

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE KALAM	I
I. THE TERM KALAM	I
The meaning of <i>kalām</i> as determined by its uses in Arabic translations from the Greek, 1. — Its new meaning as a designation of a special system of thought in Islam, 2.	
II. THE KALAM ACCORDING TO SHAHRASTĀNĪ AND IBN ḤALDŪN	3
The <i>salaf</i> , 3. — Fikḥ and Kalam, 3. — The existence of a pre-Mu'tazilite Kalam, 4. — How the Kalam originated, 5. — The two pre-Mu'tazilite Kalam problems: (a) Anthropomorphism: (1) View of "The Early Muslims," 8. — (2) Views of two groups of "Innovators," 10. — Origin of the formula "a body unlike other bodies" and corroborative evidence of the explanation, 11. — (b) Free will, 17. — The rise of Mu'tazilism, 18. — Shahrastānī on a non-philosophical Mu'tazilism preceding the philosophical Mu'tazilism, 19. — "The methods of the philosophers" and "the methods of the Kalam," 20. — Ibn Ḥaldūn on a non-philosophical Mu'tazilism preceding the philosophical Mu'tazilism, 25. — The identification of Kalam with Mu'tazilism, 29. — The Miḥnah, 31. — The three post-Miḥnah orthodox groups, 32. — The rise of the Ash'arite Kalam, 35. — Ibn Ḥaldūn's characterization of the Ash'arite Kalam, 36. — The changes subsequently introduced into the Ash'arite Kalam: (a) by Bāḳillānī, 40. — (b) by Ghazālī, 41	
III. THE KALAM ACCORDING TO MAIMONIDES	43
Maimonides' account of the Kalam contrasted with the accounts of Shahrastānī and Ibn Ḥaldūn, 43. — Maimonides' explanation of why he is to discuss the Kalam, 46. — Outline of his discussion: Christian philosophy as the background of the two philosophized systems of Kalam current in his own time, 48. — The origin of Christian philosophy, 50. — How Christian philosophy became known to Muslims, 51. — How the Kalam deviated from Christian philosophy, 55. — How the Kalam applied the method of reasoning acquired from Christian philosophy to purely Muslim problems, 56. — How Maimonides' own system of thought is to differ from that of the Kalam, 57.	

IV. INFLUENCES	58
1. CHRISTIANITY	58
Question as to whether there was any Christian influence upon the Kalam raised against Maimonides, 58.— Commonly held views concerning Christian influence upon Islam with regard to three problems, 59.— With regard to predestination and free will, 60.— With regard to attributes, 61.— With regard to the Koran, 63.	
2. GREEK PHILOSOPHY	64
3. IRANIAN AND INDIAN RELIGIONS	66
4. JUDAISM	68
V. ORIGIN, STRUCTURE, DIVERSITY	70
Two questions raised and the method used in answering them, 70.— Why of the problems dealt with in the Kalam only six were selected for treatment in this work, 72.— How five of the eight scriptural presuppositions laid down by Philo are accepted by the Kalam and how they are treated, 74.	
VI. CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH KALAM	79
Introductory statement, 79.	
1. CHRISTIAN KALAM	80
Evidence of its not having been affected by the philosophical or theological teachings characteristic of the Muslim Kalam, 80.— Verbal accommodation: the splinter group of Nestorians, 81.	
2. JEWISH KALAM	82
Maimonides' statement on the two types of Jewish philosophic literature in Arabic, 82.— Discussion of his statement, 83.— Halevi's statement on Karaite followers of the Kalam, 86.— Discussion of that statement, 87.— References by other writers to Jewish followers of the Kalam, 88.— Earliest attitudes toward philosophy among Jews, 92.— Question as to whether among Jews, as among Muslims, there were Attributionists, Predestinationists, and Anthropomorphists, 97.— The identity of "the people" referred to by Maimonides as taking Genesis 1:26 anthropomorphically, 106.— Other references by Maimonides to Jewish anthropomorphists, 106.— Rabad's comment on Maimonides' branding anthropomorphists as heretics, 108.	

CHAPTER II

ATTRIBUTES	112
I. THE MUSLIM ATTRIBUTES AND THE CHRISTIAN TRINITY	112
In search of evidence for the acceptable assumption of a Christian origin of the doctrine of attributes, 112.— How the use of <i>ma'nā</i> and <i>ṣifāh</i> in the sense of attributes shows the influence of the Christian Trinity, 114.— How the fact that at the very beginning only two attributes described by various combinations of the terms "life" and "knowledge" were used in discussions of attributes shows again the influence of the Trinity, 120.— An imaginatively constructed debate between a Christian and a Muslim wherein the latter was led to admit the reality of attributes, 129. How the number of attributes was increased, 131.	
II. DENIAL OF THE REALITY OF ATTRIBUTES	132
Two arguments against the reality of attributes: (a) Eternity means Deity; history of this argument, 133.— (b) Unity of God excludes internal plurality; history of this argument, 134.— Attributists' refutation of the first argument, 137.— Their refutation of the second argument, 138.— The exceptional treatment by some Antiattributists of knowledge, will, and word, 140.	
III. CREATED ATTRIBUTES	143
The view of the Rāfiḍah, 143.— The view of the Karrāmīyah, 145.	
IV. MODES	147
1. MU'AMMAR'S <i>ma'nā</i>	147
Various reports of Mu'ammār's theory of <i>ma'nā</i> , 149.— The question raised by Mu'ammār and why he raised it, 157.— How he first used Aristotle's term nature as an answer to his question and why he later replaced it by the term <i>ma'nā</i> , 160.— Criticism of Mu'ammār's theory of <i>ma'nā</i> on two grounds, 162.— The question whether Mu'ammār's theory of <i>ma'nā</i> applies to divine attributes, 163.— Survey of two other interpretations of Mu'ammār's theory of <i>ma'nā</i> , 164.	
2. ABŪ HĀSHIM'S <i>aḥwāl</i>	167
How the theory of <i>aḥwāl</i> arose out of a criticism of the theory of <i>ma'nā</i> , 167.— The term modes used as predicates of a subject in three senses: (a) as properties; (b) as accidents;	

(c) as genera and species, 169. — Modes as universals, 170. — The application of modes to divine attributes, 171. — The two innovations introduced by modes into attributes, 174. — How the modes were adopted by Bākillāni and Juwaynī, 175.

Appendix A. *The Threefold and the Twofold Classification of Modes* 183

Appendix B. *Relation of Abū Hāshim's Theory of Aḥwāl to Mu'ammār's Theory of Ma'nā* 188

Appendix C. *The Term Hāl* 193

3. OPPOSITION TO ABŪ HĀSHIM 197

Prefatory statement, 197. — Mu'tazilite arguments against modes, 198. — Modalists' refutation of these arguments, 201. — Attributists' arguments against modes, 204.

V. THE SEMANTIC ASPECT OF THE PROBLEM OF ATTRIBUTES 205

The three aspects of the problem of attributes, 205. — The two forms of the semantic aspect of the problem, 206. — The formula that attributes are neither God nor other than God: its history and how it is used by the Attributists, 207. — How the same formula is used by Abū Hāshim in the sense of modes, 211. — Question as to how the same formula added to another formula was used by Ash'arī, 211. — How these two formulae were used by Ash'arites, 214. How the Antiattributists came to start their treatment of the problem of attributes by stating that attributes are mere names or words, 217. — How they came to interpret these names or words as meaning actions or negations, 218. — How the different formulae used by Nazzām and Abū al-Hudhayl reflect a difference in the interpretation of Aristotle's phrase "in virtue of itself," 225. — Corroborative evidence for the preceding statement, 228. — Three observations with regard to the different formulae used by Nazzām and Abū al-Hudhayl, 229. — Explanation of a rather puzzling statement of Ash'arī with regard to formulae used by Attributists and Antiattributists, 233.

CHAPTER III

THE KORAN 235

I. THE UNCREATED KORAN 235

1. ORIGIN OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE UNCREATED KORAN 235

Prefatory statement, 235.—How "word" and "will" became real attributes, 236.—How the Koranic statements about itself mean that the Koran was pre-existent but created, 238.—How the belief in the uncreatedness of the pre-existent Koran arose, 239.—The earliest mention of opposition to the belief in the uncreatedness of the Koran, 241.—Believers in the createdness of the Koran branded as heretics, 242.—why the uncreated Koran could not be described as creator, 243.

2. THE UNRAISED PROBLEM OF INLIBRATION . . . 244

The two questions, 244.—(a) The question concerning the relation of the uncreated Word of God to the created Preserved Tablet, 244.—(b) The question concerning the relation of the uncreated Word of God to the revealed Koran, to which we shall refer as the Problem of Inlibration, 245.—How the first question is raised and answered, 246.—How, while the second question is not raised, certain statements seem like answers in anticipation of such a question, 247.

a. Ibn Kullāb and the Denial of Inlibration . . . 248

b. Ibn Ḥanbal and the Affirmation of Inlibration . . . 251

c. The Ḥanbalite Ash'arī . . . 254

d. The Kullabite Ash'arī and Ash'arites . . . 255

e. The Ḥanbalite Ibn Ḥazm . . . 257

How, though, unlike Ibn Ḥanbal, he maintains that the Word of God in the sense of the Koran is identical with the essence of God and not an attribute in it and how, still, like Ibn Ḥanbal, he maintains that the Word of God contains within itself innumerable words and is inlibrated, 257.—How the term Koran and the expression the Word of God cannot be described as created, even though four of the five things to which they are applied are created, 259.

II. THE CREATED KORAN . . . 263

1. THE DENIAL OF THE UNCREATED KORAN AND THE DENIAL OF ETERNAL ATTRIBUTES . . . 263

The difference between these two denials, 263.

2. THE CREATED KORAN AS A PRE-EXISTENT CREATED HEAVENLY KORAN . . . 264

Mu'tazilite description of the Koran as created in an "abode," 264.—How the createdness of the Koran was the original belief held by the Muslims, 265.—How the "abode" in which the Koran was created was itself created and it was the

Preserved Tablet, 266.—How two groups of Mu'tazilites differed in their views with regard to the inlibration of the pre-existent created Koran, 268.—How Shahrastānī touches upon this difference, 272.

3. THE DENIAL OF A PRE-EXISTENT HEAVENLY
KORAN 274

The view of Nazzām, 274.—The view of Mu'ammār, 276.

III. THE FORMAL CREEDS ON INLIBRATION 279

Introductory statement 279

1. THE WAṢIYYAH 280

2. NASAFĪ AND TAFTĀZĀNĪ 282

3. FADĀLĪ 289

IV. THE TERMS MUḤDATH, ḤADATH, AND ḤĀDITH AS
APPLIED TO THE KORAN 291

Stating the problem, 291.—The case of Thalji who applies to the Koran the term *muḥdath*, 292.—The case of Ḥazirī who similarly applies to it the term *muḥdath*, 294.—The case Tūmanī who applies to it the term *ḥadath*, 296.—The case of the Karrāmiyyah who apply to it the term *ḥādith*, 300.

CHAPTER IV

ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY 304

I. TRINITY AND INCARNATION IN THE KORAN 304

How Trinity and Incarnation are presented in the Koran, 304.—Refutation of these two doctrines in the Koran, 305.—The Koran's own account of the birth of Jesus: (a) Verses in which that account centers on the term "spirit," which is used in two senses, 306.—(b) Verses in which that account centers on the term "word," which is also used in two senses, 308.—Summary of the Koran's view of the birth of Jesus, 309.

II. TRINITY AND INCARNATION IN THE KALAM 310

How the Muslim learned of the Christian conception of the Trinity, 310.—How the Muslim learned of the Christian conception of the Incarnation, 312.—Muslim opposition to these new conceptions of the Trinity and the Incarnation, 312.—Traces of the influence of these new conceptions of the Trinity and the Incarnation upon certain sects in Islam, 313.

III. THE PHILOSOPHER KINDĪ AND YAḤYĀ IBN 'ADĪ ON THE TRINITY	318
Earlier and later disputations between Christians and Muslims, 318. — Kindī's three arguments against the Trinity; the first argument, 321. — Yahyā's refutation, 322. — Kindī's second argument, 323. — Yahyā's refutation, 324. — Kindī's third argument, 324. — Yahyā's refutation, 327. — Difficulties raised against the analogies used by Yahyā in his refutation of Kindī's third argument as well as in other passages, 331. — Solution of these difficulties, 333.	
IV. AN UNKNOWN SPLINTER GROUP OF NESTORIANS	337
How Shahrastānī makes Nestorius a contemporary of Ma'mūn and how he ascribes to the Nestorians a Trinitarian formula which he compares to Abū Hāshim's formula for modes, 337. — Objections to Shahrastānī's account of Nestorianism, 340. — Suggestion that Shahrastānī's Nestorians refer to a splinter group of Nestorians which appeared in Iraq during the reign of Ma'mūn, 341. — Showing that, while Shahrastānī is right in the Trinitarian formula which he ascribes to his Nestorians, he is wrong in comparing it to Abū Hāshim's formula for modes, 342. — What the Trinitarian formula ascribed by Shahrastānī to his Nestorians really means, 343. — Evidence showing that a splinter group of Nestorians did appear during the reign of Ma'mūn, 347.	
V. MUSLIM ATTRIBUTES IN MEDIEVAL CHRISTIANITY	349
How among the Church Fathers there was no problem of attributes in its ontological sense, 349. — Sporadic unsuccessful attempts in the Middle Ages to introduce into Christianity an ontological problem of attributes, 350. — How the term "attributes" and the Muslim problem of attributes became known to Christians through the Latin translation of Maimonides <i>Guide of the Perplexed</i> early in the thirteenth century, 350. — How later in the thirteenth century both Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas use the term attribute and discuss the ontological aspect of the problem of attributes, 352. — Attributes in Descartes and Spinoza, 354.	

CHAPTER V

CREATION OF THE WORLD	355
I. CREATION <i>Ex Nihilo</i>	355
I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	355
How the belief in creation out of nothing appeared in Philo	

and in the Church Fathers, 355.—How the Latin and the Greek phrase for "out of nothing" appeared in Christianity, 356.—How the belief in creation out of nothing appeared in Judaism, 356. Creation in the Koran, 357.

2. THE KALAM CONTROVERSY OVER THE NON-EXISTENT (*al-ma'dūm*) AS A CONTROVERSY OVER *ex nihilo* 359

Various views as to the origin of this controversy, 359.—Suggestion that underlying this controversy is the problem as to whether creation is out of nothing or out of a pre-existent matter, 362.—Evidence for this suggestion, 365.—The pre-existent matter in question not conceived of as composed of atoms, 366.—The change of *min al-ma'dūm* to *lā min shay'* as the Arabic expression for *ex nihilo*, 367.—Various other Arabic expressions for *ex nihilo*, 368.—Saadia's logical explanation for the use of *lā min shay'* instead of *min lā shay'*, 371.—The expression *ba'd al-'adam*, 372.

II. ARGUMENTS FOR CREATION 373

Introductory statement, 373.

1. ARGUMENT FROM FINITUDES AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF ITS ORIGINAL FORM IN JOHN PHILOPONUS 374

Analysis of Saadia's restatement of this argument, 375.—Two questions about Saadia's restatement of the argument, 375.—Answer to the first question, 376.—Answer to the second question, 377.—Reconstruction of the original form of John Philoponus' argument, 381.—Syllogistic form of Saadia's restatement of the argument, 382.

2. ARGUMENT FROM THE ANALOGY OF THINGS IN THE WORLD 382

Platonic basis of this argument, 382.—As presented by the following: Bāhilī quoted by Shahrastānī, 383.—Maimonides ascribing to "one of the Mutakallimūn," 383.—Averroes ascribing it to "the Muslim Mutakallimūn," 384.—Isaac Israeli, 385.

3. ARGUMENT FROM THE AGGREGATION AND SEGREGATION OF ATOMS 386

As presented by the following: Ash'arī as quoted by Shahrastānī, 386.—Maimonides' Mutakallimūn, 387.—Saadia, 388.—Bahya, 389.—Showing that this argument is based upon a triple argument by Abucara, 390.

4. ARGUMENT FROM THE CREATEDNESS OF THE
ACCIDENTS OF THE COMPONENT PARTS OF THE
WORLD 392

As presented by the following: Bāḳillānī, 393.—Ibn Suwār, ascribing it to the Mutakallimūn, 393.—How two of Ibn Suwār's three criticisms of this argument are based (a) upon a refutation by Aristotle of his own tentatively raised objection to the eternity of the world and (b) upon Aristotle's own view of the possibility of an infinite by succession, 395.—How Juwaynī reinforces this argument, against one of Ibn Suwār's criticisms of it, by arguing against Aristotle for the impossibility of an infinite by succession, 396.—Māwardī, Joseph al-Baṣīr, and Jeshua ben Judah, 397.—Shahrastānī, ascribing it to the Mutakallimūn and alluding to their reinforcement of it by the view of the impossibility of an infinite by succession, 398.—Judah Halevi, ascribing it to "the Masters of the Kalam" and alluding to their reinforcement of it by the view of the impossibility of an infinite by succession, 399.—Averroes, ascribing it to the Ash'arites, as well as to the Mutakallimūn, and explicitly restating their reinforcement of it by the view of the impossibility of an infinite by succession, 400.—Maimonides, ascribing it to the Mutakallimūn and explicitly restating their reinforcement of it by the view of the impossibility of an infinite by succession, 402.—Ibn Ḥazm and Joseph Ibn Ṣaddīq, 403.—Saadia and Alfārabi, 404.—How the various presentations of this argument fall into three types, 406.—How this argument is analogous to a Patristic argument for creation based upon Aristotle's tentative objection to the eternity of the world, 407.—How it can be shown that this argument is based either directly upon Aristotle's tentative objection to the eternity of the world or upon the Patristic version of it as an argument for creation, 408.

5. ARGUMENT FROM THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF AN
INFINITE BY SUCCESSION 410

Introductory statement, 410.—How John Philoponus' refutation of Aristotle's view on the possibility of an infinite by succession consists of two arguments, each of them based upon an Aristotelian principle, namely, (1) no infinite can be traversed; (2) one infinite cannot be greater than another infinite, 411.—How these two arguments against the possibility of an infinite by succession are restated by the following: Nazzām, 416.—Saadia, 417.—Juwaynī, 420.—Ibn Ḥazm, 421.—Ghazālī, 422.—Judah Halevi, 423.—Shahrastānī, 424.—Averroes, 424.—Maimonides, 425.—Averroes'

refutation of the Mutakallimūn's impossibility of an infinite succession, 427. — Maimonides' refutation of that impossibility, 431.

6. ARGUMENT FROM PARTICULARIZATION . . . 434

As presented by Juwaynī in his *Irshād*, 434. — As presented by him in his *Niẓāmiyyah*, 436. — As recast by Averroes on the basis of the *Niẓāmiyyah*, 437. — How this argument occurs in two forms, 438. — How it is presented by the following: Judah Halevi, 439. — Ghazālī, 439. — Shahrastānī, 441. — Maimonides, 443.

7. ARGUMENT FROM PREPONDERATION . . . 444

Analysis of Avicenna's argument against the temporal creation of the world in which the term *tarjīb*, "to give preponderance," occurs, 444. — How in Ghazālī's refutation of Avicenna and his affirmation of the temporal creation of the world the term *murajjīb*, "preponderator," is used, 446. — How the argument from preponderation is presented by the following: Shahrastānī, 447. — Maimonides, 449. — Maimonides' criticism of the argument, 451.

8. ARGUMENT FROM IMMORTAL SOULS . . . 452

How this argument is presented by Maimonides, 453. — Reconstruction of the history of this argument on the basis of a statement by Avicenna in his *Najāt* and statements by Ghazālī in his *Maḳāṣid* and *Tahāfut*, 453. — How the argument is reproduced by Shahrastānī, 454. — Maimonides' criticism of this argument, 455.

III. THE KALAM ARGUMENTS FOR CREATION IN ALBERTUS MAGNUS, THOMAS AQUINAS, AND BONAVENTURA . . . 455

Introductory statement, 455. — *Argument from Immortal Souls*: used by all three of them and traceable to Maimonides, 457. — *Argument from Finitudes*: used by Thomas Aquinas and traceable to Averroes, 458. — *Argument from an Infinite by Succession*: one variation of this argument is used by all three of them and two variations of it are used by Aquinas and Bonaventura, 460. — Comment on this argument, 465.

CHAPTER VI

ATOMISM 466

I. AFFIRMATION OF ATOMISM 466

1. ORIGIN OF ATOMISM IN THE KALAM 466

Evidence of its Greek origin, 466. — Why the Kalam adopted

atomism, 467.—How on religious grounds the Kalam introduced two fundamental changes into Greek atomism, 471.

2. AN UNKNOWN PSEUDO-DEMOCRITEAN FRAGMENT
AND THE UNEXTENDEDNESS OF ATOMS IN THE
KALAM

472

Problem of the origin of the unextendedness of atoms in the Kalam, 472.—How no statement as to the extendedness of atoms is to be found in the doxographies of Greek philosophers known to the Kalam, 474.—How Israeli's ascription to Democritus of the statement that atoms are points is a quotation from some doxography, 478.—Reconstruction of that doxographic statement on the basis of certain statements by Aristotle about Democritus, 480.—How early Muslim students of philosophy could have gotten from that doxographic statement the view that the Democritean atoms were unextended, 483.

3. GREEK DESCRIPTIONS OF ATOMS AS REFLECTED
IN THE ATOMISM OF THE KALAM

486

Existence, position or turning, shape, order, or intercontact, 487.—Qualities, 488.—Motion, 489.—The swerve, 490.—Apprehensibility, 491.—Homogeneity, 491.—In the composition of bodies, 491.—The void, 493.—Aggregation and segregation, 494.—Space, time, and motion, 494.

II. THE DENIAL OF ATOMISM AND THE THEORIES OF
LATENCY (*kumūn*) AND THE LEAP (*al-ṭafrāh*)

495

Nazzām's denial of atomism and affirmation of infinite divisibility of bodies, 495.—Nazzām's adoption of the Aristotelian conception of nature as inherent in things and causing their transition from potentiality to actuality, 497.—How he adapted this Aristotelian conception of nature to the Koranic doctrine of creation and how the Aristotelian "potentiality" and "actuality" are described as "hiding" and "appearing," and how this view is referred to here as the theory of latency, 497.—Hayyāt's account of Nazzām's theory of latency, 498.—Ash'arī's account of theories of latency ascribed to various Mutakallimūn among whom Nazzām and Mu'ammār are mentioned, 500.—How from these two accounts one is to infer the existence of two theories of latency, a comprehensive one, which is that of Nazzām, and a limited one, which is that of all the others, including Mu'ammār, 501.—Why Mu'ammār does not agree with Nazzām in his comprehensive theory of latency, 502.—How Baghdādī suggests an Aristotelian origin for Nazzām's theory of latency, 504.—Aris-

totalian exponents of the theory of latency referred to as Mulhid and Mulhidūn, 505.—How Shahrastānī suggests an Aristotelian origin for Nazzām's theory of latency, 507.—Historical precedents for the use of "hiding" and "appearing" for Aristotle's "potentiality" and "actuality," 509.—Historical background for Nazzām's explanation of the six days of creation as simultaneous creation, 511.—Conclusion and re-statement of four other interpretations of Nazzām's theory of latency, 511.—How Nazzām's theory of the Leap was meant to be an answer to Zeno's first argument against Aristotle's infinite divisibility of space, 514.—Why Nazzām did not use Aristotle's own answer to Zeno's first argument, 516.—Comment on the theory of the Leap, 517.

CHAPTER VII

CAUSALITY 518

I. THE DENIAL OF CAUSALITY 518

1. THE DURATION AND DESTRUCTION OF THINGS 518

How early in the eighth century Islam, in opposition to Christianity, denied that God acts through intermediate causes, affirming its belief that every event in the world is created directly by God, 518.—How Islam arrived at such a belief, 518.—How this belief gave rise in the Kalam to eight main views with regard to the "duration" and "destruction" of things whose "existence" was created directly by God, 521.—The exponents of these eight main views: Ash'arites and Ka'bī, 522.—Bākillānī, 526.—Kalānisi, 529.—Abū al-Hudhayl, 530.—The School of Baṣra supported by Ḥayyāt of Baghdad, 533.—The Karrāmiyyah, 534.—Bishr b. al-Mu'tamir, 535.—Jubbā'ī and Ibn Shabīb, 537. How these eight views fall into three groups and how the expression "continuous creation" applies to them, 543.

2. THE THEORY OF CUSTOM ('ādah) AND ITS

FORMULATION BY GHAZĀLĪ 544

How Epicureanism and the Kalam were faced by the same problem and how they each solved that problem, 544.—The meaning of "custom" in Aristotle, 545.—Ascription of the theory of custom to the Ash'arites or Ash'arī, 546.—How the theory of custom was criticized by Ibn Ḥazm and Abū Rashīd, 547.—How Ghazālī's formulation of the theory of custom obviates that criticism, 548.—What Ghazālī means by his arguing in favor of the philosophers' explanation of the lunar and solar eclipses, 549.—Ghazālī's use of a syn-

onym for "custom" and a substitute for "cause" and his loose use of the term "cause," 550.

3. AVERROES' CRITICISM OF THE DENIAL OF CAUSALITY AND OF THE THEORY OF CUSTOM . . . 551

Averroes' restatement of the Kalam's denial of causality, 551.—His four arguments against the denial of causality, 553.—His argument against the theory of custom, 556.

II. AFFIRMATION OF CAUSALITY . . . 559

Maimonides' reference to Mutakallimūn who affirmed causality, 559.—Mu'ammār as one of them, 560.—Two apparently contradictory reports on Naẓẓām and showing that he affirmed causality, 561.—The common element in Mu'ammār's and Naẓẓām's views on nature and causality, 565.—The two differences between them: the first difference, 566.—The second difference, 569.—Naẓẓām's view on the manner of nature's operation and on miracles, 569.—Mu'ammār's view on the manner of nature's operation and on miracles, 572.—Historical background of Mu'ammār's view, 573.—Three views on causality in the Kalam, 575.—Criticism of Mu'ammār by Shahrastānī and Ibn Ḥazm, 576.

III. IMPOSSIBILITIES . . . 578

Historical background, 578.—As treated by the following: The Mu'tazilites, 579.—The orthodox, 581.—The Iḥwān al-Ṣafā', 581.—Ibn Ḥazm, 584.—Ghazālī, 586.

IV. REPERCUSSIONS IN CHRISTIANITY . . . 589

1. ST. THOMAS ON THE KALAM DENIAL OF CAUSALITY . . . 589

The sources drawn upon by him in his restatements of the view of the Kalam, 589.

2. NICOLAUS OF AUTRECOURT AND GHAZĀLĪ'S ARGUMENT AGAINST CAUSALITY . . . 593

Nicolaus' denial of causality as a reaction against Latin Averroists, 593.—How a question has been raised as to whether Nicolaus' refutation of an argument for causality is based upon a certain work of Ghazālī, 594.—How the question is answered, 594.

CHAPTER VIII

PREDESTINATION AND FREE WILL . . . 601

Predestinarian and Libertarian verses in the Koran, 601

- I. THE PREDESTINARIANS 602
 How the earliest attempt at the formulation of a doctrine of human action was based upon the predestinarian verses, 602.—Why the predestinarian verses were preferred to the libertarian ones, 608.—How the earliest predestinarianism which was conceived of as compulsionism was rejected by the later Predestinarians, 612.—How Predestinarians answered two stock arguments against predestinarianism, 612.
- II. THE LIBERTARIANS 613
 How the Libertarians, with some exceptions, agreed with the Predestinarians in denying causality in all but human actions, and why they did so, 613.—Two arguments used for free will and their historical backgrounds, 616.—How the term *ḡadariyyah* came to be applied to the Libertarians, 619.—How the term "creator" came to be applied by the Mu'tazilites to man, 620.—Differences among the Libertarians with regard to their common belief in man's freedom to act, 622.
- III. THE ḤĀṬIRĀNĪ IN THE KALAM AND GHAZĀLĪ AS INNER MOTIVE POWERS OF HUMAN ACTIONS 624
 In the Koran only two external powers, God and Satan, are referred to as motivating man to good and evil, 624.—The appearance in tradition of another external power, a good angel, as the opponent of Satan, 626.—The mention in a tradition of two created motivating powers, one for good and another for evil, without making clear whether they are outside man or within man, 626.—Nazzām's two motive powers within man, which in matters religious are called by him *ḡāṭirānī*, a *ḡāṭir* each for obedience and disobedience, 628.—Possible origins of Nazzām's *ḡāṭirānī*, 631.—Nazzām's *ḡāṭirānī* among the Mu'tazilites, 634.—His *ḡāṭirānī* among the orthodox: Muḡasibī, 630.—Ghazālī, 639.
- IV. GENERATED EFFECTS (*al-mutawalladāt*) 644
 Mu'tazilite classifications of human actions, 644.—Eight Mu'tazilite views with regard to generated effects reported in the names of the following: Bishr b. al-Mu'tamir, 646.—Abū al-Hudhayl, 648.—Nazzām and Mu'ammār, 648.—Saliḡ Ḳubbah, 649.—Thumāmāh and Jāḡiz, 649.—Ḍirār, 652.—These eight views fall into two main groups, differing on the question as to whether generated effects are free acts of man, 654.—How those Mu'tazilites who do not consider generated effects as free acts of man would justify man's responsibility and punishability for them, 654.

V. THE ANTINOMIES OF FREE WILL 655

Introductory statement, 655.

1. FREE WILL AND THE PREDESTINARIAN VERSES IN THE KORAN 655
2. FREE WILL AND THE APPOINTED TERM (*ajal*) 657
3. FREE WILL AND PREORDAINED SUSTENANCE 660
4. FREE WILL AND GOD'S FOREKNOWLEDGE 660

God's foreknowledge in the Koran, 660. — Two Mu'tazilite views: (1) denial of divine foreknowledge, 661. — (2) God's foreknowledge not causative, 662.

5. FREE WILL AND GOD'S POWER: THE THEORY OF ACQUISITION (*kasb*; *iktisāb*) 663
 - a. Pre-Ash'arite Acquisition 663

(1) *Three Theories of Acquisition* — Mu'tazilite view on the relation of God's power to man's freedom, 664. — Shaḥ-ḥām's theory of acquisition, 665. — Ḍirār's theory of acquisition, 667. — Najjār's theory of acquisition, 669. — General characterization of these three theories, 671. — Hishām b. al-Ḥakam and Ibn Kullāb on acquisition, 672.

(2) *Spread of Acquisition among Libertarian Groups and Individuals* — Groups, 674. — Individuals: Nashī, 676. — Jub-bā'ī, 679.

(3) *Acquisition among the Ahl al-Ithbāt* — How as Predestinarians they followed either Ḍirār or Najjār, 681.

- b. Acquisition in Ash'arī, Baḳillānī, and Juwaynī 684

How Ash'arī's views on acquisition are in agreement with those of Najjār, 684. — Why and how Baḳillānī revised the view of Ash'arī, 691. — How Juwaynī rejected Baḳillānī's revision and offered a solution of a difficulty in Ash'arī's view, 693. — Analysis of a report of a new moderate conception of predestinarianism by Juwaynī, 694.

- c. Acquisition in Ghazālī 698

His three discussions of acquisition: His first discussion ending with his adoption of Ash'arī's conception of acquisition, 699. — His second discussion ending with the qualified statement that acquisition could be found to be "true only from one aspect," 703. — His third discussion ending with his identification of what "the People of Truth" call "acquisition" with his own conception of man as the "abode" of everything created in him by God, used by him as a solution of the antinomy of God's power and man's free will, 705.

d. Acquisition in Māturīdī 711

Analysis of three passages reported as quotations, in translation, from a work of Māturīdī, 711. — How Taftāzānī's attribution of a theory of acquisition to the Maturidite Najm al-Nasafi raises the question whether the attributed acquisition is of the Dirārite or the Najjārite type, 714. — How this question is answered by showing that Taftāzānī's description of the attributed acquisition is based upon a description of acquisition in a work by Hāfiz al-Nasafi wherein it is attributed to Maturidites, 715. — How the view on acquisition of the Maturidites as reported in Hāfiz al-Nasafī's work is presented in the work of Abū 'Udhbah, 717.

CHAPTER IX

WHAT IS NEW IN THE KALAM	720
1. ATTRIBUTES	720
2. THE KORAN	723
3. CREATION	725
4. ATOMISM	727
5. CAUSALITY	729
6. PREDESTINATION	733
CONCLUSION	739
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE	741
BIBLIOGRAPHY	743
INDEX OF REFERENCES	755