

Ibn al-Malāhīmī's Refutation of the Philosophers

Wilferd Madelung

The comprehensive refutation of the Muslim philosophers *Tuhfat al-mutakallimīn fī l-radd 'alā l-falāsifa* by the Khwārizmian Mu'tazili theologian Rukn al-Din Maḥmūd Ibn al-Malāhīmī (d. 536/1141) was considered lost until the recent discovery of a single manuscript copy announced by Ḥasan Anṣārī in 2001.¹ The existence of the book among Ibn al-Malāhīmī's writings and its earlier availability in the Yemen had been known from references in Zaydī works of the early 8th/14th century which shed but little light on its contents and scope.² The heretical and eventual suppression of Mu'tazili theology in Sunnī Islam had obviously precluded a wider spread and impact of the book on Islamic thought. It was al-Ghazālī's (d. 505/1111) refutation of the philosophers in his *Tahāfut al-falāsifa*, composed four decades before Ibn al-Malāhīmī's, that came to be commonly recognized as the authoritative answer of Islamic theology to *falsafa*. The discovery of Ibn al-Malāhīmī's work is apt to modify significantly our understanding of the reaction of *kalām* theology to the spectacular ascendancy of an Islamic philosophy, inspired chiefly by the teachings of the Shaykh al-Rā'īs Abū 'Alī b. Sīnā (d. 428/1037).

Criticism of philosophical metaphysics became a major concern of Ibn al-Malāhīmī in most of his theological writings. He had been thoroughly introduced to the thought of the philosophers by the grammarian, physician and man of letters Abū Muḍar Maḥmūd b. Jarīr al-Ḍabbī al-Īsfahānī (d. 508/1115), who visited Khwārizm when Ibn al-Malāhīmī was already an accomplished Mu'tazili scholar, and became his teacher.³ Abū Muḍar also brought the Mu'tazili school doctrine of Abu l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī (d. 426/1044) to Khwārizm which Ibn al-Malāhīmī adopted after having earlier adhered to the predominant school doctrine of Abū Hāshim al-Jubbā'ī (d. 321/933) and Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār (d. 415/1025). In his early massive exposition of *kalām* theology *Kitāb al-Mu'tamad fī uṣūl al-dīn* he expressly espoused the doctrine of Abu l-Ḥusayn and included a lengthy discussion and refutation of the ancient and the Muslim philosophers, quoting in particular the criticism of philosophical cosmology by the Shī'ī Mu'tazili theologian al-

¹ Ḥasan Anṣārī, "Kitāb-i tāza-yi yāb dar naqd-i falsafa: Paydā shudan-i 'Kitāb-i Tuhfat al-mutakallimīn-i' Malāhīmī", *Nashr-i dānish* 18 iii (2001), pp. 31-32.

² See Rukn al-Din Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad al-Malāhīmī, *K. al-Mu'tamad fī uṣūl al-dīn*. The extant parts edited by Martin McDermott and Wilferd Madelung, London 1991, Introd. p. iv.

³ On Abū Muḍar al-Īsfahānī see Zāhir al-Dīn al-Bayhaqī, *Ta'rikh ḥukamā' al-Islām*, ed. M. Kurd 'Alī, Damascus 1365/1946, pp. 139-40; Yāqūt, *Kitāb Irshād al-ārīb ilā ma'rīfat al-adīb*, ed. D.S. Margoliouth, Leiden 1907-31, vol. 7, p. 145.

Ḩasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī (d. between 300/921 and 316/923) in his *Kitāb al-Ārā' wa-l-diyānāt*.⁴ His lost *Jawāb al-masā'il al-Isfahāniyya*, which was presumably dedicated to Abū Muḍar al-Isfahānī, contained a critical discussion of the thesis of the philosophers that doing good for a purpose was not really good and thus inappropriate for God. In his *Kitāb al-Fā'iqa fī uṣūl al-dīn*, an abridged version of the *Kitāb al-Mu'tamad* written at the same time as the *Tuhfah al-mutakallimīn*, he also included a substantial critical discussion of the teaching of the Muslim philosophers.⁵

At the beginning of the *Tuhfah* he refers to his *Kitāb al-Mu'tamad*, stating that he had there described the views of the Muslim philosophers such as al-Fārābī (d. 329/960) and Ibn Sīnā on the origins of the world, the proof for the existence of an eternal Creator and His attributes, the imposition of obligations (*taklīf*), the reality of those obligated (*mukallaf*), the reality of prophethood, the religious laws conveyed by the prophets, and the Return in the hereafter (*ma'ād*). He had shown there that these Muslim philosophers set forth the religion of Islam in accordance with the doctrines of the ancient philosophers, removing it from its reality and the teaching of the prophets. Then he had found that many of the would-be scholars of the religious law, among them a group affiliated to the school of al-Shāfi'i (d. 204/820), were eagerly acquiring the disciplines of these modern philosophers in the illusory belief that they could help them even in mastering the science of the religious law and its principles (*uṣūl*). These were then followed by some scholars of the Ḥanafiyah, Ibn al-Malāḥīmī's own legal school. They all fell into this trap because they failed to realize that the study of the religious law must rather be preceded by the study of the *uṣūl al-fiqh* and the *uṣūl* of Islam, that is the study of *kalām* theology. He, Ibn al-Malāḥīmī, was afraid that the Muslim community might end up in relation to Islam like the Christians in regard to the religion of Jesus. The leaders of the Christians had become so attracted to the philosophical science of the Greeks that they finally set forth their religion according to the doctrines of the ancient philosophers, supporting superstitions such as the Trinity, union with God (*ittibād*), and Jesus having become divine after being human.

Ibn al-Malāḥīmī therefore intended in his present book to explain the teaching of these philosophers who claimed to be upholding Islam and expounded it according to their methods, to expose its corruption, and to describe the reasons of those inclining towards them on account of their exact sciences in the non-religious disciplines. This would fill a gap in the theological literature since he had not found any *kalām* theologian dealing adequately with the doctrine of

⁴ The relevant section is extant in a newly discovered manuscript of the *K. al-Mu'tamad*.

⁵ Ibn al-Malāḥīmī does not mention his *K. al-Fā'iqa* at the beginning of his *Tuhfah*, but refers to it together with the *K. al-Mu'tamad* toward the end of the *Tuhfah*. Since the *Fā'iqa* was completed on 7 Rabi' II 532/ 22 December 1137, it is likely that the *Tuhfah* was completed after that date.

these modern would-be philosophers. He would thus first relate summarily what they said about the origination of the world, the proof for the existence of the Creator and His attributes, prophethood, the religious laws, the hereafter, reward and punishment. Next he would demonstrate their agreement with the views of the Dahriyya, the Dualists and the Greek Christians. Then he would present in detail the arguments with which they gave preference to their method over that of the Muslims and answer them, mentioning the position and arguments of the Muslims in every chapter.

Ibn al-Malāhimī does not mention al-Ghazālī and his *Tahāfut al-falāsifa* here or elsewhere in his book. He no doubt considered al-Ghazālī's refutation of the philosophers as inadequate, partly because he saw him as an Ash'arī agreeing with the philosophers, against basic Mu'tazilī positions, on determinism, denial of human free will, and affirmation that God was the source of all evil in the world, even though He was pure goodness. Al-Ghazālī in turn had charged the philosophers with support of such Mu'tazilī "innovations" as the denial of divine attributes additional to God's essence and the admission of natural causation of all events and action in the world by God.⁶ In view of al-Ghazālī's neutral exposition of the views of the Muslim philosophers in his *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*, Ibn al-Malāhimī may well have counted him among those scholars of the school of al-Shāfi'i who eagerly promoted philosophical thought among the students of Islamic law.

Ibn al-Malāhimī's refutation of the Muslim philosophers is indeed more comprehensive and systematic than al-Ghazālī's. He does not share al-Ghazālī's prime concern with the legal status of the philosophers which had induced al-Ghazālī to concentrate on the famous three issues on which they must be condemned for infidelity (*kufr*): their assertion of the eternity of the world, their denial of God's knowledge of particulars, and their denial of the physical resurrection. Besides these three major points al-Ghazālī had dealt more summarily with seventeen specific questions on which the philosophers could be charged with heretical innovation. Although his criticism was obviously based on Ash'arī dogma, he had emphasized that he only intended to demonstrate the defects of philosophical teaching rather than defend any particular doctrine, which he would do in another book.

Ibn al-Malāhimī in contrast systematically presents and compares the teaching of the modern Muslim philosophers and "the Muslims", by whom he primarily means the Mu'tazila. While he discusses at length the three issues on which al-Ghazālī charged the philosophers with unbelief involving the death penalty, he does not single them out for special condemnation. Instead of focusing on a number of specific points of heresy he deals broadly with all major subjects of *kalām* theology, including some al-Ghazālī had ignored or touched upon only

⁶ Al-Ghazālī, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, trans. M.E. Marmura, Provo, 1997, pp. 97, 230.

marginally in his *Tahāfut*, such as the imposition of obligation by God on mankind, prophethood, and the nature of religious laws. Throughout he seeks to demonstrate that the Muslim philosophers, while going to great lengths in claiming to uphold Islam with their rational proofs, either were unable to do so on the basis of their principles or entirely distorted the substance of Muslim beliefs. He is scathing in his denunciation of their assertion that their theology and cosmology, in contrast to that of the Muslim *kalām* theologians, was based on apodictic demonstration (*burhān*) and pours ridicule on the results of their *burhān*, such as that from the One only a single one can issue.

In presenting philosophical doctrine, Ibn al-Malāhīmī primarily quotes from a source – without ever identifying it – that often agrees literally with al-Ghazālī's *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa* but occasionally deviates substantially. On first sight one might think that he relied on a different recension of al-Ghazālī's work. It seems more likely, however, that he and al-Ghazālī both copied from an exposition of philosophical teaching designed for Muslim readers by a follower of Ibn Sīnā. Al-Ghazālī's source, or sources, for his *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa* are not known. It has been suggested that he used and adapted Ibn Sīnā's Persian *Dāniš-nāma-yi 'Alā'i*.⁷ While there is certainly substantial agreement between the contents of the *Dāniš-nāma* and al-Ghazālī's exposition, it is, however, not close enough to identify it as al-Ghazālī's main source or even an immediate source. Much of the actual formulation of philosophical doctrine in the *Maqāṣid* may well go back to an author of the school of Ibn Sīnā rather than al-Ghazālī.

Aside from this anonymous and unacknowledged source Ibn al-Malāhīmī, in contrast to al-Ghazālī, frequently copies from the writings of the philosophers directly, sometimes at length. Most often Ibn Sīnā is quoted, usually, though not always, with the title of his work. Thus there are quotations from his *Kitāb al-Shifā'*, *Kitāb al-Mabda' wa l-ma'ād fī sa'ādat al-nafs*, *Maqāla fī l-quwāt al-insāniyya*, *Kitāb al-Nafs*,⁸ and *al-Ishārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt*. In some cases, for instance for the *Kitāb al-Shifā'*, a recension different from that now available appears to have been used by Ibn al-Malāhīmī. There is also a quotation from a sermon (*khuṭba*) attributed to Ibn Sīnā in which he ridicules those who worship God in the belief that He acts with the purpose of benefiting humans. Ibn al-Malāhīmī frequently quotes Muslim philosophers later than Ibn Sīnā, without, however, naming them or their works. At the present stage of research about the early school of Ibn Sīnā, it does not seem possible to identify any of them. Some are critical of Ibn Sīnā's views. There are lengthy quotations from a text in which the anonymous author seeks to interpret the Muslim eschatological expectations such as the Resurrection, the Scale (*mīzān*), Intercession (*shafā'a*), the Passage over hell

⁷ See Jules Janssens, "Le Dāniš-nāmeh d'Ibn Sīnā: Un texte à revoir?" *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 28 (1986), pp. 163-77.

⁸ It is unclear to which of Ibn Sīnā's works dealing with the subject of the soul this title refers. The quoted text differs from the relevant section of the *K. al-Shifā'* on the soul.

(*şirāt*) in accordance with philosophical principles. Ibn al-Malāhimī admits that he is not sure how representative the author's opinions are of those of the philosophers in general since they do not normally deal with this subject in their books. Of pre-Islamic philosophers he refers to Plato, Aristotle, Proclus, John Philoponus, and of earlier philosophers of the Islamic era to al-Kindī, al-Fārābī, Abū Bakr b. Zakariyyā' al-Rāzī besides the Christian Yaḥyā b. 'Adī.⁹ His quotations of their opinions and writings, however, are indirect.

In setting forth the doctrine of the Muslims as against the false interpretations of the philosophers, Ibn al-Malāhimī repeatedly cites Abu l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, referring to his *Kitāb Taṣaffuḥ al-adilla*. He does not mention any other Mu'tazilī scholars by name. In his chapter on the human soul he quotes at length from a *Kitāb al-Ma'ād* by an otherwise unknown author Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb whose *nisba* appears in variants in the manuscript, but is most likely to be read al-Jadīdī. Jadīd was the name of a street quarter (*sikka*) of Bukhārā to which the author's name may refer.¹⁰ The formula *raḥimabu llāh* used by Ibn al-Malāhimī after his name indicates both that he approved of his views and that al-Jadīdī was no longer alive. Unfortunately it is unclear whether the quotation of Ibn Sīnā's *Kitāb al-Nafs* in this chapter was copied by Ibn al-Malāhimī from al-Jadīdī's work or taken directly from Ibn Sīnā's book. Of his own works, Ibn al-Malāhimī refers to his *Kitāb al-Mu'tamad*, *Kitāb al-Fā'iq*, *al-Masā'il al-Isfahāniyya*, and a *Mas'ala fī l-rūḥ* about the reality of the spirit according to the faith of the Muslims.

The arguments Ibn al-Malāhimī employs against philosophical doctrine are primarily rational, based on plain common sense. He quotes Qur'ān and *ḥadīth* secondarily, mostly to demonstrate that the Muslim philosophers, while claiming to be in concord with the revealed message of Islam, in fact explain it away by their arbitrary interpretations. These interpretations, he charges, are in conflict with the literal meaning of the text as well as with any legitimate metaphorical meaning which must be accepted when the literal meaning does not agree with reason. They are in their arbitrariness like those of the Bāṭiniyya, whose esoteric speculation defies any rational control. Ibn al-Malāhimī deals with the Ismā'īlī Bāṭiniyya in a special chapter where he quotes from a so far unknown section of the treatise of the early anti-Ismā'īlī polemicist Muḥammad b. Zayd Ibn Rizām al-Ṭā'ī.

At the end of his book Ibn al-Malāhimī presents excerpts from a *Message of Sincere Advice* (*al-Risāla al-Nāṣiha*) by the secretary and man of letters Abu l-Faraj 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Hindū to a friend. Ibn Hindū, it is known, was a trained physician and had studied the philosophical sciences. A collection of wise sayings of the Greek philosophers (*al-Kalim al-rūbāniyya fī l-hikam al-Yūnāniyya*) and excerpts from an epistle encouraging the study of philosophy (*al-Risāla al-mushawwiqa fī*

⁹ Ibn al-Malāhimī confuses John Philoponus and Yaḥyā b. 'Adī, calling both of them Yaḥyā b. 'Adī al-Nāḥwī.

¹⁰ See al-Sam'ānī, *al-Ansāb*, s.v. al-Jadīdī.

l-madkhal ilā ʻilm al-falsafa) by him have been published.¹¹ In the present epistle he chides and ridicules his friend for his vainglorious display of philosophical learning and terminology and reminds him of the superior values of the Qurʼān and the faith of Islam.

The single extant manuscript of Ibn al-Malāhīmī’s *Tuhfa* was formerly preserved in the Nāṣirīyya Library in Lucknow and is now kept in the Rīḍawīyya Shrine Library in Meshhed. It is written in *nastaʻīq* script evidently by a scribe of Persian literary culture and was completed in Dhu l-Hijja 1104/August 1693. It was copied from a single original dated in the second half of Rajab 693/June 1294, about two and a half centuries after Ibn al-Malāhīmī’s death. This original was most likely a Yemenite manuscript written by a Zaydī scribe as suggested by the formulas of blessing. It probably had deteriorated in many places, and the scribe of the later manuscript copied what he saw without much effort to restore the correct text. There are obvious concealed gaps throughout. A critical edition will have to rely on comparison with parallel texts in Ibn al-Malāhīmī’s other books and in the works quoted by him. Many emendations, however, must remain speculative as long as no other manuscript is found.

References

Anṣārī, Ḥasan, “Kitāb-i tāza-yi yāb dar naqd-i falsafa: Paydā shudan-i Kitāb-i ‘Tuḥfat al-mutakallimīn-i’ Malāhīmī,” *Nashr-i dānish* 18 iii (2001), pp. 31-32.

-Bayhaqī, Ẓāhir al-Dīn, *Tārīkh ḥukamā’ al-Islām*, ed. M. Kurd ‘Alī, Damascus 1365/1946.

Dā’irat al-Ma‘ārif-i buzurg-i Islāmī 1-, ed. Kāzim Mūsawī Bujnūrdī, Tehran 1989-.

-Ghazālī; *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, trans. M.E. Marmura, Provo 1997.

Janssens, Jules, “Le Dānesh-nāmeh d’Ibn Sīnā: Un texte à revoir?” *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 28 (1986), pp. 163-77.

Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad al-Malāhīmī, *K. al-Mu‘tamad fī uṣūl al-dīn*: The extant parts edited by Martin McDermott and Wilferd Madelung, London 1991.

Yāqūt al-Rūmī, *Kitāb Irshād al-arīb ilā ma‘rifat al-adīb* 1-7, ed. D.S. Margoliouth, Leiden 1907-31.

-Sam‘ānī, Abū Sa‘d ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad b. Manṣūr al-Tamīmī, *al-Ansāb* 1-13, Hyderabad 1962-82.

¹¹ On Ibn Hindū and his writings see *Dā’irat al-Ma‘ārif-i buzurg-i Islāmī*, vol. 5, pp. 124-27.