic Thought. Al-Ghazālī's Theory of Mystical Cognition and its Avicennian Foundation*, London 2011.
- VAJDA 1960: G. VAJDA, *Isaac Albalag, averroïste juif, traducteur et annotateur d'al-Ghazālī*, Paris 1960.
- WATT 1964: W.M. WATT, *The Faith and Practice of al-Ghazali*, London 1964.



Finito di stampare nel mese di dicembre 2018  
presso CSR S.r.l.  
Via di Salone, 131/c - 00131 Roma  
Tel. +39 06 4182113