

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Kaukua, Jari

Title: The Flying and the Masked Man, One More Time : Comments on Peter Adamson and Fedor Benevich, 'The Thought Experimental Method : Avicenna's Flying Man Argument'

Year: 2020

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © American Philosophical Association 2020

Rights: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Rights url: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Please cite the original version:

Kaukua, J. (2020). The Flying and the Masked Man, One More Time : Comments on Peter Adamson and Fedor Benevich, 'The Thought Experimental Method : Avicenna's Flying Man Argument'. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 6(3), 285-296.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2019.52>

The Flying and the Masked Man, One More Time:

Comments on Peter Adamson and Fedor Benevich, ‘The Thought Experimental Method:

Avicenna’s Flying Man Argument’

Abstract: This is a critical comment on Adamson and Benevich 2018, published in issue 4/2 of the *J-APA*. I raise two closely related objections. The first concerns the objective of the flying man: instead of the question of *what* the soul is, I argue that it is designed to answer the question of *whether* the soul exists independently of the body. The second objection concerns the expected result of the argument: instead of knowledge about the quiddity of soul, I claim it yields knowledge about the soul’s existence independently of the body. After the objections, I turn to the masked man fallacy, claiming that although the Adamson-Benevich interpretation does save the argument from the fallacy, this comes at the cost of plausibility. I then give a more modest interpretation that both avoids the fallacy and is plausible. The paper concludes with a remark about the metaphysical possibility of the flying man.

Keywords: Avicenna, flying man, thought experiments

If you can cook up an imaginatively engaging, apparently plausible, but ultimately suspicious thought experiment, chances are that you will secure posterior fame in philosophy. This recipe certainly worked for Avicenna, whose flying man argument has troubled his readers for almost a millennium. Indeed, the argument’s correct interpretation, and consequently its validity, are still matters of controversy. In their recent article, ‘The Thought Experimental Method: Avicenna’s Flying Man Argument’ (Adamson and Benevich 2018), Peter Adamson and Fedor Benevich offer an interesting new interpretation that is designed to reconstruct the argument as one that *both* yields substantial new knowledge about the essence of the human soul *and* is immune to the masked man fallacy often attributed to it. In this rejoinder, I want to raise two problems in the Adamson-Benevich reconstruction. The first of these concerns the role of the flying man in the context of *Shifā’*: *Nafs* I.1, the version of the argument Adamson and Benevich mainly focus on, with especial attention at the order of scientific investigation that Avicenna presents in his theory of science. My claim is that the flying man is not a question of

what the soul is, but a special kind of question of *whether* there is a soul, namely whether there is a soul that can exist independently of the body it governs. The second concern is related to the first, for I do not believe that it makes sense to interpret the information yielded by the flying man as information about the essence, or quiddity, of the soul.

The central virtue of the Adamson-Benevich interpretation is that it saves the flying man from arguably the most serious criticism foisted upon it, namely that it lapses into the fallacy commonly known as the masked man. Thus, after raising the aforementioned concerns about their interpretation, I want to offer another interpretation that avoids the problems but is also capable of saving the argument from the fallacy. Finally, by way of an appendix, I conclude with a brief consideration of why I think the flying man must be understood as a *per impossibile* argument.¹

Which question does the flying man address?

Adamson and Benevich claim that in *Shifā': Nafs* I.1, Avicenna is dissatisfied with the Aristotelian definition of the soul as “the first perfection of a natural organized body that performs acts of life.”² According to them, the flying man should be understood as an attempt at a more adequate formula, in particular one that does not include the relation to the body, allegedly an accidental feature, in the definition of soul (Adamson and Benevich 2018: 152-153).³

It is difficult to reconcile this claim with Avicenna’s method of procedure in the chapter as a whole. He begins from the observation of phenomena specific to living things, and concludes that since not all bodies exhibit these phenomena, they cannot be due to corporeality as such. Thus, a further principle is needed, and he says:

¹ For the sake of brevity, I refrain from describing the flying man here. An interested reader will find a translation and commentary in Adamson and Benevich 2018. For the same reason, I do not aim at a comprehensive review of the scholarship on the flying man. My main aim here is to comment on Adamson’s and Benevich’s new insights; and I have already engaged with the most important previous scholarship in Kaukua 2015.

² Avicenna, *Shifā': Nafs* I.1, 12; cf. Ar. *De an.* II.1, 412a27-28. Unless mentioned otherwise, all translations from the Arabic are mine.

³ Alpina 2018, 191-202, also argues that Avicenna rejects the Aristotelian definition of soul. The following thus applies to his reconstruction as well.

The thing out of which these actions issue and, in short, anything that is a principle for the issuance of any actions that do not follow a uniform course devoid of volition, we call ‘soul.’ This expression is a term for this thing not on account of its substance but on account of a certain relation it has, that is, in the sense that it is a principle of these actions. We shall later investigate its substance and the category in which it belongs. (Avicenna, *Shifā’*: *Nafs* I.1, 4)

Here, at the very beginning of the chapter, Avicenna clearly states that ‘soul’ is a relational term that designates the thing that is a principle of life *insofar as it is a principle of life*, that is, insofar as it is related to living bodies. Today we would perhaps say that ‘soul’ is a functional term. He explicitly says that ‘soul’ remains neutral about what the thing that is such a principle is in itself, and goes on to add that this will be dealt with later. Whether this means later on in the same chapter, later on in psychology, or perhaps even later on in the philosophical curriculum, is left unspecified.

When it comes to this relative or functional concept of soul, however, Avicenna happily endorses Aristotle’s definition. This is corroborated by his evaluation of the different candidates for the definition of soul. He first rules out *quwwa*, that is, ‘power’ or ‘faculty,’ because this term signifies both active and passive capacities (for instance, motion and perception, respectively). It is therefore ambiguous, and as an ambiguous term, unfit for a real definition. On the other hand, neither of the disambiguated meanings alone is capable of encompassing all life activities, which is why *quwwa* fails to signify “soul absolutely,” that is, all kinds of soul (Avicenna, *Shifā’*: *Nafs* I.1, 7-8). But *pace* Adamson and Benevich, Avicenna finds no similar qualms with defining soul as perfection. Indeed, he has earlier stated unequivocally that “[i]t is clear from this, then, that when we define the soul as a perfection, this most properly denotes its meaning and likewise includes all the species of the soul in all respects, not excluding the soul that is separate from matter” (Avicenna, *Shifā’*: *Nafs* I.1, 7). The definition of soul as perfection does precisely what the definition as *quwwa* fails to do: it encompasses all kinds of soul (plant, animal, and human), and thereby all life activities. What is more, as Avicenna explicitly mentions, this definition is neutral about the ontological status of the kinds of things that can function as souls – in particular, whether they are forms, which are inseparable parts of hylomorphic compounds, or incorporeal substances (see the long argument in Avicenna, *Shifā’*: *Nafs* I.1, 8-10).

The slightly later passage that Adamson and Benevich introduce as evidence for Avicenna's rejection of 'perfection' as *definiens* of 'soul' is readily explained in this light. Let us recall the passage:

If we come to know that soul is a perfection, then however we explain and elucidate 'perfection,' we will not thereby come to know the soul in its quiddity but only know it insofar as it is a soul, given that the name 'soul' applies to it not insofar as it is a substance, but insofar as it governs bodies and is related to them. (Avicenna, *Shifā'*: *Nafs* I.1, 10; cf. Adamson and Benevich 2018: 152.)

This is not a rejection of the Aristotelian definition of soul, but a qualifying remark, according to which it only defines the functional term, remaining neutral about the ontological status, as well as the constitutive features, of the things that function as souls. Avicenna hastens to add that this is the concept of soul proper to natural philosophy, a branch of which psychology is, precisely because it includes "a connection to matter and motion" (Avicenna, *Shifā'*: *Nafs* I.1, 11). It is true that Avicenna elsewhere uses the term 'soul' to refer to the thing that functions as a soul, seemingly independent of this function – think about phrases like 'separate soul' (*nafs mujarrad*) or 'rational soul' (*nafs nāṭiqā*). However, I do not think this is evidence for his rejecting the Aristotelian definition as proper for the science of psychology, the subject matter of which is constituted by the functions of life ranging from the most basic vegetative operations to the most sophisticated levels of cognition. At best, it tells us that 'soul' can be said in different senses, and it is perfectly reasonable to assume that Avicenna would have held the looser use to be ultimately grounded in the scientific one, as shorthand for 'the thing that functions as a soul'.

On the heels of these considerations, I find it unlikely that the flying man is concerned with the quiddity of *soul*, simply because that quiddity has already been acquired. In other words, it is not concerned with the constitutive features of being a soul in the absolute sense of the word – we already know those features. What, then, is it about? – Heeding the example of Adamson and Benevich and taking our cue from Avicenna's logic, we find that in *Shifā'*: *Burhān* I.5, he elaborates on the Aristotelian distinction between the different kinds of scientific questions (cf. *An. post.* II.1) as well as the related theory concerning their proper order in scientific inquiry. Once we have a nominal definition

for a scientific term, the first question to ask is *whether* (*hal*) anything instantiating the nominal definition exists in the extramental world. This is the starting point of all science insofar as a positive answer to the question *whether* establishes that there is something for the science to study in the first place. The question *whether* is in turn divided into two types, namely the simple (*basīṭ*) and the composite (*murakkab*) *whether*. The simple one asks whether something denoted by the subject term exists pure and simple, whereas the composite one asks whether something exists *as something*, or under a certain qualification. Finally, once we have located grounds for a positive answer to a *whether* question of either kind, we can proceed to ask anew *what* (*mā*) that existing thing is. This second *what* is not a mere repetition of the initial question, for this time we are not inquiring about the meaning of the subject term but about the real definition of the thing that is called by the term and that has now been shown to exist. A successful answer to the second question *what* (the real *what* as opposed to the first, nominal *what*) is a detailed account of the constitutive features of the thing's quiddity (*māhīya*).⁴

Now, *Shifā'*: *Nafs* I.1 begins with a simple *whether* question, namely whether the subject of psychology, or "the thing we call soul," exists.⁵ This question is answered affirmatively by recourse to the empirical observation of life processes, which, although they take place in bodies, are inexplicable by means of the essence of corporeality alone: if life were grounded in corporeality pure and simple, then all bodies would be alive by definition. Hence, an explanatory factor must be added to mere corporeality, and this factor is what we are accustomed to call soul. The chapter then proceeds to ask the real *what* question about soul, and answers it by means of the Aristotelian formula that defines the soul as the first perfection of a natural organized body that is potentially alive. It is at this point, after dealing with all three steps, that we come up with the flying man. In light of the foregoing, it is clear that we need not deal with the real *what* question anymore, let alone ask *whether* there are souls pure and simple. However, the investigation remains concerning the quiddity of the thing that functions as

⁴ Avicenna, *Shifā'*: *Burhān*, I.5, 68-69. A third kind of question is the *why* (*limā*), which can only be dealt with once the first two kinds of questions have been answered. This question is not relevant to our present concern.

⁵ Avicenna, *Shifā'*: *Nafs* I.1, 4. It is not entirely clear whether Avicenna simply assumes the nominal definition of the term 'soul' to be known, or whether the preliminary characterization of the functional term quoted above ("[t]he thing out of which these actions [of life] issue") is his nominal definition. The problem with the latter alternative is that he would then violate his stated order of procedure, because the nominal definition would be given after (or at best, together with) the positive answer to the simple *whether*.

soul, only now considered in itself, and not insofar as it is a soul. In order to get this question off the ground, the first question to ask is whether there is anything to be investigated in the first place, that is, whether the thing that functions as a soul has an existence apart from its being a soul. Thus, it is time for a composite question *whether*, namely the question of whether there are things that function as souls, but exist *independently of the bodies they animate*.

Attending to Avicenna's introduction of the thought experiment, we find that he is explicit about these methodological points. Let us retranslate the relevant sentences:

We have now become acquainted with the meaning of the name that applies to the thing,⁶ which is called soul by virtue of a relation it has, but we have barely occupied ourselves with perceiving the quiddity of this thing, which has become a soul in the said respect. In this place, we must point at asserting the existence of the soul, which belongs to us, by way of drawing attention and reminding.⁷

There are two things to note about this introduction of the flying man. First, Avicenna explicitly says that we already have the definition of 'soul' as a relational, or functional, term. He also tells us that the relational term does not inform us about the quiddity of the thing that functions as a soul, considered in itself and apart from its being a soul. What he does not say, *pace* Adamson and Benevich, is that we lack a satisfying definition of *soul*. On the contrary, the investigation that still lies ahead concerns the quiddity of the thing that we already know is a soul – the question of what that thing is in itself, regardless of its function as a soul. Second, Avicenna does not say that we now turn to address this *what* question – all he says is that we have not dealt with this question yet. Moreover, if we look at the very

⁶ Avicenna characterizes the Aristotelian definition here as giving us “the meaning of the name [‘soul’].” This might suggest that Adamson and Benevich are right: so far, we have only acquired a nominal definition and must still nail down the real definition of ‘soul.’ Even if this were the case, the point I am making remains: the proper question to ask after a nominal definition is whether anything matching the definition exists, and the flying man that follows is intended to prove the existence of the thing that functions as a soul, not its quiddity.

⁷ Avicenna, *Shifāʾ: Nafs* I.1, 15. Note that I have translated the phrase *fa-bi'l-ḥarā* as ‘barely,’ whereas Adamson and Benevich (2018: 140, 153-154, and 159) opt for “*it would be appropriate for us to occupy ourselves with grasping the essence (māhīya) of this thing which is said to be a soul*” (my emphasis). Even if we adopted their translation, the connection of this task to the flying man would not be unambiguous. Avicenna might just be saying that in due time, we will still have this question to investigate, leaving open whether the investigation will take place in the flying man or later on in the treatise.

last sentence, he does not say that the flying man is designed to answer the *what* question either. Instead, the flying man is an argument for the *existence* of the kind of soul we human beings have.⁸ This is another way of saying that it is an attempt at answering a composite *whether* question concerning the human soul: does it exist independently of the body?

This interpretation is further corroborated by Avicenna's descriptions of what it is that the flying man would be aware of and that we must therefore assert even in the absence of any knowledge of the body. Avicenna characterizes this variously as "the existence of his *dhāt* [that is, essence or self]" (Avicenna, *Shifā'*: *Nafs* I.1, 15 *bis*), "his *dhāt* as something that exists" (Avicenna, *Shifā'*: *Nafs* I.1, 15), or in a later version of the argument, "the existence of his *annīya*,"⁹ and the single consistent feature here is the emphasis on existence, which is precisely what one would expect of an answer to a *whether* question. Thus, it is not knowledge of the definition of soul, or even of some of the constitutive features of our essence, that we acquire but knowledge of the fact that the essence is there, independently of the body. In other words, the flying man provides the basis for studying what the human essence is in itself, or apart from its function as a soul. This knowledge can be pursued *after* the flying man (as Avicenna does in *Shifā'*: *Nafs* I.3 and V.2), but it is not gained through it.

Can the flying man yield knowledge of quiddity?

There is another, independent reason for why I find it unlikely that Avicenna designed the flying man to yield knowledge of the quiddity of the thing that functions as a soul in the human body. This is due to Avicenna's general theory of what is involved in a true conception of a quiddity.

As we have already seen, Avicenna explicitly asserts that the flying man is aware of his *dhāt*. Now, Adamson and Benevich claim that throughout *Shifā'*: *Nafs* I.1, including in the flying man, the

⁸ Note that Adamson and Benevich read the feminine *allatī lanā* ('that which belongs to us') as referring to the grammatically masculine *ithbāt* ('assertion' or 'affirmation'), which yields the translation "which is an affirmation for us." I believe it is more natural to read the relative pronoun as referring to *nafs* ('soul'), which is grammatically feminine.

⁹ Avicenna, *Shifā'*: *Nafs* V.7, 255. The technical term *annīya* means, strictly speaking, 'thatness.' It commonly signifies the fact of existing, but since Avicenna here speaks of *annīya* as existing, this seems redundant. I believe that here the term should be understood as denoting the individual instantiation of an essence that one is, and hence to be used synonymously with *dhāt*.

central term *dhāt*, or ‘essence,’ is used interchangeably with *māhīya*, or ‘quiddity’ (Adamson and Benevich 2018: 153). It is true that the two terms are intimately connected, and we can probably find passages from Avicenna, in which they are used as synonyms. On the other hand, there are equally clear cases where replacing *dhāt* with *māhīya* is controversial, such as the sections on self-awareness (*shu ‘ūr bi’l-dhāt*) in the *Ta ‘līqāt* (for the relevant texts, see Kaukua 2015, 55-61). When it comes to our chapter, reading the two terms as simply equivalent seems problematic in the light of passages, in which Avicenna explicitly distinguishes between them. For instance, very early on in our chapter, he characterizes the order of investigating the quiddity of the thing that functions as a soul in following terms:

We need to move from this accidental thing [that is, being a soul] it has to a point at which we can verify its essence (*dhāt*), in order to become acquainted with its quiddity (*māhīya*). (Avicenna, *Shifā’*: *Nafs* I.1, 5)

Replacing ‘essence’ with ‘quiddity’ would make Avicenna’s description of scientific inquiry strangely redundant: once we have verified a quiddity, what could possibly remain that we are not yet acquainted with? But if we distinguish between essence and quiddity, we can understand the verification of essence along the aforescribed lines as an investigation into *whether* the essence we are concerned with exists, which then allows us to inquire into the question of *what* it is, that is, into the constituents and the correct definition of its quiddity. The two terms may refer to the same extramental thing, but they do so in different senses: knowledge of a *dhāt* is knowledge *that* the *dhāt* exists, and this precedes knowledge of *what* it is, or of its quiddity.

This is important because it is the identification of essence with quiddity that allows Adamson and Benevich to claim that the flying man is designed to yield knowledge of the quiddity and the constitutive features of soul. Indeed, they claim that “[the flying man] is intended to give us a very particular insight about the essence of soul, namely, that this essence requires no connection or relation to body,” or in more positive terms, it “helps us to see that it is essential to soul that it be ontologically independent of body” (Adamson and Benevich 2018: 154). In other words, the flying man is designed “to ‘remind’ us that we already have a conceptualization of our own souls, which is enough to give us

access to the existence conditions of our own souls – in this case, that a connection to body is *not* an existence condition” (Adamson and Benevich 2018: 162). A negative feature, however, cannot be constitutive of any real entity, and if that is all the flying man has taught us, it has not provided us with an insight into the constitutive features of the quiddity of the thing that functions as the human soul. It has only shown us that there are things that function as souls but also exist independent of their bodies, which is an answer to a *whether* question. From the point of view of the quiddity of such things, their *not* being connected to bodies is an extrinsic necessary property, or a property concomitant (*lāzim*) to their quiddities. To put this another way, we can ground the human soul’s independence (or more properly, the independence of the thing that functions as a human soul) from its body in the soul’s quiddity, but since it is a mere concomitant of that quiddity, it cannot be the basis of our knowledge of the quiddity. In order to get off the ground, the flying man of Adamson and Benevich needs to have knowledge of some positive quiddity.

The masked man and the principle of charity

Adamson and Benevich claim that their interpretation has the asset of being more charitable to Avicenna than existing alternatives (Marmura 1986, Sebtı 2000, Black 2008, and Kaukua 2015), with the sole exception of Dag Hasse’s similar reconstruction (Hasse 2000: 80-92). This is because their robust account of the content of the flying man’s knowledge supposedly renders the argument innocent of the so-called masked man fallacy. Earlier interpreters have attributed Avicenna with a suspicious move from a merely epistemic distinction to a metaphysical one, and thus suggested that he may be guilty of the fallacy. Even if it were the case that I can be aware of myself while unaware of my body, it does not follow that the self is really distinct from the body, just as from my knowing Darth Vader but not knowing Anakin Skywalker, it does not follow that Darth Vader is not Anakin Skywalker. Now, if the flying man does not merely point our attention at the fact of our self-awareness under a very specific set of conditions, but allows us to veridically conceive of our quiddity, then the inference from the evidence of self-awareness to the incorporeality of our essence is indeed warranted. The argument is no longer a tacit shift from an epistemic distinction to a metaphysical one, but firmly anchored in a metaphysical discussion about the constitutive features of the human essence.

Charitability is a valid virtue in reconstructing the thought of historical authors. But before giving a verdict on the degrees of charity respective to each interpretation, let us consider the cost of the alleged immunity to the masked man. From this point of view, it is important to note that the interpretation of Adamson and Benevich requires the flying man to have knowledge of at least some of the constitutive features of human being, despite all the trouble Avicenna goes through in convincing us that he can perceive, imagine, or think about nothing. If such knowledge is granted, then it is true that the masked man will not apply, precisely because for Avicenna, “[h]uman existing in the mind must fully correspond to the extramental essence of *human*” (Adamson and Benevich 2018: 160). If one can validly think of humanity without thinking of corporeality, then corporeality is not constitutive of humanity.

But why would a reluctant interlocutor of Avicenna – and such there were, for the flying man was subjected to explicit criticism by his contemporaries (see Michot 1997: 169-174, and Kaukua 2015: 80-85) – accept that the flying man entertains anything like a mental instantiation of the form of humanity? It is important to notice here that my conceiving the real definition of humanity, or even my conceiving of humanity in some less rigorous sense, is considerably richer in content than, and definitely *not* the same as, my being aware of myself. I am then thinking of a concept, which is an object of a specific kind, albeit one that I can apply to myself, among other things. Hence, in the more robust reading initially put forth by Hasse and now refined by Adamson and Benevich, the argument can no longer hinge on self-awareness alone. But is the flying man’s knowledge of himself then anything more than a postulate? If it isn’t, the flying man is hardly a plausible argument – indeed, it may be debated whether it’s an argument in the first place.

Adamson and Benevich seem to recognize this when they write: “One may worry here that there is a slip from saying that the flying man is aware of *his own* ‘essence’ [...] to claiming that the flying man is aware of, or conceptualizes, the essence of his *soul*. To which we would reply that this is a distinction without a difference: the flying man *just is* his soul.”¹⁰ If this means that awareness of one’s

¹⁰ Adamson and Benevich 2018: 162. Incidentally, later on in *Shifā’*: *Nafs* V.7, 256-257, Avicenna engages with precisely the question of whether the self I am aware of as the agent of various actions is a soul. Here the question concerns the functional definition of ‘soul’ that we have argued for, and Avicenna’s answer is that as soon as that

own *dhāt*, in the sense of self-awareness, amounts to knowing the essence of soul, in the sense of a conception of its constitutive features, the claim hinges on the ambiguity of the Arabic *dhāt*, which can mean either ‘self’ or ‘essence.’ From a third-personal point of view, the flying man’s essence (*dhāt*) is a human essence and will therefore be accurately captured by the concept of humanity, once he has acquired it. But why should we believe that his first-personal awareness of himself (*dhāt*) is such a conceptualization of humanity? Surely, one may be aware of the existence of something, including oneself, without knowing *what* that thing is, and it is precisely such an awareness of existence that the flying man has.

In an alternative attempt at charitability, which I have defended at some length elsewhere (Kaukua 2015: 30-42), Avicenna designed the flying man to point our attention at our being aware of ourselves independently of any further content of experience, including any awareness of our bodies, and to apply that observation as evidence for the incorporeal existence of our *dhawāt*, our selves, or our essences. Admittedly, if we then take the thought experiment as a decisive proof for the incorporeality of the human essence, we must judge that Avicenna committed the masked man fallacy: he proceeded from the self’s epistemic, or experiential, distinctness from its body to its metaphysical independence from the body.¹¹ No physicalist worthy of the name would accept the argument, and for good reason,

definition is learned, the answer is obvious: yes, *I* am an instantiation of such a principle. This, however, entails nothing about my quiddity – it only warrants Avicenna to use personal experience as empirical evidence in psychology. Moreover, the identification requires learning the definition of soul, an option unavailable to the flying man.

¹¹ According to Adamson and Beneviseh (2018: 152), Avicenna’s explicit mention of the principle that “what is affirmed is distinct from what is not affirmed” would make no sense if he were merely making a point about distinctness in experience. I fail to see why this is the case, given that even the experiential distinction between the self and its embodiment would have been controversial enough. Anyone who has taught the flying man to a class of undergraduates is probably familiar with some form of the counterargument that the flying man could not possibly be aware of anything, since self-awareness is necessarily embodied. This was also a common view among the theologians (*mutakallimūn*) contemporaneous with Avicenna, who held that we cannot be aware of ourselves without thereby being somehow aware of our bodies (for some of the background, see Marmura 1986 and Vasalou 2007). Thus, Avicenna’s insistence on the fact that “what is affirmed is distinct from what is not affirmed” serves to make a phenomenological point: if it is *possible* to be aware of nothing but oneself, then the self is phenomenally distinct from the body, regardless of how unusual such an awareness might be. Furthermore, it seems that Avicennian thought experiments were generally intended not to yield judgments about metaphysical possibility, but as tools for distinguishing covariant but conceptually distinct empirical features. The point requires further study, but for preliminary statements along these lines, see McGinnis 2006: 69, and Kukkonen 2014: 456-457.

because so far Avicenna has given us no reason to believe that our experience is transparent, even when it comes to the metaphysical ground of our own existence.

There is a way around the fallacy, but this requires compromising the intended strength of the argument. It can only convince interlocutors who are already prone to accept that we *can* know ourselves immediately, something for which Avicenna does believe he has arguments but which he knows he has not yet demonstrated. Perhaps this is why he insists that the thought experiment is intended for readers who are “capable of catching sight of the truth on [their] own” and “do not require that [their] way of thinking is set straight” or “that [they] are steered away from sophisms” (Avicenna, *Shifāʾ: Nafs* I.1, 15). There is a proper demonstration for the claim that the thing that functions as a human soul is an intellect, and thus incorporeal and transparent to itself,¹² and those who find the flying man fallacious, including the staunch physicalist, must be countered with them. These demonstrations can also provide the ground for the validity of the flying man, most importantly the reason why our experience of ourselves really is transparent, but not the other way around.

The argumentative nature of the flying man is betrayed by Avicenna’s characterization of it as a *tanbīh*, or a way of pointing attention at a piece of evidence that corroborates the true view (see Marmura 1986). It is true that Avicenna normally describes such arguments as providing a valid framework for a proper demonstration, one just has to fill in the gaps by coming up with the missing premises. In this case, the gaps cannot be filled with anything available from the thought experiment itself, but once we know that as an intellectual being, the flying man is transparent to himself, the masked man can be avoided. We would then have a relatively straightforward application of the Barbara syllogism:

Minor: My *dhāt* (in reality) is my *dhāt* (in self-awareness) (true due to the transparency of an intellectual being)

Major: My *dhāt* (in self-awareness) is distinct from my body (empirically true through the flying man)

Conclusion: My *dhāt* (in reality) is distinct from my body.

¹² That any human being is an intellect is proved in Avicenna, *Shifāʾ: Nafs* V.2, 209-216, by means of arguments that have nothing to do with self-awareness.

Hence, the more modest interpretation of the flying man need not be uncharitable to Avicenna, nor does it necessarily commit him to the masked man. In addition, I would like to claim that it is left with one central asset, for it is capable of reconstructing the flying man as a *plausible* argument – not one that is entirely uncontroversial, of course, but then all the more loaded with philosophical interest.

Per impossibile?

Although by no means central to their argument, Adamson and Benevich make an interesting comment about the nature of the thought experiment in passing, when they say that the conceivability of the flying man makes it “actually *possible* within the causal structure of the real universe, in the good Avicennan sense that God could render him existent” (Adamson and Benevich 2018: 151). While this seems like an innocent remark – surely, an omnipotent God could come up with a person floating in the air with a specific set of meteorological conditions – it is scarcely true in the broader framework of Avicenna’s metaphysics. For Avicenna, creation is a process of emanation that follows necessarily from God’s essence. He explicitly denies the possibility that God could have created a different kind of universe, let alone that He could interfere with the process of the unfolding of the world’s existence. Thus, the inference of metaphysical possibility from mere conceivability would require radical revisions to Avicenna’s concepts of God and creation, and as far as I know, nothing suggests that he would have been willing to make them.

As a result, I believe it is more natural to approach the flying man as a *per impossibile* argument. It is an exercise in mere conceivability, but this is not a problem, if thought experiments are understood as ways of pointing attention at something that is empirically available to us, but that we either altogether miss or confuse with other things it is frequently associated with. Self-awareness is precisely such a thing: arguably, most of us have no experience of being aware of nothing but ourselves, given that in the normal circumstances, we are aware of ourselves as embodied agents and subjects of cognition, constantly immersed in our mutual engagement with the world around us. The argument is designed to show that self-awareness would remain even if these features normally associated with it were bracketed. It points at something, ourselves, the existence of which we assert without asserting

the existence of any body, and this is sufficient for recognizing an existing instantiation of a real essence, the quiddity and the capacities of which we can then set out to investigate by other means.¹³

Bibliography

- Adamson, Peter and Benevich, Fedor 2018. 'The Thought Experimental Method: Avicenna's Flying Man Argument.' *Journal of the American Philosophical Association* 4/2 (2018): 147-164.
- 'Affifi, Abū l-'Alā (ed.) 1956. *Ibn Sīnā. Al- Shifā' . Al-Manṭiq 5: al-Burhān* (Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organisation). (= Avicenna, *Shifā'*: *Burhān*)
- Alpina, Tommaso 2018. 'The *Soul of*, the *Soul in Itself*, and the Flying Man Experiment'. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 28: 187-224.
- Black, Deborah L. 2008. 'Avicenna on Self-Awareness and Knowing that One Knows.' 63-87 in Shahid Rahman, Tony Street, and Hassan Tahiri (eds), *The Unity of Science in the Arabic Tradition* (Springer: Dordrecht).
- Hasse, Dag Nikolaus 2000. *Avicenna's De anima in the Latin West: The Formation of a Peripatetic Philosophy of the Soul 1160–1300* (The Warburg Institute and Nino Aragno Editore: London and Turin).
- Kaukua, Jari 2015. *Self-Awareness in Islamic Philosophy: Avicenna and Beyond* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).
- Kukkonen, Taneli 2014. 'Ibn Sīnā and the Early History of Thought Experiments.' *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 52/3: 433-459.
- Marmura, Michael E. 1986. 'Avicenna's "Flying Man" in Context.' *Monist* 69: 383-395.
- McGinnis, Jon 2006. 'A Penetrating Question in the History of Ideas: Space, Dimensionality and Interpenetration in the Thought of Avicenna.' *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 16: 47-69.

¹³ This research was generously funded by the European Research Council (grant agreement no. 682779). I am very grateful to Peter Adamson and Fedor Benevich for their warm collegial correspondence, and to Davlat Dadikhuda, Yusuf Daşdemir, Hadel Jarada, Kutlu Okan, Nathan Spannaus, and the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments.

- Michot, Jean R. 1997. 'La Réponse d'Avicenne à Bahmanyâr et al-Kirmânî: présentation, traduction critique et lexique arabe-française de la *Mubâhatha* III.' *Le Muséon* 110 (1997): 143-221.
- Rahman, F. (ed.) 1959. *Avicenna's De anima (Arabic Text). Being the Psychological Part of Kitâb al-Shifâ'* (Oxford University Press: London). (= Avicenna, *Shifâ'*: *Nafs*)
- Sebti, Meryem 2000. *Avicenne: L'âme humaine* (Presses universitaires de France: Paris).
- Vasalou, Sophia 2007. 'Subject and Body in Başran Mu'tazilism, or: Mu'tazilite *kalâm* and the Fear of Triviality.' *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 17/2: 267-298.