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This article is a study in which the researcher traced the most prominent allegations that philosophical opinions impacted on Al-Ghazali. It was in three axes: the claim of the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali when he examined their opinions, and the claim of impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali based on books attributed to him, and the claim of impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali because of his interest in logic and authorship in it. Then I analysed this claim, and criticised it, and reached the acquittal of Imam Al-Ghazali of this claim.
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Introduction

It is not hidden from anyone the standing of Imam Al-Ghazali, and his efforts in classification, in various sciences and arts, including logic, and his criticism of philosophers.

But what is surprising is the claim that he was influenced by philosophical opinions and adopted them, further than that the claim of some contemporaries that he was hiding this, and that he compiled books that included the truth of his belief in those opinions, and he hid it from people, except for a specific category.

This study: (The impact of philosophical opinions on Imam Al-Ghazali between truth and illusion) aims to determine the most prominent domains of this claim, then analyse and criticise them, to know the truth of these allegations, and Al-Ghazali’s position from philosophy.

The importance of this study is evident in discussion of the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali, and the refutation of the suspicion that it was leaked to him, or his belief in its validity.
This study is based on methodology by tracking the most prominent of the claims – the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali, then analysing it, and responding to it.

The study axes were first: the claim of the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali when he examined their opinions, second: the claim of the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali based on books attributed to him, third: the claim of the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali because of his interest in logic and his classification in it; then the research concluded the most prominent results.

**Researcher**

**First: The claim of the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali when he examined their opinions:**

Some scholars claimed that Al-Ghazali was impacted by philosophers during his reading of their opinions, and he adopted some of their opinions, such as Mazeri, Abu Bakr Ibn Al Arabi, Al-Tartoushi Al-Maliki (Al-Dhahabi, 1985, P. 19/327, 339. Ibn Al-Sobky, 1992, P. 6/241-243) and Ibn Taymiyyah (Ibn Taymiyyah, 2001, P. 1/168), and others.

The answer to this claim:

These are just claims that lack the proof from the words of Al-Ghazali himself, and the words of some of them, such as Al-Tartoushi Al-Maliki, included transgression not hidden from the mind; therefore, Ibn Al-Sobky described his statement as claims that are without evidence, and which are not evident among scholars, and indicated that their origin is fanaticism (Ibn Al-Sobky, 1992, P. 6/252).

It is no secret that Al-Ghazali's mere reading of the books of philosophy, is not considered an infraction, especially since he set a great rule in responding to the opponents, He said: “no one know contraindicated of some kind of science, unless he studied that science, until he equals the most knowledgeable of them, in the origin of that knowledge, then he adds to it, and exceeds its degree, and he learns of what the knowledge-holder did not know, and then he can decide nullity those claims”(Al-Ghazali, 1971, P.126).

This is the correct scientific method in responding to the violators, otherwise how is it possible to discuss the opponent without knowledge of his opinion?! That is why Al-Ghazali wrote his book: (Maqasd Al-Falasifah), in explaining their doctrines and editing their articles, and then the fruit of that was his classification a book: (Tahafut Al-Falasifah), in which he responded to them, and explained the nullity of their articles; he says: “when I had read these books, I get with the utmost knowledge of them in less than two years, then I still continued to think about it after understand it, and repeat it, and inspect its mysteries, until I became
aware of what it contains of deception, dressing, investigation and imagination, knowledge that I did not doubt so listen now to his story, and the story of their science recipient, for I saw them as varieties, and I saw their sciences in sections, and they - despite the large number of their types - have the stigma of disbelief and atheism, even if it is between the ancient among them and the oldest, and between the last and the first, There is great variation in distance from and closeness to truth” (Al-Ghazali, 1971, P.126-127).

"Al-Ghazali warned against being deceived by their knowledge and their words, which may be mixed with some truth, so he said the second scourge is a scourge of acceptance for those who looked at their books, such as Ikhwan Al-Safa and others, and saw what they had mixed up with their words of the prophetic ruling and Sufism words; perhaps they were accepted, and they believed in it, yet he is quick to accept their falsehood mixed with it because he thinks it is good and he accepts it, and that is a kind of luring into falsehood; so he must prevent the ignorant from reading their books (Al-Ghazali, 1971, P. 155-156).

It must be pointed out that the claim of the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali may be due to some issues that come under the realm of interpretation and difference, or have an origin from the Sharia, and so on, which is what Al-Ghazali himself stipulated, when he said: “In our classifications of the secrets of the sciences of religion, a group of those who did not keep their secrets in the sciences, did not open themselves to the utmost goals of the doctrines with their insights, and claimed that those words came from the words of the early adopters, even though some of them are generators of thoughts, and it is just a compatible, and some of them are found in the books of legitimacy, most of which is the meaning of which is found in Sufism books, and given that it does not exist except in their books, so if that speech was reasonable in itself, supported by evidence, and was not against the Qur’an and Sunnah, why should be abandoned it?! Abandoning every right preceded by a void thought, we have to abandon a lot of the truth, and we have to forsake a number of verses from the verses of the Qur’an, the narrations of the Messenger, my God’s prayers and peace be upon him, the stories of the predecessors, and the words of the wise men and Sufis, because the owner of (Ikhwan al-Safa) included them in his book, citing them and drawing the hearts of Fools through it to vain, This applies until the nullified extract the truth from our hands by depositing it in their books” (Al-Ghazali, 1971, P. 153-154).

So who was this with his stance on the philosophers, and this is his opinion of them, how is he accused of being affected by them, and believing in their opinions?!

Second: The claim of the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali based on books attributed to him:

The claimants of the impact of philosophy on al-Ghazali relied on books attributed to him, the most famous of which are: (Al-Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr Ahlih, and Maarij Al-Quds Fi
Maerifat Al-Nnafs), which included the statement or allusion to a set of opinions that the philosophers said, such as the world is ancient, the denial of God’s ancient knowledge of the partial details, the negation of the attributes, the denial of the returning bodies, and other articles known about the philosophers (Ibn Al-Salah, 1992, P. 1/263-264. Ibn Taymiyyah, 2001, P. 1/169. Al-Dhahabi, 1985, P. 19/329. Ibn Al-Sobky, 1992, P. 6/257).

As for the book: (Al-Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr Ahlih), Ibn Al-Salah stated that it is attributed to him, from the book: (Maqasd Al-Falasifah), which Al-Ghazali replied by a book: (Tahafut Al-Falasifah), and this book contains what is not appropriate for what is true of the virtue and religion of the man. This was Al-Ghazali’s belief; (Ibn Al-Salah, 1992, P. 1/263-264. Al-Dhahabi, 1985, P. 19/329. Ibn Al-Sobky, 1992, P. 6/257), this was confirmed by Ibn Al-Sobky too (Ibn Al-Sobky, 1992, P. 6/257), and a number of contemporary writers, including Dr. Abd al-Rahman Badawi (Badawi A., 1977, P. 152-155), and Dr. Mashhad al-Allaf (1- Al-Allaf M., 2002).

As for the book: (Maarij Al-Quds Fi Maerifat Al-Nnafs), it is false to al-Ghazali too, as was shown by Dr. Abd al-Rahman Badawi (Badawi A., 1977, P. 244-247), and Dr. Mashhad al-Allaf (1- Al-Allaf M., 2002).

In spite of the scholars, in the past and present, declaring that these two books were not written by Imam Al-Ghazali, we find some of contemporaries, Suleiman Dunya in his book: (Al-Haqiqah Fi Nazar Al-Ghazali), (1) confirm their attribution to Al-Ghazali for proof that the opinions expressed in them are the true doctrine of Al-Ghazali, which he concealed from the common people. Suleiman Dunya said: “as for whoever wants to study Al-Ghazali in order to know the truth as he thinks it, let him study it in his books that he gave not to the public, and he kept them for himself and for a group that is reassured that their intellectual level is able to perceive it, and we now have two books of these books: the first: (Al-Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr), the second: (Maarj Al-Quds), and we will rely on a book: (Maarj alquds), because we believe in the validity of its attribution to Al-Ghazali...” (Dunya S., 1980, P. 118-119).

In the view of the researcher, Suleiman Dunya was not successful either in the curriculum he adopted, or in the results he reached, and this is the statement:

1- His explanation of Al-Ghazali’s words in sections of the doctrine, unlike his own:

Suleiman Dunya claimed that Al-Ghazali concealed his true opinions and prevented them from the unqualified; he started by dividing Al-Ghazali’s doctrine into three sections, and abbreviated it in a bad way with a bias to his previous conclusions; so he said:

(1) It is originally a doctoral thesis, which was printed Dar Al-Maeerif-Cairo, in several editions. Between the years: 1947-1980.
“The first: a doctrine that is intolerant to one, because it is the doctrine of the country in which he grew up, and the doctrine of his people, and it is either the doctrine of Al-Ash'ari, or Mu'tazili ... etc.

The second: the doctrine of the educated, and it differs according to their situation, so if the learner could not understand the precise issues, then it is not told him: the God neither within the world nor outside it, nor connected to it or separated from it, but if he was intelligent you can tell him the truth.

The third: the doctrine in which a person believes in the privacy of himself, and he does not reveal it except for those who have certain qualities. "Then" he counted Al-Ghazali in the third doctrine” (Dunya S.,1980, P. 57-58).

But when we read the book: (Mizan Al-Aamal), we find that Suleiman Dunya neglected the division that was mentioned by Al-Ghazali and its reason. It came as an answer to those who ask: Perhaps you say your words in this book have been divided into what corresponds to the doctrine of Ash’arism and some other scholars of theology, and the words are understood only on one doctrine, so what is the truth of these doctrines, and if the whole is true, how is this imagined, and if some of it is true then what is that is right? (Al-Ghazali, 1964, P.405).

Al-Ghazali here lists a possible problem that may be directed at him, because of his adopting some opinions in contradiction to the Ash’arism; he replied that the people’s attitude towards the doctrine is of two groups: the first group: what a person becomes intolerant of and influenced by the environment in which he grew up, and the second: what he speaks about in counselling and teaching, and this must be taking into account the status of the learner; Therefore, it changes and differs briefly and in detail, and it is with each one according to what he can understand, and the third: what a person believes in himself, this is between him and God Almighty, so he condemns God Almighty with him, and he does not mention it except to those who are readied to understand it (Al-Ghazali, 1964, P.405-408).

Then Al-Ghazali mentioned the second group: they are the most, and they say: “The doctrine is one, it is the belief, and it is the one that is uttered as an instruction and guidance with every human being, regardless of his situation, and it is which intolerant to it, and it is either the Ash'ari, Mu'tazili or Karami doctrine, or any of the schools of thought” (Al-Ghazali, 1964, P.408-409).

When Al-Ghazali clarified the opinion of the first group on the doctrine, he did not mention the sections of the doctrine in the sense that they differ from each other, but rather decided
that they are ranks of the same doctrine, but they differ according to the status of the recipient. In contrast the second team did not take this diversity into account.

Before al-Ghazali detailed the ranks of the doctrine with the first group and explained them, he said: “every perfect one has three doctrine”; (Al-Ghazali, 1964, P.406), this indicates that he supports dividing the doctrine into three ranks, and this is clear from his behaviour in composition, and he stated that in more than one of his books (Al-Ghazali, 1982, P. 1/22, 97-99. Radhi Mohammed M., 2013, P. 229-232).

It is as if Al-Ghazali says: I am in the original: Ash’ari and Shafi’I; this is the first rank, and when you see me abbreviate it and do not mention the details, this does not mean that I do not understand the terminology of theologians and their statements, but rather I take into account the condition of the learner; this is the second rank, and at the same time when you see me, I disagree with opinion of the Ash'arism or Shafi’iism in some sub-issues, and agree with others; this does not mean that I departed from my Ash'arism and Shafi’ism, but this is what my understanding led me to, and this is the third level, and since opinions are sometimes not suitable for public presentation, because they lack a scientific and psychological preparation, it is only appropriate to talk about it except with who is qualified to receive it, lest he leave his religion because he did not understand those opinions.

Then Al-Ghazali encourages the questioner and says: “leave doctrines, and I seek the truth by way of research and consideration, to be the owner of a doctrine, and not to be in a blind image imitating a leader who guides you on a path, and around you a thousand like your leader calling for you, that he: I destroy you and shade you from the straight path, and you will know in your affair's consequence an injustice your leader, there is no salvation except in independence” (Al-Ghazali, 1964, P.409).

The abstention from expressing an opinion to those who are not qualified to understand it, we cannot look at it as Suleiman Dunya decided it,, because the intended opinions are not just sub-issues of controversy that can be interpreted, rather they may take their beliefs out of religion, such as the world is ancient, the denial of the returning bodies, and the negation of the attributes (Dunya S.,1980, P. 100, 206, 212, 237-238, 358-364. Al-Ghazali, 1994, P. 335-336. Al-Ghazali, 1975, P. 143-144, 147-155, 166-168, 172-173, 176-177), and the end of this is to accuse Al-Ghazali of hypocrisy because he states in his words and writings otherwise.

B- Suleiman Dunya tried to prove the ratio of the two books to Al-Ghazali:

We have previously mentioned that scholars, both ancient and modern, have proven the invalidity of attribution of these two books: (Al-Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr Ahlih, and Maarij Al-Quds) to Al-Ghazali, yet we found Solomon Dunya confirming the validity of their attribution to him, and he claimed that he nullified all the appeals that were mentioned on the
two mentioned books, but the truth of his action does not indicate that, and I am not here to return what scholars have written about nullifying the ratio of these two books, but to shed light on more observations that support the invalidity of this ratio.

1- Suleiman Dunya supported his claim, by that Ibn Al-Salah ruled on the book: (Al-Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr Ahlih) without knowledge of it, and that the book does not contain any of the famous sayings of philosophers, except for a reference to that the world is ancient (Dunya S.,1980, P. 98-100).

In fact, this is a claim against Ibn Al-Salah, and it seems that this wrong judgment was issued by Suleiman Dunya, because he relied on what Ibn Al-Sobky had transmitted in his book from Ibn al-Salah in brief, but if he returned to the book of Ibn Al-Salah: (Tabaqat Al-Fuqaha Al-Shafi’iyyah), he would not have fallen into this error, and he did not direct his criticism to him, especially that Ibn al-Salah mentioned that these opinions were attributed to al-Ghazali in another brief book attributed to him, and that when he searched for it, it was ascertained that it was a fake (Ibn Al-Salah, 1992, P. 1/263-264).

Despite what Suleiman Dunya reported from the opinion of some researchers regarding the possibility of another book in which Ibn al-Salah found what he mentioned, he ruled that out without proof, and then he claimed that he nullified all opinions that challenged the attribution of the book to Al-Ghazali (Dunya S., 1980, P. 101-102).

2- Whoever wants to conceal a book includes his opinions that he has concealed from the common people, and does not name his book like this attractive title: (Al-Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr Ahlih); this excites the listener to discover what is hidden, and who are the eligible, and who are not, and this is contrary to the purported intention of the book. Therefore the one who placed the book on Al-Ghazali intended by this title to stimulate curiosity to review it, not to prevent it from doing so, in order to ensure that these opinions are attributed to Al-Ghazali.

3- From what Suleiman Dunya adopted regarding the validity of the ratio of these two books is the phrases and texts in them, and even parts of chapters found in the other books of Al-Ghazali, and these were replied by Ibn Al-Salah and others as previously, when they explained that these books took from the books of Al-Ghazali and deposited them in them, and added opinions not related to Al-Ghazali.

4- Suleiman Dunya fell into turmoil and ambivalence in his desperate attempts, to confirm the authenticity of the attribution of these books to Al-Ghazali. Once he says: “Al-Ghazali banned his books from the public, and he kept them for himself, and for a sect that reassured that their intellectual level was able to perceive them”; (Dunya S., 1980, P. 118) this is understood from him that Al-Ghazali found someone to throw these books on him, but he
returns to say in the margin of the same page: “Al-Ghazali did not want to write about these thoughts, which he had hidden from others, and to keep them for himself, and only those who are qualified for it are told about them, but when he did not find the qualifies, he was compelled to write these thoughts in the books that he called: (Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr Ahlih)”; (Dunya S., 1980, P. 118), this means that he did not find anyone to give him these books orally, so he codified them for fear of being lost!!

This saying is surprising, because Al-Ghazali - as he saw- did not find anyone to inform them of these so-called secrets, so he codified it in books, and thus put them in the reach of everyone, because the codification of science lead to the prevalence of it.

5- The objections were directed at the book: (Al-Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr Ahlih), that it is a weak book, and there is nothing in it that is suitable to be called an infatuation with it; so Suleiman Dunya defended this by saying that Al-Ghazali promised many books "Madnun Biha Ealaa Ghyr Ahliha", then he said: “Al-Ghazali may have been in distributing his philosophical opinions among a number of books, so long as he wants to conceal these opinions, then in distributing them among several books, he will help him in this concealment, and this is good behavior without a doubt” (Dunya S., 1980, P. 100-102).

I do not know from where Suleiman Dunya came, that Al-Ghazali promised many books, and if his document was what was mentioned in the last of the books: (Al-Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr Ahlih), what is mentioned in it is another concealed book; (Al-Ghazali, 1994, P. 358), he did not mention many books, and all the references in other his books are not explicit that they are books, as well as being many books (Al-Ghazali, 1986, P. 43. Al-Ghazali, 1988, P. 17).

Also, this talk is contradicted by what is stated in the book: (Maarij Al-Quds), which Suleiman Dunya made it the basis of his research, because Al-Ghazali says in it: “this is what we wanted to mention in this book, on the secrets stored, and the hidden sciences were shown in it, a closeness to the brothers who have the power of clarity, clarity of mind, cleverness of the soul, purity of intuition, and the certainty that time has been devoid of the inheritors of these secrets by default, and those who are limited to surrounding them in deduction and consolation” (Al-Ghazali, 1975, 180-181).

It is not understood from these words except that he deposited all the so-called secrets in this book, but he recommends at the end of the book not to put it in the unqualified hand, and this contradicts Suleiman Dunya's theory that Al-Ghazali has many books. It contained his hidden opinions, and that he differentiated opinions in more than one book; it is no secret that the outrageous exaggeration in this claim is rejected by many minds.
6- Suleiman Dunya relied in confirming the attribution of the book: (Maarij Al-Quds) to Al-Ghazali on the fact that it was mentioned in a letter submitted by one of al-Ghazali's students; he considered it strong evidence of the correctness of his lineage, and this speech came in the introduction of the book: (Kuhlasat Attasanif Fi Attsawf); (Dunya S., 1980, P. 111), the student says: “my master, if the path to my answer is written in your many books, such as Ehyaa ALoloum, Kiamya alsaeada, Jawahir Al-Qur'an, Mizan Al-Aamal, Alqistas Almustaqim, Mearaj Al-Quds, Minhaj AlAbidin, and the like of it” (Al-Ghazali, 1994, P. 165-166).

Although the text did not mention Maarij alquds, but rather Mearaj alquds, which makes the matter hesitant between: (Mearaj Assalikin), or: (Maarij Al-Quds)? Suleiman Dunya decided that Al-Ghazali does not have a book with this name, but rather (Mearaj Assalikin); the strong assumption is that it is a perversion of (Maarij Al-Quds) (Dunya S., 1980, P. 111).

The strange thing is that this matter, despite its importance, was deposited by Dounia Suleiman in (margin of the page), and he did not explain to us why the strong belief that it was a perversion of (Maarij Al-Quds), although his interpretation of one of the two books without evidence is considered unscientific.

The researcher believes that according to what Suleiman Dunia decided in the reality of the book, Maarij alquds, that it is one of the books which al-Ghazali concealed from the public because it includes revealing secrets and sciences, and it is only given to a very specific group, and this student is definitely not among them; otherwise why would he ask such a question: “I don’t know which knowledge is more beneficial to me than it is to be a reason for my guidance and lead me in the resurrection, I also do not know what is useless from it so that I will avoid it and beware of it”?! (Al-Ghazali, 1994, P. 165).

In addition to what was previously mentioned, Dr. Mashhad Al-Alallaf mentioned an important matter related to this book: (Kuhlasat Attasanif Fi Attsawf), as it is a book of Al-Ghazali: (Aiyaha Alwald) translated into Persian with an increase of approximately five pages; these increases are consistent in meaning with the content the book, and it seems that the translator into Farsi has added it in good faith, and gave it the name: (Kuhlasat Attasanif Fi Attsawf) for what it contains of summaries of morals, mysticism and practical wisdom, by translating it from Persian into Arabic, as he mentioned in the introduction, and it was noticed in the Arabic version of the book: Ayha alwld. This student does not mention the books above, but rather the book: (Ehyaa oloum aldean) only (Al-Allaf M., 2002).

7- As for what Suleiman Dunya invoked from Al-Ghazali’s reference that he wrote a book or books that he banned from the public, (Dunya S., 1980, P. 92-95), as in the book: (Jawahir Al-Qur’an) (Al-Ghazali, 1986, P. 43), and: (Al-Arbaein Fi Usul Al-Diyn) (Al-Ghazali, 1988, P. 17), because that does not require that the intended purpose be these books whose
attribution has been found to be invalid; rather, the one who examines the words of Al-Ghazali does not understand from him except that there are details that should not be presented to every person; so it is not permissible to understand from them that he is saying: “the occurrence of the world in the books of the first rank”. Then he returns to say with his foot in his other books, or prove the qualities in those and denies them in this!! What is understood from the context of the text is that it requires certain qualities to go into the second and third rank.

However, prohibiting some kinds of books, and even information, may be necessary when the recipient is not ready for something like that; so the issue is relative to the recipient’s level and ability to understand, so that it does not raise doubts and shake their beliefs; (Radhi Mohammed M., 2013, P. 250-251), therefore Al-Ghazali warned against delving into theology with those not qualified for this, as was previously mentioned, and the commander of the faithful, Ali bin Abi Talib, my God be pleased with him, said: “Talk to people about what they know do you wants to them lie God and His Messenger” (Al-Bukhari, 1422 A.H, P.1/37/127), and Abdullah bin Masoud, my God be pleased with him, said: “you are not talking to a modern people whose minds do not reach him, except that some of them will have a disorder” (Muslim, 1991, P. 1/11).

This is not just for the common people, but also for the characteristics, Ibn Al-Jawzi said: “Just as the world should not address the common people with all knowledge, so it should allocate the properties to the secrets of knowledge, because the tolerance of these is something that those who cannot tolerate, and different understandings are known” (Ibn Muflih, 1996, P. 2/64).

8- An exaggeration from Suleiman Dunya to confirming his theory, he mentioned what agrees with the opinions mentioned in the book: (Maarij Al-Quds) from the books of philosophers such as Al-Farabi, Ibn Sina and others, in his work to prove the proportion of these opinions to Al-Ghazali.

9- The reader of Suleiman Dunya's book: (Al-Haqiqah Fi Nazar Al-Ghazali) came out with result: that Al-Ghazali was declaring certain opinions that are pleasing to and in line with the public, but in reality he believes in other opinions, although he confronted those opinions, and wrote books in response to it, and explained its invalidity.

At the conclusion of this part of the article I say: It was necessary for Suleiman Dunya to be more investigative about the correctness of the attribution of these books to Al-Ghazali, and to review his book, which he first printed in (1947), and the fourth: (1980), to see the validity of what was stated in it, especially since he fell into a kind of turmoil; at the time he confirmed the attribution of these books to Al-Ghazali and denied any doubt about that.; we find him saying elsewhere from his book; from this it appears that the search for Al-Ghazali
will not produce more than speculations, and the speculation is sufficient in a parable, as there is no way to certainty (Dunya S., 1980, P. 111).

Even if the author wants to apologise with these words, according to the researcher, he destroyed the entire book because he acknowledges that his research is based on speculations; however, he wrote more than 400 pages in it, and he apologises there is no way to certainty, and that the speculations are suffices; this is a strange statement!!

Is it permissible for us to build a complete research by which we destroy the certainty we know about Al-Ghazali from his documented books based on a speculation based on books of doubtful attribution to him?!

_Third: The claim of the impact of philosophy in Al-Ghazali because of his interest in logic and authorship in it:_

One of the reasons for the claim of the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali what was known about his interest of logic and its classification in it; he was considered one of the first to adopt Aristotelian logic in Islamic sciences; for the evidence, these were the beginnings of the method that was called the method of the latecomers, as opposed to the method of the applicants (Radhi Mohammed M., 2013, P. 102-104, 108-109), he has been criticised for this interest in logic by some of the Muslim scholars (Ibn Taymiyyah, (416 A.H, p. 9/184 230-231. Al-Dhahabi, 1985, P. 19/329. Ibn Al-Sobky, 1992. P. 6/256).

But if Al-Ghazali's stance on logic was the same as his well-known position on philosophy, then logic would not have had this impact on Muslim research methods.

The mind may ask: How does Al-Ghazali have such a solid stance on philosophy, while at the same time he exalts Aristotelian logic, while he looked at what the philosophers had previously reached?

We may find from Al-Ghazali indicating an anti-logic stance hovering over the stance towards philosophy, when he says: “Rather, we conveyed this story for you to know that there is no proof or mastery of their doctrine, and that they are judging by speculation, without verification and certainty, and they are inferred to Their divine sciences were validated by the emergence of mathematical and logical sciences, and they lured the weak-minded, and if their divine sciences were elaborate proofs, pure from guesswork, like their arithmetic sciences, they would not disagree about it, just as they did not differ in arithmetic” (Al-Ghazali, 1980, P. 76-77).

Al-Ghazali did not exclude logic as he excluded mathematical sciences, but he revealed the truth of his position on logic when he said: “As for the logic: most of them are based on the
method of righteousness, and error in them is rare, but Philosophers different from the people of truth with terms and revenues, and the purpose of logic is to straighten out the methods of inferences” (Al-Ghazali, 1961, P. 32. Al-Ghazali, 1971, P. 141-142. Al-Ghazali, 1980, P. 85).

Rather, he goes further in the introduction to his book Almustasfa, where he said: “This introduction is not part of the science of origins, nor of its introductions, but rather it is the introduction to all sciences, and whoever does not surround it has no confidence in his sciences” (Al-Ghazali, 1993, P. 10).

Because Al-Ghazali’s reliance on logic may be understood as being influenced by philosophy, we find some researchers, such as Dr. Al-Nashar, think that Al-Ghazali changed his position on logic in his last days; (Al-Nashar, S, 1984, P. 172-173), but this is a mistake, so I will transfer his words to know the truth of his position on logic.

Al-Ghazali says: “as for the logic none of them is related to religion in denial or proof, but rather is to look at the methods of evidence and measures, the conditions of the preliminaries of the evidence, how they are structured, the conditions of the correct boundary and how to arrange it, and that a way to conceive knowledge is the limit, and a way to discover the verification, is the proof, and nothing from this should be denied, rather, it is of the same type as what scholars have mentioned, but rather they separate them with phrases and idioms by further exploring the definitions and bifurcations, an example of their words in logic: If it is proven that all (A) is (B), then it is necessary that some (B) is (A), that is, if it is proven that every human being is an animal, then it is necessary that some of the animal is a human, and they express this as the total obligation is reflected partial positive, this does not attach to religion until it is denied, and if it is denied, only Suspicion in the mind of the denier has occurred, as well as in his religion, which he claimed is dependent on such denial, yes philosophers have a kind of injustice in this science, which is that they collect conditions for proof that lead Inevitably certainty, but upon of the religious objectives they do not act on those conditions, but rather they are indulging in the end of leniency, and the logic may also be considered by those who approve of it and see it as clear, and he thinks that what is transmitted from philosophers is supported by such proofs, so he hurries with disbelief before completing the divine sciences this pest also in it” (Al-Ghazali, 1971, 141-142).

So Al-Ghazali, while adopting logic as a research method, was not influenced by philosophical opinions, so we find him excusing the logic from the results reached by the philosophers, accusing them of wrongly using logic, and he also draws attention to another negativity, which is that one might prefer logic; so falls into himself that the opinions of philosophers are right because it is based on logic, but the defect is not in logic, but in the application of philosophers the rules of logic.

Therefore, Al-Ghazali remained attached to logic, even after his inclination to the path of mysticism, and if there was a change in his position on logic, he would have stated it, but we
find him stressing the importance of logic even in his last books, such as Almunqudh min alldlal, and this position had a great impact on the continuation of the methodology which Al-Ghazali followed in those who came after him.

**Conclusion**

1- The claim that philosophical opinions had an impact on Al-Ghazali relied on three matters, the most prominent of which are his work in editing articles of philosophers and responding to them; some of the books are attributed to him, and his interest in logic and his classification in it.

2- The claim that philosophy had an impact on Al-Ghazali is a false claim without proof, in addition to being inconsistent with Al-Ghazali's explicit stance on philosophy.

3- The invalidity of the attribution of book: (Al-Madnun Bih Ealaa Ghyr Ahlih), and (Maarij Al-Quds) to Al-Ghazali, and what Suleiman Dunya mentioned in terms of arguments did not to change this ruling.

4- Al-Ghazali’s division of the doctrine into three ranks; he wanted to take into account the condition of the learner and warned against throwing details of knowledge on the unqualified, because he is not able to perceive it, and it is possible he left religion because of his lack of understanding of it.

5- The approach taken by Suleiman Dunya in trying to prove the impact of philosophy on Al-Ghazali; its result: Al-Ghazali was concealing a belief, but he declared in his words and writings otherwise, and this leads to Al-Ghazali being accused of hypocrisy, indirectly.

6- Although Al-Ghazali relied on logic and praised it, this does not require that philosophy had an impact on him, especially since he sees in it a law and an abstract standard of evidence; so he acquitted it, accusing the philosophers of the wrong use of the logic, and the defect in the application of its rules.

7- Those who thought that al-Ghazali’s position on logic had changed in his late days are mistaken.

8- Al-Ghazali himself stated that some of what was criticised and attributed to philosophy, is not from what the philosophers are unique to, but is from what is due to some of the origins of the Sharia, or it was supported by evidence.

The last Dua'a is thanks to Allah and blessings and peace be upon our master Mohammad and his family and companions as a whole.
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