Title: Al- Ghazali's Critique of Philosophy and His Place in the History of Islamic Science

Hasan Aydin
Prof. Dr., Lecturer, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Republic of Türkiye

Received: 22.01.2025 Accepted: 12.03.2025 Publishing: 15.05.2025 Doi: 10.56334/sei/8.4.90[1]

Abstract
Modern studies speak more about Ghazali's influence on the history of Islamic science than about his attitude to the philosophical thought of the Islamic world. The main reason for this is that philosophy at that time was also a system of sciences. Whereas, during the Islamic Middle Ages, sciences were an integral part of philosophy, being recognized as a system of rational sciences, just as in the Middle Ages in the West, the seven liberal arts were part of philosophy. That is, philosophy preserved the humanities and the exact sciences, and sciences were not separated from philosophy. At the same time, the acceptance of philosophy as a system of sciences was a consequence of the fact that it also had the character of an educational program. In fact, the foundations of this thought go back to Aristotle and developed in the Hellenistic period. For this reason, Ghazali, criticizing the worldview of philosophers in general, also criticized their philosophical system of sciences in general. This criticism, in the form in which Ghazali interpreted the philosophical sciences, demonstrates the extent to which it coincides or does not coincide with the general Islamic worldview, and corresponds to an approach that analyzes these sciences through the prism of a religious worldview. Ghazali set boundaries for the analysis and interpretation of scientific innovations, preparing the ground for the rejection of scientific concepts that ran counter to the Sharia or did not support it. He prevented the inclusion of philosophical sciences in the educational system of madrasahs, defended the idea of the uselessness of religious and philosophical sciences, and was the initiator of the emergence of an approach in Islamic culture, the supporters of which doubted the expediency of philosophical sciences. It even went so far as to establish a view according to which such concepts as philosopher, philosophical science, reason were equated with unbelief (kufr), apostasy and zindiqism . It can be said that similar views, the cause of which was Ghazali, are still defended in the Islamic world today.

Keywords: al- Ghazali, philosophy of islamic cultural region, kalam, criticism of philosophical sciences.

Citation. Aydin H. (2025). Al- Ghazali's Critique of Philosophy and His Place in the History of Islamic Science. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 8(4), 692-697; doi: 10.56352/sei/8.4.90. https://imcra-az.org/archive/362-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-4-volviii-2025.html

Introduction

Ghazali's classification of sciences was the reason for the development of thought and the emergence of epistemological diversity. In this context, one can speak about the purpose of Ghazali's classification of sciences or the influence of the diversity of targets on the goal. For the reason that Ghazali, who characterized science as "the perception of reality and the image of an object by the mind or the understanding and recognition of an object as it is", unlike Farabi and I ibn Sina, did not create an independent work on the topic of classification of sciences, this must be taken into account when analyzing his reasoning on this topic in all his works. His habit of immediately expressing his attitude to each topic indicates that the topic and classification of sciences are not alien to him. He classified sciences sometimes by subject matter, sometimes by the degree of usefulness or uselessness, and sometimes by their connection on some point with philosophy or epistemological origin or the degree of value and purpose.

That he devoted a great deal of space to the logical and traditional sciences, as well as revelation or divinely revealed knowledge, during the period when he was directly engaged in tasawwuf is also an important indicator of his distinctive classification. For this reason, as Najib rightly noted Taylan, it would be much more appropriate to speak about the analysis of sciences in Ghazali, which he produced for various purposes, than about his systematic classification of sciences.

Ghazali's approach to science and his classification of logical disciplines during the period when he was attached to the Ash'ari system of Kalam, we need to take his works " Maqasid al- Falasifa " and "Tahafut al- Falasifa" as a basis. The classification of logical sciences presented in these two works is purposeful and shows a certain influence of philosophers. In the first work, he briefly touches on the sciences that interested philosophers and their philosophical views, while in the second, he devotes significant space to criticism and in his critical reasoning, one can mainly feel the influence of Ash'ari ideology and his teacher Juwayni . In the introductory part of " Maqasid al- Falasifa ", he divides the sciences that interested philosophers into four parts: "mathematical sciences, logical sciences, natural sciences and metaphysical sciences". In the work, after he states that each science has its own subject, and that each subject is studied by science in various forms, from an ontological point of view he divides creations into two parts - into "creations whose being is connected with our actions", and into creations "whose being is not connected with our actions". As an example for the first part, Ghazali points out such humanistic spheres of activity as politics, leadership, worship, mathematics, and for the second part - heaven, earth, animals, mines, angels, jinn, shaitans. Then, turning his attention to the science of wisdom, that is, philosophy, he divides it into two parts - theoretical and practical. Through the practical science of wisdom, the state of our deeds is studied, world problems are solved, and the features of deeds leading to the Day of Judgement are revealed.

Classification of sciences in Ghazali, philosophical or rational sciences.

As for theoretical wisdom, the essence of creations through the human soul is revealed through this science, through which the essence of creations is studied.

This position of science in relation to the soul is similar to the position of an object in front of a mirror. Just as an object is reflected in a mirror, so is truth reflected in the soul. The emergence of the science of theoretical wisdom in our soul is a sign of maturity for us ; this state is the cause of virtue in the world and a happy outcome on the Day of Judgement. According to Ghazali, the practical and theoretical science of wisdom are divided, in turn, into three parts. The directions of the practical science of wisdom are politics, the institution of the family and ethics. Political science regulates the relationships of people with each other. Fiqh is a science based on the Sharia, and this science is supplemented by political science, regulating the life of the city and the urban population . The science of the institution of the family determines the behavioral standards of a person in his treatment of his wife, children, servants and other people in his family environment. Ethics, in its attributes, character, is needed by a person as a science of how to become well-behaved and virtuous. Theoretical sciences, in turn, are divided into metaphysics, mathematics and natural sciences. Ghazali, in contrast to metaphysics, uses the concept of theology and first phi-

losophy (al- falsafa a l - 'ula) [2]; in contrast to mathematical sciences, he uses the word mathematics and calls it the middle science (al- ilm al-awsat). He designates natural sciences as the lower science (al- ilm a- adna). Ghazali 's classification of sciences relies heavily on philosophers and is similar to a summary of I ibn Sina's classification of sciences. The concepts he uses also belong to I ibn Sina. Ghazali says nothing in Tahafut al- Falasifa in connection with such sciences of philosophers as logic and mathematics. Therefore, the greatest mistake of philosophers, in his view, is the divine sciences; In these sciences they rely entirely on logic and have fallen into atheism by proposing the thesis that the universe is not eternal and that material resurrection is impossible. According to Ghazali, there are no sciences that philosophers have called natural. Natural sciences, being fundamental and branches, are divided into the following parts. Fundamental sciences are divided into eight parts: physics, heavens and earth, creation and resurrection, meteorology, substance of culture, plants, animal world, spiritual substances and psychology. This classification is similar to Aristotle's classification and is known in the Islamic philosophical tradition. The remaining areas are divided into seven parts: medicine, astronomy, science of talent, interpretation of dreams, science of witchcraft, science of amazing events, chemistry. Ghazali says that from the point of view of religion, philosophers do not object to these sciences, but they fear two things, the first of which is the problem of the primary cause of being, and the second is the teaching of philosophers about the soul.

In Ghazali's work " Ihya ulum al-Din (The Resurrection of the Sciences of Faith), which he wrote during his period of tasawwuf, devotes a great deal of space to the classification of sciences. This work contains traces of epistemology based on revelation, and Ghazali praises sciences based on observation and revelation. The Sharia sciences, which are learned only through the practice of the Prophet, are sciences that cannot be learned through reason, like arithmetic, or through experience, like medicine. Non-Sharia sciences are sciences that are learned through other types of information that lie outside revelation. From the religious point of view, sciences are divided into praiseworthy (mahmud), criticized (mazmum), and permitted, neutral (mubah). The differentiation is made in accordance with the categories of fiqh a . Praiseworthy (mahmud) sciences are medicine, geometry and arithmetic, which are necessary for worldly affairs. Their study is obligatory. That is, the study of these sciences, together with the sciences related to them that satisfy social needs, as well as teaching them, is a mandatory condition. Such areas as weaving and arable farming also belonged to this area. Criticized (mazmum) sciences are useless sciences and those that have no place in religion, such as, for example, magic and witchcraft. In reality, no science is bad; however, these sciences are bad because they cause harm to those who are involved in them, as well as to others. As for the neutral sciences, poetry and interest in ancient history are precisely related to them; but they should be studied little by little. In his work "Al- Mustasfa " Ghazali divides the sciences into three parts. The first covers purely intellectual sciences, which are not encouraged or guided by the Sharia, such as mathematics, geometry and astronomy; the second are such sciences as hadith studies and tafsir (interpretation of hadith), based on the tradition of transmission. They rely on the oral tradition of memorization. The third are sciences that are united by means of the Sharia and the intellect. An example of such sciences is fiqh and the methodology of fiqh (usul al- fiqh). In the Risala al -dunniyya (Treatise on the Unseen), Ghazali also divides the sciences into Sharia and intellectual. Sharia sciences consist of two parts; the first is the science of monotheism (tawhid), and the second is its offshoot - fiqh and ethics. Intellectual sciences are divided into three parts - logical and mathematical sciences, natural sciences, and divine sciences. In his bio-bibliographical work “Al- Munqidh min ad- dalal ” (“ The Remover of Error”), Ghazali again touches upon the classification of the sciences of philosophers, and divides them into mathematical, logical, natural, divine, political and ethical. This classification of sciences, presented by Ghazali in chronological form, is obviously unsystematic, and at times, groundless. In particular, it should be noted that the classification with reference to philosophers does not reflect his original thought, but in fact, he is the author of the classifications presented in “ Ihya ulum ad-din ", in "Al- mustasfa " and "Ar - Risala alladunniyya ".

[2]“On First Philosophy” (Arabic: “Fi al- falsafa al- 'ula ”) is a work by al- Kindi , dedicated to the legalization of philosophy (in its ancient form). – Ed . Note .

Ghazali's view on intellectual sciences and his criticism: Just as Ghazali sometimes dwells on the evaluation, functions and purposes of the sciences, so he directs his criticism towards the intellectual sciences from the point of view of a religious perspective. This criticism determines his positions regarding the role of the philosophical sciences in relation to religion. In Tahafut al- Falasifa he also argues against the philosophers' view that it is necessary to study the intellectual sciences, particularly geometry and arithmetic, in order to be mature in theological discourse and says: "...theology has nothing in common with arithmetic. To say that the comprehension of the divine sciences depends on mathematics is as foolish as to say that medicine, grammar and the encyclopedic sciences need mathematics or arithmetic." Ghazali does not make the same accusations against logic and maintains that the philosophers' judgments about the necessity of logic for theology are correct. However, this science is not in the hands of philosophers, but is a basic science, appearing under its own name in the sciences of logic and kalam. With a slight change in the name, the philosophers called it logic in order to give it grandeur. Mutakallims They call it " Kitab ad- Jadal ", and sometimes - " Madarik al- ukul ". People of limited intelligence and fashionable people, hearing the name "logic", consider it a science known only to philosophers, and unknown to mutakallims . In the natural sciences, it is limited to criticism of the idea of a necessary causal connection and the teaching of philosophers about the soul. In particular, it does not imply proof of the existence of a causal relationship to justify a miracle, the power of the Creator and confirmation of his intervention in the affairs of the universe. He uses a more systematic approach in "Al- Munqiz " and in " Ihya ulum ad-din ". At first he takes up the mathematical sciences. Therefore, these sciences are related to arithmetic, geometry and astronomy. These sciences have no positive or negative sides related to religion. After these sciences are studied, they are not subject to overthrow, and are absolute.

If religion were true, it would not remain a secret for people who have their own mathematical methods of research. With this thought, Ghazali expressed the fact that many people, having no other basis, deviated from religion . Therefore, the second danger lies in ignorant but religious people who seek to “help” religion by denying the philosophical sciences. Despite such a cautious approach, he again comes to the following conclusion in connection with the mathematical sciences: “Those who study these sciences a lot must be hindered. Because, although they have no connection with religion, they can adopt the negative features of philosophy, since they are the beginning of the philosophical sciences. There are few people who would study these sciences a lot and at the same time would not go beyond the boundaries of religion and would not distance themselves from piety (taqwa).” Ghazali characterizes such sciences as mathematics and geometry here as not directly encouraged by the Sharia and not guided by it, and says about them: “Sciences of this type cover unstable, insidious and senseless information. And we rely on the Lord in sciences that do not bring benefit. The profit will disappear, the real profit is the reward (sawab) on the Day of Judgement (akhira).” Justifying in “ Ihya ulum ad-din and in "Al- munqiz min ad- dalal " the danger of these sciences, Ghazali turns to interesting comparisons. According to him, protecting those with weak faith from these sciences is like the need to protect children walking on the bank of a river from falling into the water, protecting those who have recently converted to Islam from unbelievers is like keeping children away from poisonous snakes. Ghazali also includes magic and witchcraft among the intellectual sciences. Therefore, in essence, these sciences are not bad, since no science is bad. Their negative aspect is that they are used for the purpose of causing harm to people.

Of these sciences, we will focus only on the science of the stars, since it is related to astronomy. According to Ghazali, astrology does not have negative aspects, like other sciences of this series. Therefore, this science is divided into two parts. The first part is related to arithmetic; the second, covers dogmas. Ghazali implies through dogmas through causes finding evidence for events, and likens it to how a doctor finds the causes of a disease by examining the pulse. This science means revealing the influence of the Almighty on creation. However, Ghazali condemns those who, while studying chemistry and astronomy, alienate themselves from the order established by the Creator, tying events to nature. Therefore, the Sharia is against this science, because the Prophet commanded to remain silent if the stars were spoken of. Hazrat Umar also said that only that part of astrology should be studied that helps not to get

lost on sea and land, and the rest should be rejected. According to Ghazali, the reasons for the call of Hazrat Umar's reason for refraining from the widespread development of this science is its harmfulness from the point of view of religion.

This harm lies in the idea that events occur as a result of the movement of the stars, and the real cause of this is in the stars. Ghazali gives the example of an ant in this regard: "An ant, seeing writing on paper, will say that it was written by a pen, since it cannot raise its head and see the fingers above, the hand and the will that sets them in motion, the person, and finally the one who gave the person this will and power."

It can be said that by criticizing the intellectual sciences, Ghazali wanted to show the discrepancy between the sciences that are the product of Greek logic and the general Islamic worldview, with the theory and epistemology of the existence of the Creator. However, interpreting Ghazali's criticism of these sciences mainly in this vein does not reveal the whole essence of the issue. In particular, establishing the boundaries of religious sciences, after mastering the epistemology based on revelation, indicating its direction in the direction of a certain mystical pragmatism, also indicates the influence of this mystical pragmatism on his own critical approach. With this approach, Ghazali emphasizes the immutability of the Day of Judgement (akhira), the transience of worldly life, touches upon the significance of the science of observation, and declares only this way of revealing the truth.

It is necessary to admit the inadequacy of the assessment of Ghazali, who is a critic of philosophy in the Islamic world, and that his criticism also covers the intellectual sciences, since philosophy covered them in that period. It would certainly be an exaggeration to think that Ghazali doomed philosophy and the intellectual sciences to destruction, but Ghazali, rather, represented a type of thinking closer to that presented in the curricula of the madrasa . After him, the madrasa distanced itself from philosophy and the intellectual sciences, and the Islamic world lost confidence in philosophy and the intellectual sciences. This mistrust continues to exist to this day, and philosophy and science are interpreted according to the logic of Ghazali through a religious-centric paradigm. This religious-centric paradigm continues to create problems in the Islamic world in the philosophical plane and in the sphere of constructing sciences.

References

1. Bargeron, C. L. (2007). Re-thinking necessity (al-Darūra) in al-Ghazālī's understanding of physical causation. Theology and Science, 5(1), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/14746700601159390
2. Belhaj, A. (2023). Hétérodoxes et non musulmans dans la pensée d'Abū Ḥāmid al-Ġazālī: by Emmanuel Pisani, Paris, Vrin, 2022, 280 pp., (paperback), ISBN 9782711629800, https://www.vrin.fr/livre/9782711629800/heterodoxes-et-non-musulmans-dans-la-pensee-dabu-amid-al-gazali. Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations, 34(1), 109–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/09596410.2023.2192857
3. Gazâlî, Kimya-yı Saâdet, çeviren: A. Faruk Meyan, Bedir Yayınevi, İstanbul 1979, s. 42-45.
4. Gazzâlî, el-Munkiz., s. 16-17; Tehâfüt., s. 40; Felsefenin Temel İlkeleri (Makasıd el-Felâsife), çeviren: Cemaleddin Erdemci, Vadi Yayınları, Ankara 2001, s. 36.
5. Gazzâlî, Eyyuhâ el-Veled, Mecmu'a er-Resâ'il el-İmâm el-Gazzâlî içinde, cilt: I, Beyrût 1986, s. 155;
6. Gazzâli, İhya, cilt: I, s. 25-26; Mustasfa (İslam Hukuk Metodolojisi), cilt: I, çev.: Yunus Apaydın, Klasik yayınları, İstanbul 2006, 40-44.
7. Gazzâlî, İhyâ., cilt: I, s. 34. Aynı örnek için bkz. Gazâlî, Kimya-yı Saâdet, s. 42.
8. Gazzâlî, Tehâfüt el-Felâsife, Tahkik: Maurice Bouyges, Beyrût 1927, s. 44.
9. Hulâsa et-Tasânîf fî et-Tasavvuf, Mecmu'a er-Resâ'il el-İmâm el-Gazzâlî içinde, cilt: IV, Beyrût 1986, s. 136.
10. Qəzali, Tehafüt el-Felasife, çev.: Bekir Sadık, Ahsen Yayınları, İstanbul 2002, s. 175-176.

11. Malik, S. A. (2023). A Historical Introduction to Islam, Science, and Evolution: The Book Symposium on 'Islam and Evolution: Al-Ghazālī and the Modern Evolutionary Paradigm'. Theology and Science, 21(4), 564–587. https://doi.org/10.1080/14746700.2023.2255945
12. Mehmet Dağ, İslam Felsefesinin Bazı Temel Sorunları Üzerinde Düşünceler,OMÜİF Dergisi, sayı: 5, Samsun 1991, ss. 6-7.
13. Necip Taylan, Qəzali'nin Düşünce Sisteminin Temelleri, MÜİF Yayınları, İstanbul 1989, s. 31.
14. Parvizian, S. (2023). Al-Ghazālī, nativism, and divine interventionism. British Journal for the History of Philosophy, 31(6), 1105–1127. https://doi.org/10.1080/09608788.2023.2187343
15. Rayan, S. (2004). Al-Ghazali's Use of the Terms "Necessity" and "Habit" in his Theory of Natural Causality. Theology and Science, 2(2), 255–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/1474670042000261132
16. Richmond, J. (2022). Al-Ghazālī on Experiential Knowing and Imaginal Mediation. Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations, 33(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/09596410.2022.2025562