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Ibn Rushd was not an imitator of Aristotle with all his ideas. The text of the Aristotelian conclusion of ambiguity, obsession and the presentation of different visions expressed his independent status among Islamic philosophers. Ibn Rushd was not successful in reconciling the contents of Shari'\'a and philosophy, its source is human and human thought is incomplete, sacred, lacking, and needed, and human action is relative and limited and cannot be valid for all time and place while the divine law is light, proof, truth and sanctity, and absolute and valid for all time and place. Ibn Rushd imagines that the Shari'\'a, since it is a right and an advocate for the thought that leads to knowledge of the truth, is known to Muslims and that they know that evidence does not lead to the examination of what is stated in the Shari'\'a. It is a forensic conclusion that cannot be relied on in its logical conclusions from the first correct introduction. Ibn Rushd was different in his views, his ideas and his writings. This was born of suspicion among many scholars and reached the point of accusation (atheism). On the contrary, Ibn Rushd was closer to the people of Hadith in his methodology and interpretation of the religious text, and in taking the text on its face.
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Introduction

Sacred texts of the ancient religious are subject to the concept of interpretation and explanation. Although the sacred texts are from Allah and its rulings imposed orders, especially the texts of the Qu\'an, have undergone many interpretations and therefore we should present those interpretations, which include the philosophical interpretation of the text in the writings of Ibn Rushd, and before that the concept of linguistic terminology (Omar, 2019).
Definition and types of interpretation

a. Definition of interpretation

The interpretation is a possibility that confirms the evidence that most often expresses the meaning of what is apparent in the matter (Katarzyna Ziora, and Zofia, 2019), or is the apparent response to what is explained in the case of the explicated (Rajal B., and Ming, 2019). Another said it is the interpretation of the speech on the unexplained apparent with the possibility (Castellani, and Ludovico, 2019). Ibn Rushd said that interpretation is the extraction of the meaning of the word from the real significance (Stayton, 2015).

b. Types of interpretation

- First: Dialectical Interpretation

Ibn Rushd said that the methods of speech are dialectical methods that do not reach the person to the right and may end up lying, and may lead to false beliefs (Giustiniano, 2018). Ibn Rushd said the majority of the most controversial it often leads to believe things are outside and far from the nature of the thing, and the reason that requires human speech without considering whether it is identical to the existing or non-identical, leads to false beliefs and inventions (perspective, 2015).

- Second: Demonstrative Interpretation

He called it Demonstrative Interpretation ‘the difference between this interpretation and the other interpretations of interpreters, that this interpretation is based on certain introductions or premises that are necessary, apart from the rejected interpretation based on uncertain interpretations, that is, if the duty of proof must be necessary, the premises must be necessary (Chang, 2016).

Criteria presented by Ibn Rushd

- The first criteria: Revelation and Text

There are things in Shari'a that can't be known or aware of the mind only if the path of revelation and prophecy, such as worship. Ibn Rushd says that human powers are limited to the awareness and understanding of the purposes of the Shari'a. Therefore the mind must be silent about matters that are shrouded in Shari'a and are limited to legitimate education, that is permitted in Shari'a because it is the common education of all that is sufficient to achieve their happiness. Omar (2019) and Fierro (1999) put an example of the clarification (that the doctor is checking the health to the extent that the healthy people agree to keep their health and patients in the removal of their sickness), as well as the Lawgiver, he knows the public of things as much as they get their happiness as well as the case in practical matters. In practical
matters, completed issues move away from Shari'a, especially in the places where it appears that it is a kind of business in which there is a Shari'a ruling (Ege, 2017).

**The second criteria: text rationality**

Mind has the ability to know the truths and teachings of the Shari'a and to detail and analyse the texts, and then to analyse the proverbs as well as the representation of the meaning of the texts, since Ibn Rushd stressed the representation of sensory knowledge as closer to the spiritual representation (De Boer, 2017). This is evident in the texts of the Qura'n about resurrection and reward and punishment and representation, that use examples close to the minds of people, and bring them closer to the world that Ibn Rushd required, so that the explanations offered by the proof of the mind accord with the law; so too the owner of scientific proof and the jurisprude of analogy and knowledge (Ali, and Abdullah, 2018). The jurisprude can measure falsity and knowledge, the one who has a measure of certainty and emphasises that all that lead to proof and the true Shar', or the law of Arab interpretation (De Boer, 2017; Asghar, and Khalil, 2019).

Ibn Rushd has classified the interpreters in ‘Fasl El-Maqal’ to:

1. Discourses are mostly the public as there is no one has a sound mind of this type of ratification (Radin, 2010).

2. The interpreters are the origin of rational interpretation. It is not possible to declare this interpretation to the people of controversy, or to the public. Ibn Rushd explains that the intention of the people of certainty is to nullify the apparent and to prove what is interpreted (Belo, 2004). If the appearance of the origin of apparent is not proven, it may lead to lack of faith, if it was in Osol Al shari'a and gave a greater role to the ulterior in the text, through the owners of the proof and the philosophers who explain the text and said that the apparent text of the senses of the people either its inner meaning is to the philosophers and those firm in knowledge. He tried to find agreement between the mind and the shari'a. That is a great consensus if the mind informs him of the true results, and agrees with the shari'a (Islam, 2018), but he stressed the necessity of the conceding agreement with shari'a, and wavering things in the shari'a to be in consent with the mind, and he said that the prophets were philosophers and that the origin of evidence and philosophers are the heirs of the prophets, so are the descriptions of Ibn Rushd in the book (Fasl Al-Maqal) in this subject (Hoover, 2018).

**The third criteria: the meaning of the text**

Ibn Rushd tried to criticise all the linguistic terms that merely used the religious text according to their beliefs and tried to distort the words of the shari'a (Farhan, 2019).
stressed the need to rely on the apparent text and prove all that comes from it and independence by addressing three issues:

**The issue of inference the existence of Allah**

Ibn Rushd criticised the evidence of some of the linguistic groups, especially the visceral ones, who said that the way of knowledge of Allah is the hearing, not the mind. Ibn Rushd said that these misguided groups forgot that Allah ‘Almighty’ had called on them to believe in him with mental evidence (Ruano, 2006). As for ‘Asharism’, they saw that the ratification of Allah’s existence ‘Almighty’, is only in the mind, but they follow in this way the methods of legitimacy that Allah warned them that their general method was based on the statement that the world is an accident, and they built the world to say that the composition of the bodies of indivisible parts and that the integral part is modernised and the updated objects and the way they walked, in the occurrence of the part, is integral to the essence of the individual, (Ruano, 2006; Abrahamov, 1986). That is not an ostensible method of Ibn Rushd, because if we assume that the world is updated, we must be an updated actor, but in the presence of this modernised doubt which is not in the power of the industry of speech and is separation, we make it eternal (Ruano, 2006).

As for ‘Sufism’, Ibn Rushd says that their methods are not theoretical or knowledge of Allah, and other assets have something in the self when stripped of the opposed sensuality. Ibn Rushd said that this method is not generalised among the people even if they intended to invalidate the way of consideration and its existence in vain and the Qura'n; Ibn Rushd responded to the Mu'tazilat in the same manner as his response to the poet (Lampe, 2017). Ibn Rushd then put the correct method that was called by the law al-Shari'a 'and was followed by the (Sahaabah) that is limited to two proofs:

- Interest evidence, that is based on two pillars: the first based on the consent of the assets of the existence of human, and the second is based on the need for approval by the actor intended to do that. Ibn Rushd believes that this consent cannot be by agreement, and this consensus is achieved with certainty as the approval of the assets, times and place of the existence of man. (Mufti, 2017) and here it becomes clear that care and knowledge of the benefits of the assets are included in the sex, so the need for this knowledge to achieve full knowledge of Allah ‘Almighty’ (Halim, 2018).

The evidence of invention, based on two pillars: The first is that all the inventive assets we see of the body then go to life, we know that there is a creator of it; and the second is that each exists to be a creator. Ibn Rushd notes from these pillars the assets’ creator (and in the many signs of the number. The inventions were therefore obligatory for
those who wanted to know Allah's right to know the core of things to know the true creation in all the assets) (Halim, 2018).

- Ibn Rushd then recites the texts which support his words and divides them into texts that guide through interest, texts containing the evidence of invention, and texts that combine between two evidences (Mufti, 2017).

**The issue of inference on the oneness of Allah**

Ibn Rushd believes that the best way to infer the oneness of Allah is to know the God of God alone and deny divinity from Allah alone and prove that through several Quranic verses (Ayat), it is clear that every action is managed and effective (Mufti, 2017), even if there are actors to get a difference in the type of act and result in corruption. And that the absence of the presence of the idol is actually in one place. And that the multiplicity of the gods required the multiplicity of acts, so that obedience to some gods would be avoided, and a dispute would arise and prove the need for the individual one actor (Ruano, 2006; Mufti, 2017).

**Issue of characteristics**

According to Ibn Rushd, the characteristics that the Qur'an has stated as the Creator are descriptions of man's perfection, namely, science, life, ability, will, hearing, sight, and speech. And then he drew criticism of some theories that explained the qualities, especially the saying that the qualities of the self or the self-sufficiency that is a psychological characteristic or a moral and meaning of the self-described psychological self, do not to make a sense of self-sufficiency such as our old one and the moral self-described meaning of the existing (Halim, 2018).

In this sense, The Ashariya says that he is a scientist with an excessive science and lives with an excess of himself as in the witness and obliges them to be a creator body, because there is a recipe and described and pregnant and mobile and this is the case of the body, the Mu'tazilat said in this aspect that the self and characteristics are one thing is far away from the first acquaintance (Halim, 2018).

But he thinks that he is against it. This thought, to be one of the first acquaintance, science must be changed to the world, and is not allowed to be science unless it is permissible to have one of the contents, is a presumption, and this education is far from making the public understand and declaring it is 'bid'ah' (Mufti, 2017).

Then Ibn Rushd reveals the Creator's shortcomings. The knowledge of kind, that is defiance and sanctification, has also been stated in ‘ayat’ of Qur'an, and its words and meanings. Allah
Almighty said: ‘There is nothing like unto Him’) Surat Ash-Shura, Aya (11) and said Almighty: ‘He is the Hearing, the seeing’. Surat Ash-Shura, Aya (11), and also Almighty said: ‘It is Allah who has sent down the Book in truth and [also] the balance (Radin, 2010). And what will make you perceive? Perhaps the Hour is near.’ Surat Al-Nahl, Aya (17) Is proof of aya ‘There is nothing like unto Him’) Surat Ash-Shura, Aya (11) and that it is tempting in the fungus of all that the Creator must be either on his description, which does not create anything or a recipe is not similar in a way that does not create anything or was created not by the Creator (Radin, 2010). Ibn Rushd addressed the issue of physicality and stated that shari'a does not deny the existence of these physical qualities of the Creator, but the difference lies in the description of the creator of the orphan of the creature and preferred after proving or denying the body of the Creator, and mentioned three obstacles in this issue, namely that each object is modernized, not imaginary and nothing, and that the denial of objectivity is inherited suspicions (Mufti, 2017). Therefore Ibn Rushd stressed the need to take some texts on its apparent, because it is a means to convince the public if it determines the physical body of Allah Almighty, but that sheds the interpretation on these and similar in the law shatter the entire shari'a the whole law is torn apart and invalidates the intended wisdom, or it is said in all these that it is one of the similarities, and all this is invalidation of the law and erasing it from the souls, unless the offender feels the great benefit of the law. They are all non-demonstrative (Stayton, 2015). Ibn Rushd criticised the Mu'tazilat and the ‘Asharya’ of their denial by specifying a hand to Allah, explaining that the apparent of shari'a all require proof of the body, which are many of ayat, if the interpretation is given to them, all shari'a is returned to it. (Radin, 2010). If it is said that it is one of the similarities, from which the angels descend by revelation to the Prophets and that from the sky the books and the suspicion that led them to the denial of the body are revealed, that the proof of the body necessitates proving the place and then the body (Stayton, 2015).

As for the vision, Ibn Rushd noted that the Mu'tazilat denied the negation of the vision, relying on the fact that Allah said: ‘Vision perceives Him not, but He perceives [all] vision; and He is the Subtle, the Acquainted.’ Surat Al-Anaam, Aya (103) as well as the negation of the body, which necessitates negation of the body and vision and the recitation of the (Hadiths) that necessitate vision because the source is one. This is not without their sophistication (Radin, 2010). They believe that the vision is capable of understanding and identifying the body with no discernible meaning. These are considered by Ibn Rushd (they were confused by the perception of the mind with the eyesight), the mind was the one that understood what was not in the sense of the place, from the police to be visible from him in hand and not in Destined only, but in terms of what it is not specific to any situation comes the vision agreed to have sight of the visible but limited conditions and requirements are also three things which the presence of light and transparent body medium between sight and the fact that sighted and sighted the colours of necessity) (Radin, 2010).
Results

1. Ibn Rushd was not an imitator of Aristotle with all his ideas. The text of the Aristotelian conclusion of ambiguity, obsession and the presentation of different visions expressed his independent status among the Islamic philosophy.

2. Ibn Rushd was not successful in reconciling the contents of the Shari'a and philosophy, because the source of the divine law is philosophy, its source is human and human thought is incomplete, sacred, lacking, and needed, and human action is relative and limited and cannot be valid for all time and place while the divine law is light, proof, truth and sanctity Absolute and valid for all time and place.

3. Ibn Rushd imagines that the Shari'a, since it is a right and an advocate for the consideration leading to knowledge of the truth, is known to Muslims that the evidence does not lead to the examination of what is stated in the Shari'a, the right not to oppose the right, but agree and testify to him and this is not true because it is a fixed introduction. It is true that it is false and correct. It is a forensic conclusion that cannot be relied on in the conclusion from the first correct introduction.

4. Ibn Rushd was different in his views, his ideas and his writings. This was born of suspicion among many scholars and reached the point of accusation (atheism). On the contrary, Ibn Rushd was closer to the people of Hadith in his methodology and interpretation of the religious text and taking the text on the face. That he identified the authors and made the right of interpretation primarily to the people of proof only philosophers.
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