れば，イブン・スィーナーの哲学は存在論哲学と解釈することができる．このイブ
ン・スィーナー哲学の解釈をめぐってイスラーム世界では論争が続いた．しかし，イ
ブン・スィーナーの哲学を存在論哲学とみなす人々のほうがイスラーム世界では多数
派である．この解釈に立つ人々の間から"存在の根源性説（アサーラト・ル・ウジュ
ード）"が現れ，やがて"存在一性論"が成立することになった．

意 見

Charles Burnett

Hidemi Mizuta has shown in his presentation how Thomas Aquinas, in spite of
referring several times to Saracens, and purportedly writing his *Summa contra
gentiles* (1261) as a means to convert Muslims to Christianity, shows very little first
-hand knowledge of Islam. The description of the depravity of Muhammad in
Summa contra gentiles, I, ch. 6, is indebted to the *Apologia* of Pseudo-Al-Kindi,
translated into Latin more than a century earlier. Mizuta's conclusions concerning
Thomas's *actual* knowledge of Islam conform to those of Louis Gardet, who states
that 'the passages [on Islam] in the *Summa contra gentiles* tend to prove to us that
Saint Thomas' knowledge of the Muslim faith was only on a rather general and,
one must admit, biased level': Louis Gardet, 'La Connaissance que Thomas d'
Aquin put avoir du monde islamique', in *Aquinas and Problems of his Time*, ed. G.
Verbeke and D. Verhelst, Leuven and The Hague, 1976, pp. 139-49 (at p. 140; my
translation). This may seem surprising, given the fact that it was on the request of
Ramon de Penyafort, the Dominican Master General (1185-1275) that Thomas
wrote his *Summa contra gentiles*, and Ramon de Penyafort, in turn, was a friend of
Ramon Marti, and was for a while a fellow resident of the Dominican Convent of
Santa Catalina in Barcelona, where Ramon Marti resided. Ramon Marti wrote his
principal work, the *Pugio fidei*, also as a polemic against Muslims (in the first
book), as well as against Jews (in the second and third books). In fact, there is
considerable *verbatim* correspondence between the first book of the *Pugio fidei* and

the *Summa contra gentiles*, which has prompted a discussion as to which work was prior. But there is a notable difference between the two Dominicans, Aquinas and Ramon Marti; for Ramon *does* show extensive knowledge of Arabic texts in their original language, and of contemporary Islam. This would seem to indicate that Ramon drew material from the *Summa contra gentiles* rather than vice versa. In the first book of the Pugio fidei, Ramon quotes literally, giving his own Latin translations, several Arabic works on philosophy and religion: not only works in the tradition of Aristotle's philosophy written by al-Farabi, Avicenna and Averroes, but also works advocating faith over reason, and the ways of revelation and mysticism, by al-Ghazali (*The Deliverer from Evil, The Niche of Lights, The Book of the Most Exalted Meanings of the Most Beautiful Names of God and The Incoherence of the Philosophers*). Ramon Marti does not discuss the tenets of Islam specifically in the *Pugio fidei*. However, in two other, complementary, works he does: namely, the *Explanatio Simboli Apostolorum* ('The Explanation of the Apostles' Creed') and the *De Seta Machometi* ('Against the Sect of Muhammad'), also known as the *Quadruplex reprobratio* ('The Fourfold Reproval') he attacks Islam by quoting liberally from the Koran and the early *hadith*-literature (the 'traditions' of the Prophet Muhammad): see J. Hernando I Delgado, 'Le "De Seta Machometi" du Cod. 46 d'Osma: oeuvre de Raymond Martin (Ramon Marti) ', in *Islam et chretiens du Midi (XIIe-XIVe s.)*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 18, Toulouse, 1983, pp. 351-71. The works of Thomas Aquinas and Ramon Marti, therefore, although nearly contemporary, and written in the same Dominican milieu, present stark contrasts to each other in respect to their direct use of Islamic material. The absence of such use in Thomas is all the more surprising, considering that he attended the University of Naples, newly founded by the Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick II, in 1224. The Emperor himself spoke Arabic, and sponsored the translation of Arabic works into Latin and Hebrew; some of these translations were made in Naples itself, where Arabic speakers could easily be found. But it must be noted that both Thomas and Ramon considered that Muslims could be won over by reason. Perhaps, then, Thomas did not think it necessary to expose the irrationality of Islam, since he was

so convinced of the sheer power of reason to win over any infidel – a conviction which is the driving force of the argument in the *Summa contra gentiles*.

———————————

意 見　　　　　　　　中世における諸宗教間対話

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　K.リーゼンフーバー

　通常の意見によれば，諸宗教の間の対話は現代の宗教的状況を特徴づけるものと見なされることがあろうが，実際には，古代末期教父時代からキリスト教諸宗派の間——たとえば，アウグスティヌスが主導的な役割を果たしたカトリック教会と北アフリカのドナトゥス派との宗教会議など——だけではなく，中世全般において，異なった宗教に属する信仰者の間の積極的な協力や対話への意志が見られる．諸文化の接触は，学問に関する協力に限らず，宗教そのものを主題とする対話にも及んだ．ライムンドゥス・ルルスはアラブ人の諸学問と言語を学び，西洋各地にアラビア語学校を設立した．12世紀前半のユダヤ人，イェフダ・ハレヴィは『クザリ』において諸宗教の間の対話を描いているし，ペトルス・アベラルドゥスは，哲学と諸宗教の代表者の対話において，人間の幸福への憧憬を共通な焦点として相互理解に努め，中世末期にクザーヌスも『信仰の平和』という対話篇で諸民族・諸宗教に対話させ，理性的に理解できる真理のもとで諸宗教の統一を図る．アラブ人たちの間では，アル・キンディーは理性的に把握できる真理を通して一つの世界宗教を根拠づけることを哲学の課題と見なしている．これらの試みにおいてそれぞれの著者の信奉している宗教が最終的な規範と目標となることはそれらの哲学的努力の意義を減少させるものでもないだろう．

　トマス・アクィナスの根本的な態度は，人々が何を思ったかではなく，事柄の真理そのものだけが肝心であるという言葉において典型的に表れる．すなわち，トマスは開かれた客観的な態度で，また，文献の的確な知識にもとづいて古代ギリシアの哲学だけではなく，ユダヤ人哲学者のモーゼス・マイモニデスの預言論，アヴィセンナの形而上学から，たとえば存在と本質の区別，存在と知性との関係について学んでいる．ちなみに，アヴィセンナの著作は13世紀に入って間もなくパリ大学で徹底的に研究され，13世紀半ばから哲学者・神学者たちによって正確に理解され高く評価されて