PAKISTAN PHILOSOPHICAL CONGRESS PUBLICATION NO. 3

AL-GHAZALI'S

TAHAFUT AL-FALASIFAH

[INCOHERENCE OF THE PHILOSOPHERS]

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH

by

SABIH AHMAD KAMALI

1963

PAKISTAN PHILOSOPHICAL CONGRESS

CLUB ROAD, LAHORE—3

Copyrigth

All rights, including those of translation and reproduction in parts or whole, except for purposes of review, reserved

First published, 1958
Second impression, 1963

Printed by
Photo offset process at Nawa-i-Waqt Printers
Queen's Road, Lahore

Published by
B. A. Dar, Secretary (Publications)
Pakistan Philosophical Congress, Lahore

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

THE present work began in 1948 as part of a comprehensive plan for the translation of Islamic classics under the auspices of the Muslim Educational Conference, Aligarh, India. Prof. M. M. Sharif, then the Chairman of the Philosophy Department, Muslim University, Aligarh, was appointed as my guide. Soon after, I left Aligarh, and Prof. Sharif left India. Therefore, I could not submit to him more than the first few pages (i.e., 1-35) of the translation. Prof. Sharif's departure not only deprived me of his invaluable guidance, but also left the Muslim Educational Conference in an uncertain frame of mind. Consequently, I decided to have our contractual relationship terminated; but the translation continued.

When in 1953 I came to study at the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, the first draft of this work was complete. The Institute organised a Ghazālī Seminar, at which my readings from that first draft served a twofold purpose. On the one hand, they enabled the members of the Seminar to acquaint themselves with Ghazālī's chief philosophical work. On the other hand, they enabled me to revise my translation in the light of the comments made by the 'auditors.' Prof. Faḍl al-Raḥmān of the University of Durham, England, and Dr. A. G. O'Connor of the University of Montreal were the two members of the Seminar who also kindly read (or audited) the revised version, as I could make it ready for them by slow degrees. It was at this stage that the Institute obtained for us a proof copy of Dr. Simon Van den Bergh's English translation of Ibn Rushd's *Tahāfut al-Tahāfut* (since published under the auspices of the Gibb Memorial Trust and the International Commission for the Translation of Great Works: Oxford University Press, 1954). It gives me very great pleasure to acknowledge the use I have made of Dr. Van den Bergh's scholarly work (*vide* the Note on pp. 309-10 which now may be taken to refer to the published work as well).

When revised and supplied with an Introduction and Notes, this work was submitted to, and accepted by, the McGill University (1945) as my M.A. thesis. That a work

originally undertaken outside McGill should have been accepted as a Thesis, or that I should have so compelety revised it as to make of it quite a new thing, is due to the interest taken in this work by Prof. W.C. Smith, Director of the Institute of Islamic Studies. Prof. Smith has also kindly tried to help me to find a publisher. It is through his good offices that the work has been accepted for publication by the Pakistan Philosophical Congress. It is a great honour for me thus to be connected with, and sponsored by the Congress, even as the sense in which that organisation has connected itself with Gahzālī does honour to it. Nor is it a mere coincidence that this honour should have been done to me by the Philosophical Congress of Pakistan upon the recommendation of its President, Prof. M. M. Sharif, who had been my guide, and was one of the architects of the great plan once entertained by the Muslim Educational Conference at Aligrah.

Ṣabīḥ Aḥmad Kamālī

Montreal :
March 11, 1958

CONTENTS

Page

Translator's Preface v
Introduction 1

Problems

I. Refutation of the philosophers' belief in the Eternity of the world 13
II. Refutation of their belief in the everlasting nature of the world, time and motion 54
III. Of their dishonesty in saying that God is the agent and the maker of the world which is His action or product: and the explanation of the fact that these words have only a metaphorical, not real, significance to them 63
IV. To show their inability to prove the existence of the creator of the world 89
V. Of their inability to prove by rational arguments that God is one, and that it is not possible to suppose two necessary beings each of which is uncaused 96
VI. Refutation of their denial of the Divine Attributes 109
VII. Refutation of their thesis that it is impossible that something should share a genus with God, being separated from Him by differentia; and that the intellectual division into genus and differentia is inapplicable to Him 125
VIII. Refutation of their thesis that God's is simple being—i.e., it is pure being, without a quiddity of essence to which existence would be related—and that necessary existence is to Him what quiddity is to any other being 132
IX. Of their inability to prove by rational arguments that God is not body 136
X. Of their inability to prove by rational arguments that there is a cause or creator of the world 140

Problems *Page*

XI. Refutation of those philosophers who hold that God knows the Other, and that He knows the species and genera in a universal manner 143
XII. To show their inability to prove that God knows Himself either 150
XIII. Refutation of their doctrine that God (may He be exalted above what they say) does not know the particulars which are divisible in accordance with the division of time into 'will be,' 'was,' and 'is' 153
XIV. To show their inability to prove that the heaven is living, and obeys God through its rotatory motion 163
XV. Refutation of what they consider to be the purpose which moves the heaven 168
XVI. Refutation of their theory that the souls of the heavens are aware of all the particulars which originate in the world 172
XVII. Refutation of their belief in the impossibility of a departure from the natural course of events 185
XVIII. Of their inability to give a rational demonstration of their theory that the human soul is a spiritual substance which exists in itself; is not space-filling; is not body, or impressed upon body; and is neither connected nor disconnected with body—as God is neither inside the world nor outside it, or as the angels are 197
XIX. Refutation of their thesis that, having come into being, the human souls cannot be destroyed; and that their everlasting nature makes it impossible for us to conceive of their destruction 221
XX. Refutation of their denial of the resurrection of bodies 229

Conclusion 249
Notes 251
Bibliography 257
Index 261

INTRODUCTION

In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful

WE BESEECH God, in the name of His greatness which transcends all limits, and His munificence which outruns all measures:

To pour upon us the light of guidance, and to remove from us the darkness of ignorance and wrong-doing;

To make us like those who saw truth as truth, and chose to follow it; and those who saw falsehood as falsehood, and decided to eschew it;

To bestow upon us the felicity which He has promised to His saints and prophets;

To initiate us, on our departure from the House of Delusion, into that happiness the height of which cannot be scanned by the understanding, and the extent of which cannot be conjured up by the imagination;

To give us, when after deliverance from the horrors of the Doomsday we approach the bliss of Paradise, "that which no eye ever saw, no ear ever heard, and which never occurred to the heart of man"; and

To invest with peace and bless our Prophet Muḥammad, the Chosen one, the best one of all mankind; and his noble descendants and pure companions, who were the keys to guidance, and the lamps lit in darkness.

Now, I have observed that there is a class of men who believe in their superiority to others because of their greater intelligence and insight. They have abandoned all the religious duties Islam imposes on its followers. They laugh at the positive commandments of religion which enjoin the performance of acts of devotion, and the abstinence from forbidden things. They defy the injunctions of the Sacred Law. Not only do they overstep the limits prescribed by it, but they have renounced the Faith altogether, by having indulged in diverse speculations, wherein they followed the example of those people who "turn men aside from the path of God, and seek to render it crooked; and who do not believe in the life to come." The heresy of these people has

common Matter between blackness and power, or between any other two Genera. Hence the impossibility of transformation in their case.

As regards the case in which God causes the hand of a dead man to move, and places him on the footing of a living man, so that he may sit up and write, till the movement of his hand results in coherent writing, we must say that in itself it is not impossible. For we ascribe all temporal events to the will of One who acts by choice. But it is to be rejected insofar as it is subversive of the usual course of events. Your statement that the possibility of such a thing will destroy the probative value of the adjustment of an action as an indication of knowledge on the agent's part is not true. For it is God who is the agent; He makes the adjustment, and performs the action—through the dead man.

As regards your statement that there remains no distinction between voluntary and spasmodic movements, we will say that we know such a thing from ourselves. When in our own case, we observe a distinction between the two states, we designate the cause of distinction as power. And then we conclude that what actually happens is only one of the two possible things—i.e., either the state in which movement is produced by power, or the state in which it is produced not-by-power. So when we look at someone else, and see many coherent movements, we acquire the knowledge of his power over the movements. Now, this knowledge is one of those cognitions which are created by God, and which depend upon the continuance of the regular course of events. Knowledge of this kind can only tell us of the existence of one of the two possible things. But, as shown earlier, it does not prove the impossibility of the other alternative.

PROBLEM XVIII

OF THEIR INABILITY TO GIVE A RATIONAL DEMONSTRATION OF THEIR THEORY THAT THE HUMAN SOUL IS A SPIRITUAL SUBSTANCE WHICH EXISTS IN ITSELF; IS NOT SPACE-FILLING; IS NOT BODY, OR IMPRESSED UPON BODY; AND IS NEITHER CONNECTED NOR DISCONNECTED WITH BODY—AS GOD IS NEITHER INSIDE THE WORLD NOR OUTSIDE IT, OR AS THE ANGELS ARE

THE consideration of this problem requires the description of their theory of the animal and human faculties:

The animal faculties are divided by them into two: motive and perceptive. The perceptive faculties are of two kinds: external and internal. The external perceptive faculties consist of the five senses. These are impressed upon bodies. The internal perceptive faculties are three:

(i) The faculty of fantasy, which is located in the forepart of the brain, behind the faculty of sight. In this faculty remain the forms of seen things, when the eyes are closed. Indeed, the data of all the five senses are impressed upon it. Hence it is called the *sensus communis*. But for it, he who saw white honey, and could not perceive its sweetness until he tasted of it, would not perceive the sweetness without tasting it—as he did before—even on seeing it a second time. But in this faculty there is something which judges that this white thing is also sweet. It follows that this 'something' is a judge working with the combination of two things—viz., colour and sweetness. For only thus can it judge of the existence of one from that of another.

(ii) The estimative faculty perceives the meanings, whereas the preceding one perceives the forms. Form means something which depends upon Matter—i.e., body—for its existence. By meaning, on the other hand, is understood something whose existence does not require body, although accidentally it may be in body—e.g., hatred or kindliness. For instance, the goat perceives the colour and shape of a wolf. These things cannot but be in body. But it also perceives the wolf's hostility towards it. Or the lamb per-

ceives the shape and colour of its mother, then her kindliness and agreeableness. Therefore, it runs away from the wolf, but follows its mother. Unlike colour or shape, it is not necessary for kindliness or enmity to be in bodies, although accidentally they may be.

Thus the estimative faculty is distinguished from the preceding one; and it is located in the hindmost ventricle of the brain.

(iii) The third internal perceptive faculty is called sensitive imagination in the case of animals, and cogitation in the case of man. Its function is to compose sensible forms with one another, or to superimpose meanings upon forms. It is in the middle ventricle of the brain, between the faculties of retention and memory. It enables a man to imagine a flying horse or any other combination which he may never have observed. This faculty could, as will be seen presently, more properly be connected with the motive faculties, not the perceptive ones. The knowledge of the location of these faculties is derived from the Art of Medicine. When one of the ventricles of the brain is affected, these things—i.e., perception, etc.,—are also disturbed.

Further, (they assert) the faculty upon which are impressed the forms of the data of the five senses conserves those forms—which (forms) therefore persist after having been received. When something conserves another, it does not do so by the faculty by which it receives. For instance, water receives, but does not conserve. Wax receives by its moisture; but, unlike water, it conserves—by its dryness. Therefore, the conserving faculty is not a receiving one. So it is called 'retention.'

The meanings impressed upon the estimative faculty are likewise conserved—by the faculty which is called 'memory.'

So the internal perceptions, when the faculty of sensitive imagination is included among them, are five, just as the external are five.

The motive faculties are divided into (a) that which moves in the sense that it impels towards movement; and (b) that which moves in the sense that movement is the result of its direct efficiency.

The motive faculty which moves in the sense that it impels towards movement is the faculty of appetence. When

the form of an object of desire or aversion is impressed upon the faculty of fantasy (which we have mentioned above), the faculty of appetence impels the active motive faculty towards movement. It has two subdivisions:

(i) Faculty of desire, which rouses to movement that brings about approximation to things imagined to be necessary or useful in the search for pleasure.

(ii) Faculty of anger, which rouses to movement whereby it is sought to keep away that which is imagined to be harmful or deleterious, and thus to overcome it. With the action of this faculty is completed the coordination of the faculties which results in the activity called action.

The active motive faculty comes into play in the muscles and the nerves. Its function is to contract the muscles and to pull the tendons and ligaments, which are connected with the limbs, towards the position where this faculty runs its course; or to relax or expand them so that they tend away from the position.

These, then, are the faculties of the animal soul, described here in a brief and general way.

The Human Rational Soul

It is also called (by them) the Communicative Soul. For, apparently, being the choicest fruit of Reason, communication by language is *the* rational activity. Hence the relation between the two terms.

The rational soul has two faculties: the theoretical, and the practical. Each one of these two is called Reason, but this is so because the name is common to them. The practical faculty is the motive principle of the human body, urging it towards those human activities which are marked by coordination, and whose coordination is derived from the deliberation characteristic of man.

The function of the theoretical faculty, which is also called Speculation, is to apprehend the realities of the intelligibles, which are free from Matter, Space, and Dimension—i.e., the universal judgments which are called States or Aspects by the *Mutakallimīn*, and the Abstract Universals by the philosophers.

Thus the soul has two faculties, corresponding to two different planes. Speculation or the theoretical faculty

corresponds to the plane of the angels, from whom the soul derives real cognitions. It behoves this faculty perpetually to be receptive to what comes to it from above. The practical faculty, on the other hand, brings the soul into relation with things of a lower order, viz., the body; the governance of body, and the reform of the moral habits. It is desirable that this faculty should govern all the bodily faculties; that the latter should be ready to learn the manners it has to teach them; and that they should be subservient to it. Not the practical faculty, but the bodily faculties should be the passive recipients of influences; for otherwise, the physical qualities would generate in the soul those servile attitudes called the Vices. Let the practical faculty be dominant, so that the soul may thereby acquire attitudes wich are called Virtues.

(This is a brief summary of their detailed account of the animal and human faculties. Even this much is lengthy enough, although we have omitted the description of the Vegetative Faculties, which were not relevant to our purpose. Nothing of what the philosophers have said here is like those things which the Sacred Law lays us under an obligation to disbelieve. For they are observable facts, which—by God's will—form part of the regular course of events. However, we intend to question their claim that by rational arguments they can know the soul's being a substance which exists in itself. Ours is not the attitude of one who would not admit God's power over such a thing, or would maintain that religion actually contradicts this view. On the contrary, we will show in the discussion of Resurrection that religion lends its support to this view. But we dispute their claim that the Intellect alone is the guide in this matter, and that therefore one need not depend on religion in regard to it.

So we demand that they produce their arguments. And they would assert that they have many:)

(1)

In the first argument, they say:

The rational cognitions subsist in the human soul. These cognitions are not infinite, and in them there are indivisible units. It follows that the substratum of these cognitions

must also be indivisible. But all bodies are divisible. Therefore, the substratum of the rational cognitions is not body. This can be put in accordance with the conditions of the logical figures. To do that in the aptest way, one might say:

(i) If the substratum of knowledge were a divisible body, then the knowledge subsisting in it would be divisible.

(ii) But the knowledge subsisting in it is not divisible.

(iii) Therefore, the substratum is not body.

This is a hypothetical syllogism in which the contrary of the antecedent follows as an indisputable conclusion from the interpellation of the contrary of the consequent. There can be no doubt about the validity of the figure of the syllogism, or about the two premises. For in the first premiss it is stated that every thing which subsists in a divisible substratum is divisible; and that if the divisibility of the substratum of knowledge is supposed, then the divisibility of knowledge will be axiomatic and unquestionable. In the second premiss it is stated that knowledge which is one and subsists in man is indivisible. For it is impossible to consider it to be divisible *ad infinitum*. If it is considered to be divisible only to a certain extent, then it will consist of units which cannot be divided any further.

In short, we know things in such a way that we cannot suppose the extinction of some of them, while others remain. For 'some' and 'others' are inapplicable to them.

Objection from two points:

Firstly, it might be said: How will you disprove one who says that the substratum of knowledge is an individual atom which, although filling space, is indivisible? This idea is found in the theories of the *Mutakallimīn*. This idea having been adopted, the only difficulty which remains is that it may be regarded as improbable. That is, it might be said: How can all the cognitions subsist in the individual atom, while all other atoms surrounding it are left vacant and unoccupied? But this assumption of improbability is no good to the philosophers, for it can be directed against their own theory. Thus, one might ask, how can the soul be something one, unspatial, undesignated, neither inside the body nor outside it, and neither connected nor disconnected with anything corporeal? However, we do not like to make

much of this point. For the question of the indivisible part has been discussed at very great length, and the philosophers have a number of mathematical arguments for it which, if considered by us, would make the present discussion too lengthy. One of those arguments may be related here. Say the philosophers:

> If the individual atom is between two other atoms, does one of its two sides come into contact with the same thing as the other does, or are the two things different? It is impossible that the two should be identical; for then the two sides of the atom would coincide. For if A touches B, and B touches C, then A will be in touch with C. If, on the other hand, things in contact with the two sides of the atom are different, that only proves multiplicity and division.

Such a difficulty cannot be solved without a lengthy discussion. However, we are under no obligation to consider it. Therefore, let us pass on to the next point.

In the second place, we will say:

Your statement that every thing which subsists in body must be divisible stands refuted by your own description of the faculty by which a goat perceives a wolf's enmity. That (perception) is something one and indivisible, because enmity has no parts some of which might be supposed to have been perceived, while others were not. And, according to you, the perception does reside in a bodily faculty, inasmuch as the soul of animals is something impressed upon bodies, and incapable of surviving death. And all the philosophers are agreed on this point. Now, even if it were possible for them to concoct the supposition of the division of the data of the five senses: of the *sensus communis*; and of the retentive faculty, still it would be impossible for them to suppose the division of the 'meanings' for which it is not a condition to be in Matter.

If it is said:

The goat does not perceive the absolute enmity divested

of Matter. It only perceives the enmity of a particular wolf which has an objective appearance—viz., the enmity associated with his person and figure. But the rational faculty apprehends realities which are divested of Matter and objectivity.

we will answer:

Tl e goat perceives the colour and the figure of the wolf, and then his enmity. Now, if colour is impressed upon the faculty of sight, and so is figure, and if both are divisible by the division of the substratum of sight, then what is that by which the goat perceives enmity? If it is a body, the perception must be divisible. And I wonder what would be the content of this divisible perception! Will it be a perception of a part of enmity? If so, how can enmity have a part? Or will every part of the perception be the perception of the whole of enmity? If so, enmity will be known over and over again—because of the existence of the perceptions in each part of the substratum.

This, then, is the doubt which will create difficulties for them in their argument. They must try to remove it.

If it is said:

This means that there is self-contradiction in the intelligibles. But the intelligibles are irrefragable. Since it has not been possible for you to doubt the two premises—namely, that the 'one' knowledge is indivisible; and that that which is indivisible cannot subsist in a divisible body—it is not possible for you to doubt the conclusion.

The answer:

Our only purpose in writing this book was to show the inconsistency and the self-contradiction involved in the philosophers' theories. And that purpose has been achieved, inasmuch as we have shown that one of the two things—viz., either the theory of the rational soul, or the explanation of the estimative faculty—must be abandoned.

Further, we will say, from the contradiction involved in their thesis, it is clear that the philosophers are unmindful

of where in their syllogism confusion lies. Perhaps the source of confusion is their assertion that, if impressed upon body, knowledge would be impressed, as colour is impressed upon the coloured object; and that, consequently, like the division of colour by the division of the coloured object, knowledge would be divided by the division of the substratum. The unsatisfactory thing here is the word 'impression.' Possibly, the relation between knowledge and its substratum is different from that between colour and the coloured object. That is to say, it is different from that which is said to be commensurate with the substratum, and impressed upon it, and spread through its extremities, so that the division of one will divide the other. It is possible for knowledge to be related to its substratum in a different way. It is possible that because of that relation the division of the substratum should not divide knowledge itself. Perhaps, therefore, knowledge is related to its substratum in the same way as the perception of enmity is related to its physical substratum. The ways in which attributes are related to their substrata are not confined to a single pattern. Nor is our knowledge of their details absolutely reliable. Therefore, judgments about them, unless based on a perfect knowledge of the details of the relation, will be unreliable judgments.

Now, to sum up. There is no denying the fact that things mentioned by the philosophers raise a strong presumption of probability. What is denied here is that they can be known by a knowledge which is certain, uncontested, and indubitable. We have seen how far it is open to doubt.

(2)

In their second argument, the philosophers say:

If the knowledge of 'one' rational—i.e., divested of Matter—object of knowledge were impressed upon Matter in the same way as accidents are impressed upon physical substances, then, as shown above, the division of the physical substratum would also divide knowledge necessarily. But if it is not impressed upon, and commensurate with, the substratum, and the word 'impressed' is objectionable, then we can express the same thing in a different way.

Thus, let us ask: Is there a relation between knowledge and the knower, or not? It is impossible to cut off all the relation; for in that case, it will not be possible to show why his being the knower of it is more appropriate than anyone else's being the knower of it. But if there is a relation, it must be one of the following three kinds: (i) Either there will be a relation with each one of the many parts of the substratum; or (ii) with some of the parts as distinguished from others; or (iii) with none of them.

Now, it will be false to say that there is a relation with none of the parts; for if there is no relation with the units there can be none with their aggregate either. The aggregate of dissimilar things is still a dissimilar thing.

Again, it will be false to say that there is a relation with some parts of the substratum. For in that case, the parts with which knowledge is not related will have nothing to do with knowledge. Therefore, it will be possible for us to exclude them from consideration.

Again, it will be false to say that there is relation between each supposed part of the substratum and the essence of knowledge. For if there were a relation with the entire essence of knowledge, then that which is known to any one part would be, not a part of the object of knowledge, but the whole object of knowledge as such. And then the known thing would be known over and over again, actually for an infinite number of times. But if each part were to have a relation with the essence of knowledge different from that of any other part, then the essence of knowledge would be conceptually divisible. And we have shown that the knowledge of something one in all respects is not even conceptually divisible. Finally, if each part of the substratum were to have a relation with something out of the essence of knowledge which was different from that with which another part was related, then the divisibility of knowledge because of this relation would be all the more evident. And the division is impossible.

From this it will be seen that the sense data impressed upon the five senses are nothing but representations of particular and divisible forms; for perception means the appearance of the image of the percept in the percipient's soul. And each part of the sensible image has a relation with a part of the bodily organ.

Objection:

Our objection to this argument is the same as to the preceding one. For the substitution of the word 'relation' for 'impression' does not remove the doubt about the impression of the wolf's enmity upon the goat's estimative faculty (as described by them). Obviously, the goat has a perception, and the perception is related to it, and the relation is determined in the same way as you have mentioned. For enmity is not a measurable and quantified thing whose image could be impressed upon a quantified body, and whose parts would bear a relation to the parts of that body. The measurableness of wolf's figure is not enough. For the goat perceives something else besides the figure, and that 'something' is enmity, or hostility, or unkindliness. And this enmity which is additional to figure has no quantity or measure. Nonetheless, it is perceived by a quantified body. Therefore, in this way, the present argument is rendered problematical, no less than the preceding one.

Should one say here:

Why did you not counter these arguments by saying that knowledge subsists in an indivisible, although space-filling, substance—viz., the individual atom?

we would answer:

The theory of the individual atom belongs to Mathematics; and the explanation of the individual atom requires a lengthy discourse. Moreover, even that theory does not remove all the difficulties. For it would follow that power and will should also be in the individual atom. Man's action is inconceivable without power and will. And will is inconceivable without knowledge. The power of writing is in the hand and the fingers. But the knowledge of it is not in the hand; for in case the hand should be cut off, knowledge would not disappear. Nor is the will in the hand; for one can be willing to write, even when the hand is paralysed. If in such a case, one fails to write, the failure is to be attributed to the absence of power, not to the absence of will.

(3)

In the third argument, the philosophers say:

If knowledge were in a part of the body, then that part, as distinguished from all other parts of a man's body, would be the knower. But man is called a knower; and being a knower is attributed to him as a whole, not to a particular place within him.

(This is silly. For man is also called a seer, a hearer, and a taster. And these attributes are also predicated of the animals. But this does not show that sensuous perception does not reside in the body. Nay, this is a permissible liberty taken with the words. For instance, it is said: 'He is in Baghdād.' Although the man is actually in only one part of Baghdād, not the whole of it, still he is related to the whole.)

(4)

In their fourth argument, they say:

If knowledge were to subsist in a part, say, of the heart or the brain, then it would be possible for its contrary—i.e., ignorance—to exist in another part of the heart or the brain. And then one might be a knower and an ignorant person at the same time and in relation to the same thing. Since such a thing is impossible, it is clear that the substratum of knowledge is also the substratum of ignorance. It is impossible that two contraries should coexist in this substratum. If it were divisible, the existence of knowledge in one part and of ignorance in another would not be impossible. For two contraries existing in two different places are not mutually exclusive. For instance, the mottled colouring combines contrary colours in the same horse, but in different places; and blackness and whiteness coexist in the same eye, but in different parts of it.

Now, this is not necessarily true of the senses; for sense perceptions have no contraries. One only does, or does not, perceive; and between the two states there is the antithesis of being and non-being. No doubt, we say that one perceives by one of his parts—e.g., the eye or the ear—and not by the

whole body. And there is no self-contradiction involved in such a statement. And this statement cannot be superseded by your statement that being a knower is contrary to being ignorant, and that the judgment applies to the whole body. For it is impossible that the judgment should refer to anything other than the substratum of the cause of the judgment. Therfore, the knower is that substratum wherein knowledge subsists. If the name is given to the whole of which the substratum is a part, this will be a metaphorical use. For instance, one is said to be in Baghdād, whereas he is in only a part of it. Similarly, one is said to be a seer; although, evidently, the judgment about seeing does not apply to the hands or the feet, but refers to the eyes exclusively. The opposition between judgments is like the opposition between their causes; for judgments exclusively refer to the substrata of the causes.

Nor can this position be invalidated by one's saying that the substratum in man which has the capacity to receive knowledge and ignorance is the same, and that knowledge and ignorance come to it as contraries. For you have held that every living body is capable of receiving knowledge and ignorance. You have not laid down any other condition besides that of life; and to you all the parts of the body are on par so far as the receiving of knowledge is concerned.

Objection:

This will recoil upon you in the case of desire, appetite, and will. For these things are possessed by men and animals alike, and they *are* impressed upon bodies. It is impossible that an animal or man should hate what he loves, thus combining within himself hatred and love for the same thing—in such a way that hatred exists in one substratum, and love in another. But this does not prove that hatred and love do not subsist in bodies. The reason why their combination is impossible is that, although the number of these faculties is large, and they are distributed among different organs, yet they are held together by one bond—viz., the soul. This bond belongs to man and animal alike. So with this bond holding them together, it is impossible for the diverse faculties to acquire relations which are—with reference to the bond—mutually exclusive. But this does not prove that the soul is not impressed upon body; indeed, in the case of animals,

it actually is.

(5)

In their fifth argument, they say:

If the intellect were to perceive the intelligibles by a bodily organ, it could not know itself. But the consequent is impossible, since the Intellect does know itself. It follows that the antecedent must be impossible.

We will say:

Doubtless, the contrary of the antecedent may follow as the conclusion from the interpellation of the contrary of the consequent. But this happens only when it is proved that there is a necessary connection between the consequent and the antecedent. Now, in your argument, it is not clear whether the connection between the two is necessary. How will you prove it?

If it is said:

The argument is as follows: Being in body, sight does not relate to sight. Vision is not seen; nor can hearing be heard. And the same holds of all other senses. So if the Intellect were to perceive by a bodily organ, it could not perceive itself. But in truth, the Intellect knows itself, as it knows what is other than itself. Every one of us knows himself, as he knows the Other. And we also know that we know ourselves as well as others.

we will answer:

For two reasons, the point made by you is invalid.

Firstly, in our view, it is possible for sight to relate to itself, thus becoming the sight of the Other as well as of itself—just as the knowledge possessed by any one of us is the knowledge of the Other as well as of itself. Although such a thing is contrary to the regular course of events, we admit the possibility of a departure from that course.

The second reason is even more cogent. We admit this

impossibility of self-perception in the case of the senses. But why is it that something which is inapplicable to some of the senses is considered to be inapplicable to all of them? What is the difficulty in believing that, in spite of the common corporeality of all the senses, the judgment about the senses with respect to perception may differ from one case to another? In fact, sight and touch do differ—inasmuch as the tactual perception is not acquired until there is contact between the object and the organ of touch (and the same applies to taste), whereas the case with sight is just the reverse. The removal of contact is a prerequisite for visual perception, so much so that if the eyes are closed, the colour of the eyelids cannot be seen just because of their contact with the organ of sight. This difference between sight and touch does not make the two differ with respect to dependence upon body. Why, then, is it improbable that that which is called the Intellect should be one of the bodily senses, differing from the other senses insofar as it perceives itself?

(6)

In their sixth argument, they say:

If the Intellect were to perceive by a bodily organ as the sense of sight does, then like any other sense it would be unable to perceive the organ. But in fact, it does perceive the brain, or the heart, or whatever may be called its organ. It follows that the Intellect has no organ or substratum. For otherwise, it would not be able to perceive it.

Objection:

Our objection to this argument is the same as that to the preceding one. It is not improbable that sight should perceive its own substratum although here the question of what is the usual thing comes up. Again, we might say (as we did in the preceding argument): Why should it be impossible for the senses to differ in this respect, even though all are alike impressed upon bodies? Why do you say that nothing which exists in body can perceive its physical substratum? Why do you make a universal judgment based upon a few particulars? That is a procedure whose invalidity is agreed

on all hands. Logic tells us (how valid the inference is) when a universal judgment is based on one or more than one particular instance. For instance, it is believed that every animal moves its lower jaw at the time of eating. This inference is made because, through the inductive observation of animals, we have found that all the animals whom we saw did the same. But this shows our failure to take cognisance of the crocodile which moves its upper jaw. Now, the philosophers have come across only the five senses through inductive observation. Having found these senses constituted in a certain manner, they pass judgment upon all senses. Maybe, however, the Intellect is a sense bearing the same relation to all other senses as the crocodile does to all other animals. On this view, therefore, the senses will, in spite of their common corporeality, be divided into those which do, and those which do not, perceive the substratum. In fact, they are already divided into those which perceive their object when it is not in contact with them (e.g., sight), and those which do not perceive until there is such contact (e.g., taste or touch). So the description given by the philosophers is not conducive to certainty, however plausible it may be.

If it is said:

We rely, not merely on the inductive observation of the senses, but on a rational argument. Thus, we say, if the heart or the brain were the soul of man, the perception of the heart or the brain could never be inaccessible to him. On the contrary, that knowledge would always be present, because man is never devoid of self-perception. The essence of none of us is inaccessible to his essence. On the contrary, we are perpetually affirming ourselves by ourselves. But as far as the heart or the brain is concerned, no one perceives them, and no one believes in their existence, until he has heard the story of the heart or the brain, or observed another man anatomically. So if the Intellect were to subsist in body, it would be necessary for it either always to perceive the body, or never to perceive it at all. But neither of the two alternatives is true. For sometimes a bodily organ is known; sometimes, not.

The point may be elucidated as follows: The perception which subsists in a substratum perceives the substratum

because of the relation between the two. And it is inconceivable that perception should bear any other relation to the substratum than that of subsisting in it. Therefore, it will always perceive the substratum. If, however, this relation is not sufficient, it will never perceive the substratum, insofar as it can bear no other relation to the substratum than that of subsisting in it—just as if it were to know itself, it would know for ever, not being inattentive at any time.

we will answer:

Man is always conscious of, and inattentive to, himself—inasmuch as he is conscious of his body, or his physical constitution. No doubt, the name of the heart, or its from, or its figure is not definite in his consciousness, yet he affirms himself, *qua* body—so much so that he affirms himself by reference to his clothes or his house. But the Self mentioned by the philosophers has no such associations as the house or the clothes (hence the inadequacy of the idea). It is clear that the fundamental affirmation of body is inseparable from self-consciousness. If one is inattentive to its figure or name, this may be like his inattention to the substratum of smell (viz., the two protuberances in the forepart of the brain which resemble the two nipples of the breast). Everyone knows that he perceives smell by his body; but everyone does not conjure up the specific character or the shape of the substratum of the perception—even when he is aware that the substratum is nearer to the head than to the back, or nearer to the inner part of the nose than to the inner part of the ear. Similarly, man is conscious of himself and knows that his ego which constitutes him is nearer to his heart than to his feet. For he can suppose the survival of his ego, while the feet do not exist. But he cannot suppose the survival of the ego, while the heart does not exist. Therefore, it is clear that the philosophers' statement that sometimes man is aware, and sometimes unaware, of body is not true.

(7)

In their seventh argument, they say:

Faculties which perceive by bodily organs are exhausted

by the incessant activity of perceiving. For incessant motion corrupts bodies, and leads to their exhaustion. Similarly, powerful things which are perceived through an intense exertion weaken these faculties, and sometimes corrupt them to such an extent that, having perceived the powerful things (e.g., a loud noise, in the case of hearing; or a dazzling light, in the case of sight), they are unable to perceive lesser and weaker ones. Therefore, the corrupting effect leaves the ear or the eye unable to perceive a low voice or minute visible things. Even so, one who has tasted of very intense sweetness is unable to perceive the sweetness of lesser intensity.

Just the reverse is the case with the rational faculty. Its continuous apprehension of the intelligibles does not tire it. The cognition of the more distinct things (viz., things whose truth is self-evident) gives it greater strength, rather than weakness, in order to apprehend less distinct things (viz., things known by inferential knowledge). If sometimes the rational faculty appears to be exhausted, this results from the fact that it had employed the faculty of fantasy, and received its assistance. It is the physical organ of the faculty of fantasy which gets weaker, and consequently fantasy does not serve the Intellect.

(This is the same technique as we found in the preceding argument. Let us reaffirm that it is not improbable for the physical senses to differ in respect of these things. Something proved in the case of some of the senses need not be true of others. Nay, even for the bodies it is not improbable to differ—so that some of them are liable to be weakened by motion of a certain kind; while others are in a position, not to be enfeebled, but strengthened by that motion (which anyhow exercises an influence over them). On this assumption, there will be a cause producing a new potency in some of the bodies, because of which they will not be adversely affected by motion. And all these assumptions are perfectly possible inasmuch as it is not necessary to universalise a judgment which is found applicable to a few things.)

(8)

In their eighth argument, they say:

The faculties which reside in parts of the body get weak-

er when, at about the age of forty, physical growth stops. From that time onwards, sight or any other physical faculty is much weaker than it used to be. But in most cases, the rational faculty grows stronger in that period; and this rule is not disproved by the fact that apprehension of the intelligibles is not feasible, when disease overtakes the body, or when senile decay brings about dotage. Once it is recognised that at least *sometimes* the rational faculty grows stronger, while the body is getting weaker, it will be clear that the former is self-subsisting. And then, even if at some other time the derangement of the rational faculty is found to accompany that of the body, it will not follow that the former depends upon the body. For if (in a hypothetical syllogism) the consequent itself is interpellated, no conclusion follows. Thus, we can say:

(i) If the rational faculty were to subsist in body, the weakness of the body would weaken it invariably.

(ii) But the consequent is impossible.

(iii) Therefore, the antecedent is impossible.

If, however, we say that the consequent exists in some cases, it does not necessarily follow that the antecedent should exist.

The cause of this (independence of the rational faculty) is that the soul has an action *per se*, when it is not distracted by, or preoccupied with, anything else. In general, it has two different functions: one in relation to the body (viz., the direction and the control of it); and the other in relation to its principles and its essence (viz., the apprehension of the intelligibles). These two functions are mutually exclusive, and opposed to each other. So when the soul is preoccupied with one, it is diverted from the other. It is impossible for it to combine the two. The diverting influences or the preoccupations arising from the body are sensation, imagination, desires, anger, fear, grief, and pain. When you begin to reflect over the intelligibles, the effect of all these diverting things on you will remain in abeyance. Sometimes, mere sensation hinders the apprehension of the intelligibles, even though the organ of the Intellect may not have been afflicted, or its essence disordered. In any case, the cause of the failure to apprehend the intelligibles is the soul's preoccupation with one function at the expense of the other. For this reason, the intellectual function is interfered with by pain and sickness and fear; for they are all diseases of the brain.

And how can it be regarded as improbable that the actions of the soul in two different directions should be mutually exclusive? For mutual exclusion results from multiplicity even in one and the same direction. For instance, fear makes a man forget pain; desire makes him forget anger; and inquiry into one intelligible makes him forget another intelligible.

An indication that disease which befalls body does not affect the substratum of cognitions is this: when a man recovers health, he does not have to learn his cognitions anew. On the contrary, the entirety of his soul as it had been is restored to him. Therefore, all his previous cognitions come back without being relearnt.

Our objection is to be stated as follows:

The increase and decrease of faculties have innumerable causes. Some of the faculties grow stronger in early life, others in the middle of it, and yet some others towards the end of it. This division takes into account the Intellect as well. The philosophers can only claim a knowledge of some of the causes (of the increase and decrease of faculties), however important they may be. It is not improbable that, in spite of their similarity in respect of subsistence in body, sight and smell should differ from each other. This difference may result in the sense of smell growing stronger after the age of forty years, whereas the sense of sight might become weaker. In fact, these faculties do differ in the case of the animals. Some animals have a comparatively strong sense of smell, others have a strong sense of hearing, and some others have a powerful sight. Such differences arise from the different constitutions of the animals. And it is impossible to give an exhaustive account of the differences of constitutions. So it is not unreasonable to maintain that the constitution of sense organs differs among individuals from one state to another. One of reasons why the weakness of sight precedes that of the Intellect may be that sight is prior to the Intellect. The activity of seeing starts in the earliest parts of life, whereas the Intellect ripens at the age of fifteen, or even later (as we may observe in the case of different men). Similarly, it is said that the effect of old age on the hair of the head precedes its effect on the hair of the beard; for the hair of the head is prior. All these facts require careful investigation.

But if the investigator is not prepared to trace them back to the regular course of events, it will not be possible for him to base upon them a reliable knowledge. For the hypotheses concerning the causes of the strength and weakness of faculties may be innumerable. To rely upon only one of them—as the philosophers have done—is not conducive to certainty.

(9)

In their ninth argument, they say:

How can body with all it accidents constitute man? The bodies are constantly subject to dissolution. What they lose through dissolution is replaced by food. Take for example a new-born baby. In the years to come, he will fall ill and become lean. Afterwards, he will recover, and grow fatter and stronger. And then it will be possible for us to say that he does not retain any one of those parts which existed at the time of his birth. Nay, first of all his being consisted of the parts of sperm. But in an advanced stage of his life, no part of sperm remains within him. For all those parts have dissolved; and others have come to replace them. Therefore, *this* body is different from *that*. And yet we say that *this* man is the same as *that*, and that the congnitions he had acquired in early childhood remain within him; although his physical parts may all have been changed and replaced. It follows that the soul's existence is independent of the body, and that the body is an instrument of the soul.

Objection:

This hypothesis breaks down, when in the case of animals and plants the earlier and later stages of existence are compared. Just as a man is said to be the same, so is an animal or a plant said to be the same as it was in the past. And this does not prove that the animal or the plant has a being other than the physical one. Further, the conservation of imagined forms may be cited in refutation of what has been said (by the philosophers) on knowledge. For the imagined forms remain from childhood to advanced age, even though all the parts of the brain may have been replaced. If here the philosophers assert that all the parts of

the brain are not replaced, then the exceptional character might belong to the heart as well; for the heart and the brain are alike physical. And in that case, how will it be possible for the body as a whole to have been replaced? We would rather say that even if a man lives for a hundred years, still parts of the sperm which begot him would remain within him. They cannot totally disappear. For *this* man is what he is by virtue of something which persists within him. His case is not different from that of a tree or a horse which remains the same in *this* stage as it was in *that*. So, in spite of many a dissolution and replacement, parts of the sperm do remain.

We can illustrate the point. Pour a pint of water into a vessel. Pour another, so that the two should mix up. Take one pint out of the vessel. Pour another into it. Again, take a pint out of it, and pour another into it. And do the same thing for a thousand times. Still at the last round we shall be able to judge that the vessel retains some part of the first water; and that no pint is taken out of it, but a part of the first water exists in it. For the first water existed in the second round; the third round consisted of parts of the second round; the fourth one, of the parts of the third; and so on to the last one. And this will be a legitimate inference from the philosophers' principles, since they have admitted the possibility of the infinite division of bodies. So the absorption of food into the body, on the one hand, and the dissolution of its parts, on the other, may be compared to the pouring of water into a vessel and the draining of water out of it.

(10)

In their tenth argument, they say:

The rational faculty apprehends the general rational universals or the States (as the *Mutakallimūn* call them). It apprehends the absolute Man; while a particular human person is perceived by the senses. The absolute Man is not the particular person whom we can observe. For the observable person is in a particular place, has a particular colour, a particular measure, and a particular position; whereas the absolute Man is divested of all these things. It includes all that falls under the name 'man'; even though it had no observ-

able colour, or measure, or position, or place. It includes all that may called 'man,' and for which it is possible to come into existence in the future. Nay, even if man does not exist at all, the reality of Man—divested of particular qualities—will subsist in the Intellect. The same applies to all other particular objects observed by the senses. For the Intellect abstracts from them their universal reality which is divested of Matters and Positions. The attributes of this universal reality may be divided into: (a) those which are essential—e.g., corporeality in the case of plants and animals, or animality in the case of man—and (b) those which are accidental—e.g., whiteness or length in the case of a man or a tree. We judge the essential or accidental character of these attributes in relation to the genus—i.e., Man or Tree, or anything else we may have apprehended (not in relation to the particular object which is observed by the senses). This shows that the universal which is divested of all sensible associations is an object for the Intellect, wherein it exists. And this intelligible universal is undesignated, non-local, and unquantified.

Now, the universal intelligible may derive its non-local and immaterial character either:

(i) from that which is universalised. But this is impossible. For that which is universalised *did* possess dimension, position, and quantity.

Or (ii) from that which universalises—viz., the rational soul. If so, it is necessary that the soul should be non-local, undesignated, and unquantified. Otherwise, if the soul were to possess these things, then that which subsists in the soul would possess them as well.

Objection:

The universal posited by you as subsisting in the Intellect is inadmissible. Only that which subsists in the senses comes to subsist in the Intellect. The difference, however, is that in the senses it subsists as an unanalysable whole; whereas the Intellect can analyse it. When the analysis is made, then—as far as particularity is concerned—the analysed thing which is isolated from its associations by the Intellect is still like that which is not isolated from its associations. Again, the difference is that that which exists in the Intellect

is conformable to the intelligible object and to all other things like it in the same way. It is in this sense that it is said to be universal—namely, that there is in the Intellect the form of the intelligible which has been isolated from its associations, and which was first perceived by the senses; and that the relation of this form to all other individuals which belong to the same genus is one and the same. So if having seen a man, one sees another man, no new form will come into being—as it would if he were to see a horse after having seen a man (whereby two different forms would have come into being).

Such a thing happens even in the case of bare sensations. When one sees water, a form comes into being in his fantasy. When, afterwards, he sees blood, another form comes into being. But if he sees another water, no new form will arise. On the contrary, the form which has been impressed upon his fantasy will represent every individual water. Therefore, in this sense such forms have often been assumed to be universal. Similarly, when one sees a hand, there arises in his fantasy and in the Intellect the form of the position of the parts of the hand as related to one another—namely, the expansion at the palm, the division into fingers, the end of the fingers at the nails, even the size of the hand, and its colour, etc. So when he sees another hand exactly similar to the first one, no new form will arise. Rather, the second observation will be incapable of giving anything new to the fantasy, just as the observation of another water in the same vessel and of the same quantity will not give anything new. But when he sees another hand which differs from the first one in colour or measure, then he will have a new form—viz., that of the different colour or measure. But there will be no new form of a hand; for the smaller and black hand is as much of a hand as the larger and white hand. The two differ only in colour and measure, etc. So that which is common to the two hands will not produce a new form; because *that* form is identical with *this*. Only that in which the second hand differs from the first one will produce a new form.

This, then, is the meaning of the universal in relation to the Intellect as well as to the senses. When the Intellect apprehends the form of body in an animal, it does not acquire a new form of corporeality from that of the tree—as the fantasy does not acquire a new form from the preception of two waters at two different times, or in general no new form is acquired

from the perception of any two things which are exactly similar. And this meaning of the universal affords no ground for the affirmation of a universal which is absolutely non-local.

No doubt, sometimes the judgment of reason does show the possibility of existence of something which is non-local and undesignated. For instance, it judges of the existence of the Creator of the world. But whence comes the idea that the existence of the Intellect in body is inconceivable? In the case of the Creator, that which is abstracted from Matter is the Intelligible-in-Himself which is independent of the Intellect and intelligent persons. But in the case of any other thing which has a basis in Matter, the explanation we have given shall apply.

PROBLEM XIX

REFUTATION OF THEIR THESIS THAT, HAVING COME INTO BEING, THE HUMAN SOULS CANNOT BE DESTROYED; AND THAT THEIR EVERLASTING NATURE MAKES IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR US TO CONCEIVE OF THEIR DESTRUCTION

LET us demand their arguments for this thesis. And they have two arguments:

(I)

In their first argument, they say:

The souls can perish (if they perish at all) because of the following things:

(i) The death of the body; or

(ii) the occurrence of the contrary of the soul which comes to replace it; or

(iii) the power of a powerful agent.

Now, it is false to say that the soul might perish because of the death of the body. For the body is not the substratum of the soul, but only an instrument used by the soul with the intermediation of the faculties which subsist in the body. The corruption of the instrument does not necessitate the corruption of one who uses it—unless the latter were subsisting in, or impressed upon, it, as the animal souls or the bodily faculties are. Because the soul has two actions: one with and the other without the help of this instrument, therefore the action performed with the help of the instrument (namely, imagination, or sensation, or desire, or anger) will undoubtedly undergo corruption or destruction, when the body is corrupted or destroyed. But the other action of the soul (viz., the cognition of the intelligibles divested of Matter) is performed without the help of the body. As far as the soul is cognisant of the intelligibles, it does not need the body at all. On the contrary, its preoccupation with the body diverts its attention from the intelligibles. And since now it is clear that

the existence of the soul and one of its two functions are independent of body, it follows that its constitution does not depend on body.

Again, it is false to say that the soul might perish because of the occurrence of its contrary. For the substances have no contraries. The only perishable things in the world are the accidents and forms which pass in succession over Things. The form of water perishes because of the occurrence of its contrary—viz., the form of air. But Matter which is the substratum of these forms is absolutely imperishable. And in the case of a substance, which exists in no substratum, perishing because of the occurrence of a contrary is also inconceivable. For that which is not in a substratum has no contrary, as contraries come to pass in succession over the same substratum.

Finally, it is false to say that the power of a powerful agent might destroy the souls. For non-existence is nothing. Therefore, it is inconceivable that the power of any agent should cause it to eventuate.

(This is exactly what they said in the problem of the everlasting existence of the world. We have settled this question, having dwelt upon it at length.)

Objection to the foregoing may be taken from several points:

In the first place, it is based upon the theory that the death of the body does not cause the death of the soul, because the soul does not subsist in body. That theory is based upon the position taken by the philosophers in the preceding problem. And that position is unacceptable.

Secondly, although they do not consider the soul as subsisting in body, yet it is evident that there is a connection between the soul and body, wherefore a soul does not come into existence unless a body exists. This view has been adopted by Ibn Sīna and some other thinkers who searched after the truth through independent inquiry, and who rejected Plato's thesis that the soul is eternal and that its relation to body is accidental. The position taken by these thinkers in their independent inquiry is as follows:

"If the soul was one before the existence of bodies, how did it get divided? The division of that which has no magni-

tude or quantity is unintelligible. If, however, it is asserted that no division took place, still it will be an absurd assertion. For, evidently, the soul of Zaid is other than that of 'Amr. If the two were one, the cognitions of Zaid would be the cognitions of 'Amr; because knowledge is one of the essential attributes of the soul, and the essential attributes enter into all the relations of the essence. And if the souls form a plurality, what is the cause of plurality? This cause cannot be found in Matters, or places, or times, or attributes; for there is nothing in all these to necessitate a difference of quality among the souls. This is not the same case as that of souls *after* the death of the body, because in the opinion of one who believes in the immortality of souls, the departed souls do differ in quality, insofar as each acquires from its body a different proclivity. No two souls can have the same proclivity; because proclivities result from the moral character, and like external physiognomy, the moral character can never be the same in any two instances. For if the moral character or the physiognomy of Zaid were the same as that of 'Amr, we would confuse one with the other."

Since it is proved by this argument:

that the soul comes into existence when the sperm enters the womb;

that because of its physical constitution the sperm is prepared to receive the soul (which will be its director); and that it does not receive the soul merely because it is just a soul. For two sperm-drops begetting twins may be within the same womb and at the same time equally prepared to receive souls. Then two souls emanate—directly or through intermediaries—from the First Principle to be related to the embryonic bodies. Thus the soul of *this* body cannot be the director of *that* body, nor the soul of *that* body the director of *this* body. This special relation can arise only from a special affinity between a particular soul and a particular body. For otherwise, the body of one of the twins would not be more apt than that of the other to receive *this* particular soul; because there were two souls which came into existence simultaneously, and there were two sperm-drops equally prepared to be directed by souls.

the question arises: What is the cause of the special affinity between a particular soul and a particular body? If it is a soul's being impressed upon body, then the elimination of the body will eliminate the soul as well. But if there is some other cause to explain the connection between *this* particular body and *this* particular soul (so that the connection is a condition for the soul's coming into existence), then how can it be improbable that this very connection should also be a condition for the soul's survival? Therefore, when this connection is severed, the soul will perish. And its existence will not reappear until God (holy and exalted be His name) causes such reappearance by way of the reinfusion or resurgence of life, as religion teaches us in the doctrine of Resurrection.

If it is said:

The connection between the soul and the body results from a natural inclination or instinctive affection created by God in the soul in favour of *this* particular body. This affection draws the soul towards *this*, and away from all other bodies. At no time does it leave the soul; but keeps it imprisoned in the particular body, so that no other body can receive its attention. But this does not make it necessary for the soul to be corrupted by the corruption of the body towards whose direction it has an instinctive affection. Nay, sometimes, this affection remains even after the soul's departure from the body, if in life the soul's preocupation with the body has been strong enough to divert its attention from the abnegation of desires and from the inquiry into the intelligibles. Then this persisting affection causes the soul pain, because the soul has been deprived of the instrument whereby the object of its affection could be attained.

As regards the definite relation between, say, the body and the soul of Zaid even in the earliest stage of existence, obviously it has a cause whereby the soul and the body are suited to each other. So *this* body becomes fitter than any other body for *this* soul because of its exceedingly suitable character. Hence the definite relationship between the soul and the body is determined. But it is beyond the power of man to know the definite character of such instances of mutual fitness. If, however, we fail to discover the details,

this cannot shake our belief in the fundamental need for the cause of a definite relation. Nor will it be harmful to our assertion that the soul does not die because of the death of the body.

we will answer:

Since the mutual fitness of body and soul is invisible to us, and because it is this mutual fitness which demands a definite relation, it is therefore not improbable that this unascertainable mutual fitness should be of such a kind as to make the immortality of the soul dependent upon the continuance of the body, wherefore the corruption of the body should cause the corruption of the soul. That which is unascertainable affords no ground for the judgment as to whether it demands a necessary interrelation between the soul and body, or not. Maybe, the relation between the soul and body is necessary for the existence of the soul; and the soul will therefore perish when this relation is severed. It is therefore clear that no reliance can be placed upon the argument which has been advanced by the philosophers.

The third objection is that it is not unreasonable to maintain that the destruction of the souls may be caused by the power of God (exalted be He)—as we have conclusively shown in the problem of the indestructibility of the world.

The fourth objection is that we do not admit that the three ways of destruction mentioned by you exhaust all the possibilities. How will you prove that destruction in any other way besides these three is inconceivable? Since the division made by you does not revolve between affirmation and negation, it is possible to add a fourth one to the three possibilities. Therefore, perhaps destruction will take place in a fourth or even a fifth way other than the three mentioned by you. To limit the number to three is not supported by an argument.

(2)

In their second argument, which is their mainstay, they say:

The extinction of a substance which does not exist in a subject is impossible. In other words, the simples are

absolutely indestructible.

In this argument, the first thing to be proved is that the death of the body does not necessitate the extinction of the soul. The reason for this has been considered above. Next, it is to be maintained that it is impossible for the soul to perish because of anything else than the death of the body either. For when something perishes by any cause whatsoever, it follows that it had the potentiality for corruption before its corruption actually took place. That is, the possibility of extinction precedes actual extinction, just as in case of a temporal event, the possibility of existence precedes existence. The possibility of existence is called the potentiality of existence; and the possibility of extinction is called the potentiality for corruption. Just as the possibility of existence is a relative attribute which requires something in which to exist (so as to be a possibility in relation to it), so does the possibility of extinction require something in relation to which it could be a possibility. This is the reason why it is said that (as shown in the problem of the eternity of the world) every temporal existence needs a preceding Matter in which the possibility of the existence of that temporal existent, or its potentiality, should reside. So Matter in which the potentiality of existence resides is the recipient of the existence which occurs. And that which receives is other than that which is received. Therefore, the recipient and that which is received (and which is other than the recipient) exist together at the time when that which is received occurs. Similarly, therefore, it is necessary that the recipient of non-existence should exist at the time when non-existence occurs—so that something passes out of it into non-existence, just as something in it had come to exist. Now, that which passes out of it into non-existence is other than that which remains. And that which remains is that in which the potentiality for, or the receptivity to, or the possibility of non-existence resides—just as that which remains at the time of the occurrence of existence is not that which occurs, but that in which the potentiality for the reception of the occurrent resided. From this it follows that anything to which non-existence occurs is composed, on the one hand, of that which passes into non-existence; and, on the other hand, of that which receives non-existence, and which remains at the time of the occurrence of non-existence (because it was the bearer

of the potentiality for non-existence before the occurrence of non-existence). This bearer of potentiality is Matter; and that which passes out of it into non-existence is Form.

But the soul is simple. It is a non-composite Form divested of Matter. If in it the composition of Form and Matter is supposed, we shall thereby reintroduce into the discussion Matter which is the primary Root or Stuff; for it will be necessary for the series thus started to end at such a fundamental principle. Thus we shall arrive at the impossibility of the extinction of this primary principle, and that is called the soul—as we have already seen the impossibility of the extinction of the Matter of bodies. For in either case, Matter is eternal and everlasting. Forms come into existence in it, and pass into non-existence out of it. It has the potentiality for the occurrence of forms to it, and the potentiality for the extinction of forms out of it. For it is equally receptive to the two contraries. And from this it is clear that every being which has a unitary essence is imperishable.

This may be set forth in another way. The potentiality of the existence of a thing is before its existence. Therefore, it is other than that thing, which (thing) cannot be the potentiality of existence itself. This can be understood in the light of the fact that one who has a sound vision is said to be a potential seer. That is, he has the potentiality for vision, which means that the quality indispensable for the eye in order to perform sound vision exists. If, however, actual vision is delayed, the delay is to be ascribed to the failure of some other condition. So the potentiality, say, for the sight of blackness exists in the eye before the actual sight of blackness. When the sight of blackness is actually attained, the potentiality for the sight of blackness will not coexist with the actual sight of blackness. For once sight is attained, it will not be possible to say that it exists actually as well as potentially.

This premiss having been proved, we proceed to say: If a simple thing were to perish, the possibility of perishing should have been possessed by that thing before actually perishing, for that is what potentiality means. And, further, it must have also possessed the possibility of existence. For that whose non-existence is possible cannot be necessary. Therefore, it must be possible of existence; and by the potentiality of existence we only mean the possibility of existence.

So the conclusion to be drawn from this will be that there can be combined within the same thing the potentiality for its own existence and the actual attainment of its existence, or that its actual existence can be identical with the potentiality for its existence. But we have shown that the potentiality for sight which resides in the eye is other than actual seeing. It cannot be identical with actual sight; for that means the existence of the same thing actually as well as potentially—which are mutually exclusive terms. Nay, when something is potential, it cannot be actual; and when it is actual, it cannot be potential. So the affirmation of the potentiality of the non-existence of a simple thing before actual non-existence carries within itself the affirmation of the potentiality for existence as concurrent with the state of actual existence. And that is impossible.

[This is exactly the same thing as we have dealt with in the problems of the eternity and of the everlasting existence of the world (wherein the philosophers had recourse to the assumption of the impossibility of the temporal origin of Matter and the elements, and the impossibility of their non-existence). The source of confusion is their postulate that possibility is an attribute which requires a subject in which to exist. We have exposed the specious character of this assumption; and we will not repeat our criticism. For the question remains the same in this problem as it was in those problems. It makes no difference whether one is speaking of a material or a spiritual substance.]

PROBLEM XX

REFUTATION OF THEIR DENIAL OF THE RESURRECTION OF BODIES

THEY deny the return of souls to bodies: the existence of a physical Paradise and Hell: the Ḥūr with large eyes, and everything which has been promised to man by God. And they maintain that these things are symbols mentioned to common men in order to facilitate their understanding of spiritual reward and punishment which are superior to those of a physical character. This being opposed to the belief of all the Muslims, we propose first to explain what the philosophers believe with respect to the things to come; and then to state our objections to all those elements which are opposed to Islam.

They say:

After the death of the body, the soul continues to have an everlasting existence either in the state of indescribably great pleasure, or in the state of indescribably great pain. In some cases, the pain or pleasure will be everlasting; in others, it will pass away in the course of time. As regards its degrees, men have different ranks which are marked by as great a variety as characterises their mundane ranks. Thus:

(i) the eternal pleasure is for the pure and perfect souls,
(ii) the eternal pain is for the imperfect and impure souls, and
(iii) transient pain is for the impure but perfect souls.

And the soul can attain absolute bliss only by means of perfection and purity or cleanliness. Perfection is derived from knowledge, and purity from virtuous action.

Knowledge is required because the rational faculty derives nourishment and pleasure from the cognition of the intelligibles, as the faculty of desire finds pleasure in the satisfaction of a desire; or the faculty of sight finds pleasure in looking at beautiful forms, and so on to all other faculties. It is the

body: the physical preoccupations, and the physical senses which prevent the rational faculty from discovering the intelligibles. It would be proper for an ignorant soul to be aggrieved, even in the life of this world, by the loss (on account of its ignorance) of the pleasures of the soul. But its preoccupation with the body makes it forgetful of itself, and diverts its attention from its own grief, as for instance one stricken with fear is insensitive to pain, or one suffering from frostbite is insensitive to fire. So if the imperfection of the ignorant soul remains till the severance of the connection with the body, the soul will be in the same situation as the man who suffers from frostbite. When exposed to the fire, the latter is insensitive to the pain caused by it. But he is suddenly overwhelmed with the consciousness of extreme agony, when the effects of frostbite disappear.

Sometimes, although a soul does cognise the intelligibles, yet the pleasure it derives from the cognitions is slight and falls short of what naturally it ought to have been. This is again due to physical preoccupations and the soul's interest in the objects of carnal desires. And this is like what happens when a sick man, who has bitterness in his mouth, gets disgusted with wholesome sweetness, and seeks to avoid that very food which is really the most adequate cause of pleasure for him. So he fails to find pleasure in wholesome things because of the effects of sickness.

Different is the case of the souls perfected by knowledge. When death puts an end to the physical preoccupations, their condition is like that of one who has recovered from sickness. Sickness prevents a man from perceiving pleasure. But when the accidental affliction is over, the perception of pleasure is overwhelming. Or the condition of the liberated soul may be compared to that of a lover. Suppose that the lover is asleep: or unconscious, or intoxicated, when his mistress comes to him. At first, he cannot notice the cause of his pleasure. But when he wakes up, he will have an overwhelming consciousness of the pleasures of union (which has been preceded by long separation). As a matter of fact, all these pleasures dwindle into insignificance in comparison with intellectual and spiritual pleasures. But people cannot be enabled to understand the latter, until they are symbolically represented through such things as may be observed in this life. For instance, if we would make a child or a eunuch understand the pleasure

of sexual intercourse, we must represent it to the child by reference to play which is the most pleasant thing to a child, and to the eunuch by reference to a wholesome meal enjoyed from an intense appetite. So the child or the eunuch will realise the fundamental character of the pleasure, although he will know that the representative symbol itself does not constitute the pleasure of sexual intercourse, for the symbol (in the case of the eunuch) is perceived only by the organ of taste.

There are two arguments to prove that intellectual pleasures are worthier than physical pleasures:

Firstly, the state of the angels is nobler than that of beasts and swine. Now, the angels do not experience sensuous pleasures like those of mating and eating. Their pleasure consists in the consciousness of the perfection and beauty which characterise them because of their insight into the realities of things, and their approximation to the Lord of the Universe (not in space, but in the order of beings). Since all beings emanate from God in order and through intermediaries, it is obvious that the intermediaries nearer to Him should possess a higher rank.

Secondly, man himself often prefers intellectual pleasures to sensuous pleasures. For instance, one who seeks victory over an enemy renounces for its sake the comfort of home and hearth. Nay, even for the sake of victory in a game of chess or dice one goes without a meal all the day long. Although such a victory is but a trifle, he would not mind the pain caused by hunger. Similarly, one who is interested in the maintenance of his dignity and prestige hesitates to deal with his mistress in such a way as to be known to others. At last, he decides to preserve his dignity, and restrains his passions, lest the contemptible passions should disgrace him. Obviously, the preservation of his dignity is more pleasant to him. Again, sometimes a brave man sallies forth to face vast hordes of warriors, because he holds the danger of death in contempt, being more absorbed in what he imagines to be the pleasure of posthumous praise and admiration for his intrepidity.

So the intellectual pleasures in the Hereafter will be far superior to the sensuous pleasures of this world. But for this fact, the Prophet (may God bless him and grant him peace) would not have reported God to say: "I have reserved for My virtuous worshippers what no eye ever saw, no ear ever heard, and which never occurred to the heart of man."

And says God (exalted be He): "No soul knows what comfort of the eye lies concealed in store for them." This, then, is the cause of the need for knowledge. And of all cognitions, the most beneficial are the purely intellectual—viz., the knowledge of God: of His attributes: of His angels: of His books, and of the way in which things derive their being from Him. As regards other cognitions, only those which are a means to the purely intellectual cognitions are beneficial by virtue of this character. Those which are not even a means to the purely intellectual cognitions—e.g., Grammar, or Philology, or Poetry, or other specialised sciences of various kinds—are only arts and methods like any other art or method.

Next, virtuous conduct and worship are required in order to purify the soul. During its connection with the body, the soul is prevented from cognising the realities of things, not because it is impressed upon body, but because it is preoccupied with the body, inclining towards carnal desires, and having affection for the requirements of the body. This inclination or affection represents a psychic proclivity, which is deepened and strengthened by prolonged concern with carnal desires and continued interest in the sensible causes of pleasures. Consequently, even after the death of the body, it is impossible for the soul to get rid of this proclivity which is, therefore, an oppressive and distressing factor for two reasons:

Firstly, because it prevents the soul from attaining its proper pleasure—viz., the union with the angels and the insight into the beautiful divine things. And the body, with which before death the soul used to be preoccupied, will not be there to divert its attention from its grief.

Secondly, because the soul still retains its interest in the causes of worldly pleasures. But having been deprived of its instrument—i.e., the body, through which the soul used to contrive to attain those pleasures—its condition will be extremely miserable. Suppose that there is a man who loves his wife: enjoys his property: has affection for his children: delights in his wealth, and takes pride in his dignity. Now, suppose that his mistress is killed: he is dismissed from his position: his children and women are taken prisoner: his wealth is taken away by his enemies, and his prestige is utterly fallen. Such a man will undoubtedly have the most clear and visible cause of grief. Nevertheless, as long as he

lives, he can hope for the restoration of things like those he used to have; for the world is always moving on from To-day to the Morrow. But what will the soul do, when its hope will be cut off because death deprived it of the body?

Deliverance from such psychic proclivities is not possible, unless the soul abstains from carnal desires: turns away from the world, and betakes itself to the struggle for the attainment of knowledge and piety. If these conditions are satisfied, then, while it is yet in the world, its connection with worldly things will be cut off, whereas the connection with things of the Hereafter will grow stronger. So when death comes, the soul will experience the same relief as a prisoner does when he is set free. And then will it find everything it could have sought. That is its Paradise.

But it is not possible for the soul to outgrow or to obliterate all the physical qualities; for the needs of the body attract it towards them. Nonetheless, it can make its connection with the body weaker. This is the reason why God (exalted be He) says: "Every one of you shall have to approach it; this is the irrevocable decree of thy Lord." When its connection with the body has been weakened, the agony caused by the soul's separation from the body will not be very great. On the contrary, the soul will learn to enjoy those divine things which it will have discovered after the death of the body. This will shortly obliterate the effects of its departure from the world and its lingering inclination towards worldly things. An analogy of the soul's condition is to be found in the case of a man who sets out from his own country towards another where he might attain a high position and magnificent authority. Separation from his family and native land may distress his soul, and he may feel unhappy. But these effects will wear off, when he gets accustomed to the pleasure he derives from the elevation born of power and authority.

The utter negation of physical qualities not being possible, religion enjoins upon us the choice of the mean between all opposite extremes in morals. Tepid water which is neither hot nor cold is equally free from either of the two opposite qualities. One should neither hoard wealth nor squander it away; for the one will engender avarice, while the other will make him a spendthrift. Similarly, one should neither shrink back from everything nor meddle with

everything; for the former is cowardice, while the latter is rashness. In the first case, he ought to aim at generosity which is the mean between miserliness and extravagance; in the second, at courage which is the mean between cowardice and rashness. And so on to all other moral qualities. The science of morals is lengthy; and the Sacred Law fully takes its details into consideration. Reform of the moral character is not possible, unless regard is had in conduct for the Sacred Law. If egotism is the principle of conduct, the subject will be like one who "sets up his own desires as his god." On the contrary, one should be bound by the Sacred Law, acting or refraining from action at its behest, not by his own choice. Only then will his moral character be reformed.

He who lacks knowledge and virtue is damned. Says God (exalted be He): "He is indeed successful who causeth it to grow; and he is indeed a failure who stunteth it." One who combines moral and intellectual greatness is the Devout Sage; and his reward will be absolute bliss. He who has intellectual, but not moral, greatness is the unreligious Scholar. Punishment awarded to him will last a long time; but it will not be perpetual, for after all his soul had been perfected by knowledge. Although in contrariety to the substance of his soul, physical accidents had tainted him with impurity, yet this impurity can be effaced in the course of time, because in that stage of the soul's existence, the accidental causes of impurity will not be renewed. He who has virtue but no knowledge will yet be saved, and will experience no pain. But he will not attain perfect bliss.

Moreover (assert the philosophers), as soon as one dies, Doomsday begins for him. As regards the expressions used in the Sacred Law, they are intended to serve as an allegory, for man's understanding fails to apprehend these spiritual pleasures and pains. Therefore, these things have been described through symbols; but at the same time it has been pointed out that really spiritual pleasures are far above what is found in the description.

(This, then, is the philosophers' theory.)

We shall answer:

Most of these things are not opposed to religion. We do not deny that the pleasures in the Hereafter are superior to

sensible pleasures. Nor do we deny the immortality of the soul separated from the body. But we know these things on the authority of religion, as expressed in the doctrine of Resurrection. No doubt, the Resurrection will not be comprehensible, if the immortality of soul is not taken for granted. But we take objection, as we did before, to their assertion that mere reason gives them final knowledge of these things. Moreover, there are elements in this theory which do come into conflict with religion. Such are the denial of the revivification of bodies: the denial of physical pains and pleasures in hell and paradise, and the denial of the existence of paradise and hell as described in the Qur'ān. What is there to prevent one from assenting to the possibility of the combination of physical and spiritual pains or pleasures? The verse: "No soul knows what lies concealed in store for them" only means that no soul knows *all* those things. Similarly, from the words: "I have reserved for My virtuous worshippers what no eye ever saw" the existence of things of supreme worth can be inferred, but the negation of any other thing besides them does not necessarily follow. Rather, the combination of the two will be conducive to greater perfection. And that which has been promised to us is the most perfect thing. Hence it follows that the combination of the two is possible; and therefore it is necessary to assent to this possibility in accordance with religion.

If it is said:

What we find in the sacred texts is only an allegory proportioned to the limitations of common understanding, just as the verses and traditions with an anthropomorphic import are allegories used to facilitate understanding (since the popular imagination is too coarse for the Divine attributes).

The answer:

It is arbitrary to equate the latter instance to the former. There are two reasons why the two instances should be kept apart:

Firstly, the words in the verses and traditions which have an anthropomorphic import bear interpretation on the same principle as governs conventional metaphors in Arabic.

But the description of paradise and hell and the details of these things are so plain that there is no room left for interpretation. What remains is that one might consider such texts to be fraudulent—i.e., suggesting something untrue with a view to people's well-being. But that is beneath the dignity and the sanctity which characterise prophecy.

Secondly, rational arguments have proved the impossibility of things like space: or dimension: or a physical form: or an organic hand: or an organic eye, or the capacity for motion and rest, in the case of God. Hence the need for the interpretation (of the sacred texts where they occur) by means of rational arguments. But things of the Hereafter promised to us are not impossible for the Divine omnipotence. Therefore, it is necessary to stick to what the text *prima facie* means, and not to take it out of the context where it occurs, and from which it derives its significance.

If it is said:

Rational arguments have actually proved the impossibility of the resurrection of bodies, even as they have proved the impossibility of anthropomorphic attributes being possessed by God (exalted be He).

then we will demand that they state what those arguments are. And they proceed from various points to argue their theory:

(1)

In the first place, they say:

The supposition of the soul's return to body involves three alternatives:

In the first place, it may be said (as some of the *Mutakallimin* have held) that man is body, and that life is merely an accident which depends on body: that the soul which is supposed to be self-subsisting, and is called the director of the body, does not exist; and that death means the discontinuance of life, or the Creator's abstaining from creating life. Therefore, resurrection will mean (a) the restoration by God of the body which had perished; (b) the recommencement of the existence of the body; and (c) the restoration of life which had

perished. Or it may be said that the Matter of the body would remain as dust, and that resurrection means that this dust will be collected and composed into the figure of a man, wherein life will be created for the first time. So this is one alternative.

In the second place, it may be said that the soul is an existent which survives the death of the body, but which will be returned at the time of resurrection to the original body when all the parts of that body have been collected. This is another alternative.

In the third place, it may be said that the soul will return to *a* body, whether it is composed of the same parts as the original body had, or of some other parts. Consequently, the returning one would be *that* man, insofar as the soul is *that* soul. Matter is irrelevant here, because man is not man by virtue of Matter, but by virtue of soul.

Now, all these three alternatives are false.

The first one is evidently false, because when life as well as the body has disappeared, the recreation of it would be the production of something similar to, but not identical with, what had been. But return, as we understand it, implies the supposition of the continuity of one thing as well as the emergence of another. For instance, when one is said to resume generosity, the meaning is that the generous person continues, but that having given up generosity he returns to it. That is, he returns to something which is generically the same as what he originally had, but differs from it in number. Therefore, the return is not to the original thing itself, but to something like it. Again, when one is said to return to a city, the meaning is that he continued to exist elsewhere: that formerly he had been in the city, and that now he resumes his being in the city which is similar to his original state. If there is nothing which continues, and if, on the contrary, there are two similar but numerically different things between which time intervenes, the conditions prerequisite for the application of the word 'return' will not be complete. One might escape this consequence by saying what the Mu'tazilah say—namely, that the non-existent is a positive thing, and that existence is a state which occurs to the non-existent as an accident: comes to an end, and returns afterwards. Thus the meaning of the word 'return' will be determined by reference to the continuity of an entity. But this amounts to the elimination of the

concept of absolute non-being which is pure negation, by affirming a permanent entity to which existence may return. Hence its impossibility.

If one in favour of this alternative

artfully tries to defend it by saying that the dust of the body is imperishable, and that therefore this dust will be the continuing entity to which life is restored,

we will reply:

This being so, it will be correct to say that dust regains life, after life had disappeared from it for a while. Now, this will not be the return of a man, or the reappearance of his former self. For a man is not what he is by virtue of the Matter and the dust of which he is composed. All his physical parts, or at least most of them are replaced by food; and he is still the same as he was at first by virtue of his spirit or soul. So in case life or spirit should perish, the return of that which has perished will not be intelligible. At the most, something similar to it can be brought into existence. If God creates human life in dust which formed the body of a tree, or a horse, or a plant, this will be the first-creation of a man. The return of that which does not exist is unintelligible. The returning entity must be an existent; it returns to a state it had before—rather, to a state like the former one. So the returning entity is dust—returning to the attribute of life. But man's body does not make him what he is. For the body of a horse often becomes man s food, which goes to the making of a sperm-drop, which begets another man. But one cannot say that a horse has become a man; for it is the form of horse, not the Matter of it, which makes a horse what it is. And (in the present instance) the form of a horse has perished, and nothing but the Matter of it remains.

Now, to consider the second alternative—viz., the supposition of the continuity of the soul, and its return to the original body. If such a thing could be conceived, it would be 'return' properly so called; it would mean the resumption by the soul of its function of directing the body, after having been separated from it by death.

But this is impossible. The body of a man is reduced to

dust, or eaten by worms and birds, and then changes into blood or vapours, and gets inextricably mixed up with the air, the vapours, the water of the whole world.

If such a thing is supposed on the strength of the belief in Divine omnipotence, then it will be inevitable

(i) either that only those parts should be recombined which were present at the time of death. This would necessarily lead to the resurrection of people whose limbs had been amputated: or whose ears and nose were cut off, or whose limbs were defective, in exactly the same form as they had in the world. But this is disgusting, particularly with reference to the people of Paradise, even though they may have been created defective in the original life. It would be most unseemly to cause them to reappear with all the deformities they had at the time of death. This is, therefore, the difficulty which arises, if the supposition of return is confined to the recombination of the parts present at the time of death.

(ii) or that all those parts should be recombined which had ever existed during one's lifetime. This is impossible for two reasons:

Firstly, because if a man eats another man (the custom prevails in some places, and it occurs frequently at the time of famine), then the resurrection of the two will be very difficult. For Matter will be the same, because the body of the eaten person will have been absorbed as food into the body of the eater. And the restoration of two souls to one body is not possible.

Secondly, because it will be necessary that the same part should be resurrected as liver and heart and a hand and a leg at once. For it has been proved by the art of Medicine that some organic parts derive nourishment from the residuary nourishment of others. Thus parts of the heart provide nourishment for the liver, and so on to all other members. So if we suppose some specific parts which had been the Matter of all the organs, to which organ will they be returned? Nay, one need not bring in the hypothesis of a man eating another in order to establish the impossibility mentioned in the first objection. If you look at any portion of land, you will come to know that particles of dust in it have been the bodies of men. Thus, in course of time, when land is irrigated and cultivated, dust becomes fruits and vegetables on which beasts and animals are fed. Then dust becomes flesh. And

when animals are eaten by us, dust finally becomes our body. So all Matter which can be designated has been the body of men. It changes: from the dust of dead bodies to plants, from plants to flesh, and from flesh to a living being. The consequences of this explanation furnish yet another—i.e., a third—reason for the impossibility of resurrection. Namely, the souls departed from bodies are infinite in number, whereas the number of bodies is limited. Therefore, the Matters of men which are to be used at the time of resurrection will be outnumbered.

Finally, the third alternative—viz., the restoration of a soul to a body made of any Matter or dust—is impossible for two reasons:

Firstly, Matters which receive generation and curruption are restricted to the Hollow of the sphere of the Moon. No addition to them is possible, and they are infinite in number. On the other hand, the souls departed from bodies are infinite in number. Therefore, the Matters will be outnumbered by the souls.

Secondly, dust as long as it remains dust cannot receive direction from the soul. In order for such reception to take place, it is necessary that the elements should mix together, so that the mixture resemble the composition of sperm. Mere wood or iron does not receive direction from the soul. Nor is it possible to cause man to reappear out of wood or iron. There can be no man until there is an organism composed of flesh and bones and humours. And whenever the body and its constitution are prepared for the reception of a soul, they are entitled to the origination of a soul from the principles which are the Givers of Souls. Consequently, according to the hypothesis under consideration, two souls will simultaneously come to belong to one body. This is impossible; and the refutation of such an hypothesis will also refute Metempsychosis. For this hypothesis is exactly the same as that doctrine, since it is based on the assumption that after its deliverance from body, the soul will resume the control of a body which will not be the original one. So the same argument is valid against this hypothesis as against the doctrine of Metempsychosis.

The objection to the foregoing may be stated as follows:

How can you disprove one who chooses the last alter-

native, and believes that the soul is immortal, and is a self-subsisting substance? And this does not come into conflict with religion. On the contrary, the verse: "Think not of those who are slain in the way of Allah as dead. Nay, they are living. With their Lord they have provision," shows that religion is in favour of it. Further evidence can be found in the words of the Prophet (peace be on him): "The spirits of virtuous men are in the crops of green birds hanging below the Throne." There are other traditions which speak of the consciousness possessed by spirits of charities and alms offered in their behalf, of the questions asked by *Munkir* and *Nakir*, and of the punishment in the grave. All these things point to the immortality of the soul. At the same time, however, religion teaches us to believe in resurrection which will be accompanied by the resurgence of life. And by resurrection is meant the resurrection of bodies. And it is possible to effect resurrection by restoring the soul to a body, whether made of the same Matter as the original one was: or made of the Matter of any other body, or of a Matter created for the first time. For it is the soul, not the body, which makes us what we are. All the parts of our body are continually changing from infancy to old age because of leanness and fatness, and because of the changes caused by food. And these changes make our constitution differ from one part of our life to another. Still we continue to be the same as we ever were. So this is a proper object for Divine omnipotence. And this will be the return of the soul. Having been deprived of its instrument (i.e., body), it was prevented from experiencing physical pains and pleasures. Now, that a similar instrument is given to it again, this is return in the truest sense of the word.

Their contention that the infinity of the souls and the finitude of Matters make resurrection impossible is absurd and groundless. It is based on the eternity of the world, and the perpetual succession of rotatory motion. But one who does not believe in the eternity of the world considers the number of souls departed from bodies to be finite and commensurable with the number of existing Matters. Even if it is granted that the number of souls is larger, God has the power to create anew any number of Matters. To deny such power is to deny that He can bring anything into existence. And that position has been refuted in the problem of the

origin of the world.

As regards the next cause of impossibility – viz., similarity to the doctrine of Metempsychosis—let there be no dispute over words. Whatever religion teaches us we must believe, even if it is the doctrine of Metempsychosis. However, we reject that doctrine as far as this world is concerned. But resurrection we cannot reject, whether it is or is not the same thing as Metempsychosis.

Your assertion that every constitution which is prepared for the reception of a soul is entitled to the origination of a soul from the Principles implies that it is nature, not will, which explains the origin of a soul. And this has been refuted in the problem of the origin of the world. How is it that you do not find it contradictory to your principles even to say that the origination of a soul is called forth, and that (no soul existing there at the time) one is brought into existence for the first time? It remains for you to say

> Why, then, did it not get connected with constitutions prepared (for the reception of the soul) in the wombs, before resurrection, even in this world of ours?

The answer will be: Perhaps departed souls require preparations of a different kind, and the causes of such preparations are not complete until the time of resurrection. And it is not improbable that the preparation required by the perfect souls which have departed from bodies should be different from the one required by souls which have come into existence for the first time, and which have not derived perfection from directing the body for a while. And God (exalted be He) best knows such requirements: their causes, and the times of their presence. Since religion introduced these things, and because these things are possible, it is necessary for us to assent to them.

(2)

In the second place, they say:

It is beyond the power of anyone to transform iron into a textile fabric, so that it may be used as a turban. Such a thing would not happen until the parts of iron broke up in-

to elements. The causes which govern iron should first reduce it to simple elements. The elements should be recombined and passed through various phases of development so as to acquire the form of cotton. Cotton should acquire the form of yarn. Yarn should acquire a definite texture—viz., the texture of the particular piece of cloth. It is absurd to say that iron can become a turban made of cotton, without gradual passage through these phases.

No doubt, it may occur to man that gradual transformation through many phases may be brought about in the minimum of time, the length of which may not be perceived by man. Consequently, he will suppose that the whole thing happened all of a sudden.

This having been understood, if follows that if the resurrected man's body were to be made merely of a stone, or a ruby, or a pearl, he would not be a man. He cannot conceivably be called a man, unless he has acquired a particular shape, resulting from the composition of bones, nerves, flesh, cartilage, humours, and the simple parts which precede the compound ones. There can be no body without organic parts: no composite organic parts without bones and flesh and nerves: no simple constituents like the bones and flesh and nerves without the humours; and the four humours cannot exist, unless their Matters are furnished by food. There can be no food without animals and plants, which are the sources of meat and vegetables. There can be no animals and plants, unless the four elements mix together under certain conditions which are far too many to be analysed by us. It is, therefore, clear that unless all these things are there, the re-emergence of a body, to which the soul might return, is not possible. And the causes of these things are many. Let us ask: "Is it possible that dust should become man, when only the word 'Be' is addressed to it?" No, it is necessary that the causes of its gradual transformation through various phases should operate. And the causes are: (a) fertilisation of a womb by a drop which comes out of the marrow of a man's body: (b) this drop is assisted by the blood of the menses and by food for a while: (c) then it grows to be a lump: (d) then a clot: (e) then an embryo: (f) then an infant: (g) then a youth; and (h) then an old man. So it is unintelligible that the whole thing should be achieved merely by uttering the word 'Be.' For no words can be addressed to

dust; and its becoming a man without passing through these phases is impossible. And its passing through these phases, without the operation of certain causes, is impossible. Therefore, resurrection is impossible.

Objection:

We agree that gradual transformation through these phases is necessary, if dust is to become man, just as it is necessary if iron is to become a turban. For if iron remains iron, it cannot be a piece of cloth. It must have become cotton which is spun and woven. But the transition may possibly take an instant, or any other length of time. It has not been explained to us whether the resurrection will take the shortest time possible, or any other length of time. The collecting of bones: then clothing them with flesh, and causing the whole thing to grow will take a long time. So this is not the question at issue. What requires consideration is whether the progress through these phases can be brought about by mere power operating without intermediaries, or by one of the natural causes. Now, to us both are possible, as we have shown in the first problem of Physics, where we discussed the nature of the regular course of events, claiming that things observed to be connected with each other are not necessarily connected, and that a departure from the regular course of events is possible. So these things may be brought about by Divine omnipotence, even when their causes do not exist.

Secondly, we might say that although these things depend on a cause, still it is not one of the conditions for them that the cause should be well known. Nay, the treasure-house of things to which Divine power extends includes mysterious and wonderful things which have not been discovered by man. Their existence can be denied only by such a person as believes that only those things exist which he has observed. This is like some people's rejection of magic, sorcery, talismanic arts, and the miraculous deeds performed by prophets or saints. All these things are generally agreed to be established facts, owing their origin to some mysterious causes which cannot be discovered by all men. Suppose that there is a man who has never seen how a lodestone attracts iron. If he is told of it, he will not believe it. "For," he will say, "it is inconceivable that a piece of iron should be

attracted, unless there were a thread tied to it to draw it." Such a thing is what from his experience he understands attraction to mean. But when he himself will observe magnetic attraction, it will fill him with wonder. And then he will come to know how his own knowledge had failed to encompass the mysterious effects of Omnipotence.

Similarly, when these atheists, who deny resurrection, will themselves be resurrected and enabled to see the wonderful things created by God, they will repent themselves of their disbelief—and repentance will not avail them! It will be said to them: "This is what you used to disbelieve"—like one who disbelieves mysterious properties and things. Suppose that a man is created in such a way that he is gifted with a mature intellect even at the time of birth. If you say to him:

> This sperm-drop, which is dirty and whose parts are homogeneous, will develop in the womb into various organs made of flesh and nerves and bones and muscles and cartilages and fat. Thus it will have eyes which will consist of seven different strata of constitution; and the tongue and the teeth whose softness and hardness make them so different from each other, in spite of their contiguity; and so on to all other wonders of human nature.

then, having heard of all these things, such a person will deny them more emphatically than was done by the atheists who said: "Are we going to be brought back to life, when we are rotten bones?" He who rejects the possibility of resurrection does not reflect whence he came to know that the causes of existence are limited to his own observation. It is not improbable that the method of the revivification of bodies should be different from anything ever observed by him. Some of the traditions say that at the time of resurrection it will rain, and that the raindrops will be like sperm-drops. So these drops will mix up with dust to beget human bodies. It is not improbable that the Divine causes should include something of this kind which it is not possible for us to discover, and that such a thing should call forth the resurrection of bodies and their capacity for the reception of reassembled souls. Can there be any ground for the rejection of such a possibility, other than the mere assumption of improbability?

(3)

If it is said:

The Divine action has one unchangeable and recurrent pattern. For this reason, He has said: "The execution of Our purpose is but a single act, like the twinkling of an eye." Further, He says: "Thou canst not find any change in the ways of God." If the causes, which you have imagined to be possible, existed, then it would be necessary for them to come into operation over and over again. This recurrence would be infinite; and the existing system of emergence and development in the universe would also be infinite. Recurrence and revolution having been granted, it is not improbable that once in every millennium the pattern of things should change. But this change itself must be perpetually along the same lines; for the ways of God do not change.

And now to pass on to space. The Divine action proceeds from the Divine will. The Divine will has no specific direction. If it had a specific direction, its system would change because of the difference of dimensions. But the will having no specific direction, whatever proceeds from it governs the First and the Last in like manner—as we see in all causes and effects.

So if you admit the possibility of the perpetuity of development and procreation on the basis of what is observed at present, or admit the possibility of the return of this pattern, after however long a time, according to the law of recurrence and revolution, then you will have precluded the Judgment, the Hereafter, and any other thing of the same kind which follows from the letter of the Sacred Law. For this admission will imply that this existence of ours has been preceded by many a resurrection, as it is to return for many a time afterwards, and this order of precedence and succession will tend to make the series infinite.

But if you say that the Divine *modus operandi* can change into something generically different: that the changed *modus* will never return; and that the duration of possibility can be divided into three periods, namely:

(i) Before the creation of the world, when God was and the world was not;

(ii) After the creation of the world, which brought about the existence of the world together with that of God; and

(iii) The process of resurrection which brings the duration of possibility to an end.

then this view will exclude all uniformity and system; for it makes the Divine *modus* changeable. But that is impossible. It may be possible in the case of a will which changes through a variety of states. But the eternal will has one invariable course. The Divine action partakes of the nature of the Divine will, which has a uniform mode of operation, so that it does not change because of different temporal relations. This (they further assert) is not incompatible with our affirmation that God is omnipotent. We do say that He has the power to effect resurrection, resurgence of life, and all other possible things—in the sense that if He would, He could do them. In order for our statement to be true, it is not a condition that He should be actually doing or willing them. This is like what we mean when we say: "Such and such a person has the power to cut off his own neck, or to burst his own belly." This statement is true, in the sense that the person could do so, if he so would. But we know that he neither wills it, nor does it. And when we say that he neither wills nor does it, we do not contradict the earlier statement that he has the power—in the sense that he could do it, if he so would. As logic explains, the categorical propositions do not contradict the hypothetical. Our statement: "He could do it, if he would," is a hypothetical affirmative proposition. And our statement: "He never willed, nor did," contains two categorical negative propositions. The negative categorical propositions do not contradict the affirmative hypothetical.

So the argument which proves that His will is eternal and unerring also proves that the course of His action must be systematic, and that if sometimes it varies, the variation itself must be systematic and uniform, so as to recur and return perpetually. For no other basis for this variation is possible.

The answer:

This is allied to the theory of the eternity of the world—

viz., that the Divine will is eternal, and therefore the world must be eternal. We have refuted that theory, and shown that reason allows the assumption of three stages—namely,

(i) when God existed and the world did not exist.
(ii) when the world is created: first, to have the order we observe at present; and, next, to have a new order which is promised to exist in paradise and hell.
(iii) when everything disappears, and God alone remains. This assumption is perfectly possible, although religion indicates that the reward and punishment in paradise and hell will be everlasting.

This problem, however formulated, is based on two questions: (a) the origin of the world, and the possibility of the emanation of the temporal from the Eternal; and (b) departure from the regular course of events, either through the creation of effects independent of causes, or through the origination of causes along lines different from the regular course of events. And we have settled both these questions.

CONCLUSION

IF SOMEONE SAYS:

Now that you have analysed the theories of the philosophers, will you conclude by saying that one who believes in them ought to be branded with infidelity and punished with death?

we shall answer:

To brand the philosophers with infidelity is inevitable, so far as three problems are concerned—namely

(i) the problem of the eternity of the world, where they maintained that all the substances are eternal.
(ii) their assertion that Divine knowledge does not encompass individual objects.
(iii) their denial of the resurrection of bodies.

All these three theories are in violent opposition to Islam. To believe in them is to accuse the prophets of falsehood, and to consider their teachings as a hypocritical misrepresentation designed to appeal to the masses. And this is blatant blasphemy to which no Muslim sect would subscribe.

As regards the rest of the problems (e.g., the philosophers' version of Divine attributes, and their doctrine of Unity, etc.), the philosophers' views have close affinity with those of the Mu'tazilah. Indeed, the philosophers' theory of the necessity of natural causes is what the Mu'tazilah have explicitly stated in the doctrine of Necessary Consequences. And the same holds of all other views held by the philosophers (in the rest of the problems). One or another of the Muslim sects has actually reiterated them. So he who would brand the 'innovators' among the Muslims with infidelity can do the same in the case of the philosophers. And he who hesitates to do so in the case of the 'innovators' may hesitate to do so in the case of the philosophers, as far as these questions are concerned. But it is not our purpose to consider whether the Muslim 'innovators' are Muslim, or not. Nor do we intend to inquire

what parts of the 'innovations' are sound or unsound. For that will take us far beyond the scope of this book. And God (exalted be He) is the Giver of the strength to pursue rectitude.

THE END

NOTES

P. 1, *ll. 13-16*: To initiate us . . . by the imagination.

Literal translation: To grant us access, when we have departed from the House of Delusion, to that happiness and delight: that prosperity and success, the summit of which towers above the highest ascent(s) of the understanding(s), and the extremities of which outdistance the range(s) of the darts of the imagination(s).

***ll. 18-20*: "that which no eye ever . . . heart of man."**

Apostolic tradition. The tradition, quoted in full in the *Iḥyā'* (Cairo, I.n.t.h.i.,—1357/1938, p. 3012), reads as follows:

وقال جابر قال لنا رسول الله صلعم الا احدثكم بغرف الجنة ؟ قال قلت بلى يا رسول الله صلى الله عليك بابينا انت و امنا قال ان فى الجنة غرفا من اصناف الجوهر كله يرى ظاهرها من باطنها و باطنها من ظاهرها و فيها من النعيم واللذات والسرور ما لا عين رات ولا اذن سمعت ولا خطر على قلب بشرا (تخريج الحافظ العراق - ابو نعيم من رواية الحسن عن جابر) -

***ll. 35-37*: "turn men . . . to come."**

Qur'ān: XI, 22 (Sale's trans.).

P. 2, *ll. 5-8*: In the second place . . . notions.

Literal translation: And the basis of this disbelief is no other than theoretical inquiries which result from stumbling over the periphery of doubt where one's attention is diverted from the path of rectitude. Also, it results from being inveigled into trivial notions which are as false as the glitter of mirage.

***l. 10*: People of wilful innovations = اهل البدع والاهواء.**

P. 3, *l. 5*: sterile genius.

Literally: tailless genius.

***l. 24*: two fundamental principles.**

Literally: (these) two poles.

P. 4, *l. 12*: for prolixity is their manner.

Reading خطبهم طويل with CE, footnote 4, p. 8 in Bouyges.

***ll. 24-25*: by saying: "Plato . . .**

Aristotle's words are: 'We had perhaps better consider the universal good and discuss thoroughly what is meant by it, although such an inquiry is made an uphill one by the fact that the Forms have been introduced by friends of our own. Yet it would perhaps be thought to be better, indeed to be our duty, for the sake of maintaining the truth even to destroy what touches us closely, especially as we are philosophers or lovers of wisdom; for, while both are dear, piety requires us to honour truth above our friends.' (Section 6, p. 1096 a: *Ethica Nicomachea*, tr. by D. W. Ross.)

Pp. 6-7, *ll. 39-40; 1-3*: The Sun . . . prayer. باب (١٣) لا تنكسف الشمس لموت احد كتاب (١٦) الكسوف.

Apostolic tradition : الجامع الصحيح للبخارى p. 270 in Vol. I of Krehl's ed.

P. 7, *ll. 16-17* : When . . . Him.

Apostolic tradition (?).

P. 8, *ll. 27-30* : I will refute . . . etc.

Lit. trans : I will make their position appear to be impure. It will be cut to pieces through various objections. Sometimes my objections will force them into the position of . . .

P. 10, *ll. 8-12* : In the Art of . . . Intellects.

Is Ghazālī referring to a formal classification actually made by an author (or authors) ? Or is the word 'book' used in the sense of a book in Aristotle's works (i.e., a chapter) ?

l. 18 : Jurists.

The word in the text is اصوليين. Shahrastānī defines اصول as (a) knowledge of the Divine attributes and unity : or (b) just knowledge—the subject of *Kalām*—as distinguished from 'obedience'—the subject of *Fiqh*.

l. 26 : Demonstration.

كتاب البرهان is Aristotle's Posterior Analytics. (See Vbg. p. 75.)

P. 11. Sections vii, viii, ix, xi, xiii : the First (Principle).

Perhaps the Absolute would be a better translation of الاول. But the problems enumerated here are largely concerned with the First Principle.

Pp. 11-12. Sections xiv, xviii, xix :

Reading فى ابطال قولهم with G, H, O, R, footnote 32, p. 19 } in Bouyges.
F, P, V, 42, p. 19
G, N, O, 47, p. 20

P. 12, *l. 18* : Standard of Knowledge.

Reading معيار العلم with E, G, L, M, N, O, V, footnote 7, p. 20 in Bygs.

P. 14, *ll. 32-33*. I should have . . . problem.

Lit. trans. : I would have had to blacken an enormous number of leaves over this problem.

Ghazālī's analysis of the philosophical theories of the world.

The intention expressed in the First Preface (pp. 4-5) does not seem to have been carried out in the present instance.

Usually, Ghazālī's references to the 'ancients' are not very precise : (for instance, see p 22, ll. 13-14). However, his reference to Plato (l. 13 on this page) may be considered to reflect the divergence of views on this point. Aristotle is definitely of the opinion that :

> 'Plato alone asserts the creation of time, saying that it had a becoming with the universe, the universe according to him having had a becoming.'—Physica, p. 251 b, ll. 13-18.

But the passage Aristotle had in mind (Timaeus, 38 B) has been 'interpreted' (in Ghazālī's sense of the word) by as modern a Platonist as A. E. Taylor (see his commentary on Timaeus, p. 184).

Galen's book (l. 16 on this page) was, according to Ibn al-Nadīm, available in Arabic through Thabit (Ibn Qurrah ?)'s translation. (See al-Fihrist, p. 45.)

P. 15, *l. 30* : unless there were a change . . .

Reading من غير تغير امر فى القديم with O, footnote 6 } p. 25 in Byg.
من قدرة with M, O, footnote 7

P. 15, *ll. 30* : most clever.

Ghazālī does not find the argument contemptible, as the Arabic words اخبل or اخيل would suggest. The translation adopted here takes its cue from the Latin heading : Hoc est potissimum argum. (P. 25 in Byg.)

P. 16, *ll. 23-24* : when all the conditions . . . are complete.

Lit. trans. : when it is complete with reference to the conditions of its causality, and with respect to its components and ingredients.

P. 17, *l. 36* : morals.

The word in the text is عادات. In this paragraph, the discussion turns to psychological, as distinguished from physical, causes and effects.

l. 40 ; **p. 18, *ll. 1, 10, 11, 12, 15*** : inclination.

Usually, the word عزم means resolve or determination. The choice of the word 'inclination' to translate it is somewhat arbitrary : but that is the way to express the unusual sense Ghazālī (or the author quoted by him) has given to the word.

P. 18, *ll. 3-4* : an inner agitation . . . an action.

Literally : an agitation inside a man which newly emerges during an action.

ll. 27-28 : the beginning . . . imagined.

Literally : to whose initial phase the Imagination cannot soar.

ll. 37-39 : Or, to use . . . term ?

The judgment questioned here would read : "The eternal will could not (have) originate(d) the world."

P. 19, *ll. 6-8* : And no one would suspect . . . untrue.

Lit. trans. : And there is no doubt concerning the fact that they do not defy the intellect(s) out of malice, and in spite of knowledge to the contrary.

P. 25, *l. 26* : The question . . .

The comparison of the Divine and the human will does not follow as the conclusion from the preceding explanation. Hence the translation made here has got to be somewhat 'independent,' so that هذا may emerge as the object of يحقق.

P. 53, *l. 26* : Principles of Belief.

This is one of the 'books' in the *Iḥyā'*. See pp. 95-130, Vol. I of the *Iḥyā'* in مصطفى البابى ed. of 1358/1939.

P. 54, *l. 35* : Abū Hudhayl al-'Allāf.

The reference embodies a general summary of al-'Allaf's well-known position.

P. 66, *ll. 33-34* : '*does* strike,' '*does* burn,' '*does* cut.'

Lit. trans. would be : does (i e., performs the action of) striking, etc.

P. 80, *ll. 31-33* : I did not . . . creation.

Qur'ān : XVIII, 49.

l. 34 : Qur'ān : XLVIII, 6.

P. 88, *ll 27-28* : Think . . . essence.

حديث ابن عباس ان قوما تفكروا فى الله عز و جل فقال النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم
تفكروا فى خلق الله ولا تتفكروا فى الله فانكم لن تقدروا قدره ابو نعيم فى الحلية بالمرفوع

منه باسناد ضعيف و رواه الاصبهانى فى الترغيب والترهيب من وجه اخر اصح منه و رواه الطبرانى فى الاوسط والبيهقى فى الشعب من حديث امن عمرو و قال هذا اسناد فيه نظر قلت فيه الوازع بن نافع متروك (تخريج الحافظ العراق - احياء العلوم - الجزو الرابع - مطبعة مصطفى البابى - ص ٣١٠) -

P. 99, *l. 11* : definitory formula.

Following is the definition of القول الشارح (ص ٢ الرسالة الشمسية) :

وقد جرت العادة بان يسموالموصل الى التصور قولا شارحا والموصل الى التصديق حجة.

But if the definition of 'man' is included (as it is in the text) in the قول شارح about him, we shall obtain from it something more important than mere تصور.

P. 109, *l. 1* : Problem VI.

Reading المسئلة السادسة فى ابطال مذهبهم فى نفى الصفات with B, I, footnote 1, p. 163 in Byg.

Ghazālī takes up the 'five categories of plurality' (see p. 108, l. 30). Thus, 1 and 3 are discussed in this (VI) problem, 2 in IX, 4 in VII, and 5 in VIII.

P. 145, *l. 6* : Interpellation.

This is Aloys Sprenger's translation of the word استثناء in كتاب كشاف اصطلاحات الفنون which contains his translation of الرسالة الشمسية.

P. 153, *ll. 14-16* : "nothing . . . knowledge."

Qur'ān : XXXIV, 3.

P. 172, *ll. 6-18* :

This paragraph forms the heading in the Arabic text. The present arrangement was found preferable for reasons of proportion and balance.

l. 6 : Preserved Tablet.

Qur'ān : LXXXV, 22.

l. 29 : 'He . . . pen.'

Qur'ān : XCVI, 4.

Pp. 181-182, *ll. 41 ; 1* : the Rod . . . the Moon.

Miracles performed by the prophets Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad respectively.

P. 191, *l. 1* : asbestos.

The dictionary equivalent of طلق is 'amianthus.'

P. 201, *ll. 1-8* : Therefore, the substratum . . . body.

The argument would be coherent if the Arabic sentence read :

وكل جسم فينقسم فدل ان محلها (=محل العلوم العقلية) ليس جسما

This is the form in which the argument is stated in the following syllogism. However, the variants given by Byg. (i.e., R, U, V, Y in footnote 6 on p. 304) support the reading محلها, but do not support ليس جسما.

P. 202, *ll. 11-12* : For if A . . . with C.

Lit. trans. : The meet-er of the meet-er is (itself) a meet-er.

P. 212, *l. 29* : ego.

Literally : 'he-ness.'

P. 217, *ll. 20-23* : For the first water . . . last one.

Lit. trans. : For the first water existed in the second round, and the third is next to the second, and the fourth to the third, and so on to the last one.

P. 231, *l. 40* : would not have reported . . .

Reading . . . حاكيا عن الله . . . قال with G, footnote 4, p 349 in Byg.

P. 232, *ll. 1-2* : "No soul . . . them."

Qur'ān : XXXII, 17.

P. 233, *ll. 19-20* : "Every . . . Lord."

Qurā'n : XIX, 72.

P. 234, *ll. 10-11* : set up . . . god.

Qur'ān : XXV, 45 ; XLV, 22.

ll. 15-16 : "He . . . stunteth it"

Qur'ān : XCI, 9, 10 (Pickthall's trans.).

P. 235, *l. 15* :

Qur'ān : XXXII, 17.

ll. 17-18 : I have . . . saw.

و قوله اعددت لعبادى الصالحين has been interpreted as an evidence of the fact that Ghazālī regards a passage from the Bible ("But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." I. Corinthians, ii, 9) as a Quranic verse. (See D. B. Macdonald's *The Life of al-Ghazālī* . . . — p. 76—in *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XX, 1899.)

On p. 1, where the 'tradition' first occurs, it is not clear what in Ghazālī's view the source of these words might have been But the context in which it occurrs on p. 280 definitely shows that it is a Ḥadīth Qudsī—i.e., an apostolic tradition in which God speaks in the first person (as He does in the Qur'ān). Hence most of the variants given by Boyg (on p. 349 : footnote 4) add words which clarify this position.

In the present instance, the quotation is not a full quotation, but an echo of the quotation on p. 280. So the verse : "No soul . . ." (XXXII, 17) is not given in full, and the tradition occurs in an ambiguous form. This shows that Macdonald's guess is an improbable possibility. And the Biblical source of the words is beside the point. For even if Ghazālī confused some extraneous matter with a Quranic verse, it was a Ḥadīth that he so confused. The Ḥadīth itself might have been borrowed from the Bible. But, then Ghazālī did not approach the Ḥadīth literature from the same point of view as in our times Goldziher did.

P. 241, *ll. 3-5* : "Think . . . provision."

Qur'ān ; III, 163.

ll. 7-9 : "The spirits . . . Throne."

Apostolic tradition. A slightly different version is to be found in Baiḍāwī's Tafsīr :

و ما روى ابن عباس رضى عنهما انه قال (رسول الله) عليه الصلاة والسلام ارواح الشهداء فى اجواف طير خضر ترد انهارالجنة و تاكل من ثمارها و تاوى الى قناديل معلقة فى ظل العرش - (انوارالتنزيل الجزء الثانى ص ٥٣) -

Ḥāfiẓ 'Irāqī has (in his notes on the traditions about Paradise quoted by Ghazālī towards the end of Iḥyā') brought out the two different versions of this