Abstract

Sūfī Terminology and Its Meaning in Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*

Omer Michaelis

The presence of $s\bar{u}f\bar{t}$ terminology in Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*, though acknowledged in scholarship, has yet to receive a detailed study. As early as 1986, Shlomo Pines suggested, in two articles, that Maimonides' discourse in *Guide* III:51 is charged with 'terms and notions borrowed directly or indirectly from the Moslem mystics, the Şūfīs'. But apart from Pines' concise remarks, the question of $s\bar{u}f\bar{t}$ terminology in the *Guide* has only been scantly noted, and always in very general terms.

In this article I argue that in *Guide* III:51 Maimonides does not adhere to a $s\bar{u}f\bar{t}$ path, but appropriates $s\bar{u}f\bar{t}$ language in a dialectical fashion to his own philosophical framework and to the epistemology he developed in the course of his *Guide*. As I demonstrate, Maimonides was not the first to perform the discursive gesture of recasting $s\bar{u}f\bar{t}$ language. Following recent scholarship, I argue that Maimonides was preceded by Abū 'Ali ibn Sīnā, in the concluding chapters of his *Kitāb al-Ishārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt* (Pointers and Reminders). An exploration of the parallel strategies employed by Maimonides and ibn Sīnā – by Maimonides following ibn Sīnā, as I argue – reveals that both utilized $s\bar{u}f\bar{t}$ language in a mode different from that of the Ṣūfīs, in order to present a religious ideal that centers on the intellect, whose characteristics are those of the *falsafa*. This exploration not only reveals a previously overlooked source that influenced Maimonides in one of the key chapters of his *Guide*, but also shows the content with which he charged the $s\bar{u}f\bar{t}$ language and the intervention he sought to make in a cultural milieu in which Ṣūfīsm was an ascending force.

The article studies $s\bar{u}f\bar{i}$ terminology in *Guide* III:51 in two modes: the first is an analysis of the function of the $s\bar{u}f\bar{i}$ terms in the chapter, which is then compared to the use of these terms in preceding $s\bar{u}f\bar{i}$ and $s\bar{u}f\bar{i}$ -inspired works. The second is a high-resolution analysis of *Guide* III:51 in light of ibn Sīnā's *al-Ishārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt*, a source that has hitherto been largely neglected in the study of Maimonides' *Guide*. This two-pronged study reveals both that Maimonides' employment of the terms is incompatible with the $s\bar{u}f\bar{i}$ approach and the source of Maimonides' recasting of $s\bar{u}f\bar{i}$ terminology.