
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Averroes and St. Thomas Aquinas Debate: How does the Moslem Philosopher understand Aristotle's Philosophy about Soul and Intellect?

Elka Anakotta

The Christian State Institute of Ambon (Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Ambon), Ambon, Maluku, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Elka Anakotta, **E-mail:** anakottaelka@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

Arabs have penetrated the joints of Europa thought through a process of transliteration involving Islamic philosophers. While medieval Europe was a dark age, Arabs provided opportunities and space for the transliteration of the works of Plato and Aristotle. Thinkers (Islamic philosophers) penetrated the joints of European thought through the process of transliteration, one of which was Averroes, who attempted to re-perceive the soul and intellect of Aristotle, which later differed from the understanding built by St. Thomas Aquinas. From their position as Islamic philosophers, Averroes and St. Thomas Aquinas as Christian philosophers, their faith interests also enriched the conflict over the understanding of Aristotle's philosophy, especially about soul and intellect.

| KEYWORDS

Islamic philosophers, medieval Europe, transliteration, Averroes, St. Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle philosophy, soul and intellect

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 01 November 2023

PUBLISHED: 08 November 2023

DOI: 10.32996/ijcrs.2023.3.2.7

1. Introduction

To understand Averroes is to understand his very controversial position, especially in his own circle, namely Muslims. He became a philosopher who was rejected among Muslims because his ideas were often considered to deviate from the rules of Islam that were believed. However, in the West, he was accepted with open arms precisely because of his supposedly "brilliant" ideas. Such a Western view should raise a big question: "Why does the often "biased" West view east-Islam accept the ideas of Averroes"? Apart from the comments he made on Aristotle's work, which became an important reference for the scholastic period, his ideas contained the content of rationalism, which was indeed very "glorified" by the West. Averroes's rationalism can be revealed because he was involved in answering the problem of the nexus of ratio and religion. One of the problems that will be studied to find Averroes's rationalism is that his understanding of the soul and intellect cannot be separated from Aristotle's philosophy. The understanding of the soul and intellect that departed from Aristotle's understanding was later developed by Averroes with his own arguments, and everything he did was his responsibility to answer the problem of the nexus of ratio and religion. (Taylor, 2007).

Among medieval Arab thinkers, Averroes was the one who ranked at the top for his commentary on Aristotle's philosophy. (Halper, 2019). Averroes wrote commentaries on Aristotle, Plato, and al Farabi. Averroes' comments spread among Spanish Muslims, among the Talmuds, and eventually among Christians and Jews. His commentaries on Aristotle's philosophy are often accepted as contradictory to their teachings. Averroes presents a modification of the positions of al Farabi and Ibn Sina.

Averroes also took up al-Ghazali's challenge by writing Tahafut al Tahafut (Destruction of the Destruction). For him, Aristotle's philosophy was the ultimate truth because his thought was the final expression of human thought. So, Aristotle was created for us through the protection of a know-it-all God. Averroes did not intend to reconcile the relationship between his philosophy and religious teachings but put the two on an equal footing with certain differences. Averroes was not a denier of his religion and

Muslim community and did not allow himself to attack and oppose religion. His doctrine forbade him to do what might weaken his faith as well as the existing social order. Averroes wanted an orderly society, so he had to philosophize in peace, and that man could not be cultured only through the abstract teachings of social ethics. (Islam, 2018a).

Averroes' contentious controversy was his interpretation of Aristotle's *De anima* III, 5, 430a10-25. He spoke of the intellect as: "immortality". The doctrine of Averroes is also very well known to Western Christianity, namely the doctrine of the unity of the intellect of mankind. Averroes adopted the distinction between material, actual and intellect found among Arab philosophers, e.g. Al-Farabi. (Bakker et al., 2019).

Averroes saw the intellect as a separate substance known to be physically distinct from all things, one for all human beings, and eternal. Human knowledge and happiness lie in the union of man (*vis cogitativa*) with the intellect, which, through understanding from an agent, the intellect illuminates fantasy. Thus, intellectual power cannot be a substantial form in which a person can be sure about who he is. This function should be fulfilled by a polluted "human soul". Thus, the human soul is neither immortal nor responsible for its actions. Man is not subject to be rewarded or punished in this life or in the future (Ogden, 2015). Averroes accepted the passive intellect as the only part of the universal psyche. Scholastic Christianity interprets Averroes' understanding that there is no real ego in everyone if the living consciousness of each is part of the life of the universal consciousness of the soul. On this side, Averroes is considered subversive because of his views that deny the immortality of the soul and that are incompatible with the principles that exist in Christianity. (Sellars, 2016).

At the beginning of 1269, when Thomas Aquinas back to Paris, he started to attack Averroes doctrine of "*monopsychism*" (Fisher, 2017). *Monopsychism* can be likened to the "unicity of intellect", which refers to the use of the word "nus", which is equivalent to "soul" in many parts of Aristotle's writings. *Monopsychism* is the doctrine that there is only one intellect or "intellective soul" for all mankind. This mention also spread among Arab thinkers and medieval commentators.

Thomas Aquinas deals with the problem of unity in man, that is, the soul – a spiritual substance standing on the body – as the form of something and being the main part or form of another. This is not a new teaching but is based on Aristotle's teaching that the soul is the ultimate or perfection of the body (Lukac de Stier, 2015). According to Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle in *De Anima* III mentions that the intellect can act on its own, understandably, when it can abstain from fantasy so that there is no separate existence from the body. For this reason, there is a possibility that the intellect is not completely separated from the body. Thomas Aquinas describes a rejection of Averroes' *monopsychism*, which, according to Aristotle's teachings (Hendrix, 2012): (1) the intellect is not a separate substance in something; (2) The intellect is not one for all. For Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle saw the human intellect as an act of the body (the substance form of man) and that the possible intellect was part or force of the soul. That intensive soul is a unique form possessed by every human being as "*potentia animae*".

There cannot be an intellectual possibility from all that exists from man's future and past, as Averroes once imagined, because the substance of the intellect is united in the human body as its form. However, one form cannot exist in more than one person, so it is impossible to have only one intellect for everyone. This is according to Thomas Aquinas, which corresponds to Aristotle's teaching in *De Anima* I (Hendrix, 2012). One soul can only reside in one human body. It is impossible for the soul of one dog to enter the body of a wolf or the soul of a human being to enter another.

2. Literature Review

This study will begin by collecting materials in the form of books, scientific journals, bulletins, and searching for the latest writings about Averroes related to the theme, then processing them through analysis and interpretation of data to be able to uncover meaning. Ibn Rushd's writings are still more widely available in the original language, and only a few have been translated into English. The original is *Tahafut Al Tahafut* (this book contains a rejection of Al-Ghazali's philosophy and expresses his attitude towards two interpreters of Aristotle's philosophy, namely Al-Farabi and Ibn Sina), *Fashl Al-Maqal* and *Al-Kasyf 'an Manahij Al-Adillah* (these two books reveal the relationship between philosophy and religion). A Harvard University dissertation work on Ibn Rushd's 1977 commentary by Steven Harvey, entitled *Ibn Rushd on the Principle of Nature: The Middle Commentary on Aristotle Physics I-II*. In addition to these works of Ibn Rushd, of course, written sources are also needed that are able to describe the socio-cultural situation of the Middle Ages, both concerning Arabs and Europeans. To deepen the understanding of Averroes, several works of Aristotle will also be used, among others, *de Anima* (cf. *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, Richard McKeon (ed)). In addition, Averroes' understanding would also be seen in medieval controversies through his "supporters" of Latin Averroism as well as his "claimants" Thomas Aquinas. To find out the background of the social and cultural context in which Averroes lived and worked, there are several references that can be put forward, including the Middle Ages, Medieval Islam, Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages.

3. Methodology

3.1. Literature study

This study began by collecting materials in the form of books, scientific journals, and bulletins, and searching for the latest writings about Averroes related to the theme, then processing them through analysis and interpretation of data to be able to reveal meaning.

3.2. Descriptive

The study is descriptive to describe the results of the literature search as described above. The data collected from the search were used as a basis for a more critical study through the following method, namely the reflective critical method.

3.3. Reflective

Reflective is used to analyze Averroes understanding of the soul and intellect derived from Aristotle's philosophy. Through comparison with Aristotle himself, supporters and opponents of Averroes concept, it is hoped that the nature of rationalism developed by Averroes will emerge as an integral part of answering polemics around the relationship of faith and ratio. This method will be supported by the following method, namely the hermeneutic method.

3.4. Interpretation

This study did not simply "read" the report of Averroes thought through the various sources mentioned in the literature research above, but through the help of the Paul Ricoeur hermeneutic method, this research is expected to be able to reveal something very essential. According to Ricoeur's (Petrovici 2013) statement, it is clear: "that text is a discourse having an open dimension with the world, a path to reality, a dialogue that has a connection with a listener". Thus, there is a triangular relationship between a person with whom he speaks, a person who listens and answers, and the world of reality that one speaks. Finally, at some point, phenomenology must be critical and determine judgment as the deepest outcrop of themes and meanings for the reader. Here, the text can be used to understand human actions, including Averroes model of rationalism.

4. Results and Discussion

Averroes understanding did not merely take all of Aristotle's thought, but there was an attempt to complement it, not only because it felt something had not been resolved but also because of the "implicit task" he had to do in terms of linking religion and philosophy. (Shah, 2014). Averroes, as a part of the middle ages, were rooted in Greco-Roman, Byzantine, and Arab civilizations that contained great principles of morality as well as a universal ethical system. In the richness of civilization this century, it is not surprising that the reach of religious power is felt so widely through its own literature, architectural art, philosophy, and institutions. This century still grapples with the fundamental question of what constitutes all things. However, if the Greek philosophers were oriented towards nature, then the philosophers of this century held that the creator of all things is 'something' that exists outside nature, outside of man, as well as outside of everything. That something is God. God as the origin of the universe. God is the creator of everything that exists in nature, and the Divine is no longer understood as something abstract (Khattab, 2019).

The involvement of Arabs (in this case, representing Islam at that time) had "penetrated" the joints of Western culture (which at that time was attached to Christianity). The words of Ettiene Gilson (Gilson, 2019) can at least describe it: "Without Averroes and his disciples, the work of Thomas Aquinas would not have been what it was." This means that the role of Arab philosophers cannot be ignored at all to see the development of philosophical thought that occurred in Europe in the Middle Ages. It is not even an exaggeration to say Arabic philosophy, which later became the basis for building a philosophical line of thought that had stagnated in Europe (Bunzel, 2015).

Philosophical works that later became school reading during the sixth century were the works of Plato and Aristotle and the commentaries on them, the philosophical works of Galen and several platonic authors, as well as Neoplatonic books. The debate surrounding Greek philosophy culminated and became familiar with Islam around the mid-9th century. For two centuries, from the mid-9th century to the mid-11th century, there was a direct conflict between philosophy (*falsafa*) and *kalam* (the Quran). Islamic philosophers sought to express their ideas within the foundations of Islamic teachings. Islam's relationship with Greek philosophy aroused philosophical and religious speculation over the revelatory message contained in their scriptures. To answer this challenge, a school was established, the "*mutazilite*" school, which focused on the need to interpret revelation rationally. (Bakker et al., 2019).

In the "theocentric" medieval situation, Averroes position was not only as a philosopher, but there was an additional label imposed on him. Averroes, as a Muslim philosopher, sought to reconcile philosophy with his Islamic faith. He tried to find a rational explanation for his faith. Bakker mentions (Bakker et al. 2019) at least three fundamental reasons that show the superiority of Averroes over several other Islamic philosophers such as Al-Farabi and Ibn Sina. First, his proficiency in expounding and interpreting Aristotle's philosophy; second, his contribution to the field of jurisprudence (*fiqh*); Third, his significant contribution to the field of theology or *kalam*.

Averroes saw that absolute truth could not be found in revelation but in the writings of Aristotle. He also wanted to show theologians that there is no conflict between faith remaining in place and philosophy that is carefully aware of the specific function of religion. Averroes point of departure for saying this is because the Holy Qur'an itself explains it: a man should study the natural things, that they may raise their minds to the knowledge of their common maker. (Taylor, 2004).

Averroes wrote a commentary on Aristotle that later spread widely among Spanish Muslims, Talmudic scholars, and eventually among Christians and Jews. His commentaries on Aristotle's philosophy are often accepted as contradictory to their teachings. Averroes presents a modification of the positions of al Farabi and Ibn Sina. Averroes took al-Ghazali's challenge by writing *Tahafut al Tahafut* (Destruction of the Destruction) (Hozien, n.d.). (Hozien, n.d.)

Averroes did not want to deny his religion and the Muslim community, nor did he allow himself to attack and oppose religion. His doctrine forbade him to do what might weaken his faith as well as the existing social order. Averroes wanted an orderly society, so he had to philosophize in peace, and that man could not be cultured only through the abstract teachings of social ethics. Averroes harmonized different systems of thought rooted in Islamic culture. The Qur'an has provided the perfect model for religious instruction, although, in some places, it has a syncretic tendency, for example, in the teachings about Abraham and its relationship to Christianity as well as Judaism. Thus, according to (Di Giovanni, 2018), Averroes had made an "attempt to save" the Islamic tradition in medieval Islam. All this can be done by Averroes because, according to him, as long as objectivity is applied, there is no contradiction between religion and philosophy. In addition, according to him, there are three sources of truth in Islam besides the Qur'an, of course, namely tradition (Sunnah), consensus (Ijma), and legal syllogism (Qiyas). (Terkan, 2012).

Keeping referred to Aristotle, Averroes sees three approaches that can be used: 1) demonstrative, following the argument precisely and reaching a clear conclusion; 2) logical, satisfied with arguments of a probable nature; and 3) an oratory exhortation or argument that is unable to follow the format (this part is owned by all ordinary people) (Di Giovanni, 2018).

Aristotle's history and work, especially on the soul and intellect, were influential not only in the ancient world but also among Arab thinkers in the Middle Ages, who later went from there to Western thinkers (D'Ancona, 2020). This also applies to Averroes, who greatly appreciates and worships Aristotle. Averroes regarded Aristotle as representing the point of departure and perfection in logic, physics and metaphysics. Aristotle was seen as so perfect and superior that no one else had or would equal him.

Averroes controversial controversy was his interpretation of Aristotle's *De anima* III, 5, 430a10-25 (Hendrix, 2012). He spoke of the intellect as: "immortality". Averroes doctrine is also well known to Western Christianity, namely the doctrine of the unity of the intellect of mankind. Averroes adopted the distinction between material, actual and intellect found among Arab philosophers, e.g. Al-Farabi. However, Averroes differed somewhat from Avicenna in his understanding of the soul. Averroes combined elements from the teachings of Alexander and Themistius. For him, the human soul is only a sensitive soul, resurrected from parents and has been corrupted. The soul merges with the body, and the soul disappears with death.

Averroes saw the intellect as a separate and known substance physically distinct from all things, one for all human beings, and eternal (Bučan, 2016). Human knowledge and happiness lie in the union of man (*vis cogitativa*) with the intellect, which, through understanding from an agent, the intellect illuminates fantasy. Thus, intellectual power cannot be a substantial form in which a person can be sure about who he is. This function should be fulfilled by a polluted "human soul". Thus, the human soul is neither immortal nor responsible for its actions. Man is not subject to be rewarded or punished in this life or in the future. Averroes followed a tradition that resembled a concept that was examined from a purely noetic problem *de Anima* over a cosmological concept constructed in metaphysics. Averroes is dissatisfied with the passage *de Anima* III.5, which states: "In the whole of nature we can distinguish between something given by matter to each genus... and then with something else, which is the cause and the agent by which they produce them all – a statement supposing that in the soul, besides there is an intellect equated with matter", then it should be the intellect that is equated with a useful cause (Hendrix, 2012).

Averroes saw that there was something that Aristotle had not had time to solve, namely, what exactly was the origin of the accepted form of the substance prepared to receive it? Averroes opposed the Platonic interpretation of Themistius, which referred back to beings separate from their substance—the soul of the world (Islam, 2018b). The problem for Averroes was how to actualize the potential state that exists within.

There were several difficulties Aristotle faced in explaining the problems of the soul (Thomas & Zedler, 1968), especially regarding active intellect, which appeared cursorily in his writings. By quoting *de Anima* 429a 21-2; 429b 6, The intellect is defined as a part of the soul that at first has no characteristics except the potentiality it has to think but can later transform into everything. The problem to be solved is where active intellect is produced and how to transform the human intellect towards its actuality?

Furthermore, according to Oliver Leaman (Shah, 2014), Aristotle never used active intellect but only passive intellect, and it was contrasted with the intellect that makes everything.

Averroes recognized the existence of the soul because all these forms have two forms, namely sensible and *ma'qul* (rationable), also forms have two forms, *ma'qul* (rationale) if separated from *hayula* (matter) and sensible form if still in *hayula*. Thus, the soul is the essence (substance), not the living, knowing, powerful, willing, hearing, seeing and speaking. To understand the doctrine of the unity of intellect expressed by Averroes, we must restore the truth to Aristotle's polemic against the Megarian as well as Plato on the question of the feasibility of the conception of language (universal) on concrete (certain) data. From the solution it offers, the material intellect is eternal because its main substance can change into various things; the human species always thinks that something that can be understood is eternal. The individual loses contact with it only through its absence and passive forces (convertible forms of imagination). As mentioned further, the material intellect attains perfection through the behavior of its own understanding of material forms and even reaches them to the highest degree so that immaterial forms can be understood in themselves, especially the agent of the intellect. This is called reaching the immortality of thought. It is this intellectual agent that, according to Averroes, is the cause of our ability to think about the world we experience and feel through the fusion of body and soul (Hendrix, 2012).

The view of the soul, which claims that it is only one substance, which then gives form to many different matters, fits perfectly with Averroes discussion of active intellect as a type of universal soul that is responsible both for our ability to think and for the content of that thought, and which can guide us step by step even to a greater level of abstraction. It comes to the possibility of relating to bright reality as well as the Active Intellect itself (Bučan, 2016). This view was later combined with Aristotle's view of the soul as a form rather than a body. This relationship is made through the material intellect as the ability to think, and for Averroes, this trait requires some form of substance in order to be meaningful. Active intelligence develops ideas in the human mind by actualizing our ability to perceive potentially perceivable forms in objects. The principal propositions for the agent of the intellect are analogous to instruments for efficient causes or in relation to matter, but they remain autonomous. That is, explaining the capacity of the material intellect to always grasp both material forms and separate forms. It is called unity but proceeds through a series of mediations, material intellect – understandable speculative potential – intellectual agents.

The intellect is the most important element of the human spirit or soul form. The one and universal intellect consists of an active intellect and a possible intellect, the same and one for all (Thornton McRae, 2014). This is Averroes *monopsychism* (Nejeschleba, 2022). The intellect may only be a particular individual when it relates to a material form or body of individuals. If it dies and the body disappears, then reason may no longer exist. Thus, what is eternal is universal reason, the origin and re-place of the intellect of individual human possibilities.

A single intellect for the basis of mankind is the basis of Averroes *monopsychism*. The active intellect is the last of the heavenly intelligences that move the moon sphere. The passive or receptive intellect receives from its already derived forms. Both intellects are at the frontier of the spiritual world and have abstractive activities that use fanaticism, in which they align themselves with humans. When the passive intellect enters activity, so we have an awareness of thought, so that when we die, leaving only the passive intellect and the intellect active, it is eternal (Hashim, 2016). As a follower of Aristotle's teachings, he regarded the possibility of personal immortality as elusive. Following Iskandar Afrodiasias, he called the intellect material, but not physical, so that all individuals should fall into one group according to the category of numbers. When separated from matter, the individual souls are truly one. That is what happens at the time of death. This in Tahafut al tahafut 343 (Hozien, n.d.) is analogous to sleep and death. The activity of the soul stops while we sleep, but the existence or life of the soul does not stop. This is also what happens to the soul at death.

At death, each person loses his or her unique individuality, while the intellect leaves the body, hence the end of the age of imagination and participation of the body in the thought process. Some people may be able to influence the end of their individuality by developing their intellect to some extent so that they can become one with an active intellect. Averroes also connects the soul with the rays in Tahafut al tahafut 16, that the soul is very similar to rays: they are divided by illuminated parts, and they are reunited; if the bodies are destroyed, and the same relationship also applies between the soul and the bodies. The soul will arrive at the body just as a carpenter directs his work, and it will not be a form in the body just as a carpenter is not a form of his handiwork. If the body is like an instrument of the soul, then the soul is a separate form as well. (Tahafut al tahafut 67-68). Averroes accepted the passive intellect as the only part of the universal soul.

Christian scholastics then interpret Averroes understanding that there is no real ego in every person if the living consciousness of each is part of the life of the universal consciousness of the soul. On this side, Averroes is considered subversive because his views reject the immortality of the soul and are incompatible with the principles present in Christianity. It is no exaggeration to say that Averroes comments on Aristotle had "shocked" Europe. Various responses also emerged from him. There are those who support,

as has been shown above, the formation of the Latin school of *Averroism*, but there are also those who oppose this view, especially that it comes from the Catholic church. Not surprisingly, the teachings of Averroes were forbidden to be read. Many 13th-century thinkers held that harmony between faith and reason was a reality because they both came from God, and God could not contradict Himself. *Latin Averroism* that relies on the thoughts of Aristotle and Averroes, such as the immortality of the world, the unity of the human intellect, the denial of personal immortality, and the denial of human responsibility for decisions made. All of this is considered contrary to the truth of the Christian faith (Adamson et al., 2021).

In general, the Christian community deals with Islam in two forms. The first form is geographically, missionaries dealing with Muslim societies and thus require doctrine in apologetic dialogue. While the second form, intellectually Arabic culture, helped preserve Greek knowledge and philosophy. So, during the 13th century, Christianity had to develop strategies for dealing with the Muslim world (Mulchahey & Noone, 2007). Although without prejudice, the Christian world itself has to thank Islam through the availability of translations of Aristotle's works. In 1258, the attention of Christian thinkers was focused on Aristotle's philosophical thought, especially considering that Aristotle's philosophical works were compulsory texts in universities. Readings from some interpretations or rather Arab philosophers began to show danger in society. Especially Averroes, who twenty years earlier was quite an influential philosopher. The need to harmonize philosophy and theology was because the Islamic world, which mediated Aristotle's work to the Latin West, also interpreted the work, which was often considered incompatible with Christianity. In this same framework, Thomas Aquinas later wrote the *Summa Contra Gentiles* as a 'provision' for Christians dealing with Muslims in Spain, Sicily and North Africa. It is undeniable that in the 13th century, Islam developed not only culturally but also spiritually and intellectually (Bakker et al., 2019). So *Summa Contra Gentiles* has a comprehensive goal regarding the Christian confession (apologetics) mission, but at the same time, it contains an intellectual goal to fend off Islamic problems rationally (Gentiles, n.d.). *Summa Contra Gentiles* is the dedication shown by Thomas Aquinas as a Dominican monk to the truth for the salvation and perfection of mankind (Ryan et al., 2004). What he has done is inseparable from the fundamental medieval struggle that continues to seek answers about: do we simply believe in Christian revelation, or do we approach certain Christian truths with the help of reason? In short, is there a conflict between faith and reason? This essential problem was summarized in Anselm's famous confession, "*Credo Ut Intelligam*", and later summarized by Thomas Aquinas in *Summa Contra Gentiles*. The *Summa Theologies* is described as the highest acceptance of the systemization of medieval theology and is even accepted as the basis for modern Roman Catholic theology. Thomas Aquinas sought to integrate the principles of Aristotle's philosophy—known deeply through his teacher, Albert the Great—with the theological tradition and "create" a rethinking of the new materials and problems of Christian philosophy. Thomas Aquinas tried to reconcile Aristotelian philosophy, Islamic philosophy, and Christian theology (Rosental & Matthews, 2004). Those deemed conforming to Christian theology will be accepted, but those that are not conforming will be rejected. Thomas Aquinas wants to put reason and faith not in contradictory positions but complementary. Just as the image of grace does not destroy nature but perfects it, the intellect should direct faith as the "natural inclination" of desires that lead to goodness. The collaboration carried out by Thomas Aquinas is an effort to harmonize philosophy with Christian teachings through rational and reasonable arguments. Thomas Aquinas could not avoid an encounter with Aristotle's philosophy, which was widespread at the time. Thus, his comments on Aristotle were due to his existence as an 'apostolic' who needed to help his young brothers and sisters who were still in education understand Aristotle's philosophy correctly and in harmony with the actual text and faith. In such a position, Averroes was a dangerous discovery.

According to Thomas Aquinas in the Second Book of *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Aristotle in *De Anima* III states that the intellect can act alone, understandably, when it can be abstained from fantasy so that there is no separate existence from the body. For this reason, there is a possibility that the intellect is not completely separated from the body (Fisher, 2017). Thomas Aquinas describes a rejection of Averroes *monopsychism*, which, according to Aristotle's teachings: (1) the intellect is not a separate substance in something; (2) The intellect is not one for all. For Thomas Aquinas (Lukac de Stier, 2015), Aristotle saw the human intellect as an act of the body (the substance form of man) and that the possible intellect was part or force of the soul. That intensive soul is a unique form possessed by every human being as "*potentia animae*". There cannot be an intellectual possibility of all that exists from man's future and past, as Averroes once imagined, because the substance of the intellect is united in the human body as its form (Hewitt, 2023). However, one form cannot exist in more than one person, so it is impossible to have only one intellect for everyone. This is according to Thomas Aquinas, which corresponds to Aristotle's teaching in *De Anima* I (Vijgen, 2019). One soul can only reside in one human body. It is impossible for the soul of one dog to enter the body of a wolf or the soul of a human being to enter another.

5. Conclusion

The above explanation has shown how Averroes, as an Islamic philosopher, linked the philosophy that prioritizes ratio in it with his faith through Aristotle's philosophical understanding of the soul and intellect. As a child of his time, Averroes constructed Greek philosophy to be in line with his faith so that he did not simply take over Aristotle's philosophy but related it to his Islamic faith. Averroes can be categorized as attempting to rationalize Aristotle's philosophy of soul and intellect as well as a reaction to Islamic theologians who opposed philosophy or the harmony of philosophy and religion. For Averroes, there was no conflict between

faith and philosophy, so his philosophy was more accepted in the West than in Islamic circles. In the West, his philosophy of soul and intellect is known as the unity of the human intellect, which St. Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century held a different view. As a Christian philosopher, St. Thomas Aquinas sought to counteract the apologetically developed Islamic Philosophy by harmonizing Christian philosophy and teachings. For him, the intellect is not a separate substance and is not one for all. According to him, what Averroes said was not in accordance with Aristotle's philosophy in *De Anima I*. The controversy between Averroes and St. Thomas Aquinas stems from the theory of the existence of one soul for all mankind and an intellect understood by both as compatible with Aristotle's philosophy.

The findings of this paper show how Averroes attempted to understand the soul and intellect from Aristotle's philosophy, and it was this understanding that led to the debate with St. Thomas Aquinas some time afterwards. A debate that shows their efforts as philosophers as well as people of faith who should be responsible for their faith. Averroes' understanding of the soul and intellect has placed him unaccepted among Islamic philosophers or thinkers and is controversial because Averroes himself sought to show continuity between Islamic philosophy and faith. The controversy that St. Thomas Aquinas debated in discussing the soul and intellect ultimately boils down to the extent to which understanding can be built in understanding Aristotle's philosophy while keeping it in harmony with the faith and trust we have.

There are still many questions unanswered that have not been explored; these include *what exactly is the controversy that Averroes born vis-à-vis fellow Islamic philosophers and Islamic theology, especially regarding the soul and intellect, what exactly the reason Averroes calls the unity of the intellect of mankind from the perspective of faith or Islamic doctrine, whether indeed the unity of the intellect will support Islamic doctrine or is it the opposite, or how the debate of St. Thomas Aquinas accommodates the harmony of philosophy and the Christian faith?* These are some of the questions that are limitations of this study and can be a reference for further research or writing.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3385-1234>

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

- [1] Adamson, P., Di, M., Averroes, I., Essays, C., & Ahmed, F. Ben. (2021). *On Recovering Ibn Rushd Interpreting Averroes: Critical Essays*. 00, 0–10.
- [2] Bakker, P. J. J. M., O'Neill, S., Mulchahey, M. M., Noone, T. B., Gracia, J. J. E., Noone, T. B., Wang, Y., Schoot, H., Valkenberg, P., Jenkins, J., Phillipson, T. A., Caelo, D., Nietlong, J., Kato, G., Quinn, P., Los, U. M. D. E. C. D. E., Mathematics, A., Taylor, R. C., Ikram, S., ... Fisher, K. A. (2019). A Companion to philosophy in the middle ages. *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, 1(1), 595–614. <https://doi.org/10.1111/muwo.12312>
- [3] Bučan, D. (2016). 'Active Intellect' in Avempace and Averroës: An Interpretative Issue. In *Synthesis philosophica*. core.ac.uk. https://www.academia.edu/download/57757486/Sarrio_Diego_2015_The_Philosopher_as_the_Heir_of_the_
- [4] Bunzel, C. (2015). From Paper State to Caliphate: The Ideology of the Islamic State. *Analysis Paper*, 19, 48. <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Research/Files/Papers/2015/03/ideology-of-islamic-state-bunzel/The-ideology-of-the-Islamic-State.pdf?la=en>
- [5] D'Ancona, C. (2020). From antiquity to the middle ages. philosophy, truth, and demonstration. In *Studies in Applied Philosophy, Epistemology and Rational Ethics* (Vol. 54, pp. 19–34). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44018-3_2
- [6] Di Giovanni, M. (2018). Averroes, Philosopher of Islam*. *Interpreting Averroes: Critical Essays*, 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316335543.002>
- [7] Fisher, K. A. (2017). *Thomas Aquinas on the Metaphysical Nature of the Soul and its Union with the Body*. June, 210.
- [8] Gentiles, S. C. (n.d.). *The Catholic Primer's Reference Series*:
- [9] Gilson, E. (2019). *History of Christian philosophy in the Middle Ages*. books.google.com. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=wWMDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=the+christian+education&ots=e_3HAMB6Uc&ig=R39_K_2MAzFuY6R3BKvsclbF-E
- [10] Halper, Y. (2019). Averroes' rewrite of Aristotle's *Metaphysics Δ*: Establishing the plain meaning of the text in the middle commentary. In *Recherches de Theologie et Philosophie Medievales* (Vol. 86, Issue 2, pp. 259–281). <https://doi.org/10.2143/RTPM.86.2.3287113>
- [11] Hashim, N. (2016). Volume 5: 2007. *Planning Malaysia Journal*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.21837/pmjjournal.v5.i1.379>
- [12] Hendrix, J. S. (2012). Philosophy of Intellect in the Long Commentary on the *De anima* of Averroes. *School of Architecture Art and Historic Preservation Faculty Papers*, Paper 26. http://docs.rwu.edu/saahp_fp/26
- [13] Hewitt, S. T. (2023). Aquinas on the Immortality of the Soul: Some Reflections. *Heythrop Journal - Quarterly Review of Philosophy and Theology*, 64(1), 30–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/heyj.14160>
- [14] Hozien, M. (n.d.). *Tahafut al-tahafut*. 1–472.
- [15] Islam, S. (2018a). The Ibn Rushd Syndrome: In Search of Rational Muslim. Available at SSRN 3211293. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3211293
- [16] Islam, S. (2018b). The Ibn Rushd Syndrome: In Search of Rational Muslim. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3211293>

- [17] Khattab, M. A. (2019). Reason and Narration with Ibn Rushd (Averroes). *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 6(10), 274–296. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.610.7101>
- [18] Lukac de Stier, M. L. (2015). Aristotle's De Anima as source of Aquinas' anthropological doctrine. *Philosophia*, 2, 75–104.
- [19] Mulchahey, M. M., & Noone, T. B. (2007). Religious Orders. In *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996669.ch6>
- [20] Nejeschleba, T. (2022). Unicity of Intellect. *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy*, 3329–3335. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14169-5_438
- [21] Ogden, S. R. (2015). *Receiving and Making Aristotle's Intellect: A New Assessment of Averroes and Aquinas*. search.proquest.com. <http://search.proquest.com/openview/c24e4d6445c734b9a4245655057d49eb/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- [22] Petrovici, I. (2013). Philosophy as Hermeneutics. The World of the Text Concept in Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutics. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 71, 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.004>
- [23] Rosental, C. J., & Matthews, G. B. (2004). *The reconciliation of faith and reason in Thomas Aquinas*. 3136773(May), 243. https://search.proquest.com/docview/305177009?accountid=8359%0Ahttp://ne4ke2fg4p.search.serialssolutions.com?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-8&rft_id=info:sid/ProQuest+Dissertations+%26+Theses+Global&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertat
- [24] Ryan, D., Kelly, T., & Dunne, M. (2004). *By November*.
- [25] Sellars, J. (2016). Pomponazzi Contra Averroes on the Intellect. *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 24(1), 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09608788.2015.1063979>
- [26] Shah, M. (2014). Kalām: rational expressions of medieval theological thought. *Encyclopedia of Mediterranean Humanism*, 1–49. <http://http://www.encyclopedie-humanisme.com/?Kalām>
- [27] Taylor, R. C. (2004). Averroes: Religious dialectic and Aristotelian philosophical thought. *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, 180–200. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL0521817439.009>
- [28] Taylor, R. C. (2007). Averroes: God and the Noble Lie. *Laudemus Viros Gloriosos: Essays in Honor of Armand Maurer*, 38–59.
- [29] Terkan, F. (2012). Ibn Rushd, Fasl Al-Maqal And The Theory Of Double Truth. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13, 107–131. <https://dergipark.org.tr/pub/iuilah/10998>
- [30] Thomas, & Zedler, B. H. (1968). On the unity of the intellect against the Averroists (De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas). In *Mediaeval philosophical texts in translation no. 19*.
- [31] Thornton McRae, H. (2014). Theories of the Soul vs. Medical Knowledge: Averroës as an Authority in Thirteenth-Century France. *Proceedings of the Western Society for French History*, 42, 216–217. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.0642292.0042.001%0Ahttps://quod.lib.umich.edu/w/wsfh/0642292.0042.001/--theories-of-the-soul-vs-medical-knowledge-averroes-as?rgn=main;view=fulltext>
- [32] Vijgen, J. (2019). In Defense of Aristotle: Thomas Aquinas on the Identity of the Living Body and the Corpse of Christ. *European Journal for the Study of Thomas Aquinas*, 37(1), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ejsta-2019-0005>