

## **Islam and Positive Orientalism In the Age of Ideology ( 2 – 2 )**

*Prof. DR. Mohamed Osman Elkhosht  
Trans. by Ali Gafari*

### **Reaction to Renan Western-Arab Debate over Islam and Philosophy and Science**

Renan's views and analyses in his lecture on Islam and science created widespread reaction on several levels in both the movement of Orientalism and modern Arabic<sup>(1)</sup>.

On the one hand, Orientalism went for some time under the influence of the views expounded in this lecture concerning the hostility that Islam harbours for science and philosophy-the relative deficiency of the Arab mind being unable to create and stopping at presenting explanations of the Greek heritage without developing or going beyond it.

A group of Orientalists followed suit and continued consecrating and supporting this tradition. Unfortunately some still echo these views up till today.

One such example is Elie Kedourie in his study *Afghani and 'Abduh: an Essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in Modern Islam* (1966)<sup>(2)</sup>.

Another is Nikki R. Keddie's book *An Islamic Response to Imperialism* (1983)<sup>(3)</sup>.

A third researcher beating the same track is Pervez Hoodbhoy who wrote *Islam and Science* (1991) in which he depended a great deal on Kiddie's views<sup>(4)</sup>.

On the other hand, some Orientalists adopt objective views and have enough knowledge of the principles of Islam and the history of its civilisation to make them able to detect the mistakes made by Renan. There is for instance M. Messmer who criticised Renan's lecture in a detailed response where he traversed the scientific progress achieved in the golden age of the Islamic civilisation. He further showed how Islam encouraged science

and supported its advance, refuting all the theses proposed by Renan, concluding that “the progress science has achieved today in the West took place in spite of Christianity. Islam, in contrast, cannot survive without the spread and progress of the sciences as Islam and science are totally connected”<sup>(5)</sup>.

In the introduction to her translation of Jamal ud-Deen Afghani, *Réfutation des matérialistes* (Refutation of the Materialists)<sup>(6)</sup>, French Orientalist Professor Amélie-Marie Goichon argued that Afghani rightly answered Renan that Islam in itself is not antagonistic to science. She attracted the attention to the fact that Afghani answered Renan on Renan’s own grounds<sup>(7)</sup>, i.e., the grounds of liberal thought, using the same tools of logic and free thinking.

Reaction from Arab thinkers varied. The first important response to the lecture, and the following-day article<sup>(8)</sup>, is that of Afghani (1838-1897). His answer to Renan has been of great influence on modern thought on the issue whether in a positive or a negative way. The answer was brief and liberal with quiet rationalism finding excuses for Renan’s confusing Islam with the behaviour of Muslims in the late decadent period of the Islamic civilisation. It is clear that the essence of Renan’s discourse which is based on a European racial attitude was obvious to Afghani. Thus, he refuted Renan’s racial arguments<sup>(9)</sup>. He also explored some instances of the church history of persecution which are found in the history of religion as they are found in the history of nations<sup>(10)</sup>. Afghani revealed the deficiency in Renan’s methodology which could not discern the differences in three issues whose fusion can lead to the researcher going off track. There is Islam a religion, the pure essence; there is how Islam was perceived and adopted when it spread over a large region; and there are the customs and traditions of the different peoples who professed Islam. Afghani embraced an objective impersonal stance, so he did not hurl accusation for accusation. He did not accuse Christianity, as a religion of hostility to science and philosophy. He rather ascribed the persecution scientists and philosopher suffered under Christianity to the Catholic priests who have their own understanding of this religion. That is to say, Afghani did not make the same

mistake of method of research that Renan made. Afghani admitted that the Muslim clergy bear some resemblance to the clergy of other religions and that some Muslim clerics are hostile to science and philosophy, but they are not Islam per se. He adds that the leaders of the Catholic Church up to that time still fight the spirit of vertigo and error by which they mean science and philosophy<sup>(11)</sup>.

In his response to Renan, Afghani wrote,

After reading this talk one cannot refrain from asking oneself if these obstacles come uniquely from the Muslim religion itself or from the manner in which it was propagated in the world; from the character, manners, and aptitudes of the peoples who adopted this religion, or of those on whose nations it was imposed by force. It is no doubt the lack of time that kept M. Renan from elucidating these points<sup>(12)</sup>.

Afghani points out that instances of persecution of scientists and philosophers took place in Islam and in other religions as well as “the venerated leaders of the Catholic Church have not yet disarmed, so far as I know. They continue to fight energetically against what they call the spirit of vertigo and error”<sup>(13)</sup>.

Thus, Afghani was able to demolish Renan’s thesis by pointing out the deficiency in the methodology he used to prove his thesis. However, Afghani’s objective admission that Islamic history has seen cases of persecution does not mean that Afghani reneged on his belief in Islam or that he admits Islam is hostile to science and obstructs its advance. Some researchers, such as Nikki Keddie, adopt this unwarranted subjective point of view, questioning Afghani’s belief. They claim that his sojourn in Paris has adversely affected his faith since he argued that Islam did not obstruct science in the first few centuries of the Islamic civilisation then it turned into a stifling force that nipped the scientific movement in the bud. In his book *Islam and Science*, Hoodbhoy adopts the same accusatory tone towards Afghani<sup>(14)</sup>. In fact, Afghani did not say that Islam per se was responsible for persecution and antagonism to scientists; he rather blames the dogmatic understanding of Islam which was espoused by the clerics and tyrannical politicians in the later ages of Islamic civilisation. It is

those who bear direct responsibility for fetters that chained the scientific movement. Afghani distinguished between Islam in its ideal form at the age of the Prophet and the first four enlightened Caliphs and Islam as was understood by the clerics and statesmen of the later ages. Egyptian liberal Islamic reformer, Muhammad Abduh (1849-1905), makes the distinction thus: Quranic Islam and rulers' Islam<sup>(15)</sup>.

Afghani was one of the pioneering reformists in Islam, if not the pioneer, to make the distinction between Islam itself as revealed in the Quran and true *sunnah* (traditions) of the Prophet as well as application of the first four Caliphs on the one hand, and the later image of Islam after the political expansion and the traditions and manners of the Muslims themselves in addition to the highly restricted form imposed by some clerics and rulers on the other hand.

When Afghani mentioned the negative images he was definitely not talking about the earlier form which he considered as an ideal, free from antagonism to science in particular and thought in general. In addition, Afghani's earlier and later writings, such as his cultural magazine articles in *Al-Basseer* (The Insightful) and *Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqa* (Strongest Bond) assert that reform should arise from within Islam itself, especially when Afghani believes that the Quran teems with implied hidden meanings which require re-interpretations in the cases where the apparent meaning of the Quran clashes with reason or science. This reflects the views of Averroes, but Afghani goes even further in order to open the door to modern science. He maintains that *ijtihad* (independent and innovative thinking) is inevitable in understanding religion.

Afghani is criticised, however, for not specifying the details of the difference between the Quranic Islam and Islam in its historical context in the later ages. He was aware of these details, no doubt, as he mentioned some in a general way at the beginning of his response to Renan. He wonders whether the evil conflict has arisen from Islam itself or from how it spread around the world and the effect of the morals of the nations that adopted Islam of its own accord or under pressure carrying over their traditions to Islam, or whether it is all these

factors that brought about the clash<sup>(16)</sup>. Nevertheless some researchers still deny that Afghani made this distinction between the two images of Islam. For instance, in *Islam and Science*, Iqbal maintains that Afghani seems to have abandoned the essential distinction between revelation and its unfolding in history, i.e., the distinction between Islam and Muslims<sup>(17)</sup>. Iqbal's view is refuted not only by the initial paragraphs of the Afghani's "*Response to Renan*", but also by the views that Afghani constantly expressed in his other writings and in his lectures. Muhammad Abduh was so influenced by this distinction that he used it in all his writings in defence of Islam<sup>(18)</sup>. Afghani emphasises that the greatness and glory achieved by the Muslims are attributed to basing their state on religion while the weak and decadent ages have been introduced later through "the separation between the rank of the religious scholars and the rank of the caliphate when the caliphs saw that the religious name of the caliphate was enough, abandoning knowledge and a better understanding of their religion as was the case at the time of the first four caliphs<sup>(19)</sup>." He sees that the remedy for this nation is in "going back to the principles of its religion and adopting the ways of the beginnings."<sup>(20)</sup>

Afghani confirmed the difference between Islam as revealed by the Quran and the Islam practiced by Muslims in an interview with Abdel Qader Al-Maghrebi who included the interview in his book on Afghani. The transcript of the interview was also included in the selection of Afghani's works collected by Mohammed Abu Rayya in *The Call of Jamal ud-Deen Al-Afghani* in which Afghani says,

The Quran is one of the best means to attract the attention of the West to the virtue of Islam as it expresses itself while the Muslims' conditions are not an expression of the Quran. They see these conditions and disdain the Quran and disbelieve it. If we want others to believe in our religion, we have, above everything else, to prove to them that we uphold the values of Islam even though we do not practise them in full<sup>(21)</sup>.

Afghani maintains that it is obvious that the Quran calls for scientific thinking as "it was our first guide to truth in the philosophical manner, i.e., the why. Most verses of the Quran occur in the context of 'Why are things like this?' and 'Why are they like that?' The

addressees are required to give the reasonable answer. And philosophy is nothing more than that<sup>(22)</sup>.” Afghani considers the Quran the first cause of transferring the Arabs from the stage of barbarism to that of civilisation. Afghani states,

One of the merits of the Quran is that the Arabs were in an indescribable state of barbarism. Then, just a century and a half later, they were the rulers of the world, surpassing all other nations in politics, science, philosophy, industry and commerce. All definitely arose from the truthful guidance of the Quran<sup>(23)</sup>.

Therefore, referring to the other writings and lectures of Afghani confirms that he did not mean Quranic Islam when he mentioned the causes of obstructing the advance of science and philosophy; he laid the blame on the rulers and the hardcore conservative Muslim clergy in the later ages who “did not have the esteemed status of scholars that seek knowledge and deep understanding of religion and formulate independent opinion on the basics and details of their creed in the manner of the first four caliphs-the enlightened and blessed<sup>(24)</sup>.”

Although Afghani’s defence of Islam was brief, his defence of the Arabs was detailed. A basic point has to be first elucidated here. Afghani could not think of Islam as separate from Arabism just as his contemporary liberal thinkers could not think of Arab nationalism without Islam. There was a fundamental link between the two concepts not only in Afghani’s consciousness but also in that of almost all Arab thinkers even the liberals whether Muslim or Christian<sup>(25)</sup>.

Starting to refute Renan’s claim that the Arabs have no natural liking for the sciences and submit to a native nature of rejecting philosophical thinking, Afghani states,

The Arab nation rose from their previous barbaric state and started to proceed on the road of intellectual and scientific progress in a speedy pace only comparable to the pace of their conquests. Within two centuries they were able to assimilate the Greek and Persian sciences ... Thus the sciences made amazing advance under the Arabs and in all the countries that were under their dominance<sup>(26)</sup>.

When Rome and Byzantium abandoned philosophic inquiry and scientific research, the Arabs set out to resume the work “where the developed nations have left off, reviving the sciences that were dying out, advanced them and added to them joy that had never been there before”<sup>(27)</sup>.

The Arabs had no doubt taken their philosophy and science from Persia and Greece, but they contributed as well to developing and upgrading this knowledge at the time when the French, the German and the English did nothing. Afghani acknowledges,

Arabs had taken from the Persians and the Greeks, but they upgraded, expanded and sorted out these sciences logically. They raised the sciences they took over after the conquests to a degree of perfection which reveals sound taste and rare accuracy and authentication. The French, the English and the German were not as far away from Byzantium and Rome as they Arabs were; it was easy for them to make use of the scientific treasures of the two cities, but they did not<sup>(28)</sup>.

The Europeans did not benefit from the sciences of the ancient nations until they communicated with the Arabic civilisation. They did not think of Aristotle in his Greek format; they thought of him and translated his work through his Arabic image. Hoodbhoy says, in a sense, the Europeans welcomed Aristotle when he migrated, so to speak, and became an Arab while they did not think of him when he was their neighbour and a Greek<sup>(29)</sup>.

As for Renan’s claim that most philosophers of the first centuries of Islam were, just like the great statesmen, of foreign origins, from Harran, Andalusia, or Persia, or were of the Syrian Christians<sup>(30)</sup>, Afghani refutes the assertion in a quiet logical tone explaining that the Harranians were of an Arab origin and when the Arabs conquered and occupied Spain they stayed Arabs. In addition, Arabic was the language of the Harranians even centuries before Islam although they kept their Sabaeen religion. However, this does not mean that they were of non-Arab origin. Moreover, the majority of the Syrian Christians were Arabs too; they were Arabs of the tribe of Ghassan who converted to Christianity<sup>(31)</sup>. As for Ibn Baja, Averroes and Ibn Tofail, Afghani sates,

It cannot be said that they are less Arabs than Al-Kindi because they were not born in Arabia, especially when there is no way to distinguish one nation from another unless it is by its language. What will it be if we confine our attention to the origin of a great figure ignoring the influence that dominated him and the encouragement he enjoys in the nation he lives within? If we do that, we shall say Napoleon is not French, and both Germany and England will not be able to say that their scientists, who migrated to them from other counties, are their own<sup>(32)</sup>.

It is clear that Afghani is borrowing here Ibn Khaldun's notion that determines the identity of a person through his language, culture and the civilisation he grew up within-an idea that will be propagated and reiterated by a large number of Orientalists especially Max Grünbaum and Bernard Lewis.

Afghani tries to discover the logic of the development of history on the basis of a sort of similarity and contrast between East and West. He argues that the Christian West took around ten centuries to accomplish evolution from primitiveness to advancement, and it cannot be expected that the East will take less than that span of time to achieve development. This last remark definitely contradicts Afghani's revolutionary reform. He disdained slow development and took up instead the approach of revolution and leaping forward without any waiting intervals.

The question that poses itself now is: Are there any differences between "*Refutation of the Materialists*" and "*Response to Renan*"?

The content of Afghani's attitude manifested no change in both essays. However, there are a number of differences in method, performance and style. The mechanism of the reaction in the first is more aggressive than defensive; the second is mostly defensive. Since the *Refutation* is addressed to common people in the East, Afghani uses rhetorical and oratorical methods with passionate persuasive arguments. It takes the form of Islamic jihad (holy war) combating heresy and moral decadence. On the other hand, the second essay, the *Response to Renan*, was addressed to the elite in Europe. Hence, he utilized a quiet rational mechanism, adopting the approaches of liberalism and modernism.



Afghani was definitely adept at using these mechanisms and methods. His arguments were “balanced and reasonable”<sup>(33)</sup> so much that he secured the admiration of Renan who described him on the next day in the same *Le Journal des débats*<sup>(34)</sup>, as “the remarkably intelligent Afghan Sheikh”<sup>(35)</sup> referring to his ideas as “judicious reflections”<sup>(36)</sup> expressing “the conscience of the enlightened Asiatic”<sup>(37)</sup>.

However, he does not let this praise go without authentication by reference to his theory on human races. Afghani is intelligent, enlightened and judicious, but, Renan argues,

The Sheik Gemmal Eddin is an Afghan, entirely emancipated from the prejudices of Islam; he belongs to those energetic races of the Upper Iran bordering upon India, in which the Aryan spirit still flourishes so strongly, under the superficial garb of official Islamism<sup>(38)</sup>.

Renan, moreover, praised Afghani, saying he occupied in his heart a place engaged only by the very few. Afghani who had a great effect on him is the best proof of his so-called great theory, declared repeatedly, which is that the worth of religions is determined by the worth of the races who profess them. He was so impressed by the personality of Afghani that in his presence he imagined he sees one his old acquaintances face to face<sup>(39)</sup>.

In his reply to Afghani’s *Response*, Renan describes Afghani, saying,

The freedom of his thought, his noble and loyal character, made me believe, when in his presence, that I had before me, in a resuscitated state, one of my old acquaintances, Avicenna, Averroes, or some other of those great sceptics who for five centuries represented the tradition of the human spirit<sup>(40)</sup>.

Some understood from comparing Afghani to the great sceptics that Renan describes Afghani as a doubter in religion, which is not true. Renan compares him to thinkers who basically manifest the human spirit of free thinking as his sentence shows. This emphasises Afghani’s liberalism as both Avicenna and Averroes were liberal, but still believers in one sense at least.

Renan maintains that there is only one point in Afghani’s *Response* on which he and Afghani differ, which is that Afghani does not recognise the distinctions, which historical

criticism leads to know. These are the distinctions made by great and complex facts called empires and conquests. Renan claims that in spite of the distinctions there are many similarities between the Roman Empire and the Arab conquest. The Latin language was turned by the Roman Empire into the organ of the human spirit through the whole of the Western world up to the sixteenth century. Similarly, the Arabic language was made by Islam the organ of the human spirit in the countries that went under the dominance of Islam. However, this does not mean that everything written in Latin is an expression of the Romans or that it is Latin, nor that everyone who writes in Arabic is an Arab or that he expresses Islam<sup>(41)</sup>. Therefore,

It is not that we think lightly of the action of Rome in the history of civilisation, any more than we fail to recognise Arabic action. But these great currents of humanity demand analysis. All that is written in Latin is not to the glory of Rome; all that is written in Greek is not Hellenic work; all that is written in Arabic is not of Arabic production; all that is done in a Christian country is not the result of Christianity; all that is done in a Mohammedan country is not the fruit of Islam<sup>(42)</sup>.

Renan's tone has become milder after Afghani's *Response*; now he does not deny the influence of the Arabs while, in his lecture, he denied their positive role in the production of civilisation which he sees as the result Persian, Andalusian, Harranian Nestorian production. Now he maintains that not all that is written in Arabic is of Arab production, which means that some is. Earlier he argued that all written in Arabic was not of Arab production.

It is clear again that his tone has become softer as he considers the wisdom of the Arabs like that of the Latin and the Greek as he sees that all these great currents of humanity need analysis since not all that written in Latin is to the glory of Rome, not all that is written in Greek is Greek work, nor all that is written in Arabic is of Arab production.

Commenting of Afghani's criticism that Renan's argument is not complete as he did not apply to Christianity what he applied to Islam, Renan acknowledges,

One aspect in which I have appeared unjust to the Sheik, is that I have not sufficiently developed the idea that all revealed religion is forced to show hostility to positive science; and that, in this respect, Christianity has no reason to boast over Islam<sup>(43)</sup>.

He says that Afghani is, no doubt, in the right. Galileo was not better treated by the Catholic Church than Averroes by the Muslims. However, he did not elaborate this fact since his views on the point are known and there was no need to reiterate what the readers of the journal know well of his views and works<sup>(44)</sup>.

He asserts that the Christian should not give up Christianity nor should the Muslim relinquish Islam; he only wants the enlightened sectors of both Islam and Christianity to support progress and science without hindrance from religious creeds, which took place in almost half the Christian nations. Renan hoped this would also happen in the Islamic world.

However, he emphasises that building positive science will not happen without separating mind from any supernatural belief. He asserts that “the human mind must be detached from all supernatural belief if it desires to labour at its own essential task, which is the construction of positive science. This does not imply any violent destruction or hasty rupture”<sup>(45)</sup>.

Renan denies he described the Muslims at all as fatally ignorant as he distinguishes between the different races of the Muslims, but he still upholds his theory concerning distinction on the bases of race.

He confirms what he said as “Islamism puts great difficulties in the way of science, and unfortunately has succeeded for five or six hundred years in almost suppressing it in the countries under its sway”<sup>(46)</sup>.

Once more using the analogy of Christianity, the West and science, he argues that renaissance will not take place through Islam; it will rather arise through enfeebling it. Renaissance in the West occurred after undermining the influence of the church. “To emancipate the Mussulman from his religion would be the greatest service that one could render him”<sup>(47)</sup>.

Renan insists on analogies and neglects the fundamental differences between Islam and the Christianity church in the West. He maintains if the movement of renaissance happened

in the West by severing the ties with the Catholic Church, so the same thing should happen in the Islamic world<sup>(48)</sup>.

Concluding his commentary, Renan acknowledges that the *Response* of Sheikh Jamal ud-Deen enriched him with important views that support his basic theory. “During the first half of its existence Islam did not prevent the scientific movement from growing in Mohammedan soil; during the second half of its existence it stifled the scientific movement within it, and that to its own misfortune”<sup>(49)</sup>.

It can be noticed that Renan is not accurate in ascribing the phrase “*it stifled the scientific movement*” to Afghani. Since what Afghani said was it is the rulers and the clergy and not Islam itself. Renan lumped together Islam as revealed in the Quran and Islam of the history of Muslims and the dogmatic image made by the tyrannical rules and their clergy in the later ages.

Ahmed Ameen claims that Renan modified his opinion that Islam is hostile to science as he mentioned that Islam did not stifle the scientific movement in the first half of its existence. He says, “This last outcome shows, no doubt, that Renan modified a great deal of his previous opinion as he sees that it is not the nature of Islam to resist science; if this had been its nature, it would not have encouraged the scientific movement at the beginning or at the end”<sup>(50)</sup>.

Despite the difference in opinion between Renan and Afghani, they expressed the admiration they bear each other and exchanged views in a calm proper scientific manner. They presented a model of how dialogue should be conducted.

It seems that Afghani meant to politically exploit the interest created by the debate on Renan’s lecture to attack the imperial English policies. He had published an article “Islam and Science: for the edification of the intelligent” in *Al-Basseer* newspaper<sup>(51)</sup>. It was published before his response to Renan in the *Journal des débats*<sup>(52)</sup>. The *Basseer* article was a commentary on another response to Renan by an anonymous Algerian writer. Afghani praised Renan despite the difference in opinion, and praised Paris for the freedom it allows.

He said, “The philosopher Renan delivered in Paris, the seat of freedom, a speech on Islam and science in which he expressed his ideas resulting from historical evidence. In his speech he was committed to decorum which requires respect of the religions that nations profess”<sup>(53)</sup>.

Afghani records the appreciation he has of the freedom enjoyed by the French nation as several people responded to his lecture/article, exposing his errors. He says,

Many great persons in the French nation were dismayed and frowned at his article considering it lacking in fairness and justice in addition to its transgressing against the Muslims whom they have a duty to take care of in general and the Algerians and Tunisians in particular. Those who can have an influence on the government of this honourable nation expressed their views and wrote articles of complaint against Renan’s article to expose his blunders, disprove his pitfalls, and defend Islam and Muslims. This revealed their refined degree of knowledge of literature and philosophy<sup>(54)</sup>.

Afghani’s words show that he never gave up his faith in Islam and that he did not change any of his views. This article was written in the same atmosphere of the then ongoing debate. Its tone proves Afghani was constant in his belief in Islam and Arabism, and those who tried to deduce from his *Response to Renan* that he was an atheist were simply wrong.

Since Afghani was, in the first place, a political activist against imperialism, he attempted to move the issue to a political arena to use it in attacking the English and their imperialist policies which were based on stifling the freedom of thought and not respecting “the religions that nations profess.” He praises the freedom practiced by the French as a refined model, and at the same time he criticises the despotic English methods. He writes,

No one really appreciates this model unless one looks at the English nation, and examined its dealings with the Muslims in India. The English rule fifty million Muslims, but think the Muslims have no rights, and do not even notice they should be cared for, or their religion respected. The arrogant Protestant priests stand in the streets of India and defame Islam in a revolting manner, tell blatant lies, make up barefaced falsehoods. They ascribe to

the Prophet of Islam unnaturally monstrous and atrocious deeds-all that under the noses of the government and the English who do not raise a finger or show dismay<sup>(55)</sup>.

Afghani mentions two Christian missionary books, which were in India at that time, full of defamation and slander against Islam. These are *Balance of Truth* and *The Antichrist*. Both teem with numerous lies, but if a Muslim scholar writes a response to them,

He would be arrested for sedition, and sent without trial to the Andaman Islands. The late Mawlawi Al-Hindi<sup>(56)</sup> escaped to Mecca because of such an accusation after the dialogues that took place between him and a protestant priest. Another example is Jawad Al-Sabat who escaped by night from India as well to Java because of his book the Sabatean Proofs which is a response to the falsehoods of the English priests<sup>(57)</sup>.

In this way, Afghani utilized Renan's lecture and the reactions it created for the benefit of his political cause, taking the opportunity to attack the English anti-Islamic policies in India. Apart from Afghani's views, the English colonial system was different from that of the French which followed the method of the Napoleonic campaign in Egypt when he attempted to gain the favour of the Egyptians by being friendly to Islam in different ways.

Afghani's "*Response to Renan*" raised a great deal of controversy and confusion. The questions that arose are such as: Does this response show that Afghani has lost his Islamic faith? Does it reflect a retreat in his thought under the influence of his stay in Paris and Renan's staunch positivism and secularism? Does it mean that Afghani gives priority to the political aspects of the issue over the religious and use the religious to serve the requirements of the conflict?

Researchers' answers to these questions varied and formulated four trends of understanding Afghani's "*Response to Renan*".

The first trend considered the *Response* different from the rest of Afghani's writings on Islam, especially *Refutation of the Materialists*, but the difference does not amount to relinquishing of faith. The *Response* was justified from the political, ideological perspective.

This trend is represented by Egyptian liberal intellectual Sheikh Mostafa Abdel Raziq and the Iranian researcher Hamid Enayat.

Mostafa Abdel Raziq (1885-1947), Egyptian thinker and former Sheikh of al-Azhar, analysed Afghani's *Response* in two articles in *Al-Seyassa* newspaper<sup>(58)</sup> in addition to the lecture he had given previously in the Egyptian University<sup>(59)</sup>. He based his analysis on a translation of the *Response* done by Mahmoud Ibrahim Al-Desouqi through a German translation. In the two articles Abdel Raziq tells of Afghani's journey to France in 1879 and how he met Renan. He further intimates that it was Afghani who suggested to Renan to deliver a lecture at the Sorbonne on the topic of Islam and science<sup>(60)</sup>.

Abdel Raziq argued that the *Response* reveals a new attitude of Afghani different from the remainder of his writings, especially the *Refutation* in the issue of the relation between religion and science. However, he only attempted to justify Afghani's views. He maintains that, "Whatever the views of Afghani on religion, he is not a promoter of atheism; neither is he an enemy of religion<sup>(61)</sup>." He mentions the reasons why Afghani wrote the *Response* in this manner, one of which is "this being his first trip to Europe and encounter with prominent philosophers and scientists, preferring to gain their friendship to serve his political goals and to integrate into the modern intellectual movement away from religion<sup>(62)</sup>."

Abdel Raziq does not doubt Afghani's goals and devotion to the struggle for the cause of liberating and uniting the Islamic countries and furthering their progress. He writes,

His ultimate goals and dearest hopes were to liberate the countries of Islam from European influence, political and otherwise, and to endeavour to bring about their advance by establishing internal liberal and independent system. He wanted to unite the disparate nations of Islam under the rule of a caliph, thus forming a powerful state able to fend off any foreign aggression<sup>(63)</sup>.

However, Abdel Raziq did not analyse or criticise Renan's commentary in which Renan claimed that Afghani supports his idea that Islam encouraged the scientific movement in the first half of its existence and stifled it in the second.

The same trend is followed by Tehran University, Head of the Political Science Department, Hamid Enayat in a book review published in the *Iranian Studies* journal<sup>(64)</sup> in which he reviews Nikki Keddie's study. He considers her analysis of the *Response* poor, slight and inadequate<sup>(65)</sup>. Enayat attributes the contradiction in Afghani's views to political reasons as he was after the liberation and unity of the Islamic countries in the first place. For this purpose, he used all available means. Therefore, if his response to Renan showed some lapse in adherence to the Islamic faith, this is explained by the fact that he was addressing the French audience in a modern progressive style, to affect them for the interest of the cause of the political independence of the Islamic world. Such a method, Enayat says, is not found in the *Refutation* which includes views that contradict others of his religious views. He thought that writing the *Refutation* in this manner strengthens the unity of India, including Muslims and non-Muslims, as a religious nation in confronting the English colonialism. This attitude displays the basic weakness of the Islamic modernisation movement and its excessive interest in politics at the expenses of facing some basic vital issues in the relation between Islam and the modern world. This may have been an inescapable duty in the struggle against colonialism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Several consecutive generations of modernisation advocates inherited this weakness. Thus they sacrificed cultural renaissance for the sake of conspiring political activity, and replaced the political education of the public with gang intrigues<sup>(66)</sup>.

Enayat makes an overgeneralization here since some of the advocates of modernisation and innovation, such as Muhammad Abduh and Abbas Al-Aqqad, preferred political education of the masses over the revolutionary change. In addition, the logic of priorities drove Afghani to concentrate efforts on the political activity at the expense of the cultural regeneration-an imposition of the circumstances of colonialisaton and political corruption of the Islamic East.

The second trend argues that Afghani was under a considerable misunderstanding. His response does not represent renegeing on his previous stances. Moreover, it does not mean that



Afghani believes Islam is responsible for stifling the scientific and philosophic movement in the Orient. Afghani adheres firmly to his Islamic creed. This trend is represented by Muhammad Abduh, Rasheed Reda, Ahmed Ameen and other writers in later periods.

Imam Muhammad Abduh (1849-1905), Egyptian thinker and founder of Islamic modernism, denies firmly any misunderstanding on the part of Afghani. He affirms that Afghani never meant that Islam caused halting the scientific movement. The responsibility rests with some rulers who misunderstood Islam and used it for their own political and ideological interests. Sheikh Muhammad Rasheed Reda communicated Abduh's views when he discussed the issue in *Al-Manar* magazine in four articles. Rasheed wrote the articles to exonerate Afghani, traversing a large number of citations from Afghani's writings to prove the authenticity of his faith and his adamant defence of Islam. He reiterated the views expressed by Abduh on the two types of Islam: expressing the Quran and embracing science on the one hand, and expressing the rulers and opposing science on the other. The Quranic Islam "speaks to the reasoning mind and highly values knowledge in many of its verses. It shows how evidence of the existence of God is seen in laws of nature on which everything is based and which cannot be changed"<sup>(67)</sup>.

Ahmed Ameen (1886-1954), one of the leaders of the Islamic enlightenment movement, gave Abduh and Reda's interpretation relative support, citing Afghani's "*Response to Renan*" repeatedly to prove this view. However, he argues.

Sayyid [Jamal ud-Deen Afghani] gave inaccurate expression in distinguishing between the nature of Islam and the history of the Muslims, especially when he rebuked Renan for not considering whether this evil arose from Islam itself, from the image made of Islam, or from the manners of some of the peoples who professed Islam. Reading his response makes us feel he was confused and had an idea that he kept attempting to formulate but could not clearly express, which is that there is a circle of religion and another of science and the two should not overlap. Religion should not oppose science in what has been proven scientifically. These ideas that are clear to us now were not plainly expressed in his answer<sup>(68)</sup>.

Although Ameen maintains that Afghani never meant that Islam halted the scientific movement, he considers Afghani's response "confused". He even considers the lecture of Renan confused as well<sup>(69)</sup>.

Ameen argues that Afghani was able to influence Renan in a positive way, making him modify his previous views. He cites what Renan stated in his commentary where he says,

The Sheik Gemmal Eddin seems to me to have brought considerable arguments in support of my two fundamental theses: During the first half of its existence Islam did not prevent the scientific movement from growing in Mohammedan soil; during the second half of its existence it stifled the scientific movement within it, and that to its own misfortune<sup>(70)</sup>.

Ameen deduces from Renan's words that Afghani was able to influence Renan, saying "this last result, no doubt, has a great deal of modification of the previous views adopted by Renan. It leads inevitably to stating that the nature of Islam itself is not against science, since if this had been its nature, it would not have encouraged the scientific movement neither at the beginning nor at the end".

Therefore, although Ameen describes both Renan's lecture and Afghani's response to him as "confused", he argues that the ensued debate ended up with a good influence on Renan's views.

This trend, started by Abduh, Reda and partially by Ameen, and was followed as well by many others such as the Egyptian historian Abdel Rahman Al-Rafie who summarised Afghani's *Response* in a manner that shows his conviction of Afghani's valid stance and staunch defence of Islam and Arabism. He concludes that Renan highly esteemed the *Response*, met Afghani "and discussed the subject with him. Renan admired Afghani's genius, width of knowledge and convincing arguments"<sup>(71)</sup>. Abdel Mohsen Abdel Hameed defends Afghani's *Response*, arguing that Renan retracted some of his views when he faced the convincing scientific and historical arguments of Afghani<sup>(72)</sup>. Mohammed Taher Al-Jabalawi adopts the opinion given by Ahmed Ameen without modification<sup>(73)</sup>.

The third trend maintains that Afghani was under the influence of Renan since

Afghani argued that Islam caused a retardation of science. Afghani's sojourn in Paris changed his views on Islam. This trend is represented by Elie Kedourie, Nikki Keddie, an anonymous senior Ottoman official, and Homa Pakdaman.

Elie Kedourie generally bases his attitude towards Afghani on a deformed understanding of him in a study entitled, *Afghani and 'Abduh: an Essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in Modern Islam* (1966). He strangely insists on questioning Afghani's faith in Islam and Muhammad Abduh's faith as well. To support his view, he enumerates several pieces of evidence in sheer arbitrariness. He finds all the defective attributes in both Afghani and his disciple Abduh. The evidence he gives is mostly guessing and judging what is in the man's heart, which renders his method highly subjective, projecting the attributes it likes on the subject of the study. He, for instance, considers disallowing his membership in the Masonic Lodge a sign of his extremism and his earlier joining as an indication that he saw in it a modern extension of the old Islamic extremism which obviously attracted him. Freemasonry at that time was closely connected with emancipation and liberal thought in the Middle East. One of its conditions was that the new member should display hatred for true traditional religion<sup>(74)</sup>. Thus, one stance and its contrast are the proof of one attribute-an untenable method of research which projects its views on the subject of study, seeing the various colours as one. According to this perspective, Kedourie confirms that one of the manifestations of Afghani's atheism is that when he wrote his "*Response to Renan*" criticising Islam's causing the retardation of science, he did not object when Renan accused him of atheism and asked Muhammad Abduh not to publish his "*Response to Renan*" in Arabic<sup>(75)</sup>.

In her book *An Islamic Response to Imperialism* (1968), Nikki Keddie reviews the debate that took place after Renan's lecture between Renan and Afghani, saying that the Afghani's *Response* indicates that his sojourn in Europe changed his views on Islam. She forgets that Afghani's defence of Islam in his magazine *Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqa* (Strongest Bond) occurred after his *Response* and he was also in Paris. He stayed in Paris from mid-January 1883 to July 1885, published his "*Response to Renan*" on 18 May 1883, and issued

*Al-'Urwah* in 1884. She considers his *Response* as the strongest evidence of his abandoning his creed<sup>(76)</sup>. She says that it is important that no translation of the *Response* appeared in any Eastern language. And Afghani was almost misrepresented in the Eastern languages as a defence of Islam. Afghani could easily have mentioned the great scientific Islamic achievements of the past and remarked that Islam's image has been tarnished in the later centuries, but instead, he chose to attack Islam in strong words<sup>(77)</sup>. Moreover, she adds that she does not mean by her words that Afghani was without any religion. He was probably one of the followers of Islamic deism. Deists believe in God but not in religion and support reason not revelation. He believed in the Creator who is the First Mover who moved the world and then let it follow the natural laws. This means that he followed the example of many Muslim philosophers who believe in the natural law as they believe in God, the first cause and the Mover who is not moved. Afghani may have also believed that pure Islam is free from the irrational elements of Christianity. He may have believed eventually, as he said, that the hidden meaning of the Quran is infinite. Thus it contains all the aspects of advance in human knowledge<sup>(78)</sup>.

Keddie refers to some analyses made by researcher Sharif Al-Mujahid in his M.A. dissertation to the McGill University in Canada in addition to other analyses by Albert Hourani in his book *Arab Thought in the Liberal Age*. She considers them helpful in understanding Afghani's intellectual background although they do not help much in understanding the anti-religious undertones that infiltrate texts such as the "*Response to Renan*".

Furthermore, Keddie compares what Selim Anhour<sup>(79)</sup> wrote about Afghani's atheism and views on the universe and nature to what Afghani himself wrote in the *Response*, and reaches a conclusion that the two are identical. She attributes that attitude to Afghani's bringing up in Iran and Iraq and his residence in India. She concludes that the *Response* displays a more modern way of expressing the equality of East and West in development in particular. Christianity took ten centuries in order to develop from intellectual petrification to free inquiry and science, so it cannot be expected that the Muslim will need less time to

develop. This last point may affect the West, but it is difficult to be proportionate to rallying the religious masses to rebuff the West.

In her book *Jamal ud-Deen Assad Abadi Known as Al-Afghani* (1969)<sup>(80)</sup>, Homa Pakdaman, mentions that the lecture given by Renan at the Sorbonne angered many people immediately after its publication in the *Journal des débats* on 30 March 1883 because he opined that Islam closed the doors in the face of science except in Iran. Afghani was one of those who reacted to the lecture, so he wrote a response that was published in the Journal on 18 May, i.e., around a month and a half later. However, the *Response* did not satisfy many of Muslims in Paris at the time as he mentions that “all religions are intolerant and each one has its own way of practicing intolerance. He further admits that Islam halted the progress of science and concludes that the conflict between stagnation and ijihad, i.e., between religion and philosophy, will never end; reason and philosophy will always be for the elite and the religious ideal will stay with the common people”<sup>(81)</sup>. Thus this researcher ascribes to Afghani ideas and words that are not in his *Response*. She may have obtained her information from the Orientalist sources which meant to deform Afghani’s attitudes and ideas, such as Kedourie’s *Afghani and 'Abduh: an Essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in Modern Islam*. More probably she may have got her information on this point from police reports on Afghani’s sojourn in Paris, especially when she refers in a different context to a 28 March 1884 report describing Afghani as having “a liberal spirit”, referring to a pamphlet he published declaring the imminent publication of *Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqa*, which aims at combating the English and uniting the Muslim around their Mahdi (spiritual leader). The report also mentions what Afghani wrote about Islam in the *Journal des débats* as a response to Renan’s lecture and how the *Response* angered the Muslims who considered it a betrayal so much that a senior Ottoman official described the responder as “a person who has never been a believer in the religion of Muhammad”<sup>(82)</sup>.

A fourth trend questions Afghani’s authorship of the *Response*. It argues that it was wrongly ascribed to him. Afghani arrived in Paris while the lecture was proceeding, and he

did not know French well. In addition, Afghani never mentioned the *Response* in *Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqa*. This trend was adopted by some researchers as stated by the Iranian researcher Pakdaman who does not mention their names. However, she rejects this view, citing Muhammad Abduh's mention of the *Response* in his letter to Afghani from Beirut, and Afghani's knowledge of French. Afghani started studying French in Istanbul in 1870, and resumed its study in Egypt, taught by Yakob Sannoua, then in Paris when he stayed there. In addition he wrote the *Response* by himself in Arabic then had it translated into French as the journal itself stated.

Questioning the authorship of the *Response* is presented as well by Hoodbhoy who immediately excludes it since Afghani was in Paris at the time and did not deny its authorship<sup>(83)</sup>.

The widespread reaction to Renan's lecture on "Islam and Science" developed beyond mere reaction to form an effective influence on trends of modern Arab thought and even the positivist Orientalist movement as well at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and well in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

\* \* \* \*

## ***Conclusion***

The study attempted to show how Ernest Renan, the positivist philosopher, has projected a European problem onto Islam, and then projected a European solution. The conflict between religion and science is a problem that has arisen within the historical development of Europe; in Islam this was the exception, and, in contrast with the European Catholic Christian case, it never reached the level of a phenomenon. It cannot be maintained that the emergence of the Muslim clergy as a class has developed into a religious authority of priesthood equal to that of the Christian Church.

The positivist movement, and at its heart Renan, reveals a characteristic of the age of ideology in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is the characteristic which indicates the role

played by French scientific positivism in accusing Islam, arbitrarily and without conclusive evidence, of either poor spiritual content or religious stagnation that stands against the advancement of science.

The first accusation arises from the analogy with Christianity. Islam is not studied according to its own dialectics, but rather as a converse of Christian history. If Christianity is monastic, Islam is sensual. If Christianity is pacifist, Islam is pugnacious, and so on and so forth. Islam is judged as lacking in spirituality as a result of a negative analogy. Islam is considered religiously stagnant obstructing the way of scientific advance by a process of analogy with Christian history. If Christianity halted the progress of science in Europe, Islam did the same in the East. This is, of course, the attitude of the secular positivist Orientalism antagonistic to priesthood. However, there is another attitude adopted by the missionary Orientalism which links European progress to Christianity on the one hand, and links the backwardness of the Orient to Islam on the other<sup>(84)</sup>.

The mechanism that controlled Renan's attitude to the relation between Islam and science is the same mechanism that dominated his views on the relation between religions in general and positive science as a whole. Renan was torn between his intellectual consciousness which submits to the dictates of the positive sciences methodology and his romantic aspirations-between attempts to free himself from the Western Christian tradition, which unfairly underestimated Islam, and confining Islam to a process of cultural conflict with the West, between criticising Islam as the cause of halting the scientific movement, fettering the mind with chains, and showing his subtle appreciation of its greatness<sup>(85)</sup>.

Renan's lecture « L'Islamisme et la science » created a widespread reaction in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, the effect did not end there; it still creates interest in the form of responses, commentaries and referencing up till today. Its influence still prejudices some Western writers who cannot free themselves from the biased traditional view.

On the other hand, despite Renan's fallacies concerning the relation between Islam and science, Renan has some relative influence within modern Arab though. This might be a

transient effect on some thinkers who believe in the priority of the Greek thought in science and philosophy. They have, thus, searched for Greek roots for the Arabic heritage, and sought to establish the culture of their countries within the tradition of the Greek civilisation, neglecting the fact that there are as well obvious Persian, Syrian and Indian roots.

This is clear in Taha Hussein's book *The Future of Culture in Egypt* (1938) and in the works of Abdel Rahman Badawi who consecrated the idea of the Greek origins in more than one book such as *The Greek Tradition in the Islamic Civilisation* (1940) and *The Greek Origins of the Political Theories in Islam* (1954). However, Badawi also wrote *The Role of the Arabs in the Formation of European Thought* (1965).

A large group of them, including Ali Sami Al-Nashar and Lewis Awad, maintain that the Arabs were intermediaries in transferring philosophy, jurisprudence and law while their creativity did not show except in theology, literature and some experimental sciences. For example, Zaki Naguib Mahmoud spoke of the artistic Orient and the scientific West.

These are some of the influences created by Renan's attitude towards Islam and Arabism on the one hand and science and philosophy on the other.

Afghani's "*Response to Renan*", in addition to his other writings, has created widespread influences, in its turn, on Muhammad Abduh in his responses refuting the arguments put forward by the then French Foreign Minister, Gabriel Hanotaux. The responses were published in Abduh's book *Islam between Science and civilisation*. The effect is also apparent in Abduh's retorting to Farah Anton's mirroring of the ideological scientific vision which dominated Europe in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as well as his view of Averroes. Retorting to Anton's views on Averroes was a response to Renan since Anton did not express his own original views but simply mirrored Renan's views as expounded in *Averroès et l'averroïsme*. In his response to Anton, Abduh mentioned the basic principles of Islam and those of Christianity. The basic principles of Islam as seen by Abduh are rational reasoning to reach faith, giving priority to reason over the apparent meaning of religious laws when there is contradiction, no accusation of apostasy, studying



and benefiting from the laws of creation. On the other hand, Abduh mentioned some of the basic principles of Christianity, among which are miracles and the authority of religious leaders.

Afghani's influence did not stop with Muhammad Abduh; it went beyond that to Rasheed Reda (who wrote responses to Lord Cromer), to Abbas Al-Aqqad in his defence of Islam, to Taha Hussein in his later writings on Islam, and even further, into the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, to Muhammad Al-Ghazali in his book *Prejudice and Tolerance between Christianity and Islam*.

The debate between positivists and Islamists is still persevering on all fronts and on all issues. Sometimes it runs against a backdrop of religion; sometimes it runs in a political setting; sometimes still it takes philosophy as its context.

\* \* \* \*

## ***Works Cited***

### **Primary Source:**

- Renan, Ernest. "Appendix to the preceding Lecture", in: Ernest Renan, *Poetry of Celtic Races and Other Studies*. Tr. with intro. and notes by William G. Hutchison, USA, Kessinger Publishing's Rare Reprints, 2003.
- Renan, Ernest. "Islamism and Science", lecture delivered at the Sorbonne, March 29th, 1883 in: Ernest Renan, *Poetry of Celtic Races and Other Studies*. Tr. with intro. and notes by William G. Hutchison, USA, Kessinger Publishing's Rare Reprints, 2003.
- Renan, Ernest. *Studies of Religious History*. Tr. by O.B. Frothingham, New York, Carleton, 1864.
- Renan, Ernest. *The Future of Science*. Tr. by A. Vandam and C. Pitman. London, 1891.
- Renan, Ernest. *Averroès et l'Averroïsme*, Paris. Calmann Lévy, 1852.
- Renan, Ernest. "Examen de conscience philosophique". in: *Feuille détachées*, Paris, Calmann Lévy, quatrième édition, 1892.

- Renan, Ernest. *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse*. Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1884.
- Renan, Ernest. *Vie de Jésus*, Paris. Calmann Lévy,1863.

### References

- 1- Aiken, Henry D. *The Age of Ideology: The 19th Century Philosophers*. New York: New American Library,1956.
- 2- Bréhier, Émile. *Histoire de la philosophie*. Tome II. La Philosophie moderne, Paris, Librairie Félix Alcan, 1932.
- 3- Carlyle, Thomas. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*. London, Chapman &Hall, 1840.
- 4- Charlton, D.G. *Positivist Thought in France during the Second Empire*. Oxford. 1959.
- 5- Cooper, David E. *World Philosophies*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1996
- 6- Comte, Auguste. *Auguste Comte and Positivism*, ed. By Gertrude Lenzer,1975.
- 7- Comte, Auguste. « Première Leçon », *Cours de philosophie positive*, Vol. 1, Paris, Rouen Frères, 1830.
- 8- Daniel, Norman. *Islam, Europe and Empire*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1966.
- 9- Daniel, Norman. *Islam and the West*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1975.
- 10- Fakhry, Majid. *A History of Islamic Philosophy*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1970.
- 11- Hoodbhoy, Pervez. *Islam and Science: Religious Orthodoxy and the Battle for Rationality*. London , Zed Books, 1991.
- 12- Hourani Albert. *Arabic Thought in Liberal Age*. London, Oxford University Press, 1967.
- 13- Iqbal, Muzaffar. *Islam and Science*. Burlington, Ashgate, 2002.

- 14- Keddie, Nikki R. *An Islamic Response to Imperialism: Political and Religious Writings of Sayyed Jamal Ud-Din Al-Afghani*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1983.
- 15- Kedourie Elie. *Afghani and Abduh: An Essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activities in Modern Islam*. London, Cass, 1966.
- 16- Mill, John Stuart. *Auguste Comte and Positivism*, 1865, repr. 1961.
- 17- Mott, Lewis Freeman. *Ernest Renan*. New York and London, 1921.
- 18- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 2003.

\* \* \* \*

#### ***Encyclopaedias, Dictionaries and Periodicals:***

- 1- Hamed, A. "Iranian Studies" Autumn, 1973, PP. 246 - 55.
- 2- Harvey, Donald J. "History of France" in: *Academic American Encyclopaedia*. New Jersey, Arete, 1980 volume 8.
- 3- Blackburn, Simon. *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996.
- 4- Rosenthal, M. & Yudin. A Dictionary of Philosophy. Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1967.
- 5- Simon, W.M. "Renan", in: Paul Edwards (editor in Chief). *Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. New York, The Macmillan Company & The Free Press, Vol. 7.

\* \* \* \*

#### **جـ المراجع العربية والمترجمة إلى العربية:**

- أحمد أمين، زعماء الإصلاح، القاهرة، مكتبة الأسرة، 1996.
  - إدوارد سعيد، الاستشراق: المعرفة، السلطة، الإنشاء. ترجمة: كمال أبو ديب، بيروت، مؤسسة الأبحاث العربية، الطبعة الرابعة 1995.
  - أليكسي جورافسكي، الإسلام والمسيحية، ترجمة د. خلف محمد الجراد، راجع المادة العلمية وقدم
-

- د. محمود حمدى زقزوق، الكويت، عالم المعرفة 215، 1996م.
- اميل برهيبه، تاريخ الفلسفة : الفلسفة الحديثة، ترجمة جورج طرابيشي، بيروت، دار الطليعة، 1987.
- إميل بوترو، العلم والدين في الفلسفة المعاصرة، ترجمة د.أحمد فؤاد الأهواني، القاهرة، الهيئة العامة للكتاب، 1973.
- بنروبي، مصادر وتيارات الفلسفة الفرنسية المعاصرة في فرنسا، ترجمة عبد الرحمن بدوي، بيروت، المؤسسة العربية للدراسات والنشر، ج1، ط1، سنة 1980. ص25.
- تهامي نقرة، القرآن والمستشرقون، بحث في "مناهج المستشرقين في الدراسات العربية والإسلامية" ج1، مكتب التربية العربي لدول الخليج.
- توماس كارلايل، الأبطال، ترجمة محمد السباعي، القاهرة، دار الهلال، 1987.
- جمال الدين الأفغانى، الأعمال الكاملة، نشر ودراسة د. محمد عمارة، القاهرة، دار الكاتب العربى، 1968.
- جمال الدين الأفغانى، سلسلة الأعمال المجهولة، تحقيق وتقديم د. على شلش. لندن، دار رياض الريس، بدون تاريخ.
- جون هرمان راندال، تكوين العقل الحديث، ترجمة د. جورج طعمه، مراجعة برهان دجانى، بيروت، دار الثقافة، 1966.
- حسن حنفي، مقدمة في علم الاستغراب، القاهرة، الدار الفنية، 1991.
- خير الدين الزركلى، الأعلام، بيروت، در العلم للملايين، 1980.
- سلطان عمر عبد العزيز الحصين، موقف المستشرق "سيدو" من السيرة النبوية: دراسة نقدية من خلال كتابه "تاريخ العرب العام"، جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية، كلية الدعوة بالمدينة المنورة، 1413هـ.
- سليم عنحورى، "شرح ديوان سحر هاروت"، دمشق، 1879.
- عبد الرحمن الرافعى، جمال الدين الأفغانى، مصر، دار المعارف، 1991، ص128.
- عبد الوهاب جعفر، خطاب الفلسفة المعاصرة: أداؤه وإشكالياته، الإسكندرية، دار الوفاء، 2003.

- عبدالمتعال محمد الجبري : السيرة النبوية وأوهام المستشرقين، مكتبة وهبة، 1988م.
- عثمان أمين ، محاولات فلسفية، القاهرة، الأنجلو المصرية، 1956.
- على شلش، جمال الدين الأفغانى، القاهرة، دار الشروق، 1987.
- علي يوسف، إرنست رينان : دين الإسلام والعلم. وقد جاء فيه نص رد مسمر على رينان. بدون ناشر ولا تاريخ نشر.
- عمر لطفي العالم، المستشرقون والقرآن، مالطا، مركز دراسات العالم الإسلامي، ط 1، سنة 1991.
- فيليسيان شالى، موجز تاريخ الأديان، ترجمة حافظ الجمالي، دمشق، دار طلاس، 1991.
- محسن جاسم الموسوى، الاستشراق في الفكر العربي، بيروت، المؤسسة العربية للدراسات والنشر، 1993.
- محسن عبد الحميد، جمال الدين الأفغانى المصلح المفترى عليه، بيروت، مؤسسة الرسالة ، 1985.
- محمد رشيد رضا، تاريخ الأستاذ الإمام، القاهرة، مطبعة المنار، 1933.
- محمد أحمد دياب: أضواء على الاستشراق والمستشرقين، القاهرة، دار المنان للنشر والتوزيع، 1410هـ-1990م.
- محمد طاهر الجبلاوى، جمال الدين الأفغانى : حياته وآراؤه، القاهرة، الهيئة المصرية العامة للتأليف والنشر، 1971.
- محمد عابد الجابري، الخطاب العربي المعاصر، بيروت، دار الطليعة، 1988.
- محمد عبده، الإسلام بين العلم والمدنية، القاهرة، دار الهلال، 1983.
- محمود حمدي زقزوق، الاستشراق والخلفية الفكرية للصراع الحضاري. قطر، كتاب الأمة، العدد 5، 1404هـ.
- مصطفى عمر حلي، الخلفية الثقافية لاتجاهات المستشرقين في دراسة شخصية الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم، المدينة المنورة، المعهد العالي للدعوة الإسلامية، 1409هـ.
- مكسيم رودنسون . " الصورة الغربية والدراسات الغربية الإسلامية." في تراث الإسلام (القسم الأول) تصنيف شاخت وبوزورث. ترجمة محمد زهير السمهوري. الكويت: سلسلة عالم المعرفة،

شعبان-رمضان 1398هـ- أغسطس 1978م.

- مكسيم رودنسون ، جاذبية الإسلام، ترجمة إلياس مرقص، بيروت، دار التنوير، 1982.
- مكسيم رودنسون ومحمد أركون وآخرون، الاستشراق بين دعائه ومعارضيه، ترجمة وتحقيق هاشم صالح. بيروت ، دار الساقى للطباعة والنشر، 2000.
- هشام جعيط، أوروبا والإسلام، بيروت، دار الحقيقة، 1980.
- يوسف كرم ، تاريخ الفلسفة الحديثة، بيروت، دار القلم، بدون تاريخ.

#### د- الموسوعات والقواميس والدوريات العربية:

- جمال الدين الأفغانى ومحمد عبده، العروة الوثقى، القاهرة، دار العرب، ط3، 1993.
- جمال الدين الأفغانى، جريدة البصير، بتاريخ 3 مايو 1883.
- عبد الرحمن بدوي، موسوعة الفلسفة، بيروت، المؤسسة العربية للدراسات والنشر، 1984.
- عبد الرحمن بدوي، موسوعة المستشرقين، بيروت، دار العلم للملايين، ط3، 1993.
- عبد الوهاب الكيالي وآخرون، موسوعة السياسة، بيروت، المؤسسة العربية للدراسات والنشر، الطبعة الثالثة، 1986.
- كميل الحاج، الموسوعة الميسرة في الفكر الفلسفي والاجتماعي، بيروت، مكتبة لبنان، ط 1، 2000.
- محمد رشيد رضا، مجلة المنار، ج4، 16 ابريل 1923، ص 307. والأعداد الثلاثة اللاحقة.
- محمد روجي فيصل ، "إلى الأستاذ محمد كرد على : أغراض المستشرقين"، الرسالة، العدد 111، السنة الثالثة، 1935.
- مراد وهبه، المعجم الفلسفي، القاهرة دار قباء، 1999.

\* \* \* \*

1-Renan's fame in the Arab World has started since 1883 mostly with the publication of this lecture. See; Badawi, *Encyclopaedia of Orientalists*, p. 314.

2- Elie Kedourie, *Afghani and 'Abduh: an Essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in*

- Modern Islam* (1966), London, Cass, 1966.
- 3- Nikki R. Keddie, *An Islamic Response to Imperialism: Political and Religious Writings of Sayyed Jamal Ud-Din Al-Afghani*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1983.
  - 4- Pervez Hoodbhoy, *Islam and Science: Religious Orthodoxy and the Battle for Rationality*, London, Zed Books, 1991.
  - 5- See: Ali Youssef, *Ernest Renan: the Religion of Islam and Science*, no date or publication details. The author included the text of M. Messmer's answer to Renan in his book.
  - 6- *Ar-Radd alä ad-Dahriyyîn*.
  - 7- Badawi, *Encyclopaedia of Orientalists*, p. 320.
  - 8- Answer of Jamal ud-Din to Renan, *Journal des Débats*, 18 May 1883. See:  
Hoodbhoy, *Islam and Science*, p. 94.
  - 9- Muzaffar Iqbal, *Science and Islam*, Burlington, Ashgate, 2002, p. 26-263.
  - 10- Keddie, *An Islamic Response to Imperialism*, p. 187.
  - 11- Iqbal, *Science and Islam*.
  - 12- Jamal ed-Deen Afghani, *Complete Works*, ed. M. Emara, Katib Arabi Publishing, 1968, p. 208.  
And: Ahmed Ameen, *Leaders of Reform*, Vol. 2, p. 44.
  - 13- Ibid. Mentioned in the two previous references, same location.
  - 14- Hoodbhoy, *Islam and Science*, p. 61.
  - 15- *Manar Periodical*, 16 April, 1923, vol. 4 p. 307.
  - 16- Afghani, *Complete Works*, p. 208.
  - 17- Iqbal, *Science and Islam*, p.264.
  - 18- One example among several is: Muhammad Abduh, *Islam between Science and Civilisation*,
-

- Cairo, Helal Publishing, 1983, pp. 17-18.
- 19- Afghani, *Complete Works*, p. 362.
- 20- Ibid, 189.
- 21- Ibid, pp. 326-327.
- 22- Ibid, p. 327.
- 23- Ibid.
- 24- Ibid, p. 362.
- 25- This has changed in the consciousness of the Arab thinkers. For more details see: Muhammad Aabid Al-Jabri, *Contemporary Arab Discourse*, Beirut, Talia Publishing, 1988, p. 69ff.
- 26- Afghani, *Complete Works*, p. 208.
- 27- Ibid.
- 28- Ibid, p. 208-209.
- 29- Hoodbhoy, *Islam and Science*, p. 90.
- 30- Afghani, *Complete Works*, p. 209. And Ahmed Ameen, *Leaders of Reform*, Vol. 2, pp. 45-46.
- 31- Keddie, *An Islamic Response to Imperialism*: p.185.
- 32- Afghani, *Complete Works*, p. 209. And Ahmed Ameen, *Leaders of Reform*, Vol. 2, p. 46.
- 33- Hoodbhoy, *Islam and Science*, p. 91.
- 34- Ibid.
- 35- Renan, *Appendix to the Preceding Lecture*, p. 103.
- 36- Ibid.
- 37- Ibid, p. 104.
- 38- Ahmed Ameen, *Leaders of Reform*, Vol. 2, p. 47.



- 39- Renan, *Appendix to the Preceding Lecture*, p. 104.
- 40- Ibid.
- 41- Ibid, p. 105.
- 42- Ibid.
- 43- Ahmed Ameen, *Leaders of Reform*, Vol. 2, pp. 47-48.
- 44- Renan, *Appendix to the Preceding Lecture*, p. 106.
- 45- Ibid.
- 46- Ibid, p. 107.
- 47- Ibid, p. 107-108.
- 48- Ibid, p. 108.
- 49- Ahmed Ameen, *Leaders of Reform*, Vol. 2, p. 48.
- 50- On 3 May 1883.
- 51- On 18 May 1883.
- 52- Afghani, *Series of Unknown Works*, ed. Ali Shalash, p. 115.
- 53- Ibid.
- 54- Ibid, pp. 115-116.
- 55- Khaleel Abdel Rahman Al-Hindi Al-Hanfi, a scholar and a comparative religion scientist. Studied in Mecca and died in it in 1888. He wrote *Notification of the Need for Revelation and Doomsday*, and *Elucidation of Truth* which Al-Zarkali described as the best book on the subject. It makes a comparative study of religions, especially Judaism, Christianity and Islam. See: Khair ud-Deen Al-Zarkali, *Biographies*, Beirut, Al-Elm Lel Mallyeen Publishing, 1980, Vol. 3, p. 81.
- 56- Afghani, *Series of Unknown Works*. P. 116.

57- On 21-22 March 1923.

58- On 20 March 1923.

59- See: *Al-Seyassa* newspaper, 21 March 1923, pp. 2-3.

60- Ibid, 22 March 1923, p. 2.

61- Ibid.

62- Hamid Enayat, "Sayyid Jamal ad-Din "al-Afghani," a Political Biography", *Iranian Studies*, Autumn, 1973 pp. 246-255.

63- Ibid, p. 247.

64- Ibid, p. 254.

65- See: *Al-Manar*, 16 April 1923, p. 307 and the following three issues. These four articles were in response to the aforementioned two articles of Mostafa Absel Raziq.

66- Ameen, *Leaders of Reform*, p. 68.

67- Ibid.

68- Quoted in Ameen, *Leaders of Reform*, p. 68.

69- Abdel Rahman Al-Rafie, *Jamal ud-Deen Al-Afghani*, Cairo, Maaref Publishing, 1991, p. 128.

70- Abdel Mohsen Abdel Hameed, *Jamal ud-Deen Al-Afghani the Maligned Reformer*, Beirut, Resala Establishment, 1985. P. 23.

71- Mohammed Taher Al-Jabalawi, *Jamal ud-Deen Al-Afghani: Life and Views*, Cairo, the general Egyptian Orgnaisarion of Authoring and Publishing, 1971, p. 59ff.

72- Elie Kedourie, *Afghani and 'Abduh: an Essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in Modern Islam* (1966). Quoted in Afghani, *Series of Unknown Works*, ed. Ali Shalash, p. 81.

73- Ibid.

74- Ibid, p. 98.

75- Ibid, p. 96.

76- Ibid, p. 98.

77- Anhoury mentioned his opinion of Afghani in his book *Explication of the Book of Poetry Harut's Magic* which he published in Damascus in 1879. He did not base what he wrote on evidence or facts, only collecting hearsay from the political opponents of Afghani. When Muhammad Abduh read the book and met Anhoury, he demonstrated the faulty information, and set forth adequate evidence. Anhoury wrote a correction and completely retracted his former opinions, admitting that he depended on hearsay and no more, now confirming that he had no doubt of Afghani true belief. See Muhammad Rasheed Reda, *History of the Imam*, Cairo, Manar Press, 1933, Vol. 1, pp. 50-51.

78- Homa Pakdaman, *Djamal ed Din Assad Abadi dit Afghani*, Paris, G. P. Maisonneuve et Larose, 1969, p. 385. This is her PhD dissertation presented to Paris University, and published with an introduction by Maxime Rodinson.

79- Quoted in Afghani, *Series of Unknown Works*, ed. Ali Shalash, p. 121.

80- Ibid, p. 145.

81- Hoodbhoy, *Islam and Science*, pp. 61-62.

82- See: Rodinson, *La Fascination de l'Islam*, p. 57, and Djait, *Europe and Islam*, pp. 61-62.

83- Renan, "Appendix to the preceding lecture", p. 99.

\* \* \* \*