



PAUL FEYERABEND'S EPISTEMOLOGICAL ANARCHISM AND ITS RELEVANCE TO THE METHODOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES

Alfiyan Chasanul Muna^{1*}, Muhammad Rizka Muqtada²

***Correspondence:**

Email:

alfiyanchasanulm@gmail.com

Authors Affiliation:

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kudus, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kudus, Indonesia

Article History:

Submission: October 16, 2025

Revised: November 27, 2025

Accepted: December 20, 2025

Published: December 30, 2025

Keywords: Epistemological Anarchism; Methodological Pluralism; Religious Studies, Paul Feyerabend; Philosophy of Science.

Kata Kunci: Anarkisme Epistemologis, Pluralisme Metodologis, Studi Keagamaan, Paul Feyerabend, Filsafat Ilmu.

Abstract

The dominance of rigid textual and monolithic methodological approaches in religious studies has increasingly limited the scope of critical and contextual inquiry. This article examines the relevance of Paul Feyerabend's epistemological anarchism as an alternative framework for enriching the methodology of religious sciences, particularly Islamic studies. Employing a qualitative library-based approach, the study analyzes Feyerabend's major works through conceptual and content analysis, alongside relevant secondary literature in the philosophy of science and religious studies. The findings demonstrate that Feyerabend's rejection of a single, universal scientific method—articulated through principles such as "anything goes," counterinduction, theory proliferation, and incommensurability—offers a productive challenge to methodological rigidity in religious scholarship. His emphasis on methodological pluralism opens space for more inclusive, dynamic, and context-sensitive approaches to theological inquiry and Qur'anic interpretation. The study argues that integrating Feyerabend's epistemological insights enables religious studies to move beyond methodological absolutism by incorporating sociological, historical, and contextual analyses without undermining the normative role of religious texts. In conclusion, Feyerabend's epistemological anarchism contributes conceptually to the development of a more adaptive and dialogical paradigm in religious sciences, allowing religious knowledge to engage more effectively with contemporary social realities.

Abstrak

Dominasi pendekatan textual yang kaku dan metodologi tunggal dalam ilmu-ilmu keagamaan telah membatasi ruang kajian yang kritis, kontekstual, dan interdisipliner. Artikel ini bertujuan menganalisis relevansi anarkisme epistemologis Paul Feyerabend sebagai kerangka alternatif untuk memperkaya metodologi ilmu-ilmu keagamaan, khususnya dalam studi Islam. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif berbasis studi pustaka dengan analisis konseptual dan analisis isi terhadap karya-karya utama Feyerabend serta literatur pendukung dalam filsafat ilmu dan studi keagamaan. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahwa kritik Feyerabend terhadap gagasan metode ilmiah tunggal—melalui prinsip anything goes, counterinduction, proliferasi teori, dan inkomensurabilitas—memberikan tantangan epistemologis yang signifikan terhadap kekakuan metodologis dalam kajian agama. Penekanannya pada pluralisme metodologis membuka ruang bagi pendekatan yang lebih inklusif, dinamis, dan sensitif terhadap konteks dalam kajian teologi dan penafsiran Al-Qur'an. Artikel ini berargumen bahwa integrasi gagasan epistemologis Feyerabend memungkinkan ilmu-ilmu keagamaan melampaui absolutisme metodologis dengan mengakomodasi analisis sosiologis, historis, dan kontekstual tanpa menegaskan peran normatif teks keagamaan. Dengan demikian, anarkisme epistemologis Feyerabend berkontribusi secara konseptual dalam pengembangan paradigma ilmu-ilmu keagamaan yang lebih adaptif dan dialogis dalam merespons realitas sosial kontemporer.

INTRODUCTION

The philosophy of science is a branch of philosophy that critically examines the foundations, methods, and validity of scientific knowledge. One of the most controversial figures in this field is Paul Feyerabend, whose epistemological anarchism fundamentally challenges the idea of a single, universal scientific method. Feyerabend rejected methodological monism and argued that scientific progress often emerges through the violation of established methodological rules rather than strict adherence to them. His well known principle of "anything goes" emphasizes methodological freedom and pluralism in the production of knowledge (Nurnazmi, dkk., 2023).

From a historical perspective, the development of science demonstrates that knowledge does not evolve linearly. Thomas Kuhn, in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962), introduced the concept of paradigm shifts, explaining how scientific revolutions replace dominant paradigms with new ones. Feyerabend extended this critique further by arguing that even Kuhn's paradigm based model still implies certain methodological constraints. According to Feyerabend, many significant scientific breakthroughs occurred precisely because scientists ignored or broke the methodological standards of their time (Feyerabend, 2002). These arguments constitute an important body of literature that questions the rigidity of scientific methodology.

Empirically, the field of Islamic studies particularly Islamic studies has long been dominated by textual, historical, and normative approaches. These approaches are often treated as the most legitimate and authoritative methods, while alternative perspectives such as sociological, anthropological, psychological, or cultural approaches tend to be marginalized. As a result, Islamic studies frequently experience methodological rigidity, which limits their ability to respond to contemporary social realities and interdisciplinary developments (Nehru, dkk., 2024). This condition represents an empirical problem in the development of religious sciences, where methodological diversity is acknowledged in theory but not fully implemented in practice.

Based on this context, Feyerabend's epistemological anarchism becomes relevant as a critical framework for rethinking methodological practices in religious studies. His emphasis on methodological pluralism offers a scientific argument that no single method should dominate the interpretation and understanding of religious phenomena. Instead, Islamic studies can be enriched by integrating diverse methods according to the complexity of the object being studied. This study argues that Feyerabend's thought provides a philosophical justification for methodological openness and flexibility in Islamic theological studies, enabling them to be more inclusive, contextual, and responsive to contemporary challenges.

The objective of this study is to analyze the relevance and contribution of Feyerabend's anarchist epistemology to the development of religious studies, particularly Islamic theology. Specifically, this research aims to (1) examine Feyerabend's critique of methodological absolutism, (2) analyze methodological rigidity in Islamic studies as reflected in existing literature, and (3) explore the potential of methodological pluralism as an alternative framework for advancing Islamic theological inquiry.

This study employs a qualitative approach to examine the relevance of Paul Feyerabend's anarchist epistemology as a methodological critique in religious studies. A qualitative design is appropriate because this research focuses on analyzing philosophical arguments, epistemological concepts, and methodological debates rather than measuring empirical variables. The study is conducted as a library based research using books and peer reviewed journal articles that discuss Feyerabend's philosophy of science,

methodological pluralism, and contemporary debates in religious and Islamic studies (Nasution, 2023).

Data were collected through purposive selection of literature relevant to three main themes: epistemological anarchism, critiques of methodological absolutism, and methodological practices in religious studies (Nurnazmi, dkk., 2023).

The collected texts were analyzed using qualitative content analysis, which was applied specifically to sections discussing key concepts such as "*anything goes*," *counterinduction*, *proliferation of theories*, and *incommensurability*. This technique was used to identify recurring arguments and conceptual patterns that reflect Feyerabend's critique of rigid scientific methodology (Muhyiddin dkk., 2022).

The analysis is further organized through thematic analysis to examine how Feyerabend's ideas challenge what this article refers to as conventional methodological approaches namely textualist, positivist, and scientistic tendencies that prioritize a single authoritative method in religious studies. Rather than employing a formal comparative method, the discussion uses conceptual comparison to contrast Feyerabend's epistemological framework with dominant approaches in religious and Islamic studies. The purpose of this article is to demonstrate the relevance of Feyerabend's anarchist epistemology as an alternative methodological perspective that supports pluralism and interpretive openness in the study of religion, with Islamic studies serving as a primary field of application (Faradi, 2014).

KEY CONCEPTS IN PAUL FEYERABEND'S EPISTEMOLOGICAL ANARCHISM

Paul Feyerabend was born on January 13, 1924, in Vienna, Austria. His childhood was marked by frequent illnesses. At the age of six, Feyerabend started school, but he didn't communicate much with the world around him, and he didn't even know how to act or behave with his classmates. He loved magic books and could read them for hours. Feyerabend always did things according to his heart and did whatever he liked, so he never focused on one thing. However, music was his most interesting field, as were vocal arts, theater, and history (Pranata Wibawa, 2023).

Feyerabend concentrated on the philosophy of science while studying science at the University of Vienna, where he wrote his doctoral thesis. From then on, he became known as a philosopher of science. In 1948, Paul Feyerabend met Karl Popper while attending an international seminar at the Austrian University in Alpbach. This encounter with the philosopher, renowned for his falsificationist method, marked the beginning of Feyerabend's intellectual career. After that meeting, he actively participated in seminars attended by Popper. However, Popper himself eventually became the target of Feyerabend's criticism through his thoughts, best known as epistemological anarchism (Fadal, 2015, hlm. 4).

Feyerabend's anarchist epistemology is based on the principle that no single scientific method should be accepted as a universal standard (Nyak Mustakim, 2022). The term anarchist refers to any form of protest movement against the established order. Feyerabend's epistemological anarchism refers to anarchism in the realm of theory, arguing historically that the history of science contains not only facts and conclusions but also ideas and interpretations of those facts, including problems arising from errors in interpretation. He also saw it as a form of theoretical protest against scientific methods that are perceived as attempting to standardize research objects. According to him, each scientific discipline develops according to its own capacity and history, so that scientific

claims in a field are merely ideologized myths. Therefore, what is more important is not a single approach to research methods (mono-methodology), but rather a diverse approach (pluri-methodology). Through critical historical analysis, he found that scientists often judge facts solely from the perspective of ideas. As a result, the history of science is complex, confusing, and rife with errors (Setiawan and Amalia 2023, 41).

Feyerabend's ideas have had a significant impact on the development of science, particularly in the research process. He argued that scientists should not be tied to a particular method, although they remain open to using it. No single method is absolute, so each scientist should apply a variety of theories and systems of thought according to their individual preferences. This is because each individual has the freedom to choose how to conduct experiments or research a particular phenomenon (Setiawan and Amalia 2023, 39).

Paul Karl Feyerabend was a philosopher of science who criticized the structure and workings of modern science. Feyerabend proposed a more liberal, pluralistic, and open approach to diverse ways of knowing. Some of the key ideas that characterize his thinking include the following:

Anything Goes

Literally, it means anything goes. This principle operates without rules and allows anything to happen, which can be interpreted as opposing all rules and laws. This principle is not categorized as a new method, but rather a way to accept traditions or practices outside of universal standards. Feyerabend stated that in this principle, even the most obvious methods have limitations, so they cannot be forced to investigate all objects. Therefore, scientists and researchers should be more open to other methodologies that may be able to provide truth. This principle also aims to combat method or scientific fanaticism, because fundamentally, the structure of science, no matter how solid, must be ready to experience epistemological anarchy in order to stimulate the growth of new knowledge.

Feyerabend also argued that the principle that most effectively supports scientific development is "anything goes," not as an unrestricted slogan, but as an expression of epistemological anarchism. For him, methodological freedom does not imply the absence of critique or rational evaluation. Rather, it is grounded in historical awareness, critical reflection, and the competition among diverse theories. Feyerabend emphasized that scientists should be free to choose and even modify methods according to the context of their research, while remaining open to criticism and alternative perspectives. In this sense, "anything goes" functions as a critique of methodological absolutism rather than a rejection of intellectual responsibility (Feyerabend, 2002).

In this principle, the emphasis is not on theory with other theories, but how a theory, when accepted by the general public, must be worthy of being tested with reality that tends to be infinitive. So when the standard rules in theory are unable to accommodate the reality of the facts, then this theory must conduct research that violates standards and practices that are not determined and cannot be determined by standards, so that this theory always evolves. It can be concluded that Feyerabend's efforts with the principle of anything goes or anything is allowed are not intended as a new method, but simply an effort so that scientists who are used to universal standards, consciously and humbly realize that there are limitations that they have (Nehru Millat Ahmad et al. 2024, 117–18).

Counterinduction

In conventional scientific thinking, induction is the primary method for drawing conclusions from existing data. However, Feyerabend proposed a counter-inductive approach, using theories or views that contradict the available evidence. His goal was to challenge established ways of thinking and create space for new possibilities. With this approach, he aimed to demonstrate that innovation in science often stems from a defiance of dominant logic (Feyerabend, 2002).

Proliferation Principle

Feyerabend strongly emphasized the importance of diversity in scientific theory. He believed that the more theories developed and studied simultaneously, the greater the likelihood of advancing knowledge. Theoretical pluralism allows for dialogue, cross-criticism, and refinement in understanding a phenomenon. In this view, no single theory is absolutely correct; all theories must be tested through interaction with other theories (Feyerabend, 2002).

Incommensurability

One of the key concepts in Feyerabend's thinking is the incommensurability of theories. He argued that scientific theories often have different logical structures, languages, and underlying assumptions, making them incommensurable. The transition from one theory to another, he argued, is not always rational or linear. Sometimes the transition is determined by non-scientific factors, such as culture, politics, or institutional power. This concept challenges the notion that science develops objectively and progressively (Nurnazmi et al. 2023, 45–49).

THE EPISTEMOLOGY OF ANARCHISM AS CRITIQUE

Paul Feyerabend was one of the most radical philosophers of science in his critique of the dominance of the modern scientific method. He rejected the claim that there exists a single scientific method that is objective, universal, and absolutely rational. Through his concept of epistemological anarchism, Feyerabend challenged the hierarchical and dogmatic structure of scientific practice and proposed a more pluralistic and open approach to knowledge production. His critique does not derive from the epistemology of political anarchism, but from a philosophical analysis of the historical development of science, which shows that scientific progress often emerges through methodological diversity and rule-breaking rather than strict methodological conformity. His main criticisms of the scientific method include the following:

Rejection of Rationalism

Feyerabend rejected methodological monism and dogmatic rationalism, namely the belief that a single, rigid scientific method constitutes the only legitimate way to acquire knowledge. He argued that strict adherence to fixed methodological rules often inhibits scientific creativity and progress, as many major scientific breakthroughs emerged precisely when established rules were questioned or violated. The slogan "anything goes" was therefore used rhetorically to emphasize methodological pluralism and to draw attention to the historical reality of scientific practice. It does not imply the rejection of reason or criticism, but rather challenges the idea that any one method should function as an absolute and universally binding standard in science.

In this context, epistemological anarchism functions as a critical framework for questioning methodological rigidity rather than as a rejection of contemporary Islamic

studies as a whole. While many strands of modern Islamic studies have already adopted integrative and interdisciplinary approaches, methodological rigidity can still be found in certain classical religious sciences ('ulūm al-dīn) and in normative or dogmatic interpretive traditions. Feyerabend's epistemological anarchism is therefore relevant not as a call to abandon established methods, but as an invitation to critically reflect on methodological authority and to remain open to alternative approaches such as anthropology, phenomenology, Sufism, and local cultural perspectives when interpreting religious phenomena. In this sense, creativity and intellectual development are understood as outcomes of methodological openness rather than mere adherence to formalized standards (Nehru Millat Ahmad et al. 2024, 111–12).

Criticism of Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn

Feyerabend also sharply criticized Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn, two major figures in the philosophy of science. Although both had made important contributions, he argued that they still maintained a hierarchical scientific structure. Popper, for example, with his theory of falsification, continued to assume the existence of a single ideal method that should serve as a universal benchmark in science. Meanwhile, Kuhn, while rejecting the linear view of scientific progress, maintained the dominance of certain paradigms in the normal phase of science.

For Feyerabend, such approaches risk generating new forms of dogmatism. Methodological pluralism is therefore proposed not as a new doctrine, but as a critical stance that resists the dominance of any single methodological authority and preserves intellectual openness in scientific inquiry (Nehru Millat Ahmad et al. 2024, 113–14).

Critique of the Dominance of Scientism in Religious Studies

Scientism is often defined as the view that scientific methods constitute the only legitimate path to knowledge, thereby marginalising other forms of understanding such as religion, myth, or tradition. Paul Feyerabend developed a far-reaching critique of this scientistic attitude by rejecting the idea of a single, universal "scientific method" and by defending methodological and epistemic pluralism. In his later work on materialism, mysticism, and religion, Feyerabend argued that monistic, scientistic conceptions of reason and science fail to do justice to important dimensions of human life, including spiritual experience, mystery, and practices of reverence that cannot be fully captured by the categories of scientific materialism. On this basis, his philosophy can be used to support a more open and inclusive approach in the study of religion, one that recognises the legitimacy of non-empirical and experiential aspects of religious life alongside, rather than subordinate to, scientific forms of inquiry (Coniglione, 2024).

Critique of Dogmatism in Religious Studies

Dogmatism in Islamic studies refers to a rigid attitude that rejects other views or interpretations. This approach can hinder the development of interfaith thought and dialogue. Feyerabend's anarchist epistemology opposes all forms of dogmatism by encouraging freedom of thought and acceptance of diverse perspectives. By adopting this approach, Islamic studies can become more dynamic and responsive to social and cultural changes. This aligns with the view that methodological flexibility can foster creativity and innovation in religious studies (Halilovic, 1997).

THE RELEVANCE OF FEYERABEND'S EPISTEMOLOGY FOR THE RELIGIOUS SCIENCES

Overall, the relevance of Paul K. Feyerabend's epistemology for the Religious Sciences lies in its capacity to reframe plurality, disagreement, and methodological diversity as epistemic resources rather than as obstacles to scholarly rigor. By challenging the dominance of single—method approaches and epistemic authoritarianism, Feyerabend offers a critical philosophical foundation for understanding religion as a complex, historically embedded, and interpretive phenomenon. His ideas help illuminate why Religious Sciences naturally develop through multiple, sometimes competing, approaches textual, contextual, normative, and critical each operating with its own assumptions and criteria of validity. In this respect, Feyerabend's epistemology does not aim to dissolve standards of inquiry but to prevent their absolutization, thereby encouraging openness, creativity, and reflexivity in religious scholarship. This general framework provides the conceptual background for the subsequent discussion, which examines more concretely how Feyerabend's thought can be engaged within specific areas of religious studies.

Paul Feyerabend's Thoughts in the Study of Al-Qur'an Tafsir

Paul K. Feyerabend's concept of epistemological anarchism offers a critical challenge to methodological monism by rejecting the assumption that a single, universal method can serve as the sole foundation for knowledge production. His critique was primarily directed at modern science; however, its implications extend to Islamic Studies, particularly in fields where methodological authority has often been contested. Feyerabend's emphasis on freedom, plurality, and historical contingency provides a philosophical lens for understanding the diversity of approaches within Islamic intellectual traditions without subordinating them to a single epistemic hierarchy.

One key conceptual variable derived from Feyerabend's epistemology is methodological pluralism. In Islamic Studies especially Qur'anic and tafsir studies this pluralism is empirically evident in the coexistence of diverse interpretive approaches, such as *tafsir maudhu'i*, *tafsir ilmi* socio—historical interpretation, and contemporary hermeneutical models. These approaches did not emerge arbitrarily but developed in response to specific intellectual, social, and historical challenges. As noted by Nehru single interpretive method claims absolute finality; rather, each method responds dialectically to the limitations of earlier frameworks. This historical reality resonates with Feyerabend's argument that scientific and by extension, scholarly progress often occurs through methodological deviation rather than strict conformity (Nehru Millat Ahmad et al. 2024, 121).

Another relevant conceptual element is anti—dogmatism, understood here not as a rejection of norms altogether, but as resistance to the monopolization of truth by a single epistemic authority. Contemporary Muslim thinkers such as Fazlur Rahman, Muhammad Syahrur, Hasan Hanafi, and Amina Wadud demonstrate this stance in practice. Their works provide empirical examples of how interpretive innovation in Islamic Studies has been achieved by critically engaging classical sources while incorporating ethical concerns, social realities, and historical consciousness. Although these scholars do not explicitly cite Feyerabend, their methodological orientation reflects a shared commitment to epistemic openness and critical engagement, aligning indirectly with the spirit of epistemological anarchism.

Furthermore, Feyerabend's insistence that "no method is perfect" reinforces a renewed understanding of *ijtihad* in Islamic Studies. Interpretation is no longer treated as

mere repetition of authoritative opinions but as an ongoing intellectual endeavor aimed at addressing contemporary problems. This dynamic is particularly visible in modern *tafsir* studies, where hermeneutical approaches facilitate dialogue across schools of thought and encourage contextual readings of the Qur'an. In this sense, Feyerabend's ideas function not as a prescriptive model but as a philosophical justification for recognizing diversity, creativity, and adaptability as legitimate strengths within Islamic Studies.

In conclusion, Feyerabend's epistemological anarchism is relevant to Islamic Studies insofar as it helps conceptualize the field's existing methodological diversity and guards against epistemic dogmatism. Rather than weakening Islamic scholarship, this pluralism constitutes an intellectual asset that supports inclusivity, critical inquiry, and responsiveness to changing social contexts. Thus, Feyerabend's thought can be strategically employed as a meta-theoretical framework for understanding and legitimizing methodological plurality in contemporary Islamic Studies (Nehru Millat Ahmad et al. 2024, 124–25)

Pluralism in Religious Approach

Feyerabend's proposed anarchic epistemology emphasizes that no single method can claim superiority in acquiring knowledge. In the context of religious studies, this anarchic approach opens up space for the acceptance of various methods in understanding religious phenomena. Methodologies such as the phenomenology of religion, hermeneutics, historical-critical approaches, and contextual approaches can be used side by side to understand religious experience more fully. This pluralistic approach is crucial, given the complex reality of religion and its deep roots in diverse social, cultural, and historical contexts (Feyerabend and Feyerabend 2002, 17–18).

The methodological flexibility offered by Feyerabend allows for creativity and innovation in religious studies. When religious scholars and researchers are no longer constrained by a single method, they are freer to explore the sources of religious teachings and relate them to contemporary issues relevant to society. This supports the emergence of an inclusive, adaptive, and contextual understanding of religion, which is increasingly needed to address today's socio-religious dynamics (Ian G. Barbour, n.d., 105–6).

Meanwhile, Thomas Aquinas's view also demonstrates that the literal meaning of scripture need not be understood in a rigid and linear manner. He implies that the literal meaning can still contain metaphorical elements and various genres within the structure of religious texts. This view reflects the spirit of pluralism, namely that in interpreting religious experience, humans are not limited by a single approach or interpretation, but are instead permitted to explore from various perspectives appropriate to the context of their time and audience.

Combining the views of Aquinas and Paul Feyerabend, we can conclude that pluralism in religious approaches is inevitable. Diversity of methods not only enriches academic religious discourse but also serves as a form of respect for the complexity of religion itself. Islamic studies that embrace a pluralistic approach will be more responsive to ever-changing social, cultural, and spiritual realities (Gavin Hyman, 2010, hlm. 99).

Feyerabend's Epistemological Incompatibility in the Conflict of Interpretations

Theoretical Incompatibility (Incommensurability) proposed by Paul Feyerabend refers to a situation where two or more frameworks of thought (paradigms) have very different standards, languages, and validity criteria, so that there can be no single, neutral benchmark for judging which is superior. In the context of Religious Sciences, this

concept becomes very relevant in understanding the contestation between Textual Interpretation and Contextual Interpretation.

1) Textual Interpretation

This interpretation establishes truth based on the authority of reason (ratio) and ethical social relevance (*maqasid*). This paradigm dares to use counter induction methods, such as philosophy or sociology, to find the universal message behind the text (Amir and Abdul Rahman 2025).

2) Contextual Interpretation

This interpretation establishes truth based on the authority of reason (ratio) and ethical social relevance (*maqasid*). This paradigm dares to use counter induction methods, such as philosophy or sociology, to find the universal message behind the text (Amir and Abdul Rahman 2025).

According to Feyerabend, these two approaches exist in two incompatible conceptual worlds. The criteria of "truth" in the textual approach cannot be applied to assessing truth in the contextual approach, and vice versa. (Nyak Mustakim, 2022)

The incompatibility formulated by Feyerabend makes an important contribution to the epistemology of interpretation. First, Feyerabend Legitimate the existence of methodological pluralism, namely the concept of epistemological anarchism and Anything Goes, as a philosophical basis for recognizing that the plurality of methods in interpretation is legitimate, not a deviation. This supports the view of religious moderation, which recognizes the existence of plurality of interpretations (Nehru Millat Ahmad et al. 2024).

Second, Feyerabend against single authoritarianism with criticizing all forms of authoritarianism that impose one method as the standard of truth. In the context of interpretation, this means preventing textual/traditional interpretation from becoming the sole authority judging all interpretive approaches (N. Nurnazmi et al. 2023b).

Third, incompatibility encourages scholars of interpretation to boldly propose new theological ideas that challenge the established status quo of a science, thus triggering the dynamics and ongoing development of the science of interpretation over time (Fadal, 2015).

CONCLUSION

According to Paul Feyerabend, the anarchist epistemology of science is a view that rejects the existence of a single, standard, and universal scientific method. He stated that the development of science does not always proceed linearly and rationally, but often involves unconventional methods, even contradicting established scientific principles. The principle of "anything goes" is the basis for the use of any method as long as it is effective in producing knowledge. For Feyerabend, this methodological freedom is essential for fostering scientific creativity and avoiding scientific dogmatism.

As a critique, Feyerabend's anarchist epistemology is directed at modern positivism and rationalism, which overemphasize formal logic and empiricism as the sole path to scientific truth. He points out that the history of science actually shows that many major breakthroughs arose from violations of the prevailing scientific method. This critique does not mean rejecting science, but rather encouraging a more inclusive and open understanding of diverse ways of acquiring knowledge, including those derived from tradition, intuition, or even religious belief. In this way, anarchist epistemology opens up space for evaluating institutional power in science and encourages autonomy in the pursuit of knowledge.

The relevance of anarchist epistemology to religious sciences lies in its ability to encourage a more pluralistic and contextual approach. In the study of Quranic interpretation, for example, this approach can strengthen the legitimacy of the diversity of interpretive methods that develop over time and space, and open up space for alternative interpretations that have been marginalized from the mainstream. Furthermore, anarchist epistemology can enrich Islamic sciences by allowing for spiritual experience, local values, and culture in shaping religious understanding. Thus, anarchist epistemology can serve as a bridge between modern scholarship and the richness of religious traditions in responding to the challenges of the times.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Fatah Nasution. (2023). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. CV. Harfa Creative.
- Amir, A. N., & Abdul Rahman, T. (2025). Pendekatan Hermeneutik A. Hasan: Analisis Tekstual Kitab Tafsir al-Furqan: Textual Analysis of A. Hasan's Hermeneutical Approaches in Qur'anic Commentary. *Al Karima: Jurnal Studi Ilmu Al Quran dan Tafsir*, 9(1), 72–91. <https://doi.org/10.58438/alkarima.v9i1.269>
- Coniglione, F. (2024). Pluralism and Mysticism in the Thought of Paul K. Feyerabend. *Filozoficzne Aspekty Genezy*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.53763/fag.2023.20.2.227>
- Fadal, K. (2015). Epistemologi Anarkisme Paul Feyerabend dalam Studi Ilmu Tafsir al-Quran. *RELIGIA*, 18(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.28918/religia.v18i1.619>
- Faradi, A. A. (2014). Epistemologi Anarkis Paul Feyerabend Dan Implikasinya Terhadap Pemikiran Islam. 02(2).
- Feyerabend, P. (2002). *Against method* (Reprinted der 3. ed. 1993). Verso.
- Hyman, Gavin (2010). *A Short History of Atheism*. I.B. Tauris and New York.
- Halilovic, E. (1997). Feyerabend's Critique of Scientism. *Enrahonar: An International Journal of Theoretical and Practical Reason*, 28, 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/rahonar.478>
- Barbour, Ian G. (t.t.). *Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues*. HarperSanFrancisco.
- Muhyiddin, D. S., Natsir, N. F., & Haryanti, E. (2022). Memahami Gagasan Anything Goes Paul Karl Feyerabend dan Implikasinya terhadap Pendidikan Islam. *JIIP - Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5(1), 290–301. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v5i1.412>
- Nehru Millat Ahmad, Lau Han Sein, & Hisyam Naufan Maulana. (2024). Pemikiran Paul K. Feyerabend tentang Anarkis Epistemologi dan Implikasinya pada Studi Islam. *Halaqah: Journal of Multidisciplinary Islamic Studies*, 1(1).
- Nurnazmi, Hala Saied Sayed Ahmed Mahmoud, & Mohamad Anas. (2023). Anarkisme Epistemologis Paul Karl Feyerabend dalam Kajian Ilmu Pengetahuan. *Edu Sociata (Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi)*, 6(1), 41–55. <https://doi.org/10.33627/es.v6i1.1110>
- Nyak Mustakim. (2022). Anarkis Epistemologis Paul Karl Feyerabend Dan Relavansinya Dalam Ilmu Keagamaan. *JURNAL AZKIA: Jurnal Aktualisasi Pendidikan Islam*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.58645/jurnalazkia.v15i2.17>
- Wibawa, N. H. H. Pranata. (2023). Paul Feyerabend's "Anything Goes" Epistemology Its Relevance in Knowledge Development. *MADANIA: JURNAL KAJIAN KEISLAMAN*, 27(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.29300/madania.v27i1.3388>
- Setiawan, I., & Amalia, A. R. (2023). Anarkisme Epistemologi Paul K. Feyerabend dan Relevansinya dengan Berpikir Kritis dalam Pendidikan Islam. 2(21).