



Published in Nairobi, Kenya
by Royallite Global.

Volume 5, Issue 4, 2024



Article Information

Submitted: 3rd May 2024

Accepted: 29th August 2024

Published: 13th September 2024

Additional information is
available at the end of the
article

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

To read the paper online,
please scan this QR code



How to Cite:

Ali, D., Madi, A., & Dababseh, H. (2024). Ibn Rushd and contemporary Russian orientalism. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.58256/9xrw292>

Ibn Rushd and contemporary Russian orientalism

Duaa Khalil Ali^{1*}, Ahmad Abdul-Aziz Madi¹, & Hamed Ahmad Dababseh¹

¹Department of Philosophy, the University of Jordan, Jordan

*Correspondence email: d.khalil@ju.edu.jo

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7571-1909>

Abstract

Researchers embarked on the thrilling journey of exploring the authors' view on the philosophy of Ibn Rushd in Russian, and the triggers behind its preparation, which is the lack of any Russian study on Ibn Rushd among Arabs who searched the philosophy of Ibn Rushd and misses the writing of Russian authors on the philosophy of Ibn Rushd, or even among other Arabs philosophers who were specialized in Russian. The researchers saw Artur Saadi as the most important student of this philosophy, in which he wrote a book in Russian that was translated into Arabic.

Keywords: contemporary thought, Ibn Rushd, Russian Orientalism



Introduction

The ethereal realms of philosophy hold within them an enchanting paradox - the beauty of gazing upon our own existence through the eyes of others. This extraordinary journey unveils an inner and outer understanding of our very essence. A captivating tapestry unfolds as we delve into the philosophy of "others," dedicating ourselves to the translation of their sacred texts, conducting meticulous research, and imparting their enlightened doctrines to eager minds. Astonishingly, though, we have yet to reciprocate this dedication, failing to truly grasp the interest that "others" hold for us and their profound evaluation of our visionary philosophers.

Regrettably, many Arab-Islamic philosophers remain oblivious to the wondrously insightful studies undertaken by Orientalists of the former Soviet Union. This state of ignorance can be attributed to a multitude of factors, with the most pivotal being the meager number of Arabs who pursued scholastic endeavors in philosophy within these lands. This select minority, regrettably, failed to acquaint our grand Arab intellectual heritage with the immense research interest devoted to our philosophy by the illustrious Russian scholars. And thus, our purpose surfaces within this research endeavor - to illuminate our cherished specialists and the passionate devotees of Ibn Rushd throughout the Arab world with the invaluable insights of those who publish and evaluate his philosophy in the Russian language. While we cannot claim to unveil a complete portrait of our beloved philosopher as reflected in the Russian mirror, our laborious efforts have succeeded in amassing the quintessence of the literature dedicated to him since 1941, providing a glimpse into the level of fascination that has enraptured these eminent scholars. A fascinating note on the journey traveled by these Russian researchers becomes apparent upon closer inspection that are guided by an unwavering conviction, fueled by their relentless pursuit of knowledge and the allure of thought, or hypocrisy and self-interest in Marxism-Leninism, as was evident at the collapse of their regime, including the researchers of Arab-Islamic philosophy. It is known that Marx and Engels did not mention Ibn Rushd in their writings, and the only text that guides some researchers in the aforementioned philosophy was mentioned in Engels's book named "The Dialectics of Nature". Engels said:

"The spiritual dictatorship had been shattered, completely overthrown by the Germanic majority, and Protestantism was adopted. In the meantime time, the magnificent freedom of thought that came from the Arabs and nourished by ancient Greek philosophy paved the way for the materialism of the eighteenth century" (Marx and Engels, 1980,p.346).

Researchers published in Russian were fascinated by Ibn Rushd, as they were deeply interested in the history of philosophy and its leaders. Moreover, they distinguish between the history of foreign philosophy on one hand, and the history of the philosophies of the (former) Soviet Union peoples, on the other. We note that, interest in the History of Philosophy II has increased in the recent decades, on several levels. It is worth noting that the Soviets consider a relatively large group of Arab and Muslim philosophers and scholars to be an integral part of the history of the philosophy of the peoples of the Soviet Union. This consideration did not change after the collapse of the Soviet regime, as a number of the most prominent philosophers and scientists belonging to the peoples of some republics that became independent from the Soviet Union, are part of the scholars of the (former) Soviet republics.

The study of Islamic and Arab philosophers led to an indirect interest in Ibn Rushd and a comparison between his philosophy and those of others, and this is the core of this research which is to identify the extent of interest of the Soviet and Russian researchers in Ibn Rushd's philosophy.

The beginning of interest in Ibn Rushd

Review and research clearly showed that the interest in Ibn Rushd's philosophy initiated in the book: "History of Philosophy", and that Arest F. Trajtenberg the first researcher addressed the philosophy of Ibn Rushd very briefly, did not exceed three pages, a greater share compared to Ibn Baha and Ibn Tufail. In our opinion, pages (433-450) were certainly devoted to "Medieval Arab philosophy" and they necessitated the brief writing on Ibn Rushd's philosophy, considering that Trachtenberg began his addressing in the thirteenth century AD with the emergence of Islam. It is worth mentioning that Trachtenberg did not refer to the references he adopted in his writing, except for Hayy Ibn Yaqzan of Ibn Tufail, which had been translated into Russian in 1920. Alexandrov also shed very little light on Ibn Rushd's philosophy in his book "History of Western European Philosophy". Trachtenberg, though studied briefly Ibn Rushd's philosophy in the first volume of the History of Philosophy, as mentioned earlier, paid more attention to the philosophy of our philosopher in his book "Studies in the History of Medieval Western Philosophy". In the sixties, interest in Arab and Muslim philosophers grew and consequently, Ibn Rushd's philosophy was labelled to have involved materialistic tendencies. S. N. Grigoryan then published a book that devoted almost all of its conclusion to Ibn Rushd, which is remarkable. This was followed by the publication of a book containing selected works of Arab and Muslim philosophers, of which Ibn Rushd was included.

The role played by Gregorian

Although only part of the book "Incoherence of the Incoherence" was not translated into Russian, however, Ibn Rushd had more share than any Arab and Muslim philosopher whose works were translated into Russian, as pages (399-455) of the selected works were devoted to excerpts from this book. It is worth mentioning that this book was translated into German and Spanish in 1875. Moreover, Gregory in his study entitled "Progressive Philosophical Thought in the Countries of the Middle and Near East Countries in the 9th-14th centuries AD, in which he stressed his interest in some selected works of Ibn Rushd compared to other Arabs and Muslims. Gregorian's interest in Arab and Muslim philosophers continued till he published another book entitled "The Medieval Philosophy of the Peoples of the near and Middle East". We believe that this author is the first and most important researcher in Ibn Rushd's philosophy, as we note in this book that Gregorian's interest in Ibn Rushd supersedes his interest in any other Arab and Muslim philosophers. In the early sixties of the last century, a book entitled "A Study in the History of Medieval Materialism", was translated from German into Russian. Stefan in his research published in the Journal of Arab Thought, in the summer of 1995, said that Hermann Le is the most important theorist after Ernest Renan considering his interpretation of Ibn Rushd in the Arab world. Field, also, argued that Hermann Le impacted the Soviet vision of Ibn Rushd's teachings even in major philosophical encyclopedias. But more importantly, Hermann Le taught some of the Arabs who spread Ibn Rushd's new vision and teachings in Arab universities, the most prominent of which is Dr. Tayeb Tiziani. Hermann Le is not known to the Arabs who specialized in Ibn Rushd's philosophy. Hermann Le, worth noting, has destined pages that none of the Russian researchers have destined. We note that Gregorian in the chapter he devoted to Ibn Rushd in his aforementioned book "Medieval Philosophy..." quotes from Hermann Le more than from other researchers. Lee's book, which is translated from Russian started with a study written by A. Gregorian that included his opinion of Ibn Rushd.

In 1962, the second volume of the Philosophical Encyclopedia was published and contained essays on Arab and Muslim philosophers, including Ibn Rushd (the article was written by Trachtenberg and Bogowoutdinov), followed by the publication of a philosophical Lexicon in 1963 included two articles on two philosophers, one of them was Ibn Rushd. the 1987 edition of this book also included a

similar article on Ibn Rushd.

In 1963, a book on aesthetics was published, and contained a chapter entitled “Medieval Aesthetics”, which included Artur Saadi’s work on “The Aesthetic Views of Arabs in the Medieval Era.” In this context, Artur touched on the Aesthetics of Ibn Rushd, in addition to other specialists in philosophy and scholars in other fields have also shown interest such as the Psychologist Yarwshyvski who devoted a few pages of his book “The History of Psychology”. Logicians such as Makovelsky in his book “The History of Logic” was greatly interested in Ibn Rushd and revealed some mutual points between Ibn Rushd and Kant. Popov and Stiaqkin were also interested in the logic of Ibn Rushd and other Arab and Muslim philosophers using Bultayv’s book “Issues of Epistemology and Logic in the Works and Doctrine of Ibn Sina “. Before this book, a logical lexicon had been published in which Kundakuv devoted articles to some Arab and Muslim philosophers, including Ibn Rushd. Interestingly, the “Brief Dictionary of Scientific Atheism” included two articles devoted to Ibn Rushd and al-Ma’ari, written by the famous Arabist Yevgeny Belive. The “Lexicon of Atheism”, published after the one mentioned above, included articles written very briefly on Ibn Rushd, Ibn Sina and al-Ma’ari. In the sixties of the previous century, a huge volume entitled “A Brief Study in the History of Philosophy” was published, and it contained a few pages written by Makovelsky and devoted to “Philosophy in the Arab Countries”. However, Ibn Rushd also had the greatest share in the part devoted to the philosophers of Morocco. This volume was preceded by the publication of a book by Makarov entitled “Introduction to the History of Philosophy” in which none of our philosophers is mentioned, although the author chronicle’s philosophy from its inception in the countries of the ancient East to the beginning of the “Leninist phase” to the development of Marxist philosophy. He merely addressed medieval philosophy, the Renaissance in Europe, but not our philosophy.

One of the pieces of evidence of the growing interest in the study of Arab and Muslim philosophy in general, and Ibn Rushd in particular in the sixties, is the publication of a book by V. Chaloyan, in which he devoted dozens of pages to the connection between Arabic and “Persian” philosophy, a good number of pages were devoted to Ibn Rushd and Rushdism. Moreover, four volumes of “Philosophical Anthology of the World” were published in 1969 the second part of the first volume of which included “Selections from Middle Islamic Philosophy” included writings by Al-Kindi, Al-Farabi, Al-Ghazali and Ibn Rushd. The first part of the aforementioned volume began with a study of ancient and medieval philosophy and included very brief words on Arab and Muslim philosophers, including Ibn Rushd.

Publication of the first book on Ibn Rushd

On the seventies, there was a remarkable interest in our philosophers in general, and Ibn Rushd in particular. In 1973, for the first time, a book on Ibn Rushd was published by Artur Saadi, the most prominent specialist in Arab and Muslim philosophy, and the most famous translator from Arabic to Russian in the philosophical field. It should be noted that this book was published in a series called “World Thinkers”. Forty-two thousand copies of which have been issued. It also contained an appendix that is a translation, for the first time, of Ibn Rushd’s book entitled “Separating the Article and Deciding What Is between Sharia and the Wisdom of Communication”.

We believe that L. V. Sokolov’s book on Middle Philosophy is the most important book published in the eighties, in terms of delving into our philosophy. It should be noted that the author devoted twenty pages to Ibn Rushd. Moreover, Sokolov compared the philosophy of Ibn Rushd and other philosophers, on the one hand, and the philosophy of Maimonides, on the other.

In the same year of Sokolov’s book, Kampitova published a book of great importance, in which she paid great attention to Al-Farabi, however, she touched on Ibn Rushd in the context of search into

the philosophy of the second scholar. In the same year, 1979, a book by B. Bekhovsky on Seger Braban was published, in which several pages were dedicated to Ibn Rushd as the inspirer of Braban, which constitutes a prestigious search on our philosopher.

Artur Saadi continued his interest in Arab and Muslim philosophers and published a book on Ibn Sina in 1980. A few years later, a second edition was published, of 70,000 copies, and this book was translated into Arabic, and was published by Dar Al-Farabi in Beirut in 1987. In 1983, A book entitled “The Question of Belief and Knowledge in Arab Philosophy” by the Arabist Y. A. Frolova, was published and marked with comprehensiveness. It should be noted that she devoted a few pages to Ibn Rushd.

Interest in the philosophy of Arabs and Muslims continued in the eighties, where in 1986 a book entitled “Freedom of Thought in Old Ages, Middle Ages, and the Renaissance” was published, and contained a study entitled “Freedom of Thought in the Islamic Middle Ages” written by Artur Saadi, in which he touched on Ibn Rushd. A second edition of the “Encyclopedic Dictionary of Philosophy” was published in 1989 and included a relatively large collection of articles on Arab and Muslim philosophy, of which Artur Saadi wrote many articles, one of which was on Ibn Rushd.

If we assume that Sokolov’s book is the most profound book published to date, the book entitled “Classical Islamic Philosophy” which was written by Tawfik Ibrahim and Artur Saadi in 1990, is also considered the next most important book in that era. Worth noting that the authors of the book did not adopt any Marxist source or reference, or quote from any of the previous studies on Arab and Muslim philosophy, including their writings. This omission may be attributed to the prevailing conditions that followed the beginning of Gorbachev’s regime, which proposed the reconstruction of Perestroika and Lasunest. This book was comprehensive and dealt with theology in the first part, philosophy in the second part, and mysticism in the third part. This inclusion is one of the world’s leading attempts to study these three fields as an integrated whole. In addition, many works of Arab and Muslim philosophers were approached from a new perspective free from the prevailing stereotypes. Ibn Rushd was mentioned in many pages of that book. I believe that the book in question deserves a special seminar to review its added value. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, a book was published in 1995, entitled: “History of Philosophy, West-Russia-East”, and its first part was entitled, “Ancient and Medieval Philosophy”, included a study entitled: “Philosophical Traditions in India, China and the Islamic World”, written by M. T. Styanians. The researcher has shed some light on Ibn Rushd’s philosophy in several pages. Remarkably, she did not quote Marxist quotes, as she did in her earlier writings, namely in the Soviet era.

Reviews of Russian researchers on Ibn Rushd

Reviewing the opinions of Russian researchers on the philosophy of Ibn Rushd, we believe that this philosopher is, in the eyes of those researchers, the greatest Arab and Muslim philosopher, and that his philosophy represents the peak of Arab philosophy. We have noticed that the first evaluation of his philosophy was found in Trachtenberg in the first volume of the History of Philosophy, where he wrote that Ibn Rushd was the most harmonious Arab Peripatetic in the principles he adopted. In another reference, it is clear that the aforementioned researcher did not only evaluate Ibn Rushd but went that Ibn Rushd is one of the great thinkers in the Middle Ages and earlier of Arab philosophy. Alexandru V. in his book entitled “The History of Western European Philosophy”, also asserts that Ibn Rushd played a remarkable role in the development of philosophy. The famous Gregorian added that he believes that Ibn Rushd has an outstanding impact on progressive Arab philosophical thought. In another reference, “Progressive Philosophical Thought..” Gregorian stated that Ibn Bajja, Ibn Tufail and Ibn RashD are

distinguished Arab philosophers and the most daring and harmonious philosophers due to the ideas they adopted compared to other thinkers of the Arab East.

Gregory asserts that the ideas of Ibn Bajja, Ibn Tufail, al-Farabi, Ibn Sina and other Arab philosophers paved the way for the great Arab philosopher Ibn Rushd, who is considered “the pinnacle of medieval philosophical thought in the Near and Middle Eastern countries” (Grigorian, 1960, p.30). A. Saadi asserts that Ibn Rushd “is an outstanding Arab philosopher” (Arthur,1973, p.7), prominent representative of the Andalusian branch of the Eastern Peripatetics” (Arthur ,1973, p. 19 and p. 39). If Trachtenberg concluded that Ibn Rushd integrated and complemented the Arab philosophy, A. Saadi concludes that this philosopher integrated and complemented the development of rational and natural views of Eastern Peripatetic” (Arthur, 1973 ,p. 29), and Ibn Rushd not only developed the views of his predecessors but also drew from them to the greatest extent, possible materialistic conclusions (Arthur ,1973, p.39).

It is worth mentioning that Makovelsky also asserted, that Ibn Rushd “completed the development of Peripatetic in Arabic” (Makovelsky, 1967, p. 263).

A. Saadi concluded that the rational approach to medieval Arab philosophy reached its peak in Ibn Rushd’s doctrine. Sokolov V. argued that Ibn Rushd’s Peripatetic is the most “harmonious and pure” (Sokolov, 1979, p.270), and it is free from many characteristics of the syncretism of his predecessors. Moreover, the author Rafiq al-Ajam believes that Ibn Rushd was influenced by pure Aristotelianism without the blending impurities that afflicted it at the hands of the Alexandrian commentators.

According to Makovelsky, Ibn Rushd was “the last prominent figure in the history of Arab philosophy in the feudal era” (Sokolov, 1979, p. 97). Stepaniants, in this context, argued that Ibn Rushd is the greatest follower of Aristotle than other Muslims and that he “surpassed all Muslim thinkers” (Sokolov, 1995, p.401). She concluded that it is the last one, considering the size of his philosophical legacy, and the diversity of issues dealt with in Aristotelianism from the constellation of the great Muslim Peripatetics (Sokolov,1995, p. 437).

Bukowski reinforced the argument of the aforementioned scholars, stating that Ibn Rushd is considered “the pinnacle of medieval Arab philosophy” (Bykhovsky, 1979, p.33), and that he far surpassed his Peripatetic predecessors “in the depth and relevance of his views” (Bykhovsky, 1979, p.33), and a “wonderful thinker” (Bykhovsky, 1979, p. 33).

On the other hand, Chaloyan’s view of Ibn Rushd’s status differs from that of his colleagues as he argued that Ibn Rushd, in addition to being the developer of the whole Arab philosophical culture, established “an education that became an important milestone in the history of general philosophy” (Chaloyan, 1968, p. 191). Frolova Y. A. believes that Ibn Rushd was the last philosopher from the constellation of great thinkers, who emerged in the Arab-Islamic Middle Ages, in terms of both “Time span and richness of content” (Frolova, 1983, p. 71).

Yaroshevsky highlighted Ibn Sina and Ibn Rushd as two great figures among Muslim philosophers and scholars (Yaroshevsky, 1966, p.94).

Discussing early Arab philosophy, we notice a kind of discretion among Russian scholars, due to that Arabs mostly knew Aristotle in his Neoplatonic interpretation or knew him distortedly. Trachtenberg argues that the Peripatetic path is valid and consistent over time, as the “extraneous impurities” (Trachtenberg, 1957, 433-450) were weekend. Makovelsky believes that Eastern Peripatetic was a “great phenomenon” in its philosophical content (Makovelsky, 1969, p. 94) and the greatest Peripatetic philosopher in the Middle Ages. It is worth mentioning that Ibn Rushd remarkably divinized Aristotle, and his admiration reached the sanctification (Renan, 1957, p. 70-71-72).

Ibn Rushd stated in Aristotle’s book “The Analogy”, “ This man is astonishing and it is striking

how his instinct differs completely from the human instinct, it seems as if he was sent by divine providence to make us think, we people, of the existence of maximum perfection in the human species felt and referred to as human and therefore the ancients called him divine” (Ibn Rushd, 1992, p. 213). However, this sanctification did not make Ibn Rushd an absolute follower of Aristotle, as Russian researchers note that he developed his philosophy and was not just an interpreter to Aristotle, and some of Ibn Rushd’s scholars also agreed with this statement.

There is a consensus among Russians that Ibn Rushd did his best to purify Peripatetic from Neoplatonic updated elements and he critically encompassed his predecessors and contemporaries of philosophers. According to the Russians, the role of the philosopher of Cordoba was not only explaining or interpreting, but “a philosopher with his imprint, and he also created his doctrine” (Gregorian, 1966, p. 287). Most probably the first evaluation of Ibn Rushd’s philosophy was by Trachtenberg, who said that he was not only a simple commentator, but he addressed his philosophy “independently” (Trachtenberg, 1941, p. 447) developing its materialistic propensity. According to Makovelsky, Ibn Rushd was not only an explainer of Aristotle’s philosophy but also “A reviser” (Makovelsky, p. 96).

It is noted that Artur Saadi glorified Ibn Rushd as an explainer, asserting that the philosopher of Cordoba’s explanation and interpretation of the huge philosophical legacy of Aristotle is enough to “perpetuate” (Arthur, 1973, p.46) [his name. He added that Ibn Rushd’s achievement is a “truly scientific leap” (Arthur, 1973, p.46), as Ibn Rushd did not know the Greek language, therefore he compared translations and commentaries then he began to interpret them, as well as, he sought to reach the truth of the thought of the great Greek philosopher, Aristotle, and presented his philosophy in a pure updated Platonic free from impurities. It is certain, in the view of Artur Saadi, that Ibn Rushd’s activity was not only directed to purifying Aristotelianism from the aforementioned impurities, but he also developed Aristotelian materialistic ideas “and enriched them with speculations and dialectical ideas” (Arthur, 1973, p.46), and developed a doctrine that represents “a stand-alone phase in the elevation of the interpretation based on pantheistic of the world” (Arthur, 1973, p.144). Artur Saadi concluded that Rushd’s approach to explaining Aristotelianism was “creative” and evidence of the “independence and originality of his thought” (Arthur, 1973, p.148).

Sokolov argued that historians of philosophy are fascinated up to date by “the astonishing ability of Ibn Rushd, which allowed him to understand and analyze Aristotle’s map of ideas” (Sokolov, 1979, p. 268) even though he knew his works translated into Arabic in a way that did not always reflect the course of his ideas and the accuracy of the origins.

Moreover, Sokolov added that Ibn Rushd’s commentaries did not represent a negative tracing of Aristotle’s writings, and argues that this view was long reversed. His explanation, not rarely, has turned into a “creative solution” to the problems raised in the works of the First Teacher. In addition, the mentioned commentaries, due to different historical contexts, led to the emergence of “New Tasks” before the commentator (Sokolov, 1979, p. 269).

Bikhovesky asserts that Ibn Rushd helped more than his predecessors in ridding the Arab Peripatetic of updated Neoplatonic elements, although he did not accomplish this task to the end (Bykhovsky, 1979, p.34), which was particularly evident in the Theory of Overflow. Indeed, Ibn Rushd criticizes this theory in his book “Incoherence of the Incoherence”. Dr. Tayeb Tiziani asserts that Ibn Rushd “clearly rejected this theory” (Tiziani, 1971, p. 375). Although the philosopher of Cordoba was a strict supporter of Aristotle compared to Arab and Muslim philosophers, however, he was not, in the view of Bekhovesky, a “neutral commentator” ((Bykhovsky, 1979, p.34) who pushed his materialistic ideas to the forefront. Moreover, the philosopher’s “historical exploit” lies not only in the fact that he placed Peripatetic in the possession of medieval philosophy, but in that, he “enriched” it more fully

and completely than any of his predecessors, by expanding the materialistic tendency embedded in Peripatetic as well.

Ibn Rushd's originality was evident in the fact that his commentary was made "in a distinguished spirit" and directed to a specific purpose (Bykhovsky, 1979, p.36). Bekgovesky concluded that the revival of Peripateticism and the enrichment of the Middle Ages with the philosophical legacy of the great Greek sage are "the great historical exploit of Ibn Rushd" (Bykhovsky, 1979, p. 129)

Ibn Rushd is outstanding, according to Stepaniants, from his great predecessors Al-Farabi and Ibn Sina, is the accuracy and depth of his commentaries (Stepaniants, 1995, p.401).

Ibn Rushd and the duality of truth

Another thing that Russian researchers have been concerned with is what has been known as the "Double truth" or "Theory of the two truths." According to Gurfunkl, this theory emerged from "the penetration of Peripateticism into the culture of Arabs, Jews and Christians in the Middle Ages (Group of authors. 1989, p .149). Rubin put forward this view, stating that it appeared in the Middle Ages, at the age of the spread of Aristotle's philosophy, and Gurfunkl believes that this theory was formed in Latin Rushdism. In the Renaissance, there was a gradual withdrawal from this theory, according to Gurfunkl, and replacement by the theory of the "Two books": the Book of Nature and the Book of the Scripture. He believed that the theory of the two truths "was a unique form of explanation of philosophical knowledge independent of revelation and theology" (Group of authors. 1989, p .10) It is noted that Rubin had another view, according to which the theory was widespread in the Renaissance.

We view that some Russian scholars have dealt with the dual truth of Ibn Rushd and that Trachtenberg was the first Russian to highlight it, where he argued that Ibn Rushd was one of the pioneers of this theory, which later became famous. According to this theory, philosophy and religion, in principle and final results, must lead, in Trachtenberg's view, to a single truth. In the words of Ibn Rushd, "the demonstrative consideration does not lead to a violation of what is stated in the Sharia", because "the truth does not oppose the truth, but agrees with it and bears witness to it" (Ibn Rushd, 1972, p. 24). Trachtenberg believes that, according to this theory, religion is intended for the public, based on revelation, and embodies truth metaphorically, while philosophy, on the other hand, is easily accessible to the private, who perceive the truth appropriately, utilizing pure mental measurement, therefore, faith must be left to the public. Trachtenberg means "the manifestation of Sharia", asserting that the theory of "double truth", in Ibn Rushd's philosophy, has not reached the final and sharp form that it reached in the philosophy of the Western European Rushdists. Trachtenberg believes that Ibn Rushd was accused of heresy as a result of this theory. It is worth mentioning that Gregorian's views, in his three studies, referred to in this paper, and are nothing but an echo of Trachtenberg's views. In the latter view, this theory was, according to Ibn Rushd, "a unique cover through which he concealed authentic philosophical views that were liberated from the shackles of the Islamic faith" (Gregorian, 1966, p. 309). Although this theory was characterized by limitation and moderation, in his view, however, it helped, at the time, "in liberation science and philosophy from religious tutelage" (Gregorian, 1966, p. 309).

Rubin's unique view is that Ibn Rushd, the "most influential thinker," adopted this theory in his dialogues with Islamic theologians. He added that Siger's French Rushdism and English nominalism were based on the same theory, and Makovelsky also echoes what Trachtenberg said in this regard. We mean that Ibn Rushd was one of the pioneers of that theory", and it is reported that Ibn Rushd said that the facts of philosophy and religion, meaning wisdom and Sharia, do not contradict each other, as they address different things, Sharia teach good deeds, while Philosophy, on the other hand, teaches the realization of "absolute truth" (Makovelsky, 1967, p. 264). This researcher means that the purpose of

the Sharia is not to know the truth, but to identify virtue, encourage good, and forbid evil.

Makovelsky concludes that the said theory later became a characteristic of a transition phase “from scholastic science to science in the modern era” (Makovelsky, 1967, p. 264). Chaloyan asserts that Ibn Rushd and the Rushdism, including Siger Braban, were challenged with a double understanding of truth, namely the truths of mind, the truths of faith, and the one truth of faith that made philosophy a servant of theology. By hiding behind the theory of “double truth”, Chaloyan believed, they “protected the independence of philosophy from theology, and mind from faith” (Chaloyan, 1968, p. 203). Bekhovesky stated that Ibn Rushd was Siger’s predecessor in adopting this theory, and asserts that the Latin Rushdians inspired by Siger, were proponents of this theory. Bekhovesky asked: What is the meaning of “double truth”? Then he answers, rejecting that the reliable truth is two truths, the first being attained by reason and the second by faith (Bikhovsky, 1979, p. 88). On the contrary, Bekhovesky believes that it means acknowledging two truths that confront each other and negate one another, which means acknowledging the possibility of conflicting truths perceived by reason and truths from faith (Bikhovsky, 1979, p. 88). Bekhovesky asserts that the theory of “double truth” does not recognize the equality of the facts to be chosen. It is entirely devoted to investigating facts and proving them by reason. The main task of this theory, in his view, is to “conceal the secularization of philosophical thought” and “cover the predicament of reason and faith” (Bikhovsky, 1979, p.9). Under the guise of this theory, compromising the uncompromised, belief and knowledge – has been appeased. Bekhovesky concluded that the aforementioned theory is a shield that protects philosophy from the interference of religious beliefs that destroy it and that it was neither inaction nor hypocrisy, but was the only possibility to instill in people the tendency to rational knowledge and to search for and perceive the abstract truth.

Remarkably, Artur Saadi, the greatest specialist in Arab-Islamic philosophy in the past Soviet era, and the author of the first book on Ibn Rushd at the time, unlike other Soviet researchers, who believe that Ibn Rushd was one of the pioneers of the theory of “double truth”, he was satisfied that Seger was one of the pioneer philosophers who advocated this theory in European philosophy (Arthur, 1973, p. 149).

Artur Saadi added that Ibn Rushd’s followers in Europe had developed the principle of “double truth” (Taufic , Artur, Sagadeev, 1990, p. 349) , and he asserted, elsewhere, that the truth for him is the same, and it is comprehended by philosophers who can reconcile any religious beliefs with the subjects of philosophy employing metaphorical interpretation (Arthur, 1989, p. 201). He means philosophers who are well-grounded in knowledge, who interpret the apparent of Sharia to conform to the results of rational proof. They are, in Ibn Rushd’s language, the proofers, the people of certain interpretations. The question asked: is Ibn Rushd considered? The pioneer or one of the pioneers of what Westerners have called the “theory of the dual truth”, the theory of “double truth” or the theory of “duality of truth”?

There is no doubt that Ibn Rushd was the inspiration for this theory, which emerged in Europe and was the brainchild of his proponents there. If it is true that the truth, in Ibn Rushd’s view, is one and indivisible, and that “all that we seek is to interpret it in different aspects”, then this theory “was wrongly attributed to him, and it belongs to the Latin Rushdians” (Mahmoud, 1963, p. 12).

Ontology of Ibn Rushd

Scholars in the Soviet era, in addition to their interest in the aforementioned theory, were interested in the ontology of Ibn Rushd in general, and the arguments of matter, image and movement, in particular. As it turned out, Trachtenberg may have been the first researcher to address the ontological dimension in Ibn Rushd’s philosophy, asserting that the material world, in his view, has no beginning or end, in

terms of time, but is finite in space. The philosopher of Cordoba denied the religious fact that Allah created the world “out of nothing.” saying that Allah and the material world are immortal in their existence (Trachtenberg, 1941, p .447). Trachtenberg argues that movement is eternal, uninterrupted, as every movement results from a previous movement, and so forth. However, every movement needs a foundation, and that foundation is Matter that is eternal and inclusive. Trachtenberg added that movement is first Hylomorphism is neither formed nor corrupted and that the transformation from absolute non-existence to existence is impossible, and vice versa is also impossible. Every movement, every change, every creation, and every corruption, is “possible” in matter, and that active power does not do more than some extraction by force into action, the transfer of the possibility to the realization, and that time, in Ibn Rushd’s view, as Trachtenberg says, exists by virtue of movement.

We measure time with the help of changes only, meaning that the mind perceives time in its association with the movement, and in Ibn Rushd’s language, “the existence of time is not abstained, except with immovable beings. As for the existence of movables, or the realization of their existence, time exist as a necessity” (Ibn Rushd, 1964, p. 150). Allah, in Ibn Rushd’s view, is the ideal “ultimate cause”. HE Only knows the general course of the world, and on this basis “Ibn Rushd’s negation of miracles”, according to Trachtenberg (Trachtenberg, 1941, p .448). This scholar repeats the same statements elsewhere, adding that matter is eternal” and “it has always existed, and will always be, and it is uncreated, nor corrupted “ (Trachtenberg, 1957, p .66). Trachtenberg paid great interest to the link between image and matter, asserting that the former is not external to the latter, and concludes that “the image is eternal and uncreated like matter”, according to Ibn Rushd (Trachtenberg, 1957, p .66).

For the philosopher of Córdoba, according to Trachtenberg, matter is a fundamental physical statement, self-sufficient, and does not need anything to exist. As for the image, it loses its decisive significance, “and this, without a doubt, is a way towards “naturalism”, that is, “materialism” (Trachtenberg, 1957, p .67). Trachtenberg means that Ibn Rushd exceeded the separation established by Aristotle between matter and image, and the importance that was assigned to the image.

Active power does nothing more than combine matter and image, and in Ibn Rushd’s language, the principles of tangible material existence are “one-third of matter and image and the combination thereof” (Ibn Rushd, 1938, p. 1467). In other words, the subject “in fact for philosophers does not do the image, nor the Hylomorphism, but does from the Hylomorphism and the image the composite of all of them” (Ibn Rushd, 1964, p. 390).

In the forties, the first volume of the History of Philosophy was issued, in which Trachtenberg discussed the philosophy of Ibn Rushd, and in the same period, Alexandru V’s book was published, in which he devoted a few pages to “Arab philosophy”, in which he showed that Ibn Rushd disagreed with Aristotle on images, stressing “the subordination of all images to matter” (Alexandrov, 1946. P.119), and that the matter, involves a latent effectiveness forms tangible things, and that these things cannot be formed from nothingness, nor can transform to non-existence. Ibn Rushd, in his view, argued that the world is eternal, denying its creation by Allah, and denying miracles as well. Iskendruv concluded that this was “a very important outcome for the later development of materialistic science and philosophy” (Alexandrov, 1946, p.119).

Although Trachtenberg did not quote Renan’s book on Ibn Rushd and Rushdism in his first address of Ibn Rushd’s philosophy, despite his being influenced by him, it turned out in his second address that his first and perhaps last reference was Renan’s above-mentioned book, and for the first time, Ibn Rushd’s philosophy was discussed with succinctly and with a quote from Ibn Rushd’s book, “Incoherence of the Incoherence”, in the preface with which Gregorian presented the “Selected Works of Thinkers of the Near and Middle Eastern Countries”.

As for the Gregorian conclusion in his book “From the History of the Philosophy of Central Asia and Iran”, in which he devoted most of it to Ibn Rushd, Gregorian words on our philosopher were not based on a specific reference. In that conclusion, Gregorian repeats what Trachtenberg had previously stated our concern in this is drawing attention to what Iskandarov stated about the difference between Ibn Rushd and Aristotle in terms of image and matter, which Gregorian repeated, more clearly in his research devoted to the “Selected Works”, above.

In addition to Gregorian’s two aforementioned researches, I consider his book entitled “Medieval Philosophy in the near and Middle Eastern Countries, the first comprehensive study of Arab-Islamic philosophy. In this book, Ibn Rushd’s philosophy is evident in much greater interest than ever. Gregory believes that the Córdoba philosopher’s ideas of “the primacy of uncreated eternal matter, its movement, and its perceptibility represent “Ibn Rushd’s great exploit in the development of philosophical materialism” (Gregorian, 1966, p.288).

And if Allah is the eternal source of reality, then matter is the permanent source of possibility, and since Allah is ancient, then the world HE made is also ancient. Makovelsky argued that Ibn Rushd differs from Al-Farabi and Ibn Sina, in that Ibn Rushd perceived the world as an eternal and necessary process that negates the possibility of its non-existence or otherwise its existence. Moreover, Ibn Rushd, according to Makovelsky, rejects the understanding of the material world as a possible existence. As for image and matter, none of them has existed independently of the other. They can only be separated in thought.

In another reference, Makovelsky repeats what Trachtenberg and then Gregorian have already stated, concluding that the material elements of Ibn Rushd’s philosophy “are associated with idealism.” Based on the fact that the philosopher of Córdoba understood the existence of which Allah represents its highest, his “last cause” hierarchically.

Chaloyan touched upon very briefly the arguments of matter, image, possibility, and realization, however, he was not concerned with Ibn Rushd’s understanding of them. Chaloyan referred to the philosopher of Cordoba by name and other Arab Peripatetics, he argued that Ibn Rushd and the other Peripatetics in the Arab Maghreb understood Aristotle’s idea of matter and image, and added a completely new connotation (Chaloyan, 1968, p. 194), as matter, in their view, is the first, which creates its images, and the image is nothing but a manifestation of matter. (Ibid, same page), and in Ibn Rushd’s language, Hylomorphism is the core and it exists by force and that image is the core in action. We note that Tayeb Tiziani adopts the same view when he stated that Ibn Rushd wished to emphasize that matter exists before the distinct independent image in the sense that it is always associated with an image whose characteristics are determined by matter (Tiziani, 1971, p.438). According to Chaloyan, Arab philosophers, in their understanding of possibility and realization, denied that the image was active before the image and it is independent of matter, an idea that led to the assertion of the ideal being, Allah, or, according to Aristotle, the “image of images.”

Chaloyan concluded that the doctrine of world eternity and the surrounding issues related to it represent an important aspect of Peripatetic philosophy in the Arab Maghreb. It is worth mentioning that Chaloyan addressed Siger’s influence on Ibn Rushd, saying that the latter gave the former a basis by saying that matter and image are different in terms of understanding, not in terms of existence.

Chaloyan concluded that the materialism of Ibn Sina and Ibn Rushd was based on the materialist interpretation of Aristotle’s philosophy, as well as the materialist interpretation of reality, and the materialistic generalization of the data of the natural sciences of the period. Sokolov argued that the actual separation of philosophy from theology was manifested very strongly throughout Ibn Rushd’s philosophy, primarily in his interpretation of existence, and the center of this interpretation was

the everlasting question: has the world been created or has it ever existed? Sokolov V. believes that comparing Ibn Rushd, Al-Farabi and Ibn Sina regarding creation, the former went beyond the two, and went deeper towards materialism than his “ancient teacher,” Aristotle (Sokolov, 1979, p.277). Sokolov V added that reducing Allah represents is the supreme divine aspect of Rushdism ontology (Sokolov, 1979, p.278).

Owing to this reduction, the world is granted the “maximum independence from Allah” (Sokolov, 1979, p.278) In Sokolov’s view related to deism, “a very strong materialist tendency” (Sokolov, 1979, p.279).

This tendency is manifested, above all, in the affirmation of the independence of matter from Allah, and also in the consideration of matter as the primary source and carrier of all natural processes and changes. In this regard, Ibn Rushd went further, in the view of Sokolov, from Ibn Sina

Regarding the link between image and matter, Sokolov noted that Ibn Rushd went further towards materialism than his Teacher. Artur Saadi echoed many of Sokolov’s judgments and ideas about Ibn Rushd’s ontology. There is no doubt that Artur Saadi’s book on Ibn RashD, as well as his book with Tawfiq Ibrahim, devoted to Islamic philosophy, deserve a separate longer discussion. In Sokolov V argued that the Aristotelian conception of Allah as the first mover and the first mind “plays an important role in the Rushdism ontological doctrine” (Sokolov, 1979, p.277-278). This researcher concluded that the result embodies the ultimate exclusion of Allah from the natural and human worlds.

Ibn Rushd received widespread attention in Western Europe and won high fame and attention, Ibn Rushd in his comments on the philosophy of Aristotle, presented Aristotle in Europe, and the European thinkers studied Ibn Rushd’s theses, and taught them in universities, and it had the greatest impact to the point of raising great concern in the Church and the clergy so that the Bishop of Paris criticized the ideas of Ibn Rushd and prohibited them, as Thomas Aquinas criticized Ibn Rushd and his views in a book entitled “Against Ibn Rushd”.

It is not going overboard to assert that Ibn Rushd’s philosophy represented a leap in Western Europe, and paved the way for modern secularism and that his book “The Separation between Wisdom and Sharia from Communication”, laid the intellectual foundations for ridding philosophy and science of the domination of theology.

In this research, we have tried to present the impact and degree of interaction between the Soviets and Russians, complementing the investigation and follow-up carried out by Arab and non-Arab researchers on the important role played by Ibn Rushd’s philosophy and its impact on the intellectual renaissance in the European West.

Finally, the study of the positions of others in the West and East towards our philosophers and thought, allows us to objectively evaluate our intellectual self and our historical heritage, provided that we do not exaggerate in self-aggrandizement, nor underestimate its importance, in a way that contributes to the consolidation of a realistic and objective view, and allows moving forward and towards an intellectual renaissance whose time has come, to reach a bright future that puts the Arabs on the map of the world.

We hope to continue to research Russian Orientalism and to know the opinions of Russian researchers on our other philosophers, besides Ibn Rushd. It is crucially important to know the opinion of the other, because he is our mirror, as well as the mirror in which we see ourselves, to draw the complete image.

Biographies

Dr. Duaa Khalil Ali is the Head of the Philosophy department at The University of Jordan. She specializes in Contemporary philosophy and Existential philosophy. Her research interests include Islamic philosophy, ethics, Arab thought, practical philosophy and Philosophy of religion.

Dr. Ahmad Madi, Professor of Philosophy at The University of Jordan, He specializes in The history of philosophy, His research interests include modern and contemporary Arab thought, and Russian philosophy.

Dr. Hamed Ahmad Dababseh is an Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Department of Philosophy at The University of Jordan, He specializes in Islamic philosophy, His research interests include Philosophy of religion and comparative philosophy.

References

- Ibn Rushd, Incoherence of Incoherence, Cairo, Dar Al-Maaref, 1964
- Ibn Rushd, Separation between wisdom and Sharia from communication, Cairo, Dar Al-Maaref, 1972
- Ibn Rushd, Summarizing Aristotle's Logic, Beirut, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Libnani, 1992
- Ibn Rushd, Interpretation of Metaphysics, 1938
- Arthur Saadi, Ibn Rushd, Moscow, Dar Al-Fikr Publishing, 1973
- Arthur Saadi, Ibn Sina, Beirut, Dar Al-Farabi, 1989
- Alexandrov A. V, History of Philosophy, Moscow, Politics Publishing House, 1941 (in Russian)
- Alexandrov A.V., History of Western European Philosophy, Moscow, Soviet Academy of Sciences Press, 1946 (in Russian)
- Bekhovskiy P, Seger Braban, Moscow, Dar al-Fikr, 1979 (in Russian)
- Popov Ren and Stajkin P, The Development of Logical Ideas from the Old Testament to the Renaissance, Moscow, Moscow University Press, 1974 (in Russian)
- Poltaev. M. N., Issues of Epistemology and Logic in the Works of Ibn Sina and his School, Dushanbey, Irvin Publishing, 1965 (in Russian)
- Chaloyan F., East – Arabs: Communication in the Philosophy of Ancient and Medieval Society, Moscow, Dar Al-Ilm Publishing, 1968 (in Russian)
- Trachtenberg, History of Philosophy, Moscow, House of Political Literature, 1941 (in Russian)
- Trachtenberg, Studies in the History of Medieval Arab Philosophy, Moscow, Dar al-Fikr Publishing, 1957 (in Russian)
- Tiziani Al-Tayeb, A New Vision of Arab Thought in the Middle Ages, Damascus, Damascus Printing and Publishing House, 1971
- Hermann Lee, Study in the History of Medieval Materialism, Moscow, Foreign Literature Publishing House, 1962 (Russian)
- Grigorian S. N. from the History of Central Asian Philosophy and Iran, Moscow, Soviet Academy of Sciences Press, 1960 (in Russian)
- Grigorian S. N., Progressive Philosophical Thought, Moscow, Publishing House of Socio-Economic Literature, 1961 (in Russian)
- Grigorian S. N., Medieval Philosophy of the Peoples of the Near and Middle East, Moscow, Dar Elm Publishing, 1966 (in Russian)
- Makovelsky, History of Logic, Moscow, Elm Publishing House, 1967 (in Russian)
- Makovelsky, A Brief Study in the History of Philosophy, Moscow, Ilm Publishing House, 1969 (in Russian)
- Frolova Y. A., The Question of Belief and Knowledge in Arabic Philosophy, Moscow, Dar Al-Ilm Publishing, 1983 (in Russian)
- Sokolov and Asmus et al., Philosophical Anthology of the World, Moscow, Fikr Publishing House for Socio-Economic Literature, 1969 (in Russian)
- Sokolov V. V., Medieval Philosophy, Moscow, Higher School House, 1979 (in Russian)
- Stepaniants, History of Philosophy: Arabs – Russia – East, Moscow, 1995 (in Russian)
- Renan, Ibn Rushd and Rushdism, Cairo, 1956 (in Russian)
- Marx and Engels Collected Works, Moscow, Russian Literature Publishing House, 1980 (in Russian)
- Bakhoveskey, History of Psychology, Moscow, Ilm Publishing House, 1966 (in Russian)
- Makarov, Introduction to the History of Philosophy, Moscow, Dar Al-Fikr Publishing House, 1967 (in Russian)
- Group of Authors, Encyclopedic Philosophy Dictionary, Moscow, Soviet Encyclopedia Publishing House, 1989 (in Russian)
- Mahmoud Zaki Naguib and Kamel Fouad et al., The Concise Philosophical Encyclopedia, Cairo, Anglo-Egyptian Library, 1963
- Group of authors, Encyclopedic Philosophical Dictionary, Moscow, Soviet Encyclopedia Publishing House 1989 (in Russian)
- Taufic Ibrahim, Arthur Sagadeev, Classical Islamic Philosophy, Progu, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1990