

# Studia graeco-arabica

6



2016

### *Editorial Board*

Mohammad Ali Amir Moezzi, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris  
Carmela Baffioni, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli  
Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, Oxford  
Charles Burnett, The Warburg Institute, London  
Hans Daiber, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a. M.  
Cristina D'Ancona, Università di Pisa  
Thérèse-Anne Druart, The Catholic University of America, Washington  
Gerhard Endress, Ruhr-Universität Bochum  
Richard Goulet, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris  
Steven Harvey, Bar-Ilan University, Jerusalem  
Henri Hugonnard-Roche, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris  
Remke Kruk, Universiteit Leiden  
Concetta Luna, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa  
Alain-Philippe Segonds (†)  
Richard C. Taylor, Marquette University, Milwaukee (WI)

Staff: Elisa Coda, Cristina D'Ancona, Cleophea Ferrari, Issam Marjani, Cecilia Martini Bonadeo.

### *Submissions*

Submissions are invited in every area of the studies on the transmission of philosophical and scientific texts from Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and early modern times. Papers in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish are published. Prospective authors are invited to check the *Guidelines* on the website of the journal, and to address their proposals to the Editor in chief.

### *Peer Review Criteria*

*Studia graeco-arabica* follows a double-blind peer review process. Authors should avoid putting their names in headers or footers or refer to themselves in the body or notes of the article; the title and abstract alone should appear on the first page of the submitted article. All submitted articles are read by the editorial staff. Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review to at least one reviewer. *Studia graeco-arabica* does not release referees' identities to authors or to other reviewers. The journal is committed to rapid editorial decisions.

Web site: <http://learningroads.cfs.unipi.it>

Service Provider: Università di Pisa, ICT - Servizi di Rete Ateneo

ISSN 2239-012X (Online)

Registration at the law court of Pisa, 18/12, November 23, 2012.

Editor in chief Cristina D'Ancona ([cristina.dancona@unipi.it](mailto:cristina.dancona@unipi.it))

Mailing address: Dipartimento di Civiltà e Forme del Sapere, via Pasquale Paoli 15, 56126 Pisa, Italia.

© Copyright 2016 by Industrie Grafiche Pacini Editore, Pisa.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the Publisher. The Publisher remains at the disposal of the rightholders, and is ready to make up for unintentional omissions. *Studia graeco-arabica* cannot be held responsible for the scientific opinions of the authors publishing in it.

### *Cover*

Mašhad, Kitābhāna-i Āsitān-i Quds-i Raḡawī 300, f. 1v  
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, *grec* 1853, f. 186v

provide the answer to the question “what is being for such and such a thing?”. That this chapter deals with *Metaph. Zeta* has already been noticed in scholarship (Chapters 4 and 5, esp. 1029 b 1 – 1030 a 4, feature in the *apparatus fontium* of Henry-Schwyzler). but Plotinus proves here to be keenly aware also of Aristotle’s point in *Zeta* 10, with his search for that kind of rational principle that provides the essential cause for something to be a ‘man’. Now, soul in the living being is precisely this: not only the *logos* providing the accurate description of what such a thing is, but also the cause of its being what it is: the forming principle of the individual substance of a living thing is described here as its οὐσία, its εἶδος, and τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι τῷ τοιόνδε σώματι (1035 b 14-16). This is what Plotinus has to say on this:

But one must [...] grasp the forming principle itself which makes, for instance, man; this applies especially to those who claim to define the essential nature in each case, when they define strictly and properly, καὶ μάλιστα, ὅσοι τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι ἀξιούσιν ἐφ’ ἐκάστου ὀρίζεσθαι, ὅταν κυρίως ὀρίζονται (VI 7[38], 4.23-28, trans. Armstrong).

When he claims that if we are to examine not the separate, Platonic Form, but precisely form in matter, we ought to search for the “forming principle itself which makes ... man”, the λόγος αὐτὸς ὁ πεποιηκὼς ... τὸν ἄνθρωπον, especially if our point is in each case to search for the τί ἦν εἶναι, Plotinus is evidently reacting to *Zeta* 10. In his eyes, the ‘Aristotelian’ definition of ‘man’ as ζῷον λογικόν is doomed to failure not because it does not meet the criteria of Platonic Form, but in so far as it does not meet the criteria of substance as defined in *Zeta* 10. Indeed, as he has pointed out shortly before, the definition ζῷον λογικόν comes after the man that already exists, but by no means can count as the latter’s rational cause, which was indeed what Aristotle was searching for.

It is a great merit of this book to raise again the question of Plotinus’ attitude towards the crucial, and most technical problems of Plato’s and Aristotle’s metaphysics.

CDA

Roger Arnaldez, *Aspects de la pensée musulmane*, Librairie Philosophique J.Vrin, Paris 2015 (Études musulmanes, 47), 316 pp.

This volume is the second edition of twenty-one essays by the eminent Islamologist Roger Arnaldez (1911-2006). Originally written by Arnaldez between 1955 and 1982, they were collected by the author himself in 1987 without any general introduction, a gap that is filled by another eminent Islamologist, Father Maurice Borrmans M. Afr.

The Introduction, “Roger Arnaldez (1911-2006). Philosophe et islamologue, au service d’un œcuménisme élargi et d’un dialogue difficile” (pp. 7-36) is in reality an essay offering a vibrant description of Arnaldez’ intellectual profile and of a lifelong endeavour for interfaith dialogue. Philosophy lies at the core of this dialogue, and this not only because of Arnaldez’s education, which combined the skills of a linguist mastering some twenty languages with his discipleship with Jacques Maritain and Maurice de Gandillac, but also because of an increasingly clear conviction that philosophy and its history provide the keys for interpreting religious experience. “Linguiste et traducteur, R. Arnaldez est ainsi attentif à l’expression linguistique de la philosophie et de la théologie, ce qu’illustre parfaitement sa thèse principale, *Grammaire et théologie chez Ibn Ḥazm de Cordoue*. [...] C’est pourquoi le présent ouvrage reproduit six articles qu’Arnaldez a publiés pour mieux faire connaître la pensée d’Ibn Ḥazm” (pp. 10-11). The titles of the sections in Borrmans’ introductory essay are instructive in this respect: “Islam et philosophie”, “Islam et sunnisme classique”, “Islam et mystique”, “Islam et christianisme”,

and “Œcuménisme élargi à tous les hommes de bonne volonté”, where Borrmans presents “l’œuvre de celui qui, philosophe et islamologue, se consacra aussi, tout au long de sa carrière, au service d’un œcuménisme élargi aux trois monothéismes que sont l’Islam, le judaïsme et le christianisme” (p. 7).

“Dieu” says Arnaldez in the first essay of this collection “tel que le Coran parle de Lui, est présenté sous *des aspects divers qui sollicitent la médiation philosophique* dans bien de directions” (p. 35, my emphasis). The fundamental tenets of Islamic theology and spirituality are dealt with in the first group of articles, written between 1962 and 1975 (“Le Dieu de l’Islam”, pp. 29-36; “Dieu, la création et la révélation en Islam”, pp. 37-57; “Prophétie et sainteté en Islam”, pp. 59-81; “Ontologie et mystique musulmane”, pp. 83-93; “Aspects de l’exégèse coranique”, pp. 94-103). Other essays, written between 1955 and 1973 deal with key authors of Sunni Islam. First comes Ibn Ḥazm, the subject-matter of Arnaldez’ doctoral dissertation *Grammaire et théologie chez Ibn Ḥazm de Cordoue*. Essai sur la structure et les conditions de la pensée musulmane, published in 1956. The articles collected here are the following: “*Abbār et awāmir* chez Ibn Ḥazm de Cordoue” (pp. 105-77); “La profession de foi d’Ibn Ḥazm” (pp. 119-38); “La guerre sainte selon Ibn Ḥazm de Cordoue” (pp. 139-52); “La raison et l’identification de la vérité selon Ibn Ḥazm de Cordoue” (pp. 153-9); “La place du Coran dans les *uṣūl al-fiqh* d’après le *Muḥallā* d’ Ibn Ḥazm” (pp. 161-7); “Controverses d’Ibn Ḥazm contre Ibn Naḡrila le juif” (pp. 169-77). All these articles, with the exception of the last two that belong to the seventies of last century, were written around the date of Arnaldez’s PhD (1955). Then comes, in this collection, a couple of articles dealing with the notions of ‘person’ and ‘individuality’ in Islamic religiosity, one devoted to Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī: “Le moi divin et le moi humain d’après le commentaire coranique de Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī” (pp. 179-98), and another to Ibn ‘Arabī: “Le moi divin dans la pensée d’Ibn ‘Arabī” (pp. 199-209). The *falāsifa* form the focus of the subsequent essays. Two studies deal with al-Fārābī, both published in the journal *Studia Islamica*: “L’âme et le monde dans le système philosophique de Fārābī” (pp. 211-18), and “Pensée et langage dans la philosophie de Fārābī. À propos du *Kitāb al-ḥurūf*” (pp. 219-25). Other essays focus on Averroes. These articles, published once again in *Studia Islamica* between 1957 and 1959, are part of one single essay that has been fundamental for future scholarship: “La pensée religieuse d’Averroès. 1. La doctrine de la création dans le *Tahāfut*” (pp. 229-37); “La pensée religieuse d’Averroès. 2. La théorie de Dieu dans le *Tahāfut*” (pp. 239-48), and “La pensée religieuse d’Averroès. 3. L’immortalité de l’âme dans le *Tahāfut*” (pp. 249-62). The last two articles of the collection deal (broadly speaking) with Muslim culture (pp. 263-92).

The focus of the collection is on one side on the basic tenets of Islamic religiosity, and on the other on the philosophic attempts at conceptualizing them: an effort made chiefly in the classical age of Muslim civilization. This attitude, that the collected essays share with other studies in the field published in the same period (see for instance Ch. Bouamrane, *Le problème de la liberté humaine dans la pensée musulmane. Solution mu’tazilite*, Vrin, Paris 1978), has become the common basis for most contemporary studies concerning Muslim theology. The focus of the research conducted by Roger Arnaldez during his long and intense lifetime was Sunni Islam, and one wonders if and how is it possible to adapt these insights to other forms of Muslim religiosity: to mention only the most recent collection of essays – Daniel De Smet and Amir Moezzi’s *Controverses sur les écritures canoniques de l’Islam* (2014) – the specialists show how complex is to speak about “Islam” in general. Another difficult issue is that of the dialogue of this religious universe and its conceptualizations with contemporary worldviews. As Arnaldez wrote in 1968, “Ce sera, espérons-le, la tâche de la théologie musulmane moderne, de dégager une idée de la personnalité de Dieu qui convienne aux exigences fondamentales de l’Islam” (p. 35). This reprint of the essays of Arnaldez, notwithstanding the fact that they all trace back to the past century, still helps us to understand the extent and implications of this task.

EC