Introduction
Both Philosophy and theology employ a sharp dagger for its meta-narratives from times immemorial. In other words, there are some real differences between religion and philosophy which warrant considering them to be two different types of systems even though they overlap in places.

To begin with, philosophy tends to emphasize just the use of reason and critical thinking whereas religions may make use of reason, but in the last instance they stick to faith, or even use faith to the exclusion of reason. There are any number of philosophers who have argued that reason alone cannot discover truth or who have tried to describe the limitations of reason in some manner or the other. Certainly philosophers do discuss the phenomena of religion, mystery, and politics of religion and the importance of sacred objects. However, a separation between the sacred and the profane is something missing in philosophy. Miracles and mysteries do play a very large role in every religion, and they constitute the main corpus of scriptures.

The fact that religion and philosophy are distinct does not mean that they are entirely separate. It is not uncommon for a person to be engaged in both religion and philosophy simultaneously. Later Wittgenstein considers religion and philosophy as language games. Life is interwoven in to it. One language game is not superior to the other. Each game has its own rules and regulations. However, he doesn’t address a situation where different language games overlap over a particular period of time.

It is probably very difficult to give a history of philosophy as such since history of philosophy is at the same time history of religion, culture and science. The point that I want to emphasize here is that the rules and regulations of each game has been complemented or contradicted by the other in such way that both of the systems simultaneously exist with
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myriads of subsystems, and the logic of these subsystems seems to accommodate the complementary or contradictory logic of the other language games.

The internal logic of philosophy tend to keep a distance from the existing correlates of knowledge, developing its own rules, regulations and sub-disciplines. Philosophical practices have been spontaneously speaking to the horizons of belief systems elsewhere in different civilizations. Often, philosophy has been appropriated to serve the logic of dominant belief systems. But, at times, philosophy could maintain a neutral character. In many spatio-temporal, blocks, the internal logic of philosophy seem to maintain its upper hand over the internal logic of belief systems.

Philosophy a system or subsystem is not free from the impacts of religion, culture, politics etc. The other systems do have a greater say in the kind of philosophy an age can produce. The rise of civilizations also marked the emergence of experts, technicians, artisans and artists. Philosophers at this stage enjoyed a privileged status as high authority of knowledge. It could be observed that these privileged agents remained faithful to the dominant political/belief systems. Knowledge too was regarded as a divine enterprise. A paradigmatic shift had occurred with the advent of Greek thought that problematised divine foundations of knowledge. The tradition was initiated with the debates of Thales, Anaximander, Pythagoreans, Heraclites and Parmenides. Socrates initiated his dialectics to reach objective and certain knowledge about things and values. The great tradition consolidated its rational advent through the contributions of Plato and Aristotle.

The systematic thought of Plato and Aristotle has ascribed a midas touch in the genre of philosophical inquiry. They played a pivotal role in compartmentalizing various branches of knowledge. The legacy of Greek philosophy and its impact on Islamic thought is unquestionable. The Scholastic philosophy of Thomas Aquinas and St. Augustine appropriated Plato and Aristotle to explain the superiority of theology over philosophy. A confrontation between religion and philosophy has sharpened in history when theologians began to use philosophical concepts at the service of religious principles and philosophers used rational methods to explain religion, without much deviating from the fundamentals. The
nature of confrontation was decided by the uniqueness of the conscious terrain of particular scholars. The question was to what extent their enquiries were foregrounded in religious horizon or to what extent they were ready to allow philosophical reasoning to take over?

All these questions find interesting account in Islamic thought. According to Muhsin Mahdi, Islam was never a closed entity. It took philosophy as a science of all sciences that interpreted even the religion itself.² The study brings to light the dialectics between religion and philosophy while reflecting up on Causality in Islamic Thought. The study specifically focuses on the Neoplatonic concept and its direct dialogue with Islamic Philosophers such as al-Kindi, al-Farabi, ibn Sina and al-Ghazali. The whole idea of research stretches from the cosmological point of view of causality to the revival of Occasionalism in al-Ghazali.

The cosmological point of view of Plotinus is entirely based on an emanation scheme. The concept of Emanationism calls for a transcendent principle from which everything is derived. It is opposed to Creationionism (where there is a sole progenitor of all creations). The Islamic Philosophers had a strong affiliation for both Plato’s and Aristotle’s modus operandi in this regard. The research highlights this adherence with a great meticulous outlook. The main problem for Islamic philosophers is two fold. Firstly, they have to twist the arc of Aristotelian theory in tune with the Qur’anic version. Secondly, they shouldn’t deviate from the basic tenets of Islamic doctrines. This was a real issue of contention right from mutakallimun who started their philosophical reflection on substance and accidents.

In Islam, majority of theologians were in favour of a rational dialogue with philosophy. But occasionally Achilles heel remained in their closed space of theological scheme. Every philosopher found stiff resistance whenever they tried to go astray from the doctrines of revelation as laid down by Qur’an. Most of these schools entail divergent

thoughts in connection with freedom and causality. Mu’tazilites exclude any notion of pre-determinism on the grounds of the necessary justice of God. They declare that God is not a body, and therefore is not to be attributed with any properties. Another school of mutakallimun called ash’arites hold the view that God has eternal attributes such as knowledge, sight, and speech and so on. Al-Kindi shared some basic differences with the mu’tazilites. The former tries to rationalize theology beyond basic belief, while the other succumbs to it finally. Al-Kindi establishes that everything in the world is only accidentally and essentially one. Identity and being, according to him, comes from an outside agent. Al-Kindi makes a major shift from mu’tazilites, when he takes a quasi-independent stand on Universe. He thus refrains himself from the mu’tazilite stand that God is continuously involved with the world. This dialectical shift is evident in most of his works. He also goes against the mu’tazilite division of all beings into atoms. Kindi feels that nothing can be thought as one or indivisible.

Al-Farabi’s views on causality reflect Neoplatonic and Aristotelian accord. He is generally known as Second Teacher after Aristotle. The main issue, according to Farabi, is that philosophy deals in generalities, in concepts with universal validity. The significance of al-Farabi mainly lies in his teachings of philosophy loaded with the essentials of mysticism. He emphatically reconciles philosophy and theology, in accordance with the Neoplatonic emanation scheme. The second teacher tries to show that Aristotle does not teach the eternity of the matter. But Aristotle meant to say that matter existed in eternity, but is so existed as a created being.

In Farabi, intellectual coherence is assured by a scheme of emanation modeled in necessity inherent in a logical system. Connections between the events shared in a connection between propositions follow logically from one another. In a nutshell, the concept of emanation offered a cosmic pattern for all causality.

Al-Ghazali, on the other hand, claims that philosophers cannot survive philosophical criticism. He uses Aristotle’s logic as a political weapon to refute philosophers’ belief in the eternity of the world and their doctrine that God does not know particulars. Al-Ghazali believes that God created the world at a creation moment in time. Ghazali responds to human action and divine actions. While the mu’tazilites uphold the view that humans completely holds responsibility for their action, the ash’arites developed an intermediate position, which attempts to distinguish responsibility for one’s action from their sheer origin. Al-Ghazali solves this problem by comprehending the created cause under the patterned regularity of actions.

The scheme of emanation elaborated by al-Farabi sought to give the first place for pre-eminence which the Qur’an demanded for the Creator. He did so by modeling creation on a logical system. In that logical system, all things emanated necessarily from this One. This necessity was further elaborated by ibn Sina. For al-Ghazali, this necessity jeopardized the freedom of God as Creator and as giver of the Qur’an. Al-Ghazali’s objections were already sharpened by a previous debate among Muslim theologians (mutakallimun). Natural philosophy was also affected by these debates.5

Ibn Sina divides being into ‘necessary being’ and ‘possible being.’ Necessary being is restricted to the One from which all the rest emanates while the remainder is characterized as possible in itself yet necessary by virtue of another. In this way, the order of the natural world is assured, since it derives from the one principle of being in a way that is modeled on logical derivation. This scheme links the entire universe in a necessary order with the first cause. Furthermore, the pattern of logical entailment extends to the action of that first cause as well. The universe comes forth from it necessarily, as premises from a principle. Such a model for causal activity cannot be easily imported into a world believed to be freely created by one God. The order described by the emanation scheme threatened the hegemony of the God revealed in the Qur’an. It was only a matter of time that this effort to harmonize creation with emanation was challenged. That challenge came notably from al-Ghazali, whose

frontal attack, entitled *Tahafut al-falasifa* (The Incoherence of the Philosophers) was in turn countered by ibn Rushd in his *Tahafut al-tahafut* (Incoherence of the Incoherence).

The quasi-logical necessity attributed to causality in the universe ran counter to the freedom of the divine agent. The mu’tazilites consider free human actions as utterly autonomous. The idea is that to insist that human actions are our creation and not God’s could not be sustained in Islam. The position was opposed vehemently by theologians (ash’arites) who shared some of the mu’tazilites’ conceptual confluences. They developed a purportedly intermediate position, whereby human actions are created by God yet performed by us. The key notion they introduced was *kasb* which attempts to distinguish responsibility for one’s actions from their sheer origination.

The important question that comes in the way of any debate on causality is as to how the first causes and other causes are related? The response of kalam thinkers to this question was explicated by their commitment to an atomistic metaphysics. Atomistic metaphysics seeks to remove all causality other than the divine from the realm of nature: This is the premise of celebrated ‘Islamic Occasionalism.’ Later, al-Ghazali responds to this challenge by comprehending created causes under a patterned regularity of the *sunna Allah*, action willed by God. Early kalam thinkers presumed an atomistic conception of nature by which the universe was divinely sustained by being freely created at each moment by God. This conception is clearly an attempt to affirm the omnipotence of divine causal action. Al-Ghazali argued that the ash’arite presumption of the atomistic constitution of nature was unnecessary to assure the omnipresence of the creator’s action in nature. According to him, creatures do indeed contain such powers, yet always subject to the will of the One who so created them. In this way, al-Ghazali could simultaneously insist that God alone is the only agent and yet, by God’s power, others are agents as well. Thus he strives to prove that causality can be attributed to creatures. However, he argues that causal connection of the quasi-logical sort demanded by the emanation scheme is impossibility.
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A brief account of these arguments and counterarguments is given in different chapters.

The first chapter titled 'Causality in Mutakallimun: Theological Scheme of Mu'tazilites and Ash'arites,' I have focused on the theological debates between mu'tazilites and ash'arites. First, I have pointed out some of common theological and philosophical notions shared by both of these schools. Both ash'arites and mu'tazilites agree with the metaphysics of atoms and accidents. They believe in the division of everything into substance and accidents, and uphold the view that instability of the accidents is the cause of world's transformation. Mu'tazillates particularly hold the view that the God had no attributes distinct from his essence. However, in contrast to the emphasis of the mu'tazila on the reality of choice in human activity, al-Ash'ari insists that good and evil is willed by God. Similarly, ash'arite atomic metaphysics negated Aristotelian causality, but not causality as such. Ash'arite point of view differs from mu'tazilites, who admitted the continuous chain of causality that caused the eternity of the world.

In the second chapter titled 'Reconciling Religion and Philosophy: Reflections on Causality in Al-Kindi' the study purports to analyze as to how Al-Kindi proceeds to answer the then existing theological questions in the light of Aristotelian logical scheme. For him, philosophy is the human endeavour to emulate divine excellence as much as possible. Having explored al-Kindi's major philosophical works, I have made an attempt to compare al-Kindi with mu'tazilites. Al-Kindi's thought is very similar to mu'tazilites in assessing the positive role of reason in the knowledge of good and evil. Like mu'tazilites, al-Kindi upholds the supremacy of Qur'an over philosophic reasoning in the last instance. Most importantly, in this chapter, I have explored Neoplatonic tenets in Al-Kindi in the light of his arguments on causality. Al-Kindi uses a Neoplatonic pattern to define God in purely negative terms as the First One, the true One (al-wahidul haq), the creator and the sustainer of all that which he created. Al-Kindi uses negative terms in a more rigid and more consistent Neoplatonic pattern than later philosophers from al-Farabi to Averroes. Kindi departed from Aristotle's view that the world is eternal. But he agreed with Aristotle that heavenly bodies and the basic elements
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of matter are permanent. It is ingenerated and imperishable. But al-Kindi clearly states that they continue like this only until and unless god wills. Further, a brief account is given on al-Kindi's notion of being, and creation in the light of his views on causality.

In the third Chapter titled 'Causality in Al-Farabi: Aristotelian Causality and Neoplatonic Philosophy of Emanationism,' I have brought to light the emanation scheme of Al-Farabi in detail. Here, first, I have reflected up on the major works of Al-Farabi and his Greek legacy. I have argued that al-Farabi maintains a balance between Aristotle's view on causality and Neoplatonic Emanationism. Moreover, the emanation scheme is further explained in terms of logical necessity. The basic triadic paradigm of Plotinus is adapted and transmuted by al-Farabi into a separate entity. Subsequently, dialectics between religion and philosophy is explained in al-Farabi's own words. In Farabian terms, logic means the process of reasoning from our innate thoughts and then has a journey to the knowledge of unknown. Al-Farabi intends to say that the philosophy and religion bring one truth in different methods.

In the fourth chapter titled 'Necessary Being and Possible Being: Reflection on Ibn Sina's Emanationism,' my focus is on Ibn Sina's views on causality. Ibn Sina embraces the emanationist cosmology of Plotinus, despite the challenging appropriations from his side. However, he rejected Neoplatonic epistemology and the theory of the pre-existent soul. Ibn Sina inherited the Neoplatonic emanationist scheme of existence from al-Farabi. He rejected creation ex nihilo. According to him, cosmos has no beginning. Cosmos is a natural logical product of the divine One. The cosmos succeeds God merely in logical order and in existence. In this chapter my effort is to explain as to how ibn Sina's scheme of emanation replaces the Qur'anic doctrine of creation. Ibn Sina employs the theory of emanation to account for the multiplicity of the universe. First intellect is a link between transcendent god and the rest of the universe. He proceeds to argue that the hierarchy of emanations is emanated eternally. The emanation process takes place by intellection. The world of being is eternally emanated from god. They are co-eternal with the god. On the basis of his causal arguments, ibn Sina classifies every existent in to necessary and possible being. In this chapter, brief account is given on the proofs for the existence of God, epistemology and theory of soul, and on existence and theory of Predication.
In the fifth chapter titled ‘Occasionalism Revived: Al-Ghazali’s Critique on Emanationism,’ my attempt is to summarize al-Ghazali’s refutation of philosopher’s claims on reason and logic of necessity. He was the first Islamic philosopher who successfully refuted Islamic Neoplatonic thought by his sheer logic. According to al-Ghazali, God is the progenitor of the whole cause, but efficient causation occurs because of God’s intervention of making a cycle of events occur. In this way, Ghazali’s dialectics enabled faith to become an intelligible entity with a rational tinge. After carefully analyzing his works, the chapter proceeds explain his critique of causality. He questions the idea of separate intelligences which make the movement of spheres through a distinct path. Ghazali argues that this sort of knowledge makes a conclusion that all earthly contingent events have their own original knowledge.