

falsafa.

Jahrbuch für
islamische Religionsphilosophie

Band 3

Religion und Aufklärung

Unter Mitarbeit von
Mansoor Khaliq
herausgegeben von
Ahmad Milad Karimi

Verlag Karl Alber Freiburg/München

Redaktionsanschrift:
Zentrum für Islamische Theologie
Hammer Str. 95
48153 Münster
www.falsafa.de



Originalausgabe

© VERLAG KARL ALBER
in der Verlag Herder GmbH, Freiburg/München 2020
Alle Rechte vorbehalten
www.verlag-alber.de

Coverfoto: © javarman / Adobe Stock
Satz: SatzWeise, Bad Wünnenberg
Herstellung: CPI books GmbH, Leck

Printed in Germany

ISBN 978-3-495-46903-3
ISSN 2367-1831

Inhalt

<i>Ahmad Milad Karimi</i>	
Geleitwort des Herausgebers	7

I. Artikel

<i>Catarina Belo</i>	
Averroes' Rationalism and the European Enlightenment . . .	13

<i>Asher D. Biemann</i>	
Treue und Toleranz: Zu Hermann Cohens Verständnis der Aufklärung	32

<i>Georg Cavallar</i>	
Islamic Enlightenments? A European Perspective	52

<i>Ahmad Milad Karimi</i>	
Von der Maxime, jederzeit selbst zu glauben. Zur Frage der religiösen Selbstkritik im Islam	79

<i>Musab Tezci</i>	
Die Notwendigkeit der Kausalität. Vergleich zweier Diskurse	104

II. Gespräche

1. Conversation with Aziz al-Azmeh	145
<i>(Mansoorah Khalilizand und Kata Moser)</i>	

2. Conversation with Oliver Leaman	163
<i>(Raid al-Daghistani)</i>	

III. Rezensionen

Christopher de Bellaigue: »The Islamic Enlightenment. The Modern Struggle Between Faith and Reason«	177
<i>(Rougiyatou Agne)</i>	

Alexander Bevilacqua: »The Republic of Arabic Letters. Islam and the European Enlightenment«	182
<i>(Aise Birinci)</i>	

Thomas Bauer: »Warum es kein islamisches Mittelalter gab. Das Erbe der Antike und der Orient«	187
<i>(Mansooreh Khalilizand)</i>	

Thomas Bauer: »Die Vereindeutigung der Welt. Über den Verlust an Mehrdeutigkeit und Vielfalt«	193
<i>(Asmaa El Maaroufi)</i>	

Geert Hendrich: »Islam und Aufklärung. Der Modernediskurs in der arabischen Philosophie«	199
<i>(Daniel Roters)</i>	

Zu den Autorinnen und Autoren	206
---	-----

Geleitwort des Herausgebers

»Gleichen einander etwa, die wissen und die nicht wissen?«
Koran 39:9

Spätestens nach dem 11. September 2001 ist das Selbstverständnis der Religion des Islams zum omnipräsenten Aushandlungsgegenstand in verschiedenen gesellschaftlichen und wissenschaftlichen Diskursen geworden. Zudem geben etwa Massenproteste gegen Karikaturen des Propheten Muḥammad das breite und emotionale Mobilisierungspotential im Kontext religiöser Identitäten und Verständnisse zu erkennen. Auch das Aufkommen des sogenannten *Islamischen Staates* und die damit zu verzeichnende Inhumanität und Irrationalität haben die Standortbestimmung des Islams als Weltreligion zu einer immer brisanter werdenden Frage gemacht, deren Beantwortung es noch zu erarbeiten gilt. Anhand dieser Entwicklungen wird schließlich die kaum zu überschätzende Bedeutsamkeit offenkundig, die die religiöse Identität und deren Integrität für das Selbstverständnis und die Handlungsorientierung von Menschen in einer globalen Welt besitzen. Dass dieses Potential leicht für Gewaltaktionen manipuliert werden kann, ist evident. Können sich, so stellt sich die Frage, religiöse Überzeugungen und deren Motivationskraft vor solch einer Manipulation nachhaltig schützen? Kann die menschliche Vernunft hier eine Wächter- und Richterfunktion im Selbstbehauptungsprozess religiöser Überzeugungen ausüben? Oder ist die ihnen eigene Motivationskraft im Grunde nicht doch rationalitätsresistent? Hat sich der Islam tatsächlich aus den Fängen des Mittelalters emanzipiert? Oder hat er die Aufklärung noch vor sich? Wie lässt sich der Islam ideengeschichtlich in einer pluralistischen, postsäkularen Gesellschaft verorten?

Solche und ähnliche Fragen werden nicht erst durch moderne Phänomene des Terrors aufgeworfen. Sie begleiten die Geschichte von Religionen und deren innere Auseinandersetzungsprozesse seit jeher. Wie

lässt sich die religiöse Selbstauslegung mit der Autorität weltlicher Wissenschaften und den Prämissen des Verfassungsstaates, die letztlich in profaner Moral gründen, zusammendenken? Hat der Islam als Religion in Europa ein destruktives Potential, wie die rechtspopulistischen Parteien wissen wollen? Benötigt nicht der Islam, sowie auch einst das Christentum, eine grundlegende Aufklärung? Die Aufklärung stellt letztlich keine flüchtige Epoche der Geistesgeschichte dar, deren Wirksamkeit verklungen und deren einziges Relikt unsere Erinnerung an sie ist. Vielmehr ist die Aufklärung eine *Kultur*, weil sie Menschsein kultiviert, ins Zentrum des Ganzen rückt, von seiner Würde, seiner Unbedingtheit, seiner Freiheit, seiner Selbstbestimmung in der Weise spricht, dass wir niemals mit ihr fertig werden. Doch inwiefern ist die Aufklärung, die es als gleichbleibendes Phänomen nie gegeben hat, universell? Wie kann die intellektuelle Geistesbewegung, die sich im Zuge der neuzeitlichen Philosophie einstellte, mit der Aufklärung erblühte und in der Französischen Revolution gipfelte, den »Richterstuhl der Vernunft« als alleinigen Maßstab definieren und dabei dem Bereich des Religiösen nicht die Existenzberechtigung verwehren? Muss sich somit, vor allem in der heutigen Zeit, ein Islamverständnis restlos der »bestverteilten Sache der Welt« unterordnen, um existenzfähig und zeitgemäß zu sein? Kann und muss es überhaupt einen Ausgang für die Muslime aus ihrer »selbstverschuldeten Unmündigkeit« geben? Oder hat der Islam womöglich die europäische Aufklärung mitvorbereitet? Kann es eine spezifisch-islamische Aufklärungstradition/Haskala geben, die aus der inneren theologischen Verfasstheit des Islams zu bestimmen wäre? Kann aus dem Islam eine dezidierte Aufklärungskritik erarbeitet werden, die der Verklärung der Aufklärung, der Totalisierung der Aufklärung (Horkheimer/Adorno) und der »Erpressung zur Aufklärung« (M. Foucault) entgegenwirken würde? Wäre dies nicht Aufklärung im besten Sinne?

Vor diesem Hintergrund befasst sich die dritte Ausgabe von *falsafa* sowohl historisch als auch systematisch mit dem Themenverhältnis *Religion und Aufklärung*. Der Beitrag von Catarina Belo bietet in diesem Zusammenhang einen optimalen, ideengeschichtlichen Einstieg in das Thema, indem sie einen Überblick über die verschiedenen Lesarten des lateinischen Averroes im Hinblick auf die Frage nach der Aufklärung ausarbeitet und detailliert darstellt, wie einige Forscher den lateinischen Averroes als Bahnbereiter für die Aufklärung ansehen

und andere hingegen jedwede Verwandtschaft zwischen jenem und den aufklärerischen Ideen ablehnen. Hermann Cohens Verständnis der Aufklärung entfaltet Asher D. Biemann anhand der Analyse der Konzepte der Treue und Toleranz bei Cohen; er erläutert wie der jüdische Neu-Kantianer diese als mitkonstituierende Elemente der Aufklärung etabliert und dadurch das Verständnis der Aufklärung neu auslegt. Der von Georg Cavallar verfasste Beitrag widmet sich gezielt der Frage nach einer islamischen Aufklärung, wobei er diese mit der Frage nach der Möglichkeit der Reform innerhalb des Islams verknüpft. Er diskutiert einige geschichtliche Phänomene in der arabischen Welt, die von einigen Intellektuellen als aufklärerische Bewegungen bezeichnet worden sind, und hebt deren zentrale Ideen hervor. Ahmad Milad Karimi geht in seinem Beitrag von der Bestimmung des Korans als Unterscheidung (*al-furqān*) aus, die mit nichts weniger als Erkenntnis gleichzusetzen ist, und erläutert, wie der Islam als eine Offenbarungsreligion im Sinne einer Religion der Unterscheidung zur Aufklärung führt. Die Aufklärung ist in diesem Sinne auf drei Ebenen zu verstehen, sie bezieht sich erstens auf die Aufklärung über das eigene Selbst, zweitens über die Welt und drittens auf die fundamentale Erkenntnis des Seinsgrunds. Im Rahmen einer komparativen Studie befasst sich Musab Tezci mit einem der konstitutiven Elemente der Aufklärung, nämlich der Kausalität. Einerseits arbeitet er eine minutiöse Analyse der Kausalitätskritik bei Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ġazālī und David Hume aus, andererseits diskutiert er die Erwiderungen von Abū Walīd Muḥammad b. Ruṣd und Immanuel Kant auf diese Kritik ausführlich.

Des Weiteren sind erneut auch in diesem Band Buchrezensionen enthalten, die sich multiperspektivisch um den Themenkreis der Religion und Aufklärung bewegen. Rougiyatou Agne rezensiert das Buch von Christopher de Bellaigue mit dem Titel *The Islamic Enlightenment. The Modern Struggle Between Faith and Reason*. Aise Birinci hat *The Republic of Arabic Letters. Islam and the European Enlightenment* von Alexander Bevilacqua gelesen. Manssooreh Khalilizand und Asmaa El Maaroufi rezensieren zwei aktuelle und debattenerregende Bücher von Thomas Bauer *Warum es kein islamisches Mittelalter gab* und *Die Ver eindeutigung der Welt. Über den Verlust an Mehrdeutigkeit und Vielfalt* und schließlich bespricht Daniel Roters *Islam und Aufklärung. Der Modernediskurs in der arabischen Philosophie* von Geert Hendrich.

Darüber hinaus sind auch in diesen Band zwei Gespräche aufgenommen worden. Oliver Leaman spricht über eine schon geschehene Aufklärung in der Geschichte der Denktradition der Muslime, während Aziz Al-Azmeh diese Behauptung streng ablehnt und dafür argumentiert, dass eine solche Aufklärung auf einer radikalen Begriffsverallgemeinerung basiere, deren unvermeidliche Konsequenz die Entleerung des genannten Begriffs von allerlei konkretem, historischem Inhalt sei.

An erster Stelle danke ich meiner wissenschaftlichen Mitarbeiterin Frau Dr. Mansoorah Khalilizand, die mit großem Einsatz diesen Band von Anfang an begleitet und maßgeblich zu seinem Gelingen beigetragen hat. Für die sorgfältige Korrekturarbeit und das Lektorat danke ich herzlich Frau Martina A. Kaluza. Zudem danke ich Frau Rougiyatou Agne und Herrn Dr. Raid Al-Daghistani für die redaktionelle Unterstützung. Mein aufrichtiger Dank gilt Herrn Lukas Trabert, dem Verlagsleiter des Karl Alber Verlages, und seinem Team für die reibungslose und hervorragende Zusammenarbeit.

Münster, im November 2020

Ahmad Milad Karimi

I. Artikel

Averroes' Rationalism and the European Enlightenment

Abstract:

The analogies between the Enlightenment and the philosophy of Averroes (Ar. Ibn Rushd) have been treated by several scholars, as part of a vast literature which approaches the subject from different perspectives. A historical approach seeks to ascertain the influence which Averroes had on the Enlightenment in Europe. Studies on medieval Averroism, in particular Latin Averroism, are part of this approach. The reception of Averroes in the Arab world has also been studied in connection with this issue. Another kind of treatment, not unrelated to the former, is a comparative approach which compares the views of the Enlightenment philosophers and those of Averroes, seeking similarities and differences.

If we hold that the ideals of freedom and equality, which culminate in the French Revolution, define the European Enlightenment, then it is apparent that Averroes does not defend those ideals in that sense. His society was dominated by a religious perspective, as was the case in Europe, and he does not put forward the principle of secularism, or the separation between religion and philosophy.

In addition, this article argues that Averroes upholds a limited kind of rationalism. While he believes that reason and the philosophers with their demonstrative method can interpret scripture, he does place limits on what reason can know. Human knowledge is limited, and it cannot be compared with divine knowledge.

Introduction

The analogies between the Enlightenment and the philosophy of Averroes (Ar. Ibn Rushd) have been treated by several scholars, as part of a vast literature which approaches the subject from different perspectives. A historical approach seeks to ascertain the influence which Averroes had on the Enlightenment in Europe. For centuries, the name

Averroes was associated, by his detractors in Europe, with unorthodox thinking. He was thus linked with the radical Enlightenment or, at any rate, with a certain confidence on the power of reason to understand reality. The association between Averroes and the Enlightenment is part of the wider question of the reception of Averroes' thought in Europe, and more recently, in the Arab world. The complex evaluation of his thought has a long history which requires a reassessment.

The historical approach takes into account the reception of his thought in the Middle Ages and into the modern period of European philosophy. Studies on medieval Averroism, in particular Latin Averroism, are part of this approach. Latin Averroism has its own characteristics and draws on Averroes' works, in particular his various commentaries on the philosophy of Aristotle.

Another kind of treatment, not unrelated to the former, is a comparative approach which compares the views of the Enlightenment philosophers and those of Averroes, seeking similarities and differences. This is the approach recently exemplified in Saud Al Tamamy's *Averroes, Kant, and the Origins of the Enlightenment*.¹ In it, Al Tamamy compares Averroes to Kant, in particular with regard to their political views. According to Al Tamamy, Averroes cannot be considered a precursor of the Enlightenment because he does not share Kant's political project of enlightening the public, nor does he advocate a kind of republicanism or democracy.² Moreover, he was not an anti-religious

¹ Saud M. S. Al Tamamy: *Averroes, Kant and the Origins of the Enlightenment: Reason and Revelation in Arab Thought*, London 2014, p. 97.

² Paul Kurtz observes that Averroes does not uphold a democratic form of government, although he is in favour of intellectual freedom (for philosophers). »Ibn Rushd was no revolutionary, and he did not criticize the Qu'ran. All that he wished to defend was the importance of rational philosophical and scientific inquiry. This inquiry he wished to restrict to a qualified group of philosophers and not the masses. There was no demand for democratic freedoms in society at large. The calls for democracy were only to come later, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as a product of the Enlightenment. What is significant in reading Averroes is his conviction that man is a rational animal and that freedom for rational investigation needs to be defended. It is this defense of rational objectivity and free inquiry that is of crucial importance, for it puts forth key values as the basis for any scientific and philosophical search for the truth; it is this principle that is later taken up and defended during the Enlightenment.«, Paul Kurtz: *Intellectual Freedom, Rationality and Enlightenment: The Contribution of Aver-*

thinker. However, according to Al Tamamy, he does develop a pedagogical project in connection with his strong political connections at the Almohad court.³

In addition to his comparative approach, Al Tamamy also provides an overview of the history of the more recent reception of Averroes by Arab thinkers in the 20th century, a topic which has been the subject of various studies in English and German. Several Arab thinkers in the 20th century took Averroes as a precursor of the Enlightenment and a possible model for an Arab Enlightenment.⁴

While an interest in the works of Averroes re-emerged in Europe in the mid 19th century, the late 19th century and the 20th century also saw a revival of interest in his works in the Arab world. The debate surrounding the influence of Averroes on other philosophers concerned the level of religiosity in Averroes, with some authors (such as Farah Antoun) defending the theory of an atheist Averroes, and others (such as Muhammad 'Abduh) upholding his religiosity and orthodoxy. Others still, such as Muhammad al-Jab(i)ri in Morocco, admired his stance on the ability of reason to inquire into reality independently of religious authority.⁵

According to Elizabeth Kassab, Averroes represented for these thinkers a rationalist thought that could be adopted today in the Arab world.⁶ As she mentions, they were influenced by a renewed interest in Averroes, particularly by Ernest Renan's book titled *Averroes and Aver-*

roes, in: Mourad Wahba, and Mona Abousenna (Ed.): *Averroes and the Enlightenment*, Amherst, N.Y. 1996, p. 32.

³ Al Tamamy holds that an enlightenment figure is »one who aims to mobilize the public through a political ideal towards socio-political reforms, based upon his philosophical insights«, *ibid.*, p. 62. He mentions Farah Antoun as defending the view that Averroes was an early advocate of the Enlightenment, p. 44.

⁴ Al Tamamy mentions, for instance, Farah Antoun's *Ibn Rushd wa falsafatuh* and Salamah Musa's *Al-Balaghah al-'asriyyah wa-al-lughah al-'arabiyyah*, *ibid.*, pp. 22–23.

⁵ Al Tamamy provides an overview on the positions on Averroes taken by Farah Antoun, Jamal al-Din al-Afghani, Muhammad 'Abduh, Hassan Hanafi, and Mohammed Abed al-Jabri, for instance, among some of the most important contemporary Arab readings of Averroes' works and legacy, *ibid.*, pp. 23–34. These were some of the authors proposing an authentic thinker within the Islamic tradition.

⁶ Elizabeth Suzanne Kassab: *Contemporary Arab Thought: Cultural Critique in Comparative Perspective*, New York 2010, pp. 162–163.

roism, which marked a new stage in the scholarship on the Andalusian thinker. Averroes was read as a commentator on Aristotle into the early 17th century. His works were translated into Latin from the early 13th century, and remained popular into the early modern period, specifically his commentaries on Aristotle. With the rise of a new science, and the demise of Aristotelian science, Averroes' commentaries ceased to be read, as we shall see. Writers like Muhammad 'Abduh and Farah Antoun observed that if Averroes had contributed to the European Renaissance and the European Enlightenment, he could also contribute to an Arab Enlightenment.⁷ Kassab refers to the work of Anke Kügelgen, which maps the reception of Averroes' thought in the Arab world in the 20th century.⁸ According to Kassab, this interest was not focused primarily on his interpretations of Aristotle's works. Rather, »Averroes is seen as the prototype of the philosopher and scientist, the defender of tolerance and openness, the advocate of the freedom of worship and the freedom of thought, the supporter of the separation of religion from philosophy, and the spokesman for the supremacy of philosophy and rationality.«⁹

Other authors emphasise the Islamic character of his rationalism, particularly with respect to his approach to Islamic law. In his most famous legal work, *Bidāyat al-Mujtahid*, Averroes famously defends the use of *ijtihād* (personal input), or the personal opinion of Islamic jurists, in their appraisal of new legal cases.¹⁰

The recent approach taken by Arab scholars, according to Von Kügelgen, is more interested in the links with current issues in Arab thought than in a scholarly analysis of Averroes' works.¹¹ This is a view

⁷ Ibid., p. 163.

⁸ Anke von Kügelgen: Averroes und die arabische Moderne: Ansätze zu einer Neubegründung des Rationalismus im Islam. Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies, Vol. 19, Leiden 1994.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 163–164.

¹⁰ Averroes/Ibn Rushd: The Distinguished Jurist's Primer: a translation of *Bidāyat al-Mujtahid*, transl. by Imran Ahsan Khan Nyazee, rev. by Mohammad Abdul Rauf, 2000.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 163. See also, Anke von Kügelgen: A Call for Rationalism: »Arab Averroists« in the Twentieth Century, in: Alif, Journal of Comparative Poetics 16 (1996), Averroës and the Rational Legacy in the East and West, pp. 97–132, p. 98.

shared by Saud Al Tamamy, who emphasises the widely varying views on Averroes offered by contemporary Arab thinkers.

Another text that tackles directly the link between Averroes and the Enlightenment, from a comparative perspective, is Butterworth's article, *Averroës, Precursor of the Enlightenment?*.¹² Butterworth argues that Averroes cannot be considered a precursor of the Enlightenment because his aim was not to share philosophical knowledge with the broader Muslim community, or to enlighten the general public with what he considered to be the highest form of knowledge – namely Aristotelian philosophy. He believed that this kind of knowledge was limited to a few people.¹³ In addition, Averroes holds that every Muslim should obey Islamic law, and according to Butterworth, disregard for religion is one of the essential characteristics of the Enlightenment, with some exceptions – a philosopher like Rousseau sought to safeguard religion.¹⁴ According to Butterworth, in order to view Averroes as a precursor of the Enlightenment, one would have to believe that he defended the theory of the double truth (philosophical and religious), which was formulated by the Latin Averroists. He argues that in Averroes' work on the harmony between philosophy and religion, the *Decisive Treatise*, philosophy protects the status of religion.¹⁵

Therefore, different views have been propounded regarding the connection between Averroes and modern thought, among Arab and Western scholars. Recent scholars have denied this affinity, stating that Averroes does not separate religion, philosophy and politics and that he does not advocate the political liberation of citizens, nor a republican or democratic form of government.¹⁶ The characteristics of the Enlightenment against which Averroes' views were measured were the

¹² Charles E. Butterworth: Averroës, Precursor of the Enlightenment?, *Alif, Journal of Comparative Poetics* 16 (1996), Averroës and the Rational Legacy in the East and West, pp. 6–18.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 11.

¹⁵ A contemporary scholar of Averroes, 'Āṭif al-'Irāqī, also denies the existence of a double truth in: 'Āṭif al-'Irāqī: Averroes, *Al-naz'a al-'aqliyya fi-falsafat Ibn Rushd* [The Rational Tendency in Ibn Rushd's Philosophy], 5th ed., Cairo 1995, pp. 314–315.

¹⁶ Among those defending the idea that Averroes did not put forward what could be described as Enlightenment ideals are Charles Butterworth and Saud Al Tamamy.

dissemination of knowledge, the defence of a republican or democratic form of government, and the separation between philosophy and religion.

In addition to the question of whether Averroes is a precursor of the Enlightenment in the sense that he contributed in any way to the Enlightenment or whether his views are similar to those of Enlightenment thinkers, we could consider the related issue of his rationalism, which pertains more specifically to his understanding of the connection between religion and philosophy, and the power of reason to understand reality.

The former question is broader, and according to many scholars, Averroes fails to meet the criteria for Enlightenment thinkers, given that he does not advocate the ideals of political and religious freedom and equality among human beings. The question of his rationalism is more theoretical than historical but it can be seen as part of the wider question of whether Averroes's views are akin to those of Enlightenment thinkers.

I will try to address both questions in this paper, in other words, his connection with the Enlightenment and the more theoretical and specific question of his rationalism. It is important to highlight the variety of Averroes' works before tackling relevant themes therein in order to discern any possible tendencies foreshadowing the Enlightenment in Averroes' thought.

Averroes' works and his legacy in Europe

In order to understand the connection between Averroes and the Enlightenment, the historical approach should be taken into account.

Averroes wrote different kinds of works on a wide variety of topics. Apart from the philosophical subjects ranging over the entire Aristotelian corpus, he also wrote on medicine, Islamic theology and Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*).¹⁷

¹⁷ See R. Arnaldez: Ibn Rushd, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Second Edition, Ed. by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W. P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 01 September 2020 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_0340 First published online: 2012

The bulk of Averroes' works consists in commentaries on Aristotle's corpus. This is not unusual. The tradition of commenting on Aristotle's works went back to Hellenistic Antiquity. The novelty in Averroes' approach was his detailed study of Aristotle's texts.

While in his commentaries on Aristotle, Averroes' main purpose is to explain the meaning of Aristotle's text, in other works which could be considered more creative or original, he specifically tackles religious and theological issues, and proposes to seek the harmony between philosophy and religion, and more specifically between the Qur'an and Aristotle, particularly in the *Decisive Treatise*.¹⁸ Some scholars believe that Averroes' true views are contained in the commentaries, others in the original works. Averroes himself considers his commentaries to be his demonstrative, or strictly philosophical, works, and a work like the *Decisive Treatise* as more popular, and addressing a wider audience. In the original works, among them the theological or religious works, he deals with theological questions pertaining to the debates held among the different schools of Islamic theology (*'ilm al-kalām*), such as human freedom and God's attributes, or the status of the Qur'an. These original works, including the *Decisive Treatise*, in which Averroes defends the notion that religion and philosophy share the same content, were not translated into Latin in the Middle Ages, thus occasioning a partial view of Averroes' corpus and philosophy. Given his detailed commentaries on Aristotle's works, he was considered the foremost commentator on Aristotle and dubbed 'the Commentator' by medieval philosophers and theologians, but some of his interpretations of Aristotle were condemned, in particular the view that the human soul loses its individuality after death.

The majority of medieval Islamic philosophers developed their theories and philosophical systems while taking into account the content of Islamic religious texts and scripture, but they did not seek an explicit reconciliation between the various religious and philosophical doctrines. These philosophers, such as Alfarabi and Avicenna, accepted

¹⁸ The complete title of this work is: The Decisive Treatise, Determining the Nature of the Connection between Religion and Philosophy, in: George F. Hourani: Averroes on the Harmony of Religion and Philosophy. A translation, with introduction and notes, of Ibn Rushd's Kitāb faṣl al-maqāl, with its appendix (*Ḍamīma*) and an extract from Kitāb al-kashf 'an manāhij al-adilla, London 1976, p. 44.

Aristotle's theories of the eternity of the world. Moreover, Alfarabi claimed that while philosophy presented a rigorous description of reality, religion presented reality through images and metaphors for the majority of believers, those who could not be trained in philosophical methods, a position that Averroes would adopt in turn.¹⁹ In other words, the same truth is expressed differently in religion and in philosophy.

The activities of the philosophers developed more or less freely until the response from the theologians made itself felt. Al-Ghazali, an Islamic jurist and theologian who in the course of his life had an inner conversion to mystical Islam, went on to set the parameters of orthodoxy within Islam; Greek philosophy and the Islamic philosophers who followed it were not considered to be within the bounds of Islamic orthodoxy. Al-Ghazali deemed that, alongside other tendencies in Islam, the philosophers' theories were not in line with the Qur'an, and in certain cases he found them guilty of unbelief. Averroes replied to al-Ghazali point by point. His philosophical project of restoring true Aristotelian thought can be seen as a response to al-Ghazali's attack on the philosophers, as we shall see.²⁰

In Europe, Averroes' commentaries were translated into Latin within a few decades of his death, and they were eagerly sought by medieval Christian scholars, not least in his native Iberian Peninsula, where Toledo became a centre of translation from Arabic into Latin. With the development of medieval universities a need was felt for comprehensive teaching materials, and these were found in the works of Aristotle, which covered practically all areas of human knowledge. However, his texts were considered difficult to read and interpret, and Averroes' commentaries provided much-needed help in that direction.

¹⁹ Alfarabi. *Al-Farabi on the Perfect State: Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī's Mabādī' Arā' Ahl al-Madīnah al-Faḍīlah*, ed. and transl. by Richard Walzer, New York 1985, pp. 276–285.

²⁰ See Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad Al-Ghazālī: *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, A parallel English-Arabic text transl., introduced, and annotated by Michael E. Marmura, Islamic Translation Series, Provo 2000, and Averroes' *Tahāfut al-tahāfut* (*The Incoherence of the Incoherence*). Transl. from the Arabic with introduction and notes by Simon van den Bergh, Gibb Memorial Trust, 2 vols, London 1954, Vol. 1.