

ON THE ORIGIN OF TWO KEY-TERMS IN  
AL-ĠAZZĀLĪ'S IḤYĀ' 'ULŪM AL-DĪN\*

BY

AVNER GIL'ADI

THE purpose of the following note is to introduce an illustrative example of al-Ġazzālī's selective borrowings from Greek philosophical sources (through Muslim philosophers) and his methods of elaborating the borrowed elements and interweaving them—behind a veil of Muslim terminology—into his mystical writings compiled in the period of his retirement. Our example could serve as another illustration of the statement attributed to Abū Bakr b. al-ʿArabī that al-Ġazzālī «having entered the philosophers' circle never succeeded in extricating himself despite his efforts to do so»<sup>1</sup>.

We shall refer to Aristotelian terminology connected with the classification of sciences, which helped to shape two of the highly significant terms used by al-Ġazzālī in his magnum opus *Iḥyā'*<sup>2</sup> 'Ulūm al-Dīn (compiled apparently between 1096 and 1105)<sup>2</sup>, namely, 'Ilm al-Mukāṣafa (The Science of Revelation and Vision)<sup>3</sup>,

\* This note is based on an introductory part of a chapter in a doctoral dissertation on al-Ġazzālī's educational thought. The dissertation was written in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem under the supervision of Professor H. Lazarus-Yafeh and Professor A.F. Kleinberger, to whom I am greatly indebted. Also, I wish to thank Mr. C. Lynes for improving my English style.

<sup>1</sup> Ibn Taymiyya, *Naqḍ al-Manṭiq*, Cairo, 1951, p. 56. See also: 'Abd al-Rahmān Badawī, «al-Ġazzālī wa-maṣādiruhu al-yūnāniyya», in: *Abū Hāmid al-Ġazzālī fī al-dīkrā al-miawīyya al-tāsi'a li-milādihi*, Cairo, 1962, p. 221 ff. The difference between Badawī's examples and ours is that the latter draws attention to al-Ġazzālī's borrowings from Aristotelian technical terminology in his «Sūfī period» whereas Badawī's examples deal with the influence of Neo-Platonic concepts on his writings during the same years. See also: H. Lazarus-Yafeh, *Studies in al-Ghazzālī*, Jerusalem, 1975, pp. 264-266; M.A. Sherif, *Ghazālī's Theory of Virtue*, New York, 1975, chs. 2,5.

<sup>2</sup> G.F. Hourani, «A Revised Chronology of Ghazālī's Writings», *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104 (1984), p. 296.

<sup>3</sup> F. Jabre, *Essai sur le lexique de Ghazālī*, Beirut, 1970, pp. 245-246. The term is rendered «dévoilement» by Jabre and explained as follows: «a) Sens subjectif: Le dévoilement en tant qu'acte de connaissance...b) Sens objectif: les vérités, objets du dévoilement...» See also: idem, *La notion de certitude selon Ghazālī*, Paris, 1958, pp. 144, 184, 220, 372 and Lazarus-Yafeh, *Al-Ghazzālī*, pp. 357-360.

*Arabica*, tome XXXVI, 1989

and *‘Ilm al-Mu<sup>6</sup>āmalā* (The Science of Behaviour and Relationship)<sup>4</sup>. The fact that *‘Ilm al-Mukāšafa* and *‘Ilm al-Mu<sup>6</sup>āmalā* are central to the thought of al-Ġazzālī is immediately apparent from the introduction to the *Ihyā’*:

«...The science by which we approach the hereafter is divided into the science of practical religion (*‘Ilm al-Mu<sup>6</sup>āmalā*) and the science of revelation (*‘Ilm al-Mukāšafa*). By the science of revelation I mean knowledge (of the metaphysical truths) and only knowledge. By the science of practical religion I mean knowledge as well as action in accordance with that knowledge. This work (*Ihyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn*) will deal only with the science of practical religion, and not with revelation, which one is not permitted to record in writing, although it is the ultimate aim of saints and the desire of the eyes (i.e. of consideration and meditation) of the sincere. The science of practical religion is merely a path which leads to revelation and only through that path did the prophets of God communicate with the people and lead them to Him...»<sup>5</sup>

During the period of his retirement, when the *Ihyā’* was compiled, al-Ġazzālī considered *‘Ilm al-Mukāšafa* to be the aim of the earthly life of the chosen believers. It is acquired by refinement and purification of the soul, and eventually by revelation—not merely by formal education. Sometimes al-Ġazzālī even identifies this degree of knowledge with the eternal happiness of the Hereafter<sup>6</sup>. Despite al-Ġazzālī’s declaration that he would not discuss *‘Ilm al-Mukāšafa* in the *Ihyā’*, the subject is sporadically referred to, at times in detail, in *Kitāb al-‘Ilm* as well as in other books of the collection<sup>7</sup>. The explicit aim of the *Ihyā’* was, however, the discussion of *‘Ilm al-Mu<sup>6</sup>āmalā* only and that aim shaped the structure of the work as a whole<sup>8</sup>. In any case, the view that all religious knowledge may be

<sup>4</sup> Jabre, *Essai*, pp. 209-210. Translating *mu<sup>6</sup>āmalā* as «transaction», Jabre distinguishes between two levels: «a) Dans les relations des hommes entre eux: terme juridique, b) Sens technique religieux...le sens est assez proche de ‘pratique religieuse culturelle’». See also: Lazarus-Yafeh, *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ġazzālī, *Ihyā’ ‘Ulūm al-dīn*. Cairo, 1967, vol.1, p. 12. Translation: N.A. Faris, *The Book of knowledge*, Lahore, 1962, p. 6. See also: A. Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, North Carolina, 1975, p. 193.

<sup>6</sup> Al-Ġazzālī, *Ihyā’*, vol. 4, pp. 170-171.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, *ibid*, vol.1, pp. 32-33 and also: Lazarus-Yafeh, *Al-Ghazzālī*, p. 363.

<sup>8</sup> The *Ihyā’* was arranged, as explained in the introduction, according to the contents of *‘Ilm al-Mu<sup>6</sup>āmalā* and its extensions. That *‘Ilm*, which is intended to guide the believer to the proper form of religious activity, concerns the exterior aspects of man’s behaviour, i.e. «the acts of the limbs» in the realm of worship (*‘Ibāda*) and social affairs (*‘Āda*). But it also deals with the interior aspects of behaviour, namely, the positive and negative characteristics of the soul. Accordingly, the *Ihyā’* is divided into four parts: The first, dealing with the acts of worship (*‘Ibādāt*) and their inner meaning, the second, dealing with the religious com-

classified as either purely theoretical or practical is central to al-Ġazzālī's thought. As is mentioned above, our aim is to draw attention to the relationship between this concept and the Aristotelian classification of the sciences.

According to the latter system, the sciences are divided into the «Theoretical», the «Practical» and the «Poetical»<sup>9</sup>. The «Theoretical Sciences» include physics, mathematics<sup>10</sup> and metaphysics. The «Practical Sciences» comprise ethics, economics, and politics. Logic is regarded as an «organon» or «tool» i.e. merely an auxiliary science.

Some of the ways in which the Aristotelian system was transmitted from Greek culture to that of medieval Islam have recently been discussed by Dimitri Gutas<sup>11</sup>. What is to be stressed here, by way of introduction to our main thesis, is the far reaching influence of the Aristotelian model of the classification of the sciences on Muslim theologians and philosophers in the Middle Ages. This influence is clearly reflected in their writings, although naturally with certain cultural adaptations. Traces of the Aristotelian system are clearly discernible, for example, in the writings of al-Fārābī, who—in his *Tanbīh ʿalā Sabīl al-Saʿāda*—divides the sciences into *al-ʿUlūm al-Nazariyya* (theoretical sciences) and *al-ʿUlūm al-ʿAmaliyya wa-l-Falsafiyya al-Madaniyya* (practical and political sciences)<sup>12</sup>.

---

mandments concerning interpersonal and social relations (*ʿAdāt*) and their inner meanings, the third discussing the blameworthy characteristics of the heart, those that cause the destruction of their possessors (*Muhlikāt*), and finally, the fourth part, treating those praiseworthy qualities that bring their possessor nearer to God and save him from Hell (*Munḡiyāt*). See: *Iḥyā*, vol. 1, pp. 11-12.

<sup>9</sup> L. Gardet, M. Anawati, *Introduction à la théologie musulmane*, Paris, 1948, p. 97; H.A. Wolfson, «The Classification of Sciences in Medieval Jewish Philosophy» in: Idem, *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion*, Harvard, 1973, pp. 493-495. For a full description of the system see: Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Miskawayh, *Kitāb al-Saʿāda*, Cairo, 1928, pp. 49 ff.

<sup>10</sup> In the fifth century A.D., mathematics had been divided by Ammonius Hermiae into arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music, all of which came to be the medieval quadrivium. See: Wolfson, *ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> D. Gutas, «Paul the Persian on the Classification of the Parts of Aristotle's Philosophy: A Milestone between Alexandria and Baghdad», *Der Islam* 60 (1983), pp. 231-267. See also: Wolfson, *ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī, *Kitāb al-Tanbīh ʿalā Sabīl al-Saʿāda* in: *Rasāʾil al-Fārābī*, Haydarabād, 1926, p. 20. See also: Wolfson, *ibid.*

In *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿUlūm*, a book intended to aid students by classifying and defining the essence and purpose of the sciences, al-Fārābī adds to the aforementioned basic scheme, the sciences of language and logic, which must be mastered before delving into other sciences, and appends *Fiqh* and *Kalām* to the science of politics. Ethics

Similarly, in Ibn Sīnā's *Aqsām al-ʿUlūm* purely theoretical sciences are distinguished from practical ones<sup>13</sup>. Another example is al-Ḥawārizmī's *Mafātīḥ al-ʿUlūm*, where the «Foreigners' Sciences» are divided into *Ġuzʾ Naẓarī* and *al-Falsafa al-ʿAmaliyya*<sup>14</sup>.

It is thus clear that the Aristotelian system was assimilated into general Muslim thought and, at times, into the common classification of the sciences into «Arabic» and «Foreign». The «Poetical

---

was included in the chapter on politics, while economics was entirely omitted (as also in the *Tanbīḥ*). See: Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī, *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿUlūm*, Cairo, 1946, pp. 43-44. See also ʿUtmān Amīn's introduction to the *Iḥṣāʾ* pp. 11-13.

Al-Fārābī, in contrast to other Muslim thinkers such as al-Ḥawārizmī and Ibn al-Nadīm (see below), does not emphasise the merits of the «Religious Sciences» at the expense of the others. Nor does he discuss them in the opening chapters of his book or even devote equal space to those parts of his book discussing «Religious and Arabic Sciences», on the one hand, and the «Sciences of the Ancients» on the other. His system is, instead, more universal, and for this reason was adopted by medieval Jewish as well as Christian thinkers. See: Gardet, Anawati, *Théologie Musulmane*, pp. 105-106.

<sup>13</sup> Abū ʿAlī Ibn Sīnā, *Aqsām al-ʿUlūm al-ʿAqliyya*, in: *Maḡmūʿat al-Rasāʾil*, Cairo, 1328, pp. 227-230: «Wisdom (science and philosophy) is divided into a purely theoretical part and a practical part. The purpose of the theoretical section is the acquisition of certain knowledge of the state of everything in existence, that is, of objects whose existence is not dependent on human acts. The purpose is then the acquisition of an idea only... The aim of the practical part, on the other hand, is not the acquisition of certain knowledge of the objects which exist, but the acquisition of a correct idea of the objects of the human activity in order to achieve the good. Thus, the purpose is not the acquisition of an idea only but of an idea in order to act (in accordance with it). (In conclusion): The aim of the theoretical part is the truth, and the aim of the practical part is the good...»

Compare with al-Gazzālī's definition of *ʿIlm al-Mukāṣafa* and *ʿIlm al-Muʿāmalā* above, p. 1. See also Ibn Sīnā, *ʿUyūn al-Ḥikma* (ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Badawī), Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, 1954, pp. 16-17. On Ibn Sīnā's classification of sciences see: G.C. Anawati, «Classification des sciences et structure de *summae* chez les auteurs musulmans», *Revue des Études Islamique*, 1976, pp. 62-66. See also: Miskawayh, *al-Saʿāda*, p. 46; G. von Grunebaum, *Islam, Essays in the Nature and Growth of a Cultural Tradition*, London, 1969, p. 117; Sherif, *Ghazālī's Theory of Virtue*, p. 5.

<sup>14</sup> ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Ḥawārizmī, *Kitāb Mafātīḥ al-ʿUlūm* (ed. G. van Vloten) Leiden, 1895, pp. 131-133 (*al-faṣl al-awwal fī aqsām al-falsafa*). But the plan of the book as a whole (pp. 5-7) is not based on the classification of the sciences described in this chapter.

*Mafātīḥ al-ʿUlūm* was compiled in the second half of the 10th century A.D. to serve as a lexicon and introduction to the sciences for the Caliphate's officials. In it, the sciences are divided into «Religious Sciences»—*ʿUlūm Šarʿiyya* (including the «Arabic Sciences»): Jurisprudence, theology, grammar, the art of composition, poetry and history, and the «Foreigners' Sciences»—*ʿUlūm al-ʿAḡam*. These, in turn, are divided into the «Theoretical Part» (*al-Ġuzʾ al-Naẓarī*) and the «Practical Part» (*al-Falsafa al-ʿAmaliyya*). The first part includes physics, mathematics and theology (metaphysics); the second consists of ethics (*ʿIlm al-Aḥlāq*), economics (*Tadbīr al-Manzil*) and politics (*Siyāsāt al-Madīna wa-l-Umma wa-l-Mulk*).

Sciences» were generally included in the first division, the «Theoretical» and «Practical» in the second division. The influence of the Aristotelian classification is evident even when it had undergone certain changes in the process of assimilation, e.g., the inclusion of logic on an equal footing with the rest of the sciences, or the differing subdivision of some of the scientific branches<sup>15</sup>.

Al-Ġazzālī himself was certainly acquainted with the Aristotelian classification of sciences. This is initially reflected in his presentation of the «Philosophical Sciences», for example, in *Maqāṣid al-Falāsifa*, where *al-ʿIlm al-Ḥikmī* is divided into «Practical» and «Theoretical» parts<sup>16</sup>. But al-Ġazzālī went a notable step further when he integrated the Aristotelian dichotomy—in parts of his later writings—into the context of Islamic religious sciences. It would be maintained that the Aristotelian influence is more obvious in works from earlier stages of his career, for example, in *Mīzān al-ʿAmal*. Later on, when the *Iḥyāʾ* was compiled, the philosophical terminology for the classification of the religious sciences is replaced by an Islamic one, but even here its philosophical origin is not entirely erased. Obviously, this argument is based on the assumption that the *Mīzān* was written no later than 1095 A.D., at the end of the first Baġdād period of al-Ġazzālī's life, before the compilation of the *Iḥyāʾ*<sup>17</sup>. This chronology is further strengthened by our argument, which is based on a comparison of the relevant terms in *Mīzān* and in *Kitāb al-ʿIlm (Iḥyāʾ)*, vol. I, book I).

<sup>15</sup> See: Von Grunebaum, *ibid*, p. 116, Wolfson, «Science», pp. 493-495.

<sup>16</sup> Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ġazzālī, *Maqāṣid al-Falāsifa* (ed. S. Dunyā), Cairo, 1961, p. 134, and see also: Sherif, *Ghazālī's Theory of Virtue*, pp. 4-5.

The inclusion of logic among the «Theoretical Sciences» is characteristic of al-Ġazzālī, who seems to have been impressed by logic more than by any other branch of philosophy. He was, therefore, much engaged with it and devoted an entire treatise to it, namely, *Mīʿyār al-ʿIlm*. But although he classified logic among the «Theoretical Sciences», he considered it an «Organon»—merely a tool of reasoning. See: Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ġazzālī, *al-Munqid min al-Ḍalāl*, Beirut, 1967, pp. 81-83. See also: W.M. Watt, *Muslim Intellectual*, Edinburgh, 1963, pp. 68-69; M.E. Marmura, «Ghazālī's Attitude to the Secular Sciences and Logic» in: G.H. Hourani (ed.), *Essays on Islamic Philosophy and Science*, Albany, 1975, pp. 102-103; von Grunebaum, *Islam*, p. 119. On the general attitude towards logic in medieval Islam see: F. Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant*, Leiden, 1970, pp. 203 ff.

<sup>17</sup> G.F. Hourani, «A Revised Chronology of Ghazālī's Writings», pp. 289-302; Lazarus-Yafeh, *al-Ghazzālī*, p. 259, note 1; Sherif, *Ghazālī's Theory of Virtue*, pp. 170-176.

In the chapter in the *Mizān* on the «kind of knowledge and act which leads the believer to paradise»<sup>18</sup>, al-Ġazzālī still generally uses the terminology in common with al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā for the classification of the sciences, but with some changes in the description of their contents. The sciences are first divided into «Theoretical» (*al-ʿIlm al-Nazarī*) and «Practical» (*al-ʿIlm al-ʿAmalī*). The latter division is subclassified, in accordance with the Aristotelian scheme, into ethics, economics and politics. But in contrast to the latter scheme, which places politics at the pinnacle of the «Practical Sciences», al-Ġazzālī substitutes ethics for politics and describes its contents in Islamic-Šūfī terms: «...*ʿIlm al-naḥs bi-ṣiḡātihā wa-aḡlāqihā wa-huwa l-riyāda wa-muḡāḡadat al-hawā*». [«(Ethics is) the knowledge of the soul's characteristics and it is the (knowledge concerning) training (of the soul) and the struggle against the desires»]; «...*wa-aḡamm ḡāḡihī l-ṡalāṡa ṡaḡḡib al-naḥs wa-siḡāsat al-badan*». [«The most important of these three (i.e. ethics, economics and politics) is the refinement of the soul and the control of the being (i.e. ethics)»]<sup>19</sup>. Al-Ġazzālī's emphasis upon ethics here is understandable when we recall that the main purpose of the *Mizān* is the examination and evaluation of human deeds (*ʿAmal*), which, together with knowledge (*ʿIlm*), may lead the individual to a state of eternal happiness<sup>20</sup>. The essence of human action, according to the *Mizān*, is the «training of one's soul, its restraint, and its subordination to the rule of the intelligence»<sup>21</sup>. «Theoretical Science», also, is defined in the *Mizān* in philosophical terms, but its subdivision and the description of its contents differ rather widely from the Aristotelian system of classifying the sciences. In the *Mizān*, the three components of this science are replaced by metaphysics alone, the aspects of which are represented in pure Islamic terms: «*Al-ʿilm bi-llāḡ wa-ṣiḡātihī wa-malāʿikatihi wa-kutubihī wa-rusulihī wa-malakūt al-samawāt wa-l-arḡ wa-aḡāʿib al-nuḡūs al-insāniyya wa-l-ḡayawāniyya...*»<sup>22</sup> [«The knowledge of God, His attributes, His angels, His books and

<sup>18</sup> Abū Ḥāmid Muḡammad al-Ġazzālī, *Mizān al-ʿAmal*, Cairo, 1973, pp. 52-55.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, p. 53, and see: Sherif, *ibid*, p.7.

<sup>20</sup> al-Ġazzālī, *Mizān*, p. 11.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid*, p. 21 and see: Sherif, *ibid*.

<sup>22</sup> al-Ġazzālī, *Mizān*, p. 52 and see below. The Aristotelian scheme is reflected also in the definition of human virtues in the *Mizān*. These are divided into a) the «Theoretical Virtues» (*al-ḡadāʿil al-maḡṣūra ḡi ḡann naḡarī*), namely «a good intellect» and «capacity to discriminate» and b) «Practical Virtues» (*al-ḡadāʿil al-maḡṣūra ḡi ḡann ʿamalī*), primarily, fine characteristics of the soul. See: *ibid*, pp. 69-70.

messengers and the knowledge of the wonders of human and animal souls...»

In considering *Kitāb al-ʿIlm* we arrive at our central point, namely, that the Aristotelian system (in its Islamic-philosophical elaboration) affected even the terminology used in *Ihyā' ʿUlūm al-Dīn*, the most comprehensive and detailed presentation of the theories of orthodox Sufism. This fact is well represented, e.g., in the first book of the *Ihyā'*, which despite the absence of the Islamic philosophical terminology used in the *Mizān*, reflects the essentially Aristotelian dichotomy between the two main branches of knowledge by dividing the «Religious Sciences» into *ʿIlm al-Muʿāmalā* and *ʿIlm al-Mukāšafa*<sup>23</sup>. Both these expressions represent a combination of early Šūfī terms—*Muʿāmalā*, *Mukāšafa*<sup>24</sup> and the Arabic-philosophical terms designating the main subdivisions of human knowledge—*ʿIlm Naẓarī*, *ʿIlm ʿAmalī*. A comparison of the content of the term *ʿIlm al-Mukāšafa* in *Kitāb al-ʿIlm* with those of *al-ʿIlm al-Naẓarī* in the *Mizān* proves that the terms are in fact generally identical, in spite of some differences:

*al-ʿIlm al-Naẓarī*:

«...al-ʿilm bi-llāh wa-ṣifātihi wa-malāʾikātihi wa-kutubihi wa-rusulihi wa-malakūt al-samāwāt waʾl-arḍ wa-ʿağāʾib al-naḥs al-insāniyya waʾl-ḥayāwaniyya min ḥaytu annahā murtabaṭa bi-quḍrat allāh ʿazza wa-ğalla, la min ḥaytu dawātuha. Faʾl-maqṣūd al-aqṣā al-ʿilm bi-llāh wa-malāʾikat allāh, lā budda min maʿrifatihim li-annahum wāsiṭa bayna llāh wa-bayna l-nabiyy, wa-kaḍā maʿrifat al-nubuwwa waʾl-nabī wāsiṭa bayna l-ḥalq waʾl-malāʾika...wa-hakaḍā yatasalsalu ilā āḥir al-ʿulūm al-naẓariyya wa-ğayātuḥa wa-aqṣāhā al-ʿilm bi-llāh ʿazza wa-ğalla»<sup>25</sup>.

*ʿIlm al-Mukāšafa*:

«...al-maʿrifa l-ḥaqīqiyya bi-dāt allāh subḥānahu wa-bi-ṣifātihi l-bāqiyāt al-tāmmāt wa-bi-afʿālihi wa-bi-ḥukmihi fī ḥalq al-dunyā waʾl-āḥira wa-wağḥ tartibihi liʾl-āḥira ʿalā l-dunyā; waʾl-maʿrifa li-maʿnā l-nubuwwa waʾl-nabī wa-maʿnā l-waḥy wa-maʿnā l-ṣaytān wa-maʿnā lafẓ al-malāʾika waʾl-ṣaytān...waʾl-maʿrifa bi-malakūt al-samāwāt waʾl-arḍ wa-maʿrifat al-qalb wa-kayfiyyat taṣāḍum ġunūd al-malāʾika waʾl-ṣaytān fihi...wa-maʿrifat al-āḥira wa-ʿaḍāb al-qabr waʾl-ṣirāṭ waʾl-mizān waʾl-ḥisāb...»<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See notes 3, 4 above.

<sup>24</sup> For *Muʿāmalā* see, e.g. al-Ḥarrāz, *Kitāb al-Farāğ*, in: Qāsim al-Samarrāʾī (ed.), *Rasāʾil al-Ḥarrāz*, Bağdād, 1967, p. 39; Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī, *Qūt al-Qulūb*, Cairo, 1961, part 1, p. 8, part 2, p. 261. For *Mukāšafa* see, e.g.: al-Ḥusayn Ibn Maṣṣūr al-Ḥallāğ, *Kitāb al-Taḥāsīn*, (ed. L. Massignon), Paris, 1913, p. 48; ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Quṣayrī, *al-Risāla l-Quṣayriyya fī ʿIlm al-Taṣawwuf*, Cairo, 1948, p. 40; Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāğ, *Kitāb al-Lumaʿ fī l-Taṣawwuf* (ed. R.A. Nicholson), Leiden, 1914, p. 70.

<sup>25</sup> al-Ğazzālī, *Mizān*, p. 52.

<sup>26</sup> al-Ğazzālī, *Ihyā'*, vol. 1, pp. 32-33.

## [Theoretical Science:

«...The knowledge of Allāh, His attributes, His angels, His books and His messengers, the knowledge of the kingdom of heaven and earth, the knowledge of the wonders of the animal as well as the human soul as entities related to God's strength, not as independent ones. The goal of knowledge is the knowledge of God. Knowledge of God's angels who serve as mediators between Allāh and the Prophet is inevitable. So is also knowledge of the prophecy and the Prophet, the latter being the mediator between angels and creatures... So the sciences branch down to the least of the theoretical sciences, the object of them all being the knowledge of Allāh may be He exalted...»]

## [The Science of Revelation:

«...The true knowledge of Allāh's essence, of His eternal and perfect attributes, of His acts and wisdom in creating this world and the Hereafter; it is knowledge of the reason for the preference of the Hereafter in relation to the earthly world, Knowledge of the meaning of the prophecy, the Prophet and the revelation as well as that of the devil and the expressions 'angels' and 'devils'... it is knowledge of the kingdom of heaven and earth, knowledge of the heart and the struggle of the agents of the angels and of the devil within it; knowledge of the Hereafter, Paradise, and Hell, knowledge of the punishment after death, the bridge, the scales and the judgement...»]

On the other hand, a comparison of the definition of *ʿIlm al-Muʿāmalā* (*Kitāb al-ʿIlm*) with that of *al-ʿIlm al-ʿAmalī* (*Mīzān al-ʿAmal*) brings to light a widening gap between the Aristotelian and the Ḡazzalian system in the *Iḥyāʾ*<sup>27</sup>. As mentioned above, all the branches of the «Practical Sciences» are presented in the *Mīzān*, though the importance of ethics is specially emphasised. The situation is quite different in *Kitāb al-ʿIlm*, where economics and politics are entirely omitted<sup>27</sup>.

Also, we may readily discern the stages of al-Ḡazzālī's elaboration of the Aristotelian classification of the sciences by comparing parallel chapters, i.e., those in which the same subjects are dealt with, in the *Mīzān* on the one hand, and in *Kitāb al-ʿIlm* on the other. For example, a comparison of the chapters on the «Duties of Students and Teachers», appearing in both books, and especially the sections devoted to the classification of the science and the curriculum, supports our supposition that the *Mīzān* clearly reflects the influence of the Aristotelian scheme upon both terminology and contents, though some indications of Islamic elaboration are already recognizable. In *Kitāb al-ʿIlm*, however, the Aristotelian scheme is veiled behind pure Islamic terminology, though it continues to play an important role. In the section on the «Fourth Duty

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 33-34. See also: Sherif, *Ghazālī's Theory of Virtue*, p. 11.

of the Student» in *Mizān*, al-Ġazzālī appeals to «those who indulge in the study of theoretical sciences», using the philosophical term *al-ʿUlūm al-Naẓariyya*<sup>28</sup>, while in the parallel section in *Kitāb al-ʿIlm* he avoids this term, replacing it with a religious term similar to *ʿIlm al-Mukāṣafa*, namely, *ʿUlūm al-Āhira* («The Sciences of the Hereafter»)²⁹. In another section of the *Mizān*, dealing with the students' duty to be acquainted with the various sciences, including their subdivisions and ramifications, the third group of the sciences is divided into two parts, according to the Aristotelian classification: «Pure Theoretical Science» (*ʿIlmī Muğarrad* also termed *ʿUlūm Naẓariyya*) and «Practical Science» (*ʿAmalī*)³⁰. Admittedly, «Theoretical Science» is identified here with metaphysics only, while its other two components, mathematics and physics, are omitted (see above) and its contents are defined by Islamic terminology: *maʿrifat allāh wa-maʿrifat al-malāʾika waʾl-anbiyāʾ* [«The knowledge of God, His angels and His prophets»]. In defining the «Practical Sciences» al-Ġazzālī uses Islamic terminology as well, but the relation to the Aristotelian subdivision is clear: *wa-amma l-ʿamalī fa-hiya l-aḥkām al-ṣarʿiyya waʾl-ʿulūm al-fiqhiyya waʾl-sunan al-nabawiyya wa-dālika maʿrifat siyāsāt al-naḥs maʿa l-aḥlāq... wa-tadbīr ahl al-bayt waʾl-wuld waʾl-maṭʿam waʾl-malbas wa-kayfiyyat al-maʿīša waʾl-muʿāmalā...*³¹ [«Practical Science includes (a discussion of) the laws of the Ṣarʿa, sciences of jurisprudence and the Prophet's way of life. (The knowledge of all these guarantees) the knowledge of how to control the soul and (how to refine) its characteristics (i.e. ethics)...and managing family life, namely, children, food, cloths and livelihood (i.e. economics)»]. Politics is not mentioned³². In the parallel section in *Kitāb al-ʿIlm*, however, al-Ġazzālī decisively avoids the philosophical terminology and subdivision of the sciences and mentions only the Islamic-Šūfī terms *ʿIlm al-Mukāṣafa* and *ʿIlm al-Muʿāmalā*³³.

It should be mentioned here that the Aristotelian dichotomy is reflected also in some of al-Ġazzālī's writings compiled after the *Iḥyāʾ* and in various contexts. Thus, for example, in *Kitāb al-Imlāʾ*

<sup>28</sup> al-Ġazzālī, *Mizān*, p. 129.

<sup>29</sup> al-Ġazzālī, *Iḥyāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 73.

<sup>30</sup> al-Ġazzālī, *Mizān*, p. 134.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid*, p. 135.

<sup>32</sup> Compare with *Mizān*, p. 53.

<sup>33</sup> al-Ġazzālī, *Iḥyāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 76-78.

*fi Iṣkālāt al-Iḥyā'*<sup>34</sup> al-Ġazzālī classifies the professions according to the Aristotelian system of classification of the sciences into «Theoretical» and «Practical»: *Wa'l-ṣanā'i' alā ḍarbayn—'ilmiyya wa-'amaliyya*<sup>35</sup>. Also, in *Ġawāhir al-Qur'ān*<sup>36</sup>, the second part is divided into two sections: *al-Qism al-'Ilmī* («The Theoretical Section») including a list of Quranic verses dealing with metaphysical subjects, such as the essence of God, His attributes and acts, and *al-Qism al-'Amalī* («The Practical Section») in which human activity is dealt with<sup>37</sup>.

Despite the evidence of Aristotelian influence on al-Ġazzālī's classification of the sciences in the *Iḥyā'*, it is impossible to ignore the great difference recognizable through the contrasting criteria for classification of the two systems. The philosophers classify the sciences according to their epistemological nature and the various levels of existence of the objects studied by them<sup>38</sup>. Al-Ġazzālī, however, in *Kitāb al-'Ilm*, employs a criterion which is «external» to the sciences. That is, he does not classify them according to their subjects and the ways in which they are acquired but according to their various degrees of usefulness in achieving religious aims. These aims are not identified with the acquisition of the sciences themselves but lie «outside» or «above» them.

Al-Ġazzālī's point of departure in discussing the classification of the sciences in *Kitāb al-'Ilm* is an interpretation of the well-known tradition *ṭalab al-'Ilm farīḍa 'alā kull muslim* [«the search for knowledge is incumbent on every Muslim»]<sup>39</sup>. In answer to the

<sup>34</sup> Hourani, «A Revised Chronology of Ghazālī's Writings», p. 297.

<sup>35</sup> Abū Hāmid Muḥammad al-Ġazzālī, *Kitāb al-Imlā' fi Iṣkālāt al-Iḥyā'*, Cairo, 1968, p. 21.

<sup>36</sup> Hourani, *ibid*, p. 299.

<sup>37</sup> Abū Hāmid Muḥammad al-Ġazzālī, *Ġawāhir al-Qur'ān*, Cairo, n.d. p. 10.

<sup>38</sup> See, for example, al-Fārābī, *Iḥsā' al-'Ulūm*, p. 43; Ibn Sīnā, *Aqsām al-'Ulūm*, pp. 226, 228, 229. See also: Anawati, «Classification», pp. 63-64; C. Nallino, *'Ilm al-Falak 'Inda l-'Arab fi l-Qur'ān al-Wustā*, Rome, 1911, p. 28; A.S. Tritton, *Materials on Muslim Education in the Middle Ages*, Longon, 1957, pp. 133-134. Occasionally, Muslim theologians would adopt the philosophical criteria for the classification of the sciences. See, for example, Abū Ma'ālī al-Ġuwaynī, *al-Irṣād* (ed. J.D. Luciani), Paris, 1938, p.8; Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī, *al-Tamhīd*, Cairo, 1947, pp. 35-36; idem, *al-Inṣāf*, Cairo, 1950, p. 13; 'Alī al-Bazdawī, *Kitāb Uṣūl al-Dīn*, Cairo, 1963, p. 10; Ḥāḡḡī Ḥalīfa, *Kaṣf al-Zunūn*, (ed. G. Flügel), London, 1835-1858, vol.1, p. 24.

<sup>39</sup> al-Ġazzālī, *Iḥyā'*, vol. 1, p. 24. On this tradition in Muslim writings see, for example, Muḥammad Ibn Māḡa, *Sunan*, Cairo; 1952-1953, Introduction, section 17; Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, *Ġawāmi' Adāb al-Ṣūfiyya wa-'Uyūb al-Nafs*

question raised by the *ḥadīṭ*, namely, what kinds of knowledge must every individual Muslim acquire (as *fard ʿayn*)<sup>40</sup> he suggests a «curriculum» of «obligatory studies» within the setting of a general scheme of sciences which he presents. This scheme is accompanied by an evaluation of the religious significance of all the branches of knowledge and their classification into juridical categories.<sup>41</sup>

In conclusion, al-Ġazzālī, well acquainted with the writings of the Muslim philosophers, employs the Aristotelian classification of the sciences not only in his philosophical writings compiled during the Baġdād period but also in his mystical writings of his years of retirement. This system of classification influenced his division of the religious sciences in the *Iḥyā'* into two main subdivisions, namely *ʿIlm al-Muʿāmalā* and *ʿIlm al-Mukāṣafa*. In *Mizān al-ʿAmal* and especially in *Kitāb al-ʿIlm (Iḥyā' I,I)*, however, the Aristotelian scheme serves as a framework whose contents al-Ġazzālī determines in keeping with the Islamic-Ṣūfī heritage.

---

*wa-Mudāwātuhā*, (ed. E. Kohlberg) Jerusalem, 1976, p. 102; al-Hujwīrī, *The Kashf al-Maḥjūb* (Translated by R.A. Nicholson) Leiden-London, 1911, p. 11. This *Ḥadīṭ* appears with many variants of *Isnād* and *Matn* in: Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Ġāmiʿ Bayān al-ʿIlm wa-Fadlihi*, Cairo, 1346 A.H., vol. 1, pp. 7ff.

<sup>40</sup> al-Ġazzālī, *ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid*, p. 27. For another example of the use of juridical categories for classifying the sciences see: al-Ġazzālī, *Imlāʾ*, p. 57: *wa-amma ḥukm ḥādīhi al-ʿulūm al-maktūba fī al-ṭalab...fa-hiya min qabīl al-waġibāt wa-l-mandūbāt aw al-mubāḥāt*. On the difference between the philosophical system of classification of sciences and the Ġazzalian one see also: G.C. Anawati, «Sciences», in: P.M. Holt and others (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Islam*, 1970, vol. 2, p. 744; F. Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant*, pp. 94-95; M.A.M. Khān, «The Muslim Theories of Education during the Middle-Ages», *Islamic Culture*, 18 (1944), p. 419.

The University of Haifa

St. Anthony's College,  
Oxford

## APPENDIX

A schematic description of the process of adapting the Aristotelian dichotomy by al-Ġazzālī

		The Aristotelian classification of the sciences as reflected in al-Fārābī's writings	Al-Ġazzālī, <i>Mizān</i>	Al-Ġazzālī, <i>Ihyāʾ</i> <sup>2</sup> - <i>Kitāb al-ʿIlm</i>
Part I: Theoretical Sciences	Terminology →	ʿIlm <i>Nazarī</i>	ʿIlm <i>Nazarī</i>	ʿIlm <i>al-Mukāṣafa</i>
	Subdivision of Sciences →	mathematics physics metaphysics	metaphysics	metaphysics
Part II: Practical Sciences	Terminology →	ʿIlm <i>ʿAmalī</i>	ʿIlm <i>ʿAmalī</i>	ʿIlm <i>al-Muʿāmalā</i>
	Subdivision of Sciences →	politics economics ethics	ethics (emphasised) economics politics	ethics