

Refereed research

The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

Azelarabe Lahkim Bennani

Laboratoire d'Etudes Ibn Rushd University Sidi Mohammed Ben Abdellah – Morocco.

All rights
reserved



جميع الحقوق
محفوظة



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

...Until the twentieth century, when the positions of both Jews and Muslims underwent radical change, the term „Judaean-Islamic “is at least as meaningful and as valid as „Judaean-Christian” to connote a parallel and in many ways comparable cultural tradition.” Bernard Lewis : The Jews of Islam. Princeton U. Press, 1984, p. X

Introduction:

I feel some trouble in presenting a dark face of the philosopher Ibn Hazm, born in Córdoba (994-1064), who wrote sublime Books on friendship, love and wisdom,¹ on the one hand, and published virulent polemical replies against Jews, Christians and his coreligionists (belonging to competing theological *Malekide*-school), on the other. The style of the polemical discourse is very violent and is different from his argumentative discourse adopted in philosophy and the phenomenological poetic approach in his main work. The same person Ibn Hazm shows a great discernment in judging philosophical and moral questions; he was not as a theologian immune from the cultural inherited rigorist stereotypes. We want to show that the polemical tone of Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela does not minimize the importance of his main philosophical and theological work. The present philosophical reception of his work ignores intentionally the replies of Ibn Hazm. But we show also that the wisdom itself cannot prevent the wise man from falling victim of stereotypes. We will not go to the details of the polemic, but would like to present the moral question of

¹ Ibn Hazm: *The Ring of the Dove*. A. J. Arberry translation, London, Luzac & Company, [1951] 2004.

See also:

ابن حزم: كتاب الأخلاق والسير، أو رسالة في مداواة النفوس وتهذيب الأخلاق والزهد في الرذائل. تحقيق إيفاء رياض، راجعه وقدم له وعلق عليه: عبد الحق التركماني، دار ابن حزم، الطبعة الثالثة، 2009.



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

peaceful coexistence which had permitted the resurgence of *Judaeo-islamic Philosophy* in the next 12th century after Ibn Hazm.

The theological controversy between Islam and Christendom.

The polemical discourse is an act of doctrinal fighting with words (paraphrasing J. Austins *How to fight human with words*). Already in the early Byzantine Empire were the polemical controversies lively spread for a long time after; for instance by *Johannes von Segovia* in the 15th century the questions of trinity and Incarnation were highly discussed with Moors.² In this vein was Islam seen as a drop of the pure Christendom.³ The polemical art often was an emotional reaction for or against the Holy Books. Some centuries later was The refutation of Koran a commonplace in the diverse controversies against Islam, so to speak against the main errors of Muhammed.⁴ Muhammad was described as a leader of Saracens and as a false prophet.⁵ The conflict between religions is a struggle for political and cultural identity. The new religion is mainly understood in light of the previous one. Each religion, according to Jan Assmann, is a *Counterreligion* (Gegenreligion).⁶

On the basis of christian censorship, new restrictions were imposed by the Christian Archbishop *Isidor of Sevilla* (599- 636)) on jews.⁷ The forced

² *Sichtung des Korans. Cribratio Alkoran* von Paul Naumann. Erstes Buch mit Anmerkungen von Gustav Hölscher, Felix Meiner in Leipzig 1943, 2. Auflage 1948. *Schriften des Nikolaus von Cues*. Im Auftrag der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften in deutscher Übersetzung. Hsg. Ernst Hoffmann Heft 6. P. 6.

³ This was the conviction of Johannes of Damascus *يوحنا الدمشقي* dead 750, the Nestorian Patriarch Timotheus 785, Abu Qurra 800, Abu Abu Nuh Al Anbari. „Abu Nuh al-Anbari [...] serait lui aussi l'auteur d'un *Traité sur l'Unité de Dieu* et un autre *Traité sur la Trinité*. ». Sources de la théologie trinitaire, Rachid Haddad : La trinité divine chez les théologiens arabes (750- 1050), Beauchesne Religions, Paris, 1985. p. 59.

⁴ Dionysius 1454, Johannes von Segovia 1454, the spain Dominican Johannes of Torquemada 1459. See also Theodore Abu Qurrah *قوة* *أبي قرة* (750- 830) the writings of the socalled Kinditen, Theophanes (758/60- 817/18) Ibid. p. 9.

⁵ *Sichtung des Korans. Cribratio Alkoran* von Paul Naumann. Erstes Buch mit Anmerkungen von Gustav Hölscher, Felix Meiner in Leipzig 1943, 2. Auflage 1948. *Schriften des Nikolaus von Cues*. Im Auftrag der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften in deutscher Übersetzung. Hsg. Ernst Hoffmann Heft 6. P. 17.

⁶ Jan Assmann: *Moses der Ägypter*: Hanser 1998, p. 12.

⁷ With the conversion to the Catholic Church of Emperor Canstantin (306- 37) and King Rekkared I (586- 601), and King Sisibus (612-621).



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

reconversion to catholicism was one of the great violations of the Human rights (with the 12. Council in Toledo 681) and the *Lex Visigothorum* (Law of the Visighots). Despite the fact that this law was egalitarian between roman and gothic people, the commitment to Judaism did not have any legal import.⁸ The unification of the law led to the forced baptism and means in the same vein the dislocation of the judaic identity.

The political-religious controversy against the Jews.

Some historians insist on the fact that severe restrictions were also imposed on Jews in the islamic world, as it was the case in the Christendom, because of substancial anti-semit position. Others support the idea that the situation of the jews's community under the Islamic domination (after the conquest of Spain (611-14)) was very likely better than their previous living under the *Lex visigothorum* and the *Catholic Church*. A large literature is written in German on this diverse opinion. (For instance, Steinschneider).⁹

The starting point of the Muslim:

The polemical violence on the side of Muslims was more violent against the Christians (polytheists) than against the monotheists Jews. The tone of the polemic was also attenuated as the muslim adopted the theory of the *typological* or *allegorical intepretation* of the Bible by the projection of the islamic prophetic reading on the previous revelation, the Bible. The Muslim was entitled to quote from the Jewish religious sources, even if these sources are more or less accurate. The recognition of the accurate, not yet availaible God's revelations in

⁸ Friedrich Battenberg: *Das Europäische Zeitalter der Juden*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Darmstadt. 1990. P. 29.

⁹ *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache*, Leipzig, 1877 Perlmann wrote „Notes on Anti- Christian Propaganda in the Mamluk Empire“*Bulletin oft he School of Oriental and African Studies* 10 (1942): 843-861. See also Perlmann: Eleventh-Century Andalusian Authors on the Jews of Granada ». *Proceedings oft he American Academy for Jewish Research* 18, 1949, 271-84.



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

Judaism and Christendom (the alleged symbolic mention of Muhammad in the Bible) is part of the islamic faith and part of the dogma.¹⁰ For instance, Steinschneider raises the thorny issue of the quotation from the Bible الأقوال القديمة of *Burhan Addine Bika Ii Chafii* dead 1480/1. This means that the quotations from the *Old Holy Books* ought to be done within strict limits, because Ibn Hazm and others start from the allegation that the available biblical sources are not accurate. Steinschneider quotes the advisory warning against the imitation of Christians and Jews تنبيه الغافلين .¹¹ الحيارى على ما ورد من النهي عن التشبه بالنصارى و اليهود والصابئين . Sometimes the jews are qualified as the *angry community* الأمة الغضبية and as the *liar people*. But this negative image is more likely exaggerated. Jews and Muslims share the same monotheism (Christendom also to a lesser extent). This positive idea puts the polemical discourse in the political heading and not in the theological of monotheism.

The starting point of the arab-Judaism:

The early Jews came to Spain with the phoenician, after the conversion of Emperor Constantine I (306-337) to Christendom.¹² They hare refrained from adopting christianity and from the initial hope in Islam, because from the start the Jews saw in Muhammad the promised *Messiah*. Once they saw that this was not the case, they retract from their hope, recognized their error and slander against the Islam.¹³ This means that the theme of *messianism* was the point of contention between Islam and Judaism.

¹⁰ Steinschneider: *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache*, Leipzig 1877, p. 391.

¹¹ Steinschneider.

¹² Friedrich Battenberg: *Das Europäische Zeitalter der Juden*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Darmstadt. 1990. P. 28.

¹³ A spain jew Petrus Alphonsus (1062- 1140) converted to Christianity had written a refutation of the Koran. In the context of the doctrinal disputes, the mutual critique of the holy Books by Christians and Muslims was widespread. We find by Steinschneider testimonies of disputes against Christians.¹³ For example: مقالة في الرد على افرانيم و ابن زرعة في اختلاف الملل of Abul-Hassan Ali Ibn Ridhwan (1061/1068).



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

More concretely and in connection with our topic, Steinschneider advances that Goldziher mentions that Ibn Hazm had a dispute with Samuel early on June 13, 1013 (the year of the fall of the Omayyade dynasty). It is also more likely that Ibn Hazm met Samuel Ibn Nagrela in Malaga and asked him about the advent of „the Messenger which is the hope of the nations.“ Ibn Nagrela neglects the allusion to the Islam messenger and refers to the offsprings of David and Yehuda. The Muslims and Jews were nevertheless unanimous about the advent of *Messiah and fear the false Messiah*. More, it can be said that the « Jewish [messiah] interpretations of Islam did not entirely die out and reappeared from time to time ».¹⁴

The shared monotheism, messianism and tacitly adopted biblical narratives attenuated the theological gap between the two religions.

The polemic was sometimes virulent. Steinschneider mentions every-day social relations which were normatively regulated between Jews and Muslims.¹⁵

But the reconciliation between Jews and Muslims found objective reasons and led to the birth of the Judaeo-islamic culture and found its apogee with the islamic and Jewish philosophers.¹⁶ (Maimonides was the incarnation of the Arab-Jewish symbiosis, of the Jewish-islamic philosophy which delivered profound debates with Al-Farabi as well as with Plato and Aristoteles.) The complaint of Maimonides against the Muslims (his *letter of advice* to the Jews of

¹⁴ Bernard Lewis: *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton U. Press, 1984, p. 94.

¹⁵ Manche Muslimen bestanden darauf dass der Schächter die Kible nach Osten einhalte und Salomo Ibn Aderet (...) gibt einem Anonymus, der daran Anstoss nimmt, seine Zustimmung, obwohl das kein Götzendienst sei, sollte es, nachdem die Muslime die Kible einen Wert (...) beilegen, lieber beseitigt werden- Die Muslime andererseits ärgerten sich, dass die Juden ihnen überließen, was sie selbst verschmähten, erörtern die Frage, ob man die Schlachttiere der Juden essen dürfen und griffen die jüdischen Speisegesetze an (Ibn Hazm, Ibn Kadjim, etc. oben S. 139, 152 Anm., vgl. Schahrastani I, 244 und das Sprichwort: „Iss bei Juden, übernachtete bei Christen 41, Prov. III (...) Die Karäer verlangen vom Schächter die Ablegung eines dogmatischen Examens; daher ist nach Ahron b. Elia (...) das von einem abgefallenen Juden (...) geschlachtete Thier verboten. Steinschneider 156.

¹⁶ Joel L. Kramer: The islamic context of medieval Jewish philosophy, in: Daniel H. Frank & Olivier Leaman (eds.) *The Cambridge companion to medieval Jewish philosophy*, Cambridge 2003 (= Cambridge companions to philosophy), p. 38-68. See: Brahil A. Bourchachene: Einblicke in die marokkanische Judaistik. Teil I: Ahmed Chahlane und der hebraische Averroes., *Judaica*, Heft 1, 70. Jahrgang, März 2014, note 4, p. 28.



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

Yemen) is sent for political reason of intolerance. The reconciliation led also to the social and cultural integration of Jews, based on the distinction between what Bernard Lewis calls „a man’s religious affiliation, which might be disapproved, and his professional competence, which might be useful “.17 This separation, as he said, was rarely expressed but often applied.

These concrete results are seen by the Andalusian Jurists and politician as a progress. Yet, the race of the reconciliation movement was too adventurous for the theologians who estimated that some aspects of the reconciliation is a blatant violation of the spirit of Islam, we mean a regression of its values.

The political realism of the ruler, or simply the immediate considerations of political expediency, have brought the ruling regime to choose the useful statesmen, irrespective of their respective confession. This realism was perhaps a progressive step toward a secular citizenship. It was doubtless an ephemeral exception in the political history, when *Dhimmi*s were appointed to the high positions of the principality¹⁸ (Ibn Nagrela for instance). Indeed, because Jews pursue no missionary goals, they acquired highly political state positions under the Kalife Abd Ar Rahmane III, such in the case of Hasday Ibn Chaprut¹⁹. But the decadence of Islam was often related to the split of the unified state in heterogeneous principalities (Taifa), or with the appointment of Jews at the summit of the Principality. The increasing political power of the minorities was interpreted as signs of islamic political decadence.

Jews as a religious minority.

¹⁷ Bernard Lewis: *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton U. Press, 1984, p. 30.

¹⁸ In 1030 the citizens of Cordova rebelled against the State and declared the Caliphate to be at an end and set up in its place a sort of republic, say municipality

¹⁹ Hasday Ibn Chaprut (915-970) was a physician, scholar and diplomat under the reign of the Omayyade Caliph Abdel Rahman III.



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

The Jews were a minority which were subjugated under the statute of *Dhimmi*.²⁰ They must pay taxes (*Jizya*) and land tax (*Charaj*).²¹ With the demographic growth of the Arabic migrants in Spain the Sephardim gained their spiritual-cultural autonomy and political power.

The decline of the Omayyaden dynasty and their capital (1013) did not affect the court culture of the Jews.²²

The more they gained autonomy, the more they have aroused suspicions expressed in anti-Jewish poems. Ibn Hazm's blasphemous accusation against Ibn Nagrela is so dangerous because the criticism of the Koran has direct political consequences on the life of Jews.²³

The family Ibn Nagrela comprehends the father Samuel and the son Joseph. The grammarian, talmudist and poet Samuel Ibn Nagrela is one of a dozen of famous Jews in Islamic-Spain. He was the first minister of the King Habbus from 1037 to 1055-6. His son Joseph Ibn Nagrela (1056- 1066) followed him as politician and religious leader *Naggid*. This was a unique situation where the Muslim community in Spain was for few years under the command of Samuel and Joseph Ibn Nagrela. Samuel, contrary to his son Joseph was beloved and admired because of his piety and humility. This ended with the killing of *Naggid* Joseph

²⁰ „By the terms of *dhimma*, these communities [*ahl al-dhimma* (people of the pact)] were accorded a certain status, provided that they unequivocally recognized the primacy of Islam and the supremacy of the Muslims. Bernard Lewis p. 21. He is a protegé of him to benefit from some limited liberties. Friedrich Battenberg: *Das Europäische Zeitalter der Juden*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Darmstadt. 1990. P. 31. See for more details:

أحمد شحلان: التراث العبري اليهودي في الغرب الإسلامي، التسامح الحق. وزارة الأوقاف والشؤون الإسلامية، 2006

²¹ „The normal interpretation was that the *jizya* was not only a tax but also a symbolic expression of subordination. The Qur'an and tradition often use the word *dhull* or *dhilla* (humiliation or abasement) to indicate the status God assigned to those who reject Muhammad » ; « In contrast to the commentators and other theologians, the jurists are less ferocious and more concerned with the fiscal than the symbolic aspect of the *Jizya*.“ Bernard Lewis: *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton U. Press, 1984, p. 14-15.

²² Friedrich Battenberg: *Das Europäische Zeitalter der Juden*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Darmstadt. 1990. P. 33.

²³ see W. J. Frischel: Jews in the economic and political life of Medieval Islam *Al-Andalus* 4 (1936) 1-18. See in Spanish: Garcia Gomez „Polemica religiosa entre Ibn Hazm y Ibn Al Nagrela“.



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

and the massacre of the Jews. The tension between theologian and political power ended with the victory of the political power of the theologian.

The butchery of december 1066 against the Jews was motivated by the politisation of orthodoxy. A saying quoted by Bernard Lewis is attributed to the caliph 'Umar: « do not appoint Jews and Christians to public office because in their religion they are people of bribes. But [in Islam] bribes are not lawful. »²⁴ This trouble arose in the name of justice « when Jews or Christians were seen to be getting too much wealth or too much power, that is to say, more than was thought proper or appropriate for them, and more particularly when they were enjoying them too visibly. »²⁵

The poet Abu Ishaq named Al Albiri wrote a pamphlet against the jews. It was not adressed at Ibn Nagrela as a single powerful person, but against the jewish religious minority. He says:

Do not consider it a breach of faith to kill them
the breach of faith would be to let them carry on.
They have violated our covenant with them
so how can you be held guilty against the violators?
Now we are the humble, beside them,
as if we were wrong, and they right!²⁶

Ibn Hazm (994- 1064)²⁷, on his side, was not only against Joseph Ibn Nagrela (prime minister from 1056-1066) in his sharp indicment, but he was also

²⁴ Bernard Lewis: *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton U. Press, 1984, p 29.

²⁵ Bernard Lewis: *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton U. Press, 1984, p 54.

²⁶ See the English translation in Bernard Lewis p. 45. The third volume of the *Rasa'il Ibn Hazm* presents only a part of the poem which describes the situation of the Muslim inhabitants of Granada under the ruling of Ibn Nagrela. See for the English translation: B. Lewis, „An-Anti-Jewish Ode“, in *Salo Wittmayer Baron Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem, 1975), reprinted in B. Lewis, *Islam in History: Ideas, Men and Events in the Middle East* (London, 1973). PP. 158- 165.

²⁷ We quote the biography of Ibn Hazm as it is delineated by A. J. Arberry in *The Ring of the Ring* (op. cit. p. 2): „Abu Muhammad ,Ali Ibn Muhammad Ibn Sa'id Ibn' Hazm [...] his ancestors-belonged to a notable family converted from Christianity several generations before. His father was a high official in the service of al-Mansur, regent of Hisham II, and of his son al-Muzaffar; al-Mansur and al-Muzaffar were members of the Banu 'Amir who had succeeded in



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

against the non-orthodox, Malekide islamic trends, which didn't adopt the literal-orthodox religious doctrine.

The polemical mainpoint made by Ibn Hazm is an attack against Jews and against the non-accepted schools from within the Islam. Thus, Bernard Lewis says:

Ibn Hazm, in his major treatise on the religions of the world *كتاب الفصل في الملل والأهواء والنحل*, shows his harsh and intolerant attitude not only toward non-Muslim religions but even toward those forms of Islam that differed from his own. In addition, Ibn Hazm wrote an anti-Jewish tract, refuting a pamphlet allegedly written by Samuel Ibn Nagrella, in which he attacked Islam. Ibn Hazm had not seen Samuel's tract, if indeed it ever existed. The book is extremely hostile in content and in tone and was certainly not unrelated to Ibn Hazm's resentment of Samuel Ibn Nagrella (993- 1056), who enjoyed a remarkably successful career as a statesman and general in the service of Muslim ruler.²⁸ Bernard Lewis was perhaps mistaken in the allegation that the man who was concerned by the criticism of Ibn Hazm was Samuel. The reason consists in the fact that he was a highly qualified scholar in the hebraic religion, he wrote an introduction to the Talmud, more than 20 treatises in the hebrew grammar. He is a very great famous poet –in the classical hebrew literature- who glorified his victory over the enemies *Ben Abbade*. The interpretation of *Ihsane Abbas* (the egyptian scholar and editor of the Works of Ibn Hazm) supposes that Joseph was more likely offending the Koran. He based his opinion on the description

arrogating to themselves all the power and privileges of the Caliphates but its name. Being a son of such a man, to whom he always refers as the « late vizier », Ibn Hazm enjoyed a happy though secluded childhood, and the advantages of an excellent education. [...] The fall of the Banu 'Amir led soon after to the dismissal and house-arrest of their faithful minister, who died four years later on 22 June 1012. The Umayyads were now near their end; Andalusia was in a state of anarchy; in 1013 the Berber insurgents seized and sacked Cordova, and on 13 July of that year Ibn Hazm fled from the city of his birth and set up upon extensive wanderings." Throughout his life he was disappointed by the vicissitudes and instability of the political life.

²⁸ Bernard Lewis: *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton U. Press, 1984, p. 87.



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

that Ibn Bassam made of the massacre of 1066.²⁹ Joseph fled from the populace and found hiding in a coal store before he was killed with nearly 4000 victims. The moroccan Ahmed Chahlane rises the question which of them, the father Samuel or the son Joseph, is meant by Ibn Hazm in his „Reply to Ibn Nagrela the Jew“. Ibn Bassam did not infer that the massacre of 1066 be in correlation with the alleged blasphemy of Joseph. Ibn Bassam attributed the mischief to Samuel.³⁰ Because Ibn Bassam attributed falsely some events to the father Ibn Nagrela, the addressee of the reply remains for Ahmed Chahlane unknown.

The arab historians establish nonetheless a direct link between the assassination of Joseph and coreligionists and the campaign of Albiri and Ibn Hazm against them. Perhaps the attack was carried out by Ibn Hazm against Joseph Ibn Nagrela instead of his father, because of the tragic end of Joseph. It is often stressed that Joseph did not have the dexterity of his father Samuel in the management of the principality's affairs. Therefore, Joseph was considered responsible for the conspiracy or the plot on rival muslim statesmen and for spoliation of their goods and even against the heir prince Belkine.³¹ In any case, the historians try to justify the crimes committed against Ibn Nagrelas (Samuel, Joseph or both) with the economic burden imposed on Muslims: the jew ruler was taking illicit levies from the muslims, was making insulting remarks on Islam. The historians mention the revolt of the muslim Purists against the ruling jews.³² Even if the purists and religious literal and rigorists were right in expressing one's opinion, the end would not justify the means. Furthermore, these means ought to distinguish carefully between *harm* and *Evil, offense and*

²⁹ ابن بسلام: الذخيرة في محاسن أهل الجزيرة، المجلد الأول، القسم الثاني، دار الثقافة، بيروت 1997، ص. 796. راجع ابن حزم، المجلد الثالث، ص. 15.

³⁰ "ألف [أسماعيل بن النغريلة] كتابا في الرد على الفقيه أبي محمد بن حزم... وجاهر بالكلام، في الطعن على الإسلام". الذخيرة، (مرجع سابق ص. 766) في: أحمد شحلان: التراث العبري اليهودي في الغرب الإسلامي، التسامح الحق. وزارة الأوقاف والشؤون الإسلامية، 2006، ص. 135.

³¹ رسائل ابن حزم الأندلسي. 384-456 هـ، الجزء الثالث، تحقيق إحسان عباس، المؤسسة العربية للدراسات والنشر، بيروت، 1987. ص. 43

³² It is true that we must nevertheless mitigate this picture, because persecution « that is to say, violent and active repression, was rare and atypical. » Bernard Lewis: *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton U. Press, 1984, p. 8.



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

crime, that is we must separate the innocent critic from the cinic destruction of dignity. The normative reading of history takes seriously in account the distinction between the innocent harm and the deliberate and willful evil. The wrongdoer hardly justifies his bad acts, while the offender is sustained by big and sacred narratives.

Ibn Naglelas (Samuel or Joseph) were criticized by the theologian Ibn Hazm at a time where the line between true and false religion was fanatically sharply drawn. There was no room for tolerance. Ibn Hazm spoke as a literalist- rational theologian for whom Islam was the Final true religion and for whom science wasn't a target *per se*, but a tool in the service the salvation in the hereafter. The earthy world can only be lived through love, friedship and anxiety.

Conclusion:

Ibn Naghrela are members of the minority community which lived in the Islamic-Spain with the statute of *Dhimmis*. This gave them some power, including political and cultural power within the majority of Muslims. This status provided for by the law is nowadays no longer admitted, because of the egalitarian character of citizenship between communities, the majority and diverses minorities. The serious forms of injustice are the forms which are justified by the the religious or legal institutions. For this reason, the new requisits of equal citizenship for majority and minorities help us to get rid of the historical forms of harm, offence which appear today in a new light. Old offences appear today as serious crimes. Old crimes are nor more but an indifferent personal behaviour. I return to my initial trouble:Dignity of character and philosophical greatness do not go always together.³³ Ibn Hazm writes sublime work on love and friendship on the one hand, and tractats full hatred against

³³ Martin Heidegger: *Philosophical and Political Writings*. The German Library. Manfred Stassen (eds.). Continuum New York, London, 2003. Introduction: XVIII.



The polemical interreligious Discourse Ibn Hazm against Ibn Nagrela

Jews. But we have in history examples of geniuses and excellent scholars which were without moral integrity. Rousseau has sent his six illegitimate children to the orphanage, while « Emile » belongs to the international literature in the protection of childhood. Heidegger elaborated the best philosophical system while pronouncing the *Rektoratsrede* (1933). They are pioneer and original. But they are product of their time. Because we are *unitas multiplex*, the question of moral integrity needs men and women who are ready to declare their solidarity with minorities. The struggle for human rights is more and more involved when the discrimination, injustice and offences are religiously, legally or historically justified at the expense of the requirements of the coexistence.

The polemical writings of Ibn Hazm did not inspire subsequent scholar authors, while his Aristotelism benefited from fruitful reception. The Aristotelian rationalism introduced by Ibn Hazm makes the birth of the « Jewish Islamic culture » possible.³⁴ The editors of the Work of Ibn Hazm in a Publishing house which takes his name Unfortunately are stressing the dark literal-rigorous theological side of Ibn Hazm at the expense of his early philosophical works. In the same vein eminent Islamic philosophers are condemned.³⁵ This prevents us from an accurate reading of Ibn Hazm as a prelude to the forthcoming « Judaeo-Islamic Culture ».

³⁴ The concept is mentioned by Friedrich Battenberg for whom the concept of *Islamic-jewish culture* is an accurate cultural heritage born in the Islamic Spain. Friedrich Battenberg: *Das Europäische Zeitalter der Juden*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Darmstadt. 1990

³⁵ See the introduction of Abdelhaq Turkmani in:

ابن حزم: كتاب الأخلاق والسير، أو رسالة في مداواة النفوس وتهذيب الأخلاق والزهد في الرذائل، تحقيق إيضا رياض، راجعه وقدم له وعلق عليه: عبد الحق التركماني، دار ابن حزم، الطبعة الثالثة، 2009