



Note on "The Meanings of the Philosophers by al-Ghazzali"

D. B. Macdonald

Isis, Vol. 27, No. 1 (May, 1937), 9-10.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-1753%28193705%2927%3A1%3C9%3AANO%22MOT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-5>

Isis is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Note on "The Meanings of the philosophers by al-Ghazzālī ,,

(*Isis*, No. 69, Vol. XXV. 1, May, 1936, pp. 9-15)

An article "ALGAZEL et les Latins" by Fr. D. SALMAN, O. P., (Le Saulchoir), in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age*, 1935-1936, pp. 103-127, has added very greatly to our knowledge of the medieval Latin translation of AL-GHAZZĀLĪ'S MAQĀŠID. Fr. SALMAN shows that at least one MS survives of that translation containing AL-GHAZZĀLĪ'S prologue in which he explains that this book is simply a reproduction of the teachings of the philosophers and does not represent his own views and that another book will follow, the *Tahāfut*, containing a criticism of these teachings. This MS is B. N., Lat. 16096 and was used by Prof. MUCKLE in his edition. He, however, rejected it as a foundation for his text and does not seem to have noticed that it contains the, otherwise missing, Prologue. He rejected it because he was ignorant of its date and its perfectly assured history and also of the use made of it by MUNK in his *Mélanges*, p. 370. Fr. SALMAN also shows that the Prologue was known to ROGER BACON and to RAYMOND MARTIN of the *Pugio Fidei*. It is, therefore, certain that a complete copy of the Arabic *Maqāšid* reached the medieval West and was put into Latin there, but we are still in the dark as to how that Latin translation came to be curtailed of its Prologue and ending. Finally, an Arabist cannot restrain himself from adding here that a great part of the confusion has arisen out of the refusal of Western Medievalists to pay any attention to the Arabic evidence, which is very much as though a student of CICERO'S philosophical writings should refuse to learn Greek and to consult CICERO'S Greek teachers. In 1859 S. MUNK put the matter perfectly clearly with citations of Arabic, Latin and Hebrew authorities and in 1928 the point was restated with still more Arabic

authorities by L. GAUTHIER in the *Rev. d'hist. de la philos.* for that year, pp. 358-365. Will the present perfectly conclusive article by Fr. SALMAN, one of themselves, in one of their own journals, make any impression on them? May it even lead some of them to learn some Arabic!

(*Hartford, Conn.*)

D. B. MACDONALD.