Pakdin Asl, Mohammad (2021) *The relation between intellect, intuition and revelation from the viewpoint of ‘Allāma S.M.H. Ṭabāṭabā’ī.* MPhil(R) thesis.

https://theses.gla.ac.uk/82397/

The Relation between Intellect, Intuition and Revelation

From the viewpoint of 'Allāma S.M.H. Ṭabāṭabā'ī

Mohammad Pakdin Asl

MPhil

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the

Degree of MPhil in Theology and Religious Studies

School of Critical Studies

College of Arts

University of Glasgow

August 2021

1. Table of Contents

Abstract

This dissertation seeks to answer the following question: how are intellect, intuition, and revelation related to one another in 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's (1904-1981) view? To answer the question, we need to consider the definitions and properties of each of the three notions, and ultimately, consider 'Allāma's view of the relation among them. 'Allāma was a prominent, influential Iranian Shiite scholar in the twentieth century who wrote many books and essays concerning Islamic philosophy, Qur'anic exegesis, theology (kalām), sociology, and so on.

Deploying an analytic method, the dissertation considers and analyzes all relevant principles and theories of 'Allāma. It takes almost all relevant work by 'Allāma into account, including *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, his collected essays, and "Risālat al-Wilāya".

Introduction

Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabāʾī (1903 – 1981), known as ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī, was one of the most influential Islamic traditional reformists and also one of the most distinguished Iranian Shīʿa scholars in the 20th century. He had great competence in all common fields of Islamic sciences during his time, such as in exegesis of the Qurʾān, Islamic philosophy, mysticism, *fiqh* (Islamic Jurisprudence) and principles of *fiqh*, theology, history etc. in a way that he can be called a "perfect Islamologist". He dedicated his entire life to learning, writing about different fields of Islamic Studies and educating many prominent students for the Shīʿa scientific society.

ʿAllāma wrote many books and essays concerning Islamic philosophy, theology (*kalām*), mysticism (*ʿIrfān*), Qurʾanic exegesis, hadith, sociology, principles of *fiqh* and so on. In philosophy, he is a follower of the Transcendent Wisdom, founded by Ṣadr al-Mutaʾallihīn Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī (1571-1640), and has contributed novel ideas to philosophy and other disciplines. Given the specific political, social, and intellectual circumstances of his lifetime, particularly during the years leading up to the Islamic Revolution of Iran in 1979, as well as his frequent scholarly encounters with rightist and leftist intellectual movements of his time, a consideration of his fundamental theories can remarkably help us to achieve a better understanding of the intellectual grounds of the Islamic Revolution of Iran.

The research is significant in that ʿAllāma's account of the relation among intellect, intuition, and revelation Should be regarded as his most fundamental theoretical principles permeating almost all of his writings. In fact, without a proper understanding of his account of this relation, we cannot grasp his methodology and theories. There are two possible impediments for this research: (1) the relevance of a variety of theoretical principles from different disciplines, such as epistemology, ontology, theology, and the philosophy of mind, to the consideration of the relation among intellect, intuition, and revelation, and (2) the complication and profundity of ʿAllāma's definitions, characterizations, and account of the relation among the three—indeed, his account of this problem might be considered as one of the most complicated and intricate issues discussed by ʿAllāma. Notwithstanding this, the research is facilitated by two facts: (1) ʿAllāma's caution in observing the boundaries of different disciplines and avoidance of confusion in the tools and methods of philosophy, mysticism, theology, and Qurʾanic exegesis, and (2) ʿAllāma's educational concerns as a consequence of which he presented many of his writings at different levels of comprehensibility. In other words, since the audience level of his

books and essays is known in advance, the researcher can easily determine the work in which 'Allāma provides outlines and majority views and the work in which he seeks to provide the precise details of his own theoretical principles.

Although 'Allāma passed away less than a century ago, there has been much scholarship on his theories—in the section on 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's work, I have provided a brief report on such scholarship. In particular, books and papers were published concerning the definition and characteristics of intellect, intuition, and revelation, as well as the relation among the three. Moreover, there are works in which the relation between intellect and intuition is, for instance, considered under the relation between philosophy and mysticism. Of all these works, I could not identify one in which 'Allāma's account of the relation among all the three—intellect, intuition, and revelation—is elaborated and analyzed; not among the Persian and Arabic literature on 'Allāma, nor in English sources. And this research seems necessary and unprecedented given that an answer to the main question of this dissertation is key to a precise understanding of many of his theoretical principles. As to a biography of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and an account of the particular political and social context in which he lived, detailed research has been carried out in Persian, Arabic, and English, including Hamid Dabashi's *Theology of the Discontent*, a chapter of which is devoted to an introduction of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and the challenges and opportunities he faced. What distinguishes 'Allāma's biography in this dissertation from that in other relevant English work is not so much its statistical information as its approach. On this approach, in addition to historical accounts, I have provided a picture of different intellectual trends as conceived by 'Allāma and his close students so as to have a more clear understanding of the reason behind his scholarly and socio-political actions and reactions as well as his projects for the publication of the Shiite doctrines and for pushing the Muslim-majority society in Iran toward an ideal Islamic community.

Deploying an analytic method, the dissertation considers and analyzes all relevant principles and theories of 'Allāma. It takes almost all relevant work by 'Allāma into account, including *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, his collected essays, and "Risālat al-Wilāya". The dissertation is structured into 6 chapters: the first chapter provides a short biographical account of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī as well as his contemporary socio-political context and schools of thoughts with which he was theoretically engaged. Chapter two—the longest and the most intellectually challenging chapter of the dissertation—deals with a definition of intellect and its types and degrees. In this chapter, 'Allāma's views as well as his disagreements with his predecessors, including Ṣadr al-

Muta'allihīn, are considered. Chapters three and four deal, respectively, with definitions and considerations of intuition and revelation. Chapter five undertakes to answer the main question of the dissertation; that is, the relation among intellect, intuition, and revelation. In the final chapter, I provide a conclusion and summary of the whole dissertation.

There are two major issues involved in each of the three problems of reason, intuition, and revelation: types of knowledge (namely, knowledge by presence and knowledge by acquisition) and different realms of existence. To preclude repetition, I discuss these in the chapter on reason, without reiterating them in the chapters on intuition and revelation. As a result, the volume of the chapter on reason is greater than the other two chapters of the dissertation. I discuss these issues in the chapter on reason in compliance with 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī since he has discussed these issues under his discussion of reason and epistemology, utilizing its conclusions in his discussion of the nature of intuition and revelation.

Finally, what is cited from the work of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and others in this dissertation is my translation of the original Arabic or Persian texts into English, and when a published translation is used, it is cited in footnotes.

1. Contextualising 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and his Intellectual Movement

Iranian society during the lifetime of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī faced social, political and cultural changes which significantly influenced his scientific life, research and educational planning. In 1926, he went to Iraq to study religious sciences. After learning seminary sciences in the seminary of Najaf, he returned to Qum with a wide array of plans and ideas for the seminary of Qum and Iranian Shīʿa society; which he shared upon his arrival.[1]

His scientific services led to the emergence of a comprehensive intellectual movement which had fundamental differences especially with other religious intellectual movements. The influence of this new intellectual movement in different social levels helped a lot in preparing the intellectual and social grounds for the uprising of Iranian people under the leadership of Sayyid Rūhullāh Mūsavī Khumeinī (1902-1989).[2] Hamid Dabashi writes: "Although the unintended consequences of an otherwise deeply scholastic mind, aspects of Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī's voluminous writings were instrumental in making possible 'the Islamic Ideology' and with it the Islamic Revolution."[3]

Three Primary Questions:

In order to comprehend the contribution made by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī to this religious, intellectual movement this introduction will focus on three questions, which are set out below:

1. In what atmosphere of intellectual, cultural and political thought did 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī live in and what intellectual movements did he encounter?
2. What is the nature of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's religious intellectualism, and what is its relationship with other types of intellectualism, especially western intellectualism?
3. What objectives did he have from scientific and educational activities?

Answer to the first Question:

During the 20th century, Iran became a terminal for the traffic and stations of different intellectual movements. A brief explanation on the most prominent and influential movements

---

[1] See pages 28-30 for information on his plan for Shi'a seminaries in Iran.
[2] See Ḥusayn Ḥaqqānī Zanjānī, 1982, Darshā'ī az Maktab-i Islam: Number 10, Naqsh-i 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī dar Zībanāy-i Inqilab-i Islamī", Qum, Mu'assisiy-i Imam Ṣādiq.
[3] Ḥamīd Dabāshī, 1951, *Theology of Discontent; The Ideological Foundation of The Islamic Revolution in Iran*, New York University Press, p. 276.

with which 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī encountered with will be mentioned in the following discussions.[4]

1.1. Prominent and influential intellectual movements in Iran during the 20th century

All intellectual movements in 20th century Iran have tried to answer questions they faced in encountering the western intellectual schools or culture and civilization; questions such as: The nature of western culture, nature and functions of modern philosophies, nature of Islam, relation between science and religion, relation between reason and faith, position and role of the human being in the world from the viewpoint of Islam and the west and the method of interaction with the west and western culture, etc. Therefore, religious and non-religious intellectual movements which did not seriously try to answer these questions or considered religion and modernism totally opposite to each other will not be mentioned in this categorization.

It is important to note that the word "west" was a concept, in the written and spoken literature of Iranians in 20th century, usually considered equal with modernity and did not usually refer to a certain country in Europe or America, while actually the more developed countries were rather meant. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī engaged scientifically with the above-mentioned questions and many other questions of a similar nature directly or indirectly; but, in most cases, he avoided mentioning the names of those who gave differing opinions to these questions in Iran and only mentioned his own opinion based on intellectual principles and revelation.

Three points about our classification of influential intellectual trends in twentieth-century Iran are in order:

1. A variety of classifications might be made in terms of different criteria such as the extent of influence, intellectual foundations, temporal order, and region, and such classifications might well be accurate. In order to show what movements 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī targeted in his writings, or alternatively how he understood such intellectual trends, I have to talk about the most outstanding aspects of such movements according to 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and others so that we might obtain a more obvious picture of the grounds of his scholarly practices. Such an approach to the classification of intellectual trends in twentieth-century Iran faces challenges the most important of which is the intellectual milieu and the scholarly literature of the audience of this dissertation in English-speaking countries as well as the intellectual milieu and the scholarly

---

[4] Please note that what comes in the following section is a brief explanation on the main intellectual movements with which 'Allāma Tabātabā'ī' encountered and the reality was much more complex than what is presented here.

literature particularly in twentieth-century Iran, which might cause confusions concerning aspects of intellectual movements in twentieth-century Iran.

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī wrote a major book in Islamic philosophy titled *Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism*, which consists of 14 articles. In particular, the first four articles of the book are devoted to critiques and rejections of theories to which 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī refers as philosophical principles of idealism, claiming that they were influential on his contemporary intellectual movements. The fact of the matter is that 'idealism' as discussed by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī was a common term in the academic or intellectual language of his time, which was fundamentally close to skepticism, and is in fact not much relevant to what is commonly understood by the term in Western philosophy. In the academic literature and heated social debates of the time in Iran, particularly in Tabriz, idealism was deemed a rationalist intellectual movement which rejected divine revelation, ridiculed atheists, and accused them of intellectual dogmatism. With these explanations at hand, it is obvious that 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī should not be included among critics of idealism in the sense in which it is used in Western philosophy, and his objections to intellectual trends inspired by idealism in the sense prevalent in twentieth-century Iran might be regarded as objections to the Western school of idealism and its associated trends in Iran.

2. Given the above remarks concerning the focus on 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's identification of twentieth-century intellectual movements for purposes of this dissertation, I need to explain certain common terms of the time and their differences as reflected in the classification provided here. In this dissertation, I classify the relevant intellectual trends into three general groups: Modern Islamic Reformism, Traditional Islamic Reformism, and Non-Islamic Reformism. There is no doubt that all the three trends were influenced by two movements in Iran known as Leftist and Rightist.[5] These two movements (i.e. Leftist and Rightist movements)

---

[5] The terms "Rightist" and "Leftist" have assumed different meanings throughout the political history of Iran. Today, in the present discourse in Iran, they have a different meaning. In the political literature of the world, particularly in the twentieth century, the terms assumed many different and even contradictory meanings, and there is more confusion about these two terms in twentieth-century Iran. As to the archeology of the notions throughout political activities of different political parties, traces of ideologies and Leftist or Rightist parties can be found in the "Constitutional Movement" of Iran. "The Democratic Party" of Iran, most of whose members were well-educated intellectuals who lived in the West, were thought to promote leftist ideas, and the "Moderate Party" of Iran, consisting of clergymen and noblemen, advocated rightist ideas. In the Pahlavi era, as influenced by the discourse governing the cold war and the division of the power blocs into Eastern and Western, respectively, under the leadership of the Soviet Union and the USA, the title was attuned to this division. For this reason, In the Pahlavi era, it was common to refer to communists and the Tudeh Party as Leftist and to liberals and pro-monarchy conservatives—because of their association with the West—as Rightist. (See Mahdī Muṭahharniyā, *Chap va Rāst, az vazhigān tā vāqiʿīyyat-i siyāsī.* Zamāne Journal, No. 78*)*

were respectively supported by intellectual and philosophical backgrounds of Marxism and liberalism, and had overshadowed the intellectual, political, social, cultural, and economic milieu of Iran. In the face of these two imported intellectual movements in Iran, at least three general fronts were formed, which I address in this dissertation as three groups of intellectual trends in twentieth-century Iran. In addition to these three trends, there were others as well: (1) the traditional Islamic trend which resisted any response or modification against Rightist and Leftist movements. They did not feel any serious need for change; instead, they adamantly resisted any such change, as exemplified by problems posed by certain scholars in the Islamic Seminary of Qum for 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī as an icon of Traditional Islamic Reformism; (2) the nationalist movement, which was divided in turn into Islamic, liberal, and Marxist. It did not have its own school of thought or ideology, mainly emphasizing patriotism and resistance toward foreigners, although there were differences within the nationalist movement, for example, over their approach to monarchy and Islam. What distinguished the movement was its political-social activism as motivated by freedom from injustices and social problems, attainment of social freedom and justice, and promotion of the place of Iran and its independence. It was not much motivated by religious incentives, even in its Islamic branches.[6] No nationalist movement particularly attracted the attention of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī as a Traditional Islamic Reformist, and he wrote nothing beyond a few lines concerning the love for one's homeland and its advantages as the main doctrine of nationalists. For this reason, and because of our discussion of liberalist and Marxist movements in this dissertation, I do not address the nationalist movement as an intellectual trend alongside the three trends taken seriously and resisted by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī.

The relation of leftists and rightists with the East and the West is prominently reflected in the well-known motto by Sayyed Ruhollah Khomeini, the founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran: "Neither East, Nor West; the Islamic Republic." In his explanation of the motto, Ruḥollāh Ramaḍānī says in the chapter "idealistic encounter" of his book *Chahārchūb-i taḥlīlī barāyi barrasī-yi siyāsat-i khārijī-yi jumhūrī-yi Islāmī-yi Irān (An analytic framework for a study of the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran)*: Ayatollah Khomeini sought to emphasize that in devising the model of the Islamic Republic of Iran, we should not immaturely follow the model of Eastern socialism or Western capitalism. He believed, instead, that Islamic democracy is superior to Eastern and Western democracies. In critique of those who interpreted the motto as impermissibility of having relations with these countries, he says, "by the motto 'Neither East, Nor West; the Islamic Republic,' Imam [Khomeini] did not suggest that Iran should not have relations with the Soviet government or America or other governments that have close ties to the superpowers; instead, what he really meant by the motto 'Neither East, Nor West' was the rejection of the dominion of foreigners, rather than severing ties with them, since negation of political relations with other countries is negation of those countries."

[6] See Āyat Muẓaffarī, 2017, *Jaryān-shināsī-yi siyāsī-yi Iran-i muʿāṣir*, Qum: Zamzam-i Hidāyat, pp. 179-198; 'Alī Dārābī, 2011, *Jaryān-shināsī-yi siyāsī dar Iran*, Tehran: Islamic Culture and Thought Research Institute, Chapter: Mellīgarā yā Nāsyunālīsm.

The criterion for distinguishing the three trends (discussed in this dissertation) is their approach to theories arising from Marxist and liberalist schools as well as intellectual foundations of those trends. Atheists[7] among these tried to carry out their intended political, social, cultural, and other reforms in Iran in line with intellectual foundations of Marxism or liberalism, to which I refer in this dissertation as Non-Islamic Reformists. Some Muslims, to whom I refer in this dissertation as Modern Islamic Reformists, tried to create the greatest harmony between Islamic doctrines and modernity (or intellectual principles of Marxism or liberalism) in Iranian society, even to the expense of opposition to appearances of Quranic verses and hadiths, and deviation from the traditional textualist reading of religion. They actually imposed on the Qur'an what they accepted as philosophical and intellectual findings, which were contrary to Islamic teachings. In other words, in the conflict between reason and revelation, they favored reason, trying to strip Quranic verses of their apparent meanings, interpreting them away in terms of their own intellectual and philosophical principles.

There were Traditional Islamic Reformists, the most influential among whom was 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, who tried to find answers to questions arising as a consequence of the encounter with modernity and Marxist and liberalist philosophies without giving up traditional Islamic principles and without interpreting Quranic verses away in terms of philosophical or scientific theories. For instance, while 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī was a prominent Islamic philosopher in the twentieth century, in the preface to his Quranic exegesis *al-Mīzān* he takes issue with those who interpret the Qur'an in terms of their own philosophical or mystical or scientific beliefs, holding that when the Qur'an characterizes itself as a light, it makes no sense to take anything else as a light with which to illuminate the Qur'an, since a light does not need anything else for illumination. Accordingly, he adopted the method of interpreting the Qur'an with the Qur'an. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and some other scholars, mostly his own students, tried to deploy the advantages of modernity, as can be seen in 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's discussion of freedom of speech, women's rights and place in Islam, social justice, etc. This is why we see the strongest advocacy of, and the strongest opposition to, theories of modernity in his work—he insistently defends a theory of modernity when he finds it in conformity with Islamic doctrines, trying to elaborate it from an Islamic point of view, even if that was disfavored by his contemporary

---

[7] Although some Muslims were also involved in this movement, it should be noted that their reformist activities did not arise from their religious beliefs or their motivations for the promotion of Islam in the society and the pursuit of the ideal Islamic society. This is what distinguishes them from Modern Islamic Reformists and Traditional Islamic Reformists.

scholars; and he unyieldingly criticizes a theory of modernity when he finds it against Islamic doctrines, noting its downsides from philosophical, exegetical, and other perspectives. This is what made him an Islamic freethinker.

From the above remarks it is obvious that the eclectic approach can apply only to Modern Islamic Reformism, and Traditional Islamic Reformism eschews eclecticism concerning Islamic and non-Islamic principles through ignorance or exotic interpretations of Quranic verses and hadiths. Traditional Islamic Reformism seeks to discover the Islamic view of modern issues or questions raised by modernity and liberalist or Marxist schools. In this trend, such research is done without relinquishing Islamic principles and by reliance on outer and inner meanings of the Qur'an (which, according to 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's view, cannot be in conflict with one another)[8] and appeals are made to hadiths from Prophet Muḥammad and his household as teachers of the Qur'an.

What should be noted about 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī is that his career must not be limited to what pertains to Traditional Islamic Reformism. Much of his scholarly career was devoted to the revival of Islamic sciences [9] in light of the philosophical and mystical principles of Transcendent philosophy, which was founded by Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī (1572-1640). In fact, what I refer to as 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's practices within Traditional Islamic Reformism is a byproduct of the revival of Islamic sciences as undertaken by him and other scholars.

3. Under each of the far-reaching trends in twentieth-century Iran, reference is made to influential figures. What should be noted about these figures is that reference to these individuals as prominent figures of the relevant trends does not mean that they were superior in terms of knowledge and ideology to their fellows within those trends. The criterion for this was just the extent to which they influenced the intellectual milieu of the society, and hence, the attention they received by those who wrote about such trends. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī often ignored their publicity and focused instead on their intellectual principles which appeared in their speeches, statements, articles, and books. Finally, since this dissertation is focused on the relation between reason, intuition, and revelation and because of its limited scopes, I cannot address all influential figures in these intellectual trends and consider their theories.

---

[8] See Sayyid Muḥamamd Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1985, *Qur'ān dar Islām,* Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb, pp. 44-50.
[9] By 'revival of Islamic sciences' I mean the majority of Islamic sciences except Islamic jurisprudence and its principles, although he also wrote works concerning the latter two sciences which were also influenced by his philosophical theories.

This categorization is as follows:

1.1.1. Modern Islamic Reformism

Intellectuals in this group tried to present a reformed version of Islam and make it compatible with modernism. They were either reluctant to use the traditional approaches or advocates of anti-traditional approaches for presenting new understandings of Islamic teachings, which are in conformity or less conflict with modernism. Some of these intellectual movements received support from the Pahlavī regime and others were considered, less or more, as antagonists of the regime.

To René Guénon (1886-1951), in many cases, an eclectic approach toward religion and modernity has led to simplification of religion and "religion is replaced by 'religiosity', that is to say by a vague sentimentality having no real significance; it is this that is acclaimed as 'progress'"[10] and this is an experience the west acquired due to setting Christianity apart from major social and political fields. He wrote, "The most typical example is that of Protestantism, in which simplification takes the form both of an almost complete suppression of rites, together with an attribution of predominance to morality over doctrine; and the doctrine itself becomes more and more simplified and diminished so that it is reduced to almost nothing, or at most to a few rudimentary formulas that anyone can interpret in any way that suits him." [11]

A similar approach can be found with individuals such as Mīrzā Fatḥʿalī Ākhūndzāda (1812 – 1878) who was among the pioneers of Iranian nationalism. Although, he did not believe in religion[12], he said, "Abandoning the religion of ancestors is not necessary. We should walk along with our fellow religious adherents in a brotherly manner, but in the heart, we follow the path of truth."[13] He defined Protestantism as, "a school in which the rights of God and obligations of all servants of God are all cancelled and only the rights of people remain."[14]

Āyatullāh Murtażā Muṭahharī (1919-1979) was among important personalities (in the 20th century) who tried to pose serious intellectual and cultural opposition against the eclectic approach, mentioned above, and according to Rasūl Jaʿfariyān, "[he tried to] wipe the dust off

---

[10] René Guénon, 2004, *The Reign of Quantity and The Signs of the Times*, Translated by Lord Northbourne, Sophia Pereniss, page 78.
[11] Ibid., p.77.
[12] Ḥamīd Pārsānīyā, 2000, *Ḥadīth-i piymānih: Pazhūhishī Dar Inqilāb-i Islāmī*, Intishārāt-i Maʿārif, Qum, p. 213.
[13] Friydūn Ādamīyyat, 1970, *Andīshihāy-i Mīrzā Fatḥʿalī Akhūnzādih*, Tehran, Nashr-i Khārazmī, p. 22.
[14] Mīrza Fatḥʿalī Akhūnzādih, 1978, *Alifbāy-i Jadīd wa Maktūbāt*, Compiled by Ḥamīd Muḥammadzādih, p. 112.

eclecticism in Iran."[15] In his different works, he seriously fought this issue.[16] About the eclectic approach toward religion and modernity, he said,

> Every Islamic cultural movement which is to become the backbone of our social movement needs to be originated and nourished from the root of our old culture, not from other cultures. It is not sufficient for guiding our movement in the Islamic path that we eclectically choose parts of other cultures such as Marxism, Existentialism and the like and put an Islamic cover over them.[17]

Some of the influential/famous personalities of this group were Sharīʿat Sanglājī and Ali Sharīʿatī, who are discussed below:

1.1.1.1. Muḥammad Ḥasan Sharīʿat Sanglājī (1891 – 1944): Sanglājī was among famous figures of this group. He was among the first seminarians who preached religious renewal in Iran and the peak of his activities was at the time of Riżā Shāh.[18] Riżā Shāh hated seminarians and took many measures to damage the seminary and cleric society and "the decisions about culture were the sole prerogative of the monarch."[19] There was a great suppression at his time and no seminarian could object these decisions. He only permitted two houses to have activities: House of Sanglājī and his followers and the house of Kasravī and his adherents (about whom, there will be a discussion in the section regarding secularism). Sanglājī and Kasravī were the continuation of Islamic Protestantism (پروتستانتیسم اسلامی).[20] In the introduction of his book titled as *Kilīd-i fahm-i Qur'ān* which was published in 1943, Sanglājī wrote, "It was the first time 14 years ago (1927 – 1928), when I became aware that true Islam was left undiscovered. And this Islam which seminarians talk about and is in the minds of common people is other than the Islam the Prophet (a) brought"[21] In *Kashf al-Asrār*, the founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Āyatullāh Sayyid Rūhullāh Khumeinī addressed Sharīʿat Sanglājī and his group and wrote,

---

[15] Rasūl Jaʿfariyān, 1989, *Murūrī bar zamīnih-hā-yi fikrī-yi Iltiqāt-i jadīd dar Iran*, p. 15.
[16] See: The second section of *Muṭahharī: pāyiguzār-i nahzat-i novīnī dar bazshināsī-yi Islām-i Asīl,* written by ʿAbulḥusayn Ḥakīmīyān, published by Sāzmān-i Mujahidīn-i Inqilāb-i Islāmī, 1982.
[17] Murṭażā Muṭahharī, 1998, *Majmūʿih-yi Āthār*, vol. 24, "Nihzat-hā-yi Islāmī dar sad sālih-yi akhīr", Ṣadrā publication, p. 75.
[18] Rasūl Jaʿfarīyān, 1989, *Murūrī bar zamīnih-hā-yi fikrī-yi iltiqāṭ-i jadīd dar Iran*, Sāzmān-i Tablīghāt-i Islāmī, p. 45.
[19] Mark Juergensmeyer & Mansoor, Moaddel, 2006, M. *Shi'a Islamic Societies. In the Oxford Handbook of Global Religions.*: Oxford University Press p. 452.
[20] ʿAlī Abulhasanī (Munzir), 1983, *Shahīd Muṭahharī, Ifshāgar-i tutiʾih*, Islamic Publication Office and Society of Seminary Teachers of Qum, p. 170.
[21] Muḥammad Ḥasan Sharīʿat Sanglājī, 1943, *Kilīd-i fahm-i Qur'ān*, Intishārāt-i Dānīsh. P. 11.

Are all this fever and frenzy of yours and agitation because people did not obey the order of Imam (a) saying that the grave should be four joined fingers above the ground?![22] Well, then if you are such a pure religious Muslim who becomes upset for just one order of Imam (a), why do not you say even one word about all the sins being committed in Tehran which is the center of Shīʿā? It would be good if you wrote one word about the humiliating removal of hijab, dance gatherings, swimming pools with mixed young girls and boys, drinking intoxicants, usurious transactions of the banks and companies; and the like about which both hadiths and the Qurʾān itself have rulings. So, it becomes clear that there is another purpose involved.[23]

In *Tafsīr al-Mīzān*, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī has comprehensive discussions about the reality of the return of the Imams (a) and some Prophets (a) and a number of pious believers after the reappearance of Imam al-Mahdi (a), about some prophets (a) such as Jesus (a) and Khiḍr (a) being alive and the merit of visiting the dwellers of graves and the possibility that some of the dead intercede for nearness of the visitors [of their graves] to God. These were the issues Sanglājī had criticized in some of his books such as *Islam and Rajʿat* and *Tawḥīd-i ʿibādat; yiktāparastī* and rejected them.

1.1.1.2. ʿAlī Sharīʿatī: Sharīʿatī was a revolutionary Muslim intellectual and a writer and a powerful speaker who had an eclectic approach toward Islam and modernity, sought evolution of human society, especially Islamic society and pursued this evolution in returning to true Islam[24] and moving toward realization of freedom and social justice. "Sharīʿatī can, perhaps, best be described as a sociologist of religion."[25] He saw Islam as an ideology[26], not as a collection of Islamic sciences including *fiqh*, *kalam* and philosophy and regarded actualization of this ideology in the society as his goal.[27] He was a critic of the traditional interpretations of Islam and considered Protestantism in the west an experienced and almost successful model/ movement in developing a social movement toward development.[28] Therefore, he evaluated the

---

[22] According to some narrations from some of the Imams, like the hadith narrated from Imam al-Bāqir (a) in *Wasāʾl al-Shīʿa*, the height of a grave is recommended not be higher than the width of four joined fingers of one's hand over the ground. Āyatullāh Sayyid Rūhullāh Khumeinī criticized the reformation in Islam which Sanglājī called for as being about such not significant matters and ignoring intentionally the primary changes needed for the Iranian Islamic society of that time.

[23] Sayyid Rūhullāh Khumeinī, 1944, *Kashf al-Asrār*, Kitābfurūshī-yi Islamī-ye Tehran, p. 65.

[24] See Pārsānīyā Hamīd, 2000, *Ḥadīth-i piymānih: Pazhūhishī Dar Inqilāb-i Islāmī*, Intishārāt-i Maʿārif, Qum, p. 349.

[25] Mihrzād Burūjirdī, 1996, *Iranian Intellectuals and the West: The Tormented Triumph of Nativism*, Syracuse University Press, New York, p.106.

[26] See ʿAlī Sharīʿatī, *Majmūʾih-yi Āthār*, vol. 2, p. 37.

[27] See Ibid., vol. 2, p. 173 & for his definition of ideology see: Ibid., vol. 11. P.147.

[28] Ibid., vol. 20, p. 294.

traditional approach of the seminary toward the mentioned movement as an invitation to inactivity, silence and contentedness.[29] He was also a critic of western modernity and did not consider the movement of modernity in the west as flawless;[30] while, he regarded the religious teaching of monotheism not only an undeniable truth and justifying the existence of the world of creatures, but rather, saw it as the foundation of humans' unity and in the ideology of the unity of all the creation.[31]

Sharīʿatī was influenced by socialism and considered the establishment of justice, human equality and basing the rights of the oppressed upon the implementation of an egalitarian model, i.e. he rejected private ownership of the means of production and regarded it as the fastest way of removing exploitation, poverty and deprivation of the oppressed.[32] He did not believe in all intellectual and philosophical principles of socialism and was a critic of non-religious socialism. He criticized it in the introduction of an article he wrote in 1355 (1977) titled as *Maktab-i wāsita (Intermediate School of Islam)*,

> Between the two schools of Materialism and Idealism, Islam has its own approach and it can be called realism. The social and economic systems of Islam are the practical Socialism based on theism and is the middle way between the two corrupted regimes of Capitalism and Communism.[33]

Ali Sharīʿatī began a movement which in many ways ran alongside the revolutionary movement led by Āyatullāh Khumaynī, Āyatullāh Muṭahharī and others in fighting the Pahlavī regime, but Sharīʿatī's eclectic views toward Islam and modernity and lack of expertise in Islamic fields resulted in a large degree of criticism of his written work and lectures by traditional scholars of the seminary. People such as Āyatullāh Sayyid Muḥammad Bihishtī (1928 – 1981) wanted to reduce tensions for reasons such as preserving unity and alignment in the fight against the Pahlavī regime,[34] but some people such as Āyatullāh Murtaẓā Muṭahharī insisted that there should not be any compromise regarding intellectual principles of the revolution and different outlooks should be divided from the beginning.

---

[29] Ibid., vol. 5, p. 42.
[30] See ʿAlī Sharīʿatī, *Chi Bāyad Kard?*, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Kāmil, p. 30.
[31] See ʿAlī Sharīʿatī, *Tawhīd wa Shirk*, part 2.
[32] See ʿAlī Sharīʿatī, 2001, *Mazhab ʿAlayhi Mazhab*, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Chāpakhsh, p21.
[33] ʿAlī Sharīʿatī, 2010, Tārikh-I Takāmul-i Falsafih, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Chāpakhsh, p. 9.
[34] See Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusaynī Bihishtī, 2012, *Dr. Sharīʿatī: Justijūgarī dar Masīr-i Shodan*, Tehran: Bunyād-i Nashr-i Āthār-i Shahīd Dr. Bihishtī.

Dr. Sharīʿatī's lack of acquisition and expertise in the fields referred to as Islamic sciences in the seminary[35] made many traditional scholars of the seminary make serious criticisms about his understanding of Islamic teachings and historical analyses of the events in early Islam.[36] Some of them expressed very harsh opinions about him and even excommunicated him[37] and some others such as ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī held a more lenient opinion of him and merely sufficed to express their opinions about incorrectness of his thought and work. For example, when ʿAllāma was asked in a question in a letter, "did you approve the ideas of Dr. ʿAlī Sharīʿatī?" He answered, "I never approved the written work of Dr. Sharīʿatī regarding Islamology. The majority of his ideas are wrong and not approvable according to Islamic documents."[38] In another letter he writes about Sharīʿatī's works: "There is no animosity between Dr. Sharīʿatī and us. The point is that there are some ideas in his works that cannot be justified by Islamic standards (criteria)."[39]

Another factor which made people like Āyatullāh Murtaża Muṭahharī take a position against the thought of Sharīʿatī was due to the latter comparing the political power of the scholars of the church in Middle Ages equal to that of Shīʿā scholars. This eclectic view of Sharīʿatī toward modernity and Islam and his many related lectures in universities and public gatherings, according to Āyatullāh Muṭahharī, "made unrecoverable damage to the harmony of seminarians and the class of educated people and made them very much distrustful toward each other and provoked the feelings of a group of unaware youths toward seminarians."[40]

Ḥamīd Dabāshī (b. 1951) in his book *Theology of Discontent*, after criticizing some of the writers for their highly hyperbolic ideas about the contributions of ʿAlī Sharīʿatī to the formation of the ideology of the Islamic revolution in Iran, writes "Muṭahharī was infinitely more erudite in matters of Islamics than Sharīʿatī could have ever been. Sharīʿatī's ideological contribution to the making of the Iranian Revolution of 1979 ought to be measured and balanced in relation to other prominent figures in this category."[41]

---

[35] For Sharīʿatī's educational background, see ʿAlī Rahnemā, 1994, *Pioneers of Islamic Revival*, London and New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd, pp. 208-218.
36 See Murtaża Motahharī's criticism of Sharīʿatī's idea about Imam Ḥusayn (as) in the following source: Murtaża Mutaḥḥarī, *Yaddashthay-i Ustād Muṭaḥḥarī*, Ṣadrā Publication, vol. 3, pp. 218-221.
[37] Muḥammad Yazdī, 2002, *Khātirāt*, Compiled and published by Makaz-i Asnād-i Inqilābe Islāmī, p. 481.
[38] Sayyid Hamīd Ruhānī, 2011, *Nihżat-i Imām Khumeinī*, Tehran: Chāp-u Nashr-i ʿUrūj, p. 375.
[39] Riża Sanʿatī, 2011, *Guftimān-i Miṣbāh*, Tehran: Markaz-i Asnād-i Inqilābe Islāmī, p. 223.
[40] Murtaża Mutaḥḥarī, *ʿĀlim-i Jāwdān Ustād Shahīd Mutaḥḥarī*,Tehran: Markaz-i Barrasī Asnād-i Tārikhī, p. 444.
[41] Ḥamīd Dabāshī, 1951, *Theology of Discontent; The Ideological Foundation of The Islamic Revolution in Iran*, New York University Press, p. 108.

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī did not have a direct debate or encounter with Sharīʿatī and the only sentences quoted from 'Allāma about 'Alī Sharīʿatī and his works are the ones mentioned above, and there is no other mention of him in the works of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī.

From the above remarks it becomes evident that this intellectual trend promoted by very influential figures such as 'Alī Sharīʿatī firmly believed in the necessity of reforms in Iran as well as the capacity of Islam for fitting into the values and ideals of modernity. In the course of such reform, they were ready to relinquish or interpret away the appearances of Quranic verses and hadiths. Given that some leaders of this intellectual movement, such as 'Alī Sharīʿatī, were not profoundly educated in Islamic seminaries, their theories concerning Islamic doctrines were seriously criticized by Traditional Islamic Reformists.

1.1.2. Traditional Islamic Reformism

Before discussing the attributes of this group, an explanation about the special intellectualism of this group is necessary. The two terms of enlightenment and intellectuality[42] entered Iran from the west. In Iran, two equivalents of the original Arabic (*munawwar al-fikrī*) and Persian (*rushangarī*) were introduced for "enlightenment" and "intellectualism".[43] In his analysis of *munawwar al-fikrī*, Ḥamīd Parsānīyā (b. 1958) writes, "In fact, the first term *munawwar al-fikrī* refers to a kind of thought, a model of thinking, or even a social and epistemological movement that emerged four centuries ago in the west and its social and cultural reflection were brought to Iran at the time of Persian Constitutional Revolution." In analysis of the term *rushanfikrī*, he says, "this word referred to another kind of thought and even social movement. It was formed in the social history of the west, in another period, since the second half of 19th century and was given its specific title in the beginning of the 20th century. Since 1320s [of solar calendar] (1945), after World War II, its historical consequences emerged in Iran."[44] The traditional religious intellectual movement had special epistemological principles toward the world and human beings and had a particular approach toward the intellect, (revelational and

---

[42] *ʿAqlāniyyat* (rationality or intellectuality) and its cognates, such as *ʿaql* (reason), *ʿuqalāʾī* (rational), and *maʿqūl* (reasonable), are concepts over the definition and types of which there is serious disagreement, although they were considered and praised by many intellectual trends (See Ḥasan Rezāʾī, 2012, Pazhūhi, Pazhūheshkadiy-i Bāqir al-ʿUlum). In the Islamic thought, rationality is deployed as a method for discovering the truth and divine commands and considerations, and reason is deployed as a tool for having a profound understanding, although such deployments have been controversial among Muslims—particularly textualists and Akhbārīs, on the one hand, and many Shiite scholars, on the other. Moreover, rationalism was adopted as a method in contrast to the method of revelatory sciences in periods of Iranian history, particularly the years before and after the Islamic Revolution of Iran, and was used as a tool for criticizing and rejecting religious beliefs by atheist intellectuals some of whom are mentioned in this dissertation.

[43] See: Ḥamīd Pārsānīyā, 2013, *Anvāʿ va advār-i rushanfikrī*, Qum: Kitāb-i Fardā, p. 20.

[44] Ibid.

non-revelational) intuition and tradition; however, an accurate look at them disapproves using the terms "Munawwar al-fikrī", "Rushangarī" and "Rushanfikrī" for their intellectual movement. Therefore, instead of using equivalent terms for "enlightenment" and "intellectualism", some writers such as ʿAbdulḥusayn Khusrupanāh used expressions such as "Religious/Islamic intellectualism" (*ʿAqlānīyyat-i Dīnī*) for the aforementioned movement and said, "an intellectualism acceptable with regards to this movement is an intellectualism which approves of revelation, not the modern intellectualism which is against revelation."[45]

This movement, as its name implies, emphasizes maintaining tradition and benefiting from it. Tradition in this understanding can refer to two issues: 1. Preserving scientific heritage of scholars of Islam and Shi's Islam in all Islamic fields especially *fiqh*, ethics, philosophy and mysticism 2. Emphasis on the authenticity of (revelational and non-revelational) intuition beside intellect as the means of acquiring knowledge. Therefore, in this intellectual movement, all jurisprudential works of Islamic scholars from early Islam up to now as well as all the works of personalities such as Al-Fārābī, Avicenna, Khwājih Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī, Suhrawardī and Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrazī in philosophy and theology as well as prominent figures of mystical works such as Ibn ʿArabī would be included in the tradition.[46] For example, in his introduction to *Usūl-i falsafih va ravish-i reālīsm*, Āyatullāh Murtaża Muṭahharī wrote about benefitting from scientific heritage in Islamic philosophy, "this book benefited from one thousand-years of research (which has been carried on by Islamic philosophers) and also, (for writing this book) the views and studies of great scholars of Europe have been fully reviewed."[47]

Another attribute of this movement, thanks to the philosophical school Mullā Ṣadrā founded and called Transcendental Philosophy, brings mysticism, theology and philosophy together. This philosophical school made great efforts to draw a tight relationship between revelation, mystical intuition and intellect and create harmony, synergy and convergence between scientific products of philosophy, mysticism and theology. The influence of this philosophical school in the aforementioned intellectual movement is so much that some writers such as Dr. ʿImād Afrūgh (b. 1956) considered the Islamic Revolution indebted to Mullā Ṣadrā and introduced it an expansion of Ṣadrā's thought.[48]

---

[45] Abdulḥusayn Khusrupanāh, 2010, *Jaryān-shenāsī-yi fikrī-yi Iran-i muʿāsir*, Daftar-i Nashr-i Maʿārif, p. 41.
[46] Ibid., p. 37.
[47] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabātabāʾī, *Usūl-i falsafih va ravish-i reālīsm*, Tehran: Sherkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīyī ʿĀm), vol. 1, Introduction of the book, p. 12.
[48] See Imād Afrūgh, 2008, *Inqilāb-i Islāmī va mabānī-yi bāztulīd-i ān*, Tehran: Sūriy-i Mihr.

Another distinguishing attribute of this group was the belief in epistemological realism. According to this view, the world beyond the mind exists, and it can be learned and taught. One of its implications is that mentally posited entities and facts in the world can be distinguished from each other. Islamic philosophy is basically founded based on this philosophy and as it can be learned from the definition of realism by ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, any discussion which is not based on this view is not included in his understanding of philosophy. In the first article of *Usūl-i falsafih va ravish-i reālīsm*, he wrote about the nature of philosophical discussions, "a philosophical discussion is that which deals with proving the existence and non-existence of things. Now, if it assumed that a person cannot benefit from philosophical discussion (i.e. he cannot acquire any definite knowledge about things), he would be called sophistic (idealism) and is considered the opposite of a philosopher."[49] The last attributes of this group which are not the least in the present study are 1. *Ijtihād*-based look at Islamic sciences, 2. Believing in comprehensiveness of Islam which has plans for all aspects of material and spiritual lives of all members of society and considers politics an inseparable part of religion and 3. Believing that all or most of Islam's teachings have social aspects.

Ijtihād-based look at religious issues is the fruit of having competence in *ijtihād* which may be acquired by a person through many years of scientific efforts, study and research about Islamic sources which are the Qur'ān, hadiths and the conduct of the Prophet (a) and Imams (a), as well as through learning the views of previous scholars. This competence in its current meaning is not only used in *fiqh* (Islamic Jurisprudence), but in early Islam, it was used in all Islamic sciences (in primary and secondary principles and ethics)[50] and the group under discussion emphasizes this level of competence in all Islamic sciences. The evident difference in having competence in *ijtihād* in all common Islamic sciences among the scholars of this group and the scholars of other movements was an important feature that this movement had over other traditional Islamic movements. Of course, it should be noted that there were other movements as well the scholars who gained the level of *ijtihād*, but their *ijtihād* was limited in *fiqh* or other limited issues and the scientific competence in this group toward all Islamic sciences common at that time was not seen in other groups. One of those scholars was Āyatullāh Sayyid Muḥammad Kāẓim Sharīʿatmadārī (1906-1989) and Sayyid Shahāb al-Dīn Marʿashī Najafī [51]

---

[49] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Usūl-i falsafih va ravish-i reālīsm*, Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i ʿĀm), First article, p. 35.

[50] A group of writers, 2018, *Baḥthī darbārih-yi marjaʿiyyat*, Qum: Intishārāt-i Ṣadrā. p. 202.

[51] See ʿAlī Darābī, 2011, *Jaryān Shināsī Sīyāsī dar Iran*, Tehran: Islamic Culture and Thought Research Institute, pp. 73-74.

whose *ijtihād* in *fiqh* was beyond question but they did not have the same level of competence in other Islamic sciences such as Islamic Philosophy or sociology. Some explanations about the second attribute (comprehensiveness of Islam) and third attribute (believing in social nature of all Islamic rules) will be given in other parts of this thesis.[52]

Some of the most influential personalities of this movement were Āyatullāh Sayyid Rūhullāh Khumeinī, ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī, Āyatullāh Murtażā Muṭahharī. Some explanations about the nature of this movement and some of these persons' thoughts, will be given in next parts of the thesis.

From the preceding remarks it follows that Traditional Islamic Reformism was born from the Islamic Seminary of Qum in Iran which, in addition to the necessity of reforms in the society, emphasized the authentic Islamic tradition and never gave up Islamic rulings in order to adapt them to the values of modernity. In addition to Islamic reformist movements, there was a Non-Islamic Reformist movement as well.

1.1.3. Non-Islamic Reformism

This group includes different intellectual, social and political movements and they can be divided to irreligious and anti-religious ones. It seems that one of the common intellectual aspects of all these movements is the issue of the division of politics from religion; an issue which none of the thinkers of the Traditional Islamic Reformism agreed upon and seriously criticized it. The major difference of this group with the first group is that these people had no interest in changing, simplifying or reducing religion for making it compatible with modernity. They basically considered religion a superstition and an obstacle for modernity and development; or they just had problems with political Islam and did not have any special problem with spirituality and religious ethics.[53] The approach the thinkers encountered with Traditional Islamic Reformism was different with that of this group. Some personalities such as Āyatullāh Khumeinī advocated the jurisprudential support of the principle of *wilayat al-faqīh* which was based on the objectivity of politics and religiosity to fight intellectually, socially and politically with this group. Some others such as ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī rather criticized principles of secularism with historical, ethical, philosophical and sociological approaches, and rarely became involved in the discussion of *wilāyat al-faqih*. In other parts of

---

[52] See page 29.
[53] See: Abdulḥusayn Khusrupanāh, and Ḥusayn, Latīfī, 2008, "Darāmadī bar Jaryān-hā-yi fikri-yi muʿāsir-i Iran", Mishkāt Journal, Qum.

this thesis, some brief explanations about 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's view regarding the issue of *wilāyat al-faqīh* will be given.

For the sake of concision, only one of the famous personalities of this group will be studied here.

1.1.3.1. Aḥmad Kasravī (1890 – 1946): He was an Iranian linguist, nationalist, historian and reformist who was first a Muslim and seminarian and later left the seminary and then, according to some research,[54] he abandoned Islam and claimed to be a prophet who brought a new religion called Pākdīnī. It seems that he only invented a new creed rather than a new religion and in *Pursish va Pāsukh*, he answered those who objected to him and regarded bringing a religion equal to prophethood, "if the claim of prophethood is this, then what is its problem?"[55] Based on the way he answered the aforementioned question and also the ideas he raised in his writings, it seems that his Pākdīnī was more a call for extreme reformation in Islam and should not be considered as a new religion nor did he promote himself as a prophet in the sense of how religion and prophets are defined in Islam.

Kasravī was born in Tabriz, where he studied traditional Islamic studies, and was frocked with clerical clothes, delivered speeches on the same minbar (a kind of pulpit in Muslim mosques) on which his ancestors preached.[56] After the siege and occupation of Tabriz by Russians, a person called Ṣamad Khān was appointed as the ruler of Tabriz. He was an old enemy of the Constitutional Movement, and put a lot of pressure on Constitutionalists, including Kasravī. Kasravī was excommunicated by anti-Constitutionalist clergies, lost his audience, and then decided to remove his clerical clothes. For a number of years, he stayed at home and took an interest in modern European sciences such as physics and chemistry. This was evident from his passion for watching Halley's Comet for which he went on the roof every night.[57] His interest in the wonders of nature led him to study scientific journals and rationality. It seems that all these led him to certain anti-religious ideas.

---

[54] See: ʿAlī Riżā Mullāʾī Tavānī, 2014, "Kasravī az Naqd-i Dīnhā tā Dāʿīyiy-i Piyāmbarī", Muṭāliʿāt-i Tārīkh-i Farhangī Journal, Number 19, Tehran.
Also see: Dāwūd Amīnī, 2002, *Jamʿīyyat-i Fadāʿīyān-i Islam*, Tehran: Markaz-i Asnād-i Inqilāb-i Islāmī. pp. 58-59.
[55] Aḥmad Kasravī, 1941, *Mā chi mīkhāhīm*, Tehran, Pāydār publication, p 6.
[56] See Ahmad Kasravi, 1944, *Zindigānī-yi Man*, Tehran: Tārīkh-i Mā, pp. 8-48
[57] See Lloyd Ridgeon, 2006, *Sufi Castigator Ahmad Kasravi and the Iranian Mystical Tradition*, Routledge, pp 5-6; also see Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Husaynī, 2000, Khāṭirāt-i Muḥammad Mahdī ʿAbdkhudāyī, Tehran: Markazi Asnādi Inqilāb-i Islāmī, p. 27 and pp. 71-79.

However, the anti-Shīʿā activities of Kasravī were so much that every year, he organized a book-burning ceremony at the beginning of Dey (December 22) and threw some Shīʿā books of supplication such as *Mafātīḥ al-Janān*.[58] Before introducing Pākdīnī, he criticized religions and believed that after Islam, establishing any new religion is vain and a sign of ignorance; because, Islam promoted theology to such a high level, no higher level would be possible.[59] But later on, in his criticism of Islamic schools (not the original Islam in which he believed), he reached the conclusion that Islamic schools should be obliterated one after another, because making efforts in reviving Islam is a fruitless action condemned to defeat; since, what is left of Islam is all harm.[60]

From this it follows that Non-Islamic Reformism was a reformist movement in Iran which was not concerned with Islam and with guiding society toward Islamic standards, and it even displayed anti-religious beliefs and activities, unlike Modern Islamic Reformism and Traditional Islamic Reformism which were mainly concerned with Islam and the Islamic society. ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī often encountered the intellectual principles of this movement, as will be elaborated in what follows.

1.2. ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī's plan for encountering the intellectual movements of his time

ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī and some of his students such as Murtazā Muṭahharī encountered many of these intellectual movements directly or indirectly. Allāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī challenged them in some of his works such as *Usūl-i falsafih va ravish-i reālīsm* (Principles of philosophy and the method of realism) which was critical of the major ideologies and schools. Meanwhile, his students mostly discussed other intellectual movements which branched from key intellectual movements. The decision to distribute the two tasks, namely confronting major and minor intellectual movements, made it possible to criticize every minor or new movement which opposed ʿAllāma's intellectual principles. It made the task straight forward for ʿAllāma's students and made the scope of their criticism and discussion broader.

The most principal intellectual movements ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī encountered before the Islamic revolution were the communist movement, known as the Leftist movement, and the Rightist movement which was under the influence of liberalism.

Since, the materialist view was the dominant spirit over Marxist philosophy and many other philosophies in the west and the east in the 20th century (and still is), in his criticism of

---

[58] See: Jalāl Āli Aḥmad, 2019, *Dar khidmat va khīyānat bi rushanfikrān*, p. 223.
[59] Aḥmad Kasravī, 2003, *Piymān* (First year), Tehran, Firdus publications, pp. 268 – 269.
[60] Aḥmad Kasravī, 1941, *Mā chi mīkhāhīm*, Tehran, Pāydār publication, p. 193.

contemporary intellectual movements, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī focuses his scientific efforts on assessing and criticizing the materialist view. For example, 'Allāma knew that by using rational arguments, if he could prove that even one immaterial being exists in the world the way for many Islamic philosophical issues would be paved and the doors for the influence of materialist philosophies such as Marxism would be closed. Therefore, in the third article[61] of *Usūl-i falsafih va ravish-i reālīsm* 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī tried to prove the immateriality of human knowledge and brought different rational arguments for his claim, and in later articles,[62] he raised other philosophical issues which were previously not designable or provable for materialist readers and using this very principle of immateriality of human knowledge, he provided arguments against them and proved his claims about them.

1.3. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī encounter with the philosophical and sociological principles of the Leftist Movement

Before the Islamic revolution, the Soviet Union which was based on socialist and communist theories and had great influence on neighboring Iran, so that the Tudeh Party which was mostly the pioneer of the communist movement in Iran could establish a party and political organization. During his exile in France in 1978, Āyatullāh Khumeinī agreed that members of the Tudeh Party could pursue their intellectual, social and political activities and could officially issue their demands in Iran provided that they did not plot against the system.[63] But, four years after Imam Khumeinī gave his conditional permission for their activities, their spying for the Soviet Union was proved in court and their activities were banned.[64]

The communist movement in Iran was not merely political, but it also preached the principles of Marxist philosophy and proposed theories on social issues such as freedom, women, justice, etc. as well. Criticizing this movement, 'Allāma does not limit himself to scientific encounters with the materialist view, but rather he separately criticizes philosophical and sociological principles of the Leftist movement.

For example, in *Tafsīr al-Mīzān*, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī discusses the social school of Socialism and some other materialists and comprehensively criticized their views about lack of fixed moral values. He considered one of the important problems with the followers of this theory, a

---

[61] See "Knowledge and perception" of the book *Usūl-i falsafih va ravish-i reālīsm* by 'Allāma S.M.H. Ṭabātabā'ī.
[62] See "The occurrence of Multiplicity in perception" and "Conventional Perceptions and Concepts" and "God of the Universe and the Universe" of the book *Usūl-i falsafih va ravish-i reālīsm* by 'Allāma S.M.H. Ṭabātabā'ī.
[63] A group of authors, 2009, *Hizb-i tūdih az shikl-gīrī tā furūpāshī*, Political Studies and Research Institute. p. 791.
[64] Ibid.

sophistry they have made which mixes conceptual ascription meaning generality with existential ascription meaning continuation of existence.[65]

Another example given by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī in the sixth article of his *Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism* considers human nature and the human natural need for social life and reliance on other people's services, as well as the natural human need for mutual service in order to define the notion of social justice from a philosophical perspective. In this light, he criticizes the economic system arising from Marxist philosophy, which led to oppression of the capitalist class. In his view, such an economic model results in violations of natural laws governing human existence which demands social justice.

1.4. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī encounter with philosophical and sociological principles of the Rightist Movement

This encounter itself took place in two fields: Social issues and philosophical issues.

A. Social issues: in the field of social issues, most efforts of 'Allāma can be seen in two general categories: 1. In *Tafsīr al-Mīzān* he criticizes and studies the views of different western intellectual schools in the discussions, which includes: discussions about freedom and social justice, women's rights, the status of intellect and intellectualism in Islamic teachings, the relationship between empirical sciences and religious sciences as well as different sociological discussions such as the truth of society and social structures, collective thought, social identity, etc. 2. Writing articles and answering different letters and publishing many of them in journals such as *Maktab-i Islam*. At that time, in order to answer social questions of people who encountered new issues raised from the confrontation of Muslims with modernity, 'Allāma wrote articles many of which were compiled by one of his students, Āyatullāh Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī (1938-2020). They were published in two volumes with the title of *Barrasī-hā-yi Islāmī*. In the introduction of this work, Khusrushāhī wrote,

> Of course, some of these discussions (articles brought in *Barrasī-hā-yi Islāmī*) have been published in previous years, firstly in journals such as: Memorial of Mullā Ṣadrā, Muḥammad: the Seal of the Prophets (a), Maktab-i Islam, the Journal of the Department of Literature, The quarterly of Maktab-i Tashayyu', Rāhnamā-yi Kitāb journal, etc. But, some others have not been published anywhere and were handed over to me by 'Allāma himself. They were published for the first time with the title of *Majmūʿih maqālāt-i*

---

[65] See Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabatabā'ī, 1996, *Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbūʿāt, vol. 1, pp. 563-574.

Ustād. I chose the title *Barrasī-hā-yi Islāmī* as the most comprehensive title which could be chosen for this collection, since this collection contains all different studies in different fields of Islamic discussions.[66]

Two important points which should be noticed are that firstly, the volume of these articles are not comparable to ''Allāma's written works in *Tafsir* (exegesis of Qur'ān), Islamic theology and philosophy; and secondly, they were mostly made when 'Allāma could not yet form a group of his students who later took these responsibilities; but, after he formed such a group, he assigned most of such tasks to his students such as Āyatullāh Murtażā Muṭahharī.

B. Philosophical issues: 'Allāma also had some considerable scientific efforts in encountering philosophical schools (other than communism about which some points were previously mentioned).

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's criticisms regarding western philosophies were not limited to ontological and epistemological questions and offered different theories regarding applied philosophies such as social, sociological, political and moral philosophies, more explanations will be given in the section regarding ''Allāma's works. Briefly said, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī tried to discuss the major principles of his contemporary intellectual movements so that his students would be able to deal with intellectual movements of minor importance and theories based on their teacher's theories. For instance, although the political system accepted by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī for the period of the occultation of Imam al-Mahdī is, in respect of people's role in the election of rulers, very similar to the model known as democracy, he writes the following about the similarity of laws in an Islamic society with those in a democratic society:

> An Islamic society is not dissimilar to democratic societies in that it has two types of regulations: invariable and variable. There are two types of regulations in democratic societies: an invariable kind of regulation, which consists in the articles of the constitution the change of which is outside the qualifications of the consultative assembly or the senate, and only the nation can revoke and repeal an article or a number of articles in the constitution either directly by public votes or by setting an assembly of their representatives. The other type includes particular laws and regulations which are enacted and enforced in the consultative assembly and the senate and in different

---

[66] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Barrasī-hāyi Islāmī,* Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb, vol. 1, p. 11.

centers, and these count as temporary interpretations of the articles of the constitution. The altter are generally subject to changes.[67]

It should not be thought, however, that for 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī the method of Islam is democratic or communist. He writes:

> The Islamic method is neither democratic, nor communist. In its two types of regulations it is clearly different from the above social and socialist methods, since invariable regulations of Islam are enacted by God (may His name be glorified), whereas invariable regulations of other social methods are produced by the nation's collective enacted opinions. Moreover, their variable regulations are fundamentally based on the will of the majority of people, and freedom, or in other words, the understanding and will of the minority (half-minus-one of people) is sacrificed for the will and preference of the majority (half-plus-one of people), regardless of whether their wills are right or not. However, variable regulations in an Islamic society are mainly based on what is right, although they are results of councils of people, and are not based on the will of the majority. They are based on realism, rather than desires and emotions.
>
> In an Islamic society, the right and the real interest of Islam and Muslims should be carried out, regardless of whether or not it is in accordance with the majority. However, in a society of knowledge and piety trained by Islam, the majority never prefers its impulsive wishes to the right and the truth.[68]

Answer to the second question:

Since the beginning of the 20th century until today, different Islamic intellectual movements have emerged in Iran, but none of them were comparable with the Traditional Religious Intellectual Movement in rational competence, the extent of scientific theorization and commitment to the Islamic tradition.

Regarding principles, this intellectual movement considered three important criteria for Shīʿa school: intellectuality, spirituality and justice. The difference between the intellectual movement, 'Allāma led with other intellectual movements in Iran, can be considered in the

---

[67] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Barrasī-hāyi Islāmī*, Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb, vol. 1, pp. 165-6.
[68] Ibid., p. 166.

focus of the movement under discussion in the three following views: 1. Social nature of the whole Islamic instructions and teachings, 2. The power of Islam in answering daily questions and demands, 3. Comprehensiveness of Islam which embraced all political, social, economic, cultural and other arenas and was completely against the separation of religion from politics.

In a way, it may be said that ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī had a concern regarding religion and about western intellectualism and modernity and thus he can neither be considered a total critic of the western intellectual movement[69] and modernity, nor completely supportive of them; but accordingly, it is very important that even though the intellectual model of ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī and the western intellectual model were not vastly different considering the significance they regarded for intellectuality in general and also the issues they discussed; but, regarding the principles, theories and sometimes, the approaches toward different issues, there are considerable differences between these two types of intellectualism.

ʿAllāma Tabtataba'i cannot be considered a so called Revolutionary Islamic Scholar from perspectives namely political opposition and direct scholarly opposition to the Pahlavī regime in his writings, but the ideal Islamic society and the requirements of its political system that he depicted in his works, were in great contradiction and opposition to the social and political system of his time.

All the efforts of ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī for establishing and promoting this model of intellectualism, except for few cases, focuses on scientific-research and educational fields. The fruits of his word were the subsequent volumes of written works and the education of students including Āyatullāh Murtażā Muṭahharī, Āyatullāh Sayyid Muḥammad Beheshtī (1928-1981), Āyatullāh Nāsir Makārim Shīrāzī (b. 1924), Āyatullāh Muḥammad Taqī Miṣbāh Yazdī (1935-2021) and Āyatullāh Abdullāh Javādī Āmulī (b. 1933) and even the current leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Āyatullāh Sayyid Ali Khāmineʾī (b. 1939), who are among the major theorists of the Islamic republic or political-intellectual fighters of Pahlavī monarchy.

---

[69] Western intellectual movement is a literal translation from nomenclature in Persian intellectual discourses and what is often meant by this is a general intellectual movement resting upon materialistic philosophical principles, based in many Western countries such as Germany, the UK, and the USA. It is believed to have produced schools of thoughts such as Marxism and liberalism and influenced certain Asian countries, including Iran. For this reason, the term as it is used in Persian does not refer to any particular philosophical school resting on materialism. In other words, the term 'western intellectual movement' is used to refer to all materialistic philosophical schools born in Europe and America which reject the supernatural—which is a tenet of Islam and is accentuated in Islamic philosophy.

'Allāma considered Islam, a comprehensive religion, which has plans for all aspects of individual and collective lives and their worldly and heavenly felicity. For example, in volume six of *al-Mizan*, *an Exegesis of the Holy Qur'ān,* he wrote,

> Undoubtedly, Islam is a religion that discusses all aspects of human life and explains their rules. It is a religion every part of which is in harmony and concomitant with others; meaning that a unique integrity and unity exists in all its rules and they are interrelated so that if a weakness occurs in one of them, or one of them is lost, its consequence is seen all around the religion, exactly like human body, that when each of its organs has sickness, it has effects on other organs; and when in the body, one organ becomes corrupt or ill, other organs should not be disregarded and the body should not be left with illness, rather, it should be kept healthy and should try to cure its illness. Also, if people's morality is inclined toward materiality, God would not disregard His other rulings.[70]

In order to understand the features and characteristics of the ideal Islamic society from the perspective of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, we need to know his definitions and ideas about the nature and perfection of a society. He believes that the social movement and development of the ideal Islamic society begins with an individuals' spiritual self-building which starts from knowledge and develops by action based on that knowledge. He does not consider the human community an abstract collection such as some apples put in a box, but rather, he believes that society is the product of a true combination of people, which is similar to the combination of soil, water, seed and light that bears new effects which are growth and bearing fruits. Therefore, he considers a society a true, not conventional constitution, which has a new identity, awareness, authority, power, rights and relations with other creatures.

When it comes to explaining the concepts which are related to governing a society, he considers many concepts in political philosophy such as government and ownership among Abstract Conventional Concepts (*Mafāhīm-i Iʿtibārī*) which have true objectives and effects. To explain these types of concepts, he says that instead of saying "Ali came like a lion", one uses the metaphor and says "the lion came", he actually has claimed that Ali is an example of a lion and this convention and abstraction he has adopted is not real in the outside world; but, he has an intention out of this metaphor which is to excite his audience, and this is a rational purpose and true effect resulted by that abstract convention and metaphor. Likewise, when it comes to

---

[70] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabātabā'ī, 1996, *Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 6, p. 211.

proving the superiority of a group of people over others in terms of making decisions and legislating laws and etc. on behalf of them, that particular group claims that they have superiority over people to do certain actions, while this claim is not real in the external world and it is only a matter of convention. What is important here is that there are some goals behind this mental convention and they have true (not conventional) effects in the society. He uses the same argument for some other concepts such as ownership. Therefore, he consideres concepts such as government and ownership of the type of human conventions which people commonly use, for rational purposes and they bear true effects. But, the whole story is centered on the question of who should make these conventions? Do spiritually self-built and faithful people adopt such conventions for the purpose of public and societal interest, or do self-interested people who prioritize their own interests over society use these conventions to suit their own aims?

In conclusion, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī considers Islamic teachings firstly and essentially intended for true human development and mentions them as the goal of prophets as well and believes that only spiritually self-built people can move human society toward an Islamic ideal society. Therefore, he focused his activities on the revival of Islamic sciences under the shadow of theoretical and practical philosophy, so that people's knowledge toward what exists and what does not exist as well as their knowledge about musts and must-nots grows. This acquired knowledge can enable people to act upon what they have learnt about the existing realities and must-do actions and pass through different stages of spiritual self-building.

Answer to the Third Question:

Briefly said, the main goal of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī was the revival of Islamic teachings, development and social movement toward the ideal Islamic society. To create this scientific and social change, he faced two major challenges: 1. Two inaccurate and harmful views which were fossilized in the seminary: A) maximum focus of Islamic teachings and research on *fiqh* and the principles of *fiqh* and disregarding other fields of Islamic sciences, B) the negative opinion of rational and mystical approaches and sciences as held by the majority of the seminary's scholars and thus, their students. 2. Broad and increasing scientific and cultural activities of the Leftist and the Rightist intellectual movements in society which was only countered by an apparent silence and inability of seminarians to answer the views and questions of these movements.

1.5. ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī's plan for Islamic Studies in the seminary of Qum

Āyatullāh Miṣbāh Yazdī, who is among famous Shīʿā philosophers in Iran and has been a distinguished student of ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī for many years, quoted from ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī,

> "When I came to Qum, I made a study about the educational situation of the seminary and the needs of the Islamic society. I did not find much correspondence between those needs and what was available. As an Islamic society, our society needed to know the Qurʾān correctly and benefit from the knowledge treasures of this great divine book. But, there was not even an official class for interpretation of the Qurʾān in all the seminaries. In order that our society could present its beliefs against others' and defend them, it needed the power of intellectual reasoning. There was a need for classes in the seminary to raise the power of reasoning among students; while, there was no such classes at that time. As the people who were in charge of spiritual leadership of people, clergies should be adorned with moral virtues and familiar with spiritual methods; but, even spiritual and moral education for such issues did not exist, and only rare private education for very few people were available."

> "However, in seminaries, there was only *fiqh* and principles of *fiqh* which discussed only a part of the conduct of the Prophet (a) and Imams (a). There was no news of philosophy and rational sciences, or of interpretation of the Qurʾān and other parts of the Book and the Tradition. I found myself obliged to run a class in philosophy, a class in interpreting the Qurʾān and a class in ethics."[71]

This short statement shows how deeply saddened Ṭabāṭabāʾī was about the status of the seminary of Qum and about its silence, weakness and passivity regarding new questions and issues which were quickly being spread by some schools of thought such as Marxism and Materialism.

However, this was one of his motivations for applying such changes to the seminary. The idea that the majority of his scientific contributions were in response to the contemporary scientific challenges and questions of his time, which mostly originated from Communism and Liberalism, is not a precise idea nor able to depict a true image of his contributions and objectives for writing many books and articles about Islamic teachings. Even a glance at all his

---

[71] A group of writers, First cultural conference in the death anniversary of late ʿAllāma Muḥammad Ḥusayn Tabātabāʾī, 1982, *Memorial of ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī*, the Iran Research Institute of Philosophy, pp. 196 – 197.

published works, can reveal the fact that he had at least two main objectives other than confronting the contemporary schools of thought.

His first object was to explain and teach different and deeper aspects of Islamic teachings by using special interpretive and intellectual methods and approaches, which shall be explained in the second chapter of this paper. To achieve this objective, he needed to, firstly make the traditional seminary of Qum recognize the intellectual and philosophical approaches as religiously authentic means for interpreting and studying Islamic teachings. He also had to show the true relation between intellect, revelation and intuition which he believed to be the three sources for knowledge. According to him they do not contradict each other, rather they are in complete conformity and can help one to understand different aspects of Islam and deeper layers of the truth. He writes in this regard in *Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*:

> The conclusion of our discussion is that the method of discussion regarding truths and discovering them is limited to three ways: discovered either through religious apparent texts (revelation and hadiths), through rational discussions or purification of the soul (intuition).[72]

About those who differentiated between the rational way (philosophical), jurisprudential and intuitive (mystical), who considered them in contradiction with each other and tried to interpret the Qur'ān based on their own preferred way, he says,

> Each branch of Muslims has passed through one of these [philosophical, jurisprudential and mystical] ways. Their approaches are like three angles of a triangle; the more you open one angle, the other two become tight and the more you open two angles, the third becomes closed, and the difference between the three [schools] will definitely have influence on the quality of the interpretation of the Qur'ān. The interpretation conducted by a religious person following apparent rules of religion has considerable differences with an interpretation made by a philosopher or a Sufi; as, we clearly see such differences in interpretations and we feel that every exegete has imposed his own school of thought upon the Qur'ān and has not [truly] wanted to know what the Qur'ān says; rather, they wanted to say that the Qur'ān says the same thing they say. Of course, this cannot be generalized to all exegetes. There are few exegetes free from such an error.

---

[72] S. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Tabātabā'ī, 1996, *Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, Vol. 5, p. 282.

You noticed that the divine book – the precious Qurʾān – has approved what is right in these three approaches and rejected the wrong among them and never has there been any truth in the three approaches the Qurʾān has not accepted; and never has there been any truth in the Qurʾān's appearance or in its esoteric meaning that the intellect has rejected nor proven to be contrary to the Qurʾān.[73]

He categorized the efforts made for reconciling the three approaches into four groups:

1. Despite their disagreements in their thought, some scholars tried to make a kind of reconciliation between religious appearances and mystical issues based on their scientific capacities; such as Muḥy al-Dīn b. Arabī, ʿAbd al-Razzāq Kāshānī, Ibn Fahd, Shahīd Thānī and Fayż Kāshānī.

2. Some others try to make a reconciliation between philosophy and mysticism; such as Abī Nasr Al-Fārābī, Shaykh Suhravardī and Shaykh Sāʾin al-Dīn Muḥammad Turkah.

3. Some others tried to make a reconciliation between 'religious appearances' and 'philosophy' such as Qāḍi Saʿīd (Qumī) and others.

4. Some others tried to reconcile between the three approaches and schools, such as Avicenna; as seen in his commentaries and other books and Ṣadr al-Mutaʾallihīn Shīrāzī (Mullā Ṣadrā) in his books and treatises and some others after him."[74]

After mentioning this categorization, he speaks about the success of these efforts and finally he says that none of them could remove these disagreements from the minds of scholars and people in the society.

With all that, the disagreements between these three (philosophical, theological/jurisprudential, mystical) approaches are so deep that these great personalities could not do anything for removing them either; and the more they tried to remove the root of disagreement, the root went deeper and the more they tried to settle the dispute, the more they provoked and expanded it.

And now, you dear reader clearly see that any expert in any of these methods calls the experts in other methods ignorant or foolish and you see ordinary people call the three methods, deviant.

---

[73] Ibid., pp. 282-283.
[74] Ibid., p. 283.

All these complex issues and difficulties befell Muslims the day they did not call the writers to think together, to establish a group for learning religious truths and teachings; and anyone took his own way; while the glorious Qur'ān had said, 'Hold fast, all together, to Allah's cord, and do not be divided [into sects].' (3:103) But, it was only one of the causes of Muslims' disunity as it has other causes as well.[75]

Therefore, showing the true relation between intellectual, theological and mystical approaches was the most challenging work he had to accomplish, due to the historical antagonism between rational and traditional branches of the Islamic discourses in the seminary. The philosophical school of thought to which he belonged is called al-Ḥikmah al-Mutaʿālīyah and he made lots of contributions to its development. This thesis will demonstrate that not being aware of the relation between intuition, revelation, intellect from the viewpoint of this school of thought will prevent the understanding of the main characteristic of his plan for Islamic societies in general and Islamic seminaries in particular.

His second primary objective for his scientific and educational contributions was to envisage a comprehensive image of the ideal Islamic society, based on his philosophical principles and rational interpretation and understandings of Islamic canon, namely Qur'ān, Hadith and conduct of Prophet Muḥammad and his Household.

These reasons, namely the inability of the seminary of Qum to answer questions from different schools of thought and 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's objectives for unveiling different aspects of Islamic teachings and delineating a comprehensive image of Islamic ideal society, made him seriously review the principles and views regarding traditional religious intellectualism and strengthen its pillars.

As is evident from the preceding remarks, the bulk of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's activities in line with the revival of Islamic sciences and the encounter with other intellectual schools and movements consisted in his numerous diverse works, most of which he wrote after his immigration to Qum. A brief introduction to his works can provide us with a better and more precise portrayal of the scope and domain of his scholarly activities and help contextualize his project. Thus, in the next chapter, we will briefly review his books and essays, most of which were written during his lifetime.

---

[75] Ibid.

2. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's Works

As pointed out before, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī was, along his teaching career, a dedicated author who also coaxed his students to writing. He wrote many works in both Arabic and Persian, most of which have been printed and published, although a few—including his commentaries on the book, *Nihāyat al-Dirāya*—are in preparation for publication. His works might in general be divided into three categories in terms of their intended audience: (1) introductory texts for teenagers and youths, (2) introductory texts for students of seminary schools, and (3) research texts. 'Allāma's work was explored by many authors in the Islamic world who write about Islamic doctrines. Moreover, since 'Allāma deals with a wide range of social, cultural, political, economic, moral, philosophical, mystical, educational, historical, exegetical, and other issues in his work, many researchers have directly or indirectly considered and criticized his theories in their work. For instance, in this dissertation which is focused on 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's theories, his account of the relation between reason, intuition, and revelation is presented for the first time. Of course, his view of each of these was previously considered by different researchers[76], but there has been no research in Persian, Arabic, and English with regard to his account of the relation among them and the fundamental impact of understanding this relation on our understanding and construal of Islamic teachings from the perspective of the Qur'an and hadiths, particularly what pertains to the human self-knowledge as well as knowledge of different realms of existence and divine names and attributes.

'Allāma published some of his writings as books. He also wrote essays, most of which were published either individually or collectively. Sometimes one article or essay is published in several collections of his essays. In order to show the exact number of 'Allāma's works in this dissertation, I refer to those written as books under "books" and to the rest as "essays," regardless of the collection of essays in which they are published. The classification of 'Allāma's work that I have in mind in this dissertation is thematic in terms of five disciplines: (1) Quranic and hadith-based works, (2) philosophical and mystical works, (3) works in theology and *kalām*, (4) social and political works, and (5) works in Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*) and its principles (*uṣūl al-fiqh*). Of course, the classification can be extended to include categories such as history, ethics, and education, but since such issues are discussed under one

---

[76] See Ramaḍān Fīrūzjā'ī, 2004, "'Aqlānīyyat Dar Nazar-i 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī", Zihn, no. 17; Muḥammad Ali Ardestānī, 2008, "Waḥy-Shināsī Dar Andīshey-i Tafsīrī 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī", Qabasāt, no. 47; Muḥammad Javād Rūdgar and Mā'idi Shākirīrād, 2013, "'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī wa 'Irfān-i Shī'ī", Pazhūheshhāy-i I'tiqādī wa Kalāmī, no. 9.

of the five headings above, I rest content to these categories.[77] It should be noted that there are other ways to classify 'Allāma's work as well; for example, those concerned with explanation and examination of the Islamic tradition and those written in response to modernity. The trouble with such classifications is that there are few works that might distinctively be characterized in these ways.[78] Therefore, they may not serve as criteria for classification of 'Allāma's work.

As a scholar of Islamic sciences, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī was immensely committed to boundaries and distinctive methods of sciences in his consideration of problems. This can be clearly seen in all of his works. Moreover, his texts are characterized by extreme brevity that has made it very difficult, and in some cases even impossible, to summarize his work while preserving the structure of his discussions. The number of works written by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī during his residence in Najaf (1925-1935) is smaller than the number of works he wrote after his return to Iran in 1935, where he stayed in a village near Tabriz (for 10 years) and then in Qum (for 35 years).

Some of his works were translated into Arabic, English, French, and other languages. English translators of his work include Seyyed Hossein Nasr, William Chittick, 'Alī Qulī Qarā'ī, and Dāwūd Sudāgar. More about this is in my introduction of each of 'Allāma's works below.

2.1. Quranic and Hadith-Based Work

The Arabic word, *tafsīr*, has been translated by different English translators as "interpretation" or "exegesis." As an Islamic terminology, *tafsīr* is used to refer to exegesis of the Qur'an, although in a broader usage, it applies to all words transmitted from Prophet Muḥammad and Shiite Imams as well. Henceforth, by "exegesis" I mean *tafsīr*. In this section of my dissertation (that is, 'Allāma's exegetical work), I use "exegesis" in its broader sense, which includes 'Allāma's exegeses of both the Qur'an and hadiths.

2.1.1. Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān (The Balance in the Exegesis of the Qur'an):

Al-Mīzān is 'Allāma's largest and best-known book as well as one of his most important books (if not *the* most important). It was written and published in Arabic within 20 volumes—8041 pages overall—from 1954 through 1971. Subject-matters tackled by 'Allama in this work are

---

[77] 'Allāma wrote a few works that do not fit any of the above categories. Of these, only has been published: *Nasab-Nāmi-yi Khāndān-i Ṭabāṭabā'ī: Awlād-i Amīr Sirāj al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb* (Genealogy of the Ṭabāṭabā'ī Family: Children of Amīr Sirāj al-Din 'Abd al-Wahhāb). This work was published in 2012 in Qum by Buūstān-i Kitāb.
[78] For instance, books such as *The Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism* and the essay, "Woman's Place and Position in Islam" might be characterized as being wholly concerned with critique or scholarly treatment of contemporary intellectual currents and modernity in Iran.

so multifarious that some people refer to it as the Great Islamic Encyclopedia.[79] Some researchers wrote books in which topics in *al-Mīzān* are classified and topic indexes are provided for it. In 2014, Computer Research Center of Islamic Sciences published a software under *Thematic Dictionary of* Tafsīr al-Mīzān, in which 40,000 topics and 131,000 combined indexes are introduced for *al-Mīzān*.

In his introduction to *al-Mīzān*, 'Allāma provides the following definition of Quranic exegesis: "it is the articulation of the meanings of Quranic verses and the discovery of their intentions and meanings." In the introduction, he briefly surveys the history of Quranic exegesis from early Islam until today (his time). Moreover, he points to various factors that incited so serious disagreements in Quranic exegesis that "led to disputes over everything except the phrase, 'there is no god except Allah and Muḥammad is God's messenger." 'Allāma enumerates five well-known approaches to Quranic exegesis: (1) the method of *Ṣaḥāba* (Prophet Muḥammad's companions) and *Tābi'ūn* (the successors of *Ṣaḥāba*): in the first two centuries after the emergence of Islam, Quranic exegesis was at first restricted to expositions of the meanings of Quranic verses and their "occasions of revelation" (*sha'n al-nuzūl*) and was later extended to citation of *Ṣaḥāba*'s words (except Imam 'Ali (a.)). After Islamic conquests when Muslims encountered different religions and denominations, they became concerned with new theological problems which reshaped their exegetical method, (2) the method of hadith scholars: in order to understand Quranic verses, they rested content to the words of *Ṣaḥāba* and *Tābi'ūn* in exegesis of the Qur'an, remaining silent about Quranic verses on which no words were transmitted from *Ṣaḥāba* and *Tābi'ūn*, (3) the method of theologians: disputes among theologians over their denominations led them to offer theory-laden exegeses and interpretations of Quranic verses; that is, they interpreted such verses in ways that were compatible with their own theories. They provided esoteric interpretations (*ta'wīl*) of verses contradicting their theories, while ensuring that the interpretations remained compatible with the rest of their theological views, (4) the method of Peripatetic and Illuminationist (*Ishrāqī*) philosophers as well as Sufis, and (5) Quranic exegesis in terms of contemporary (twentieth century) natural and social sciences.

'Allāma scrutinizes and criticizes each of these methods. His main objection to all these methods (except that of *Ṣaḥāba* which was very limited) is as follows: they did not consider

---

[79] Muhsin Fasā'ī, May 1992, "Majmu'a Athār 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī", *Āyini-yi Pazhuhish*, no. 13-14, p. 94 and Hamid Algar , "Allamah Muḥammad Ḥusayn Tabataba'i: Philosopher, Exegete and Gnostic", *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3, Oxford University Press. p. 11.

the Qur'an as a scale or measure for achieving guidance. Instead of measuring their religious, theological, philosophical, and all other kinds of views in terms of the Qur'an, they provided esoteric interpretations of the Qur'an in terms of their own beliefs. He criticizes this approach as follows:

> The Transcendent God has characterized the Noble Qur'an as guidance, light, and clarification for everything. Now how is it possible for a light to be enlightened by something else [that is, the sayings of *Ṣaḥāba* and *Tābi'ūn*]? How is it conceivable for a guidance to be in need of something else to guide it? And how can a clarification for everything be in need of something else in order to be clarified?[80]

'Allāma's exegetical method in *al-Mīzān* is the "exegesis of the Qur'an with the Qur'an" or "Qur'an-based exegesis" (*tafsīr al-Qur'ān bi-l-Qur'ān*). Broadly speaking, the method is not his invention—it was, indeed, deployed by many exegetes before him in their interpretations of various Quranic verses. [81] The main point made by 'Allāma—not made by his predecessors—is that, in exegesis of a Quranic verse, the primary source consists in other Quranic verses in light of which the meaning of the verse in question might be clarified. Rational and other transmitted sources are only secondary in the clarification of its meaning. In Āl-i 'Imrān: 7, the Qur'an makes it explicit that certain Quranic verses are "ambiguous" (*mutashābih*) and some are "precise" (*muḥkam*), and the former are clarified by recourse to the latter. 'Allāma does not restrict his method to "ambiguous" verses; rather he believes that, with respect to all Quranic verses, the Qur'an is its own primary exegete. He notes that he derived the method from Shiite Imams' (a.) method of Quranic exegesis.[82]

Hamid Algar says the following about *al-Mīzān*'s exegetical method:

> Ṭabāṭabā'ī's careful examination of the wording of each verse, taken in conjunction with all other verses pertinent to its subject matter, regularly yields fresh and convincing results. The result is that the Qur'an – if the expression be permissible – is enabled to speak for itself, without the concepts.

[80] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Tabātabā'ī, 1996, *Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 1, p. 6.
[81] See 'Alī Ramadan Usī, 2002, *Ravish-i 'Allāmih dar Tafsīr-i al-Mīzān* ('Allāma's Method in *al-Mīzān* Exegesis), Tehran: Sāzmān-i Tablīghāt-i Islāmī, p. 74.
[82] Muḥammad Taqī Miṣbāḥ Yazdī, 1993, "Ravish-i 'Allāmih Ṭabāṭabā'ī dar Tafsīr-i Qur'ān bih Qur'ān", *Pasdar-i Islam*, no. 393 and 394, p. 15.

It should be noted that 'Allāma does not restrict the method of Quranic exegesis to his Qur'an-based method. This method should be comprehended only as "primary" in the sense that we should try to clarify the Qur'an with the Qur'an itself as far as possible. Obviously enough, the method does not work in the case of all Quranic verses—some of them cannot be clarified with this method.

'Allāma's exegesis of each verse proceeds as follows: (1) etymology, meanings, and uses of the words occurring in the verse, (2) exegesis of the verse by an appeal to other Quranic verses, (3) consideration of exegetical hadiths concerning the verse in question, (4) philosophical, theological, mystical, social, and other discussions of the verse. The first two stages can be seen in his exegesis of almost all Quranic verses. The third can also be found in most Quranic verses, since there are exegetical hadiths about many of verses. The fourth stage mainly appears in the first four volumes of *al-Mīzān*, although there are scattered discussions of these sorts in other volumes as well. Moreover, fundamental discussions mostly appear in the first four volumes.[83]

Al-Mīzān has been translated to languages such as Persian and Urdu. Moreover, over half of the book has been translated into English by Sa'id Akhtar Rizvi and Muḥammad Akhtar Rizvi, which is published by WOFIS and Tawus Raja.

2.1.2. Qur'ān dar Islām (The Qur'an in Islam)
'Allāma wrote this book during his residence in Qum. It was first published in 1974. In a preface to the book, Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī says that the book was intended as an introduction of Shiism to the West. In his own introduction to the book, 'Allāma says the following about the main theme of the book:

> The book before the reader talks about the most original source of the holy religion of Islam, and the issue discussed in the book is the place of the "honored Qur'an" in the Islamic world: What is the Qur'an? And what value does it have among Muslims?[84]

In this book, he is concerned with the Qur'an's value among Muslims, its features, the relation between the Qur'an and different sciences, the order of the revelation of Quranic verses, and its circulation among people. The book was translated into English by Assadullah al-Dhakir

---

[83] For more about 'Allāma's method of Quranic exegesis see: 'Abdullāh, Javādī Āmulī, *Shams al-Waḥy al-Tabrizī*, 'Isrā Publication.
[84] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2009, *Qur'ān dar Islām,* Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb, p. 21.

Yate under *The Qur'an in Islam: Its Impact and Influence on the Life of Muslims* with a preface by Dr. Seyyed Hossein Nasr.

2.1.3. Risāli-'ī dar I'jāz (An Essay Concerning Miracle)

This brief essay deals with the definition of miracle and its features, ways of knowing a miracle, the relation between miracles and the law of causation, the way in which miracles signify prophethood, and the like. 'Allāma wrote the essay in Persian during his stay in Qum. The essay was published in different collections of essay, including the book, *I'jāz-i Qur'ān* (The Miracle of the Qur'an), which was first published by 'Allama Ṭabāṭabā'ī Scholarly and Intellectual Foundation.

2.1.4. Risāli-yi Vaḥy (An Essay on Revelation) or Shu'ūr-i Marmūz (The Arcane Sense)

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī wrote the essay in Qum and in Persian. In it, he defines revelation (*waḥy*) and discusses its relation with reason and social sense, the ground of our need to revelation in the society, and the like. The book was first published with a preface and footnotes by Āyatullāh Nāṣir Makārim Shīrāzī in 1981.

2.1.5. Sunan al-Nabiyy (The Prophet's Practices)

The book consists of approximately 410 hadiths concerning Prophet Muḥammad's (s.) appearance and conducts. It was written in Arabic during 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's stay in Najaf in 1932. Five hundred more hadiths were later added by one of his students to the book, which appear in some of its editions as *addenda*.[85] In this book, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī cites hadiths from Shiite sources only. The book was translated by Tahir Ridha Jaffer into English and was published by Islamic Publishing House in 2006.

2.1.6. Commentaries on Biḥār al-Anwār (Seas of the Lights): 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's critiques of 'Allāma Majlisī

Biḥār al-Anwār al-Jāmi'a li-Durar Akhbār al-A'imma al-Aṭhār (Seas of the Lights Containing Pearls of Hadiths from the Pure Imams) is the largest Shiite source of hadiths in Arabic compiled, classified, and commented by 'Allāma Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī (1627-1699). The book was published during the author's life in 25 volumes in the folio format, but its modern reprint is published in 110 volumes. It contains nearly 85000 hadiths from Prophet Muḥammad (s.) and his Household (a.). 'Allāma Majlisī lived during the Safavid reign in Iran when Akhbarism was prevalent. He added his analyses and exegeses of some of the hadiths in

---

[85] See Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī's preface to *Sunan al-Nabiyy*, p. 15: he quotes this from Sayyid 'Abd al-Bāqī Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 'Allāma's son.

the book. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī regards 'Allāma Majlisī as the reviver of the work and hadiths of Shiite Imams (a.), although he does not see him as an expert in profound philosophical issues.[86]

After ten years of teaching *Biḥār al-Anwār*,[87] 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī began writing commentaries on the book, in which he criticized some analyses and interpretations by 'Allāma Majlisī in his comments on some of the hadiths. The commentaries were published as footnotes to *Biḥār al-Anwār*'s reprint by Dar al-Kutub al-Islāmīyya Publication. Faced with widespread oppositions by Akhbari scholars in Qum and Najaf, 'Allāma had to quit writing the commentaries.[88] In these commentaries, he writes the following about 'Allāma Majlisī's views about philosophical issues: "it is more cautious for a person who is not familiar with profound intellectual problems to make recourse to apparent meanings of the Qur'an and nearly frequently transmitted (*mustafīḍa*) hadiths, leaving the grasp of their truths to God. Such a person should avoid any positive or negative engagement in profound intellectual issues."[89] The bulk of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's commentaries on this book is concerned with 'Allāma Majlisī's comments on intellectual problems, rather than the hadiths themselves.

2.1.7. Commentaries on Uṣūl al-Kāfī (Principles of the Sufficient)

Uṣūl al-Kāfī is the first among the three parts of the major Shiite collection of hadiths, *al-Kāfī*. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* contains hadiths concerning Shiite beliefs, the life of Shiite Imams, and some hadiths about how a Muslim should behave. *Al-Kāfī* is one of the most important and the most credible Shiite sources of hadiths collected by Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb, known as al-Kulaynī (869-941).

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī wrote commentaries on al-Kulayni's comments in the book in the style of his commentaries on *Biḥār al-Anwār*. His commentaries began to be published in *al-Kāfī*'s reprint, but again he quit writing the commentaries because of objections by some Akhbari scholars.

---

[86] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusaynī Ṭihrānī, 2005, *Mihr-i Tābān*, Mashhad: Nūr-i Tābān-i Qur'an, p. 55-56.
[87] A group of writers, 2002, *Marzbān-i Vaḥy va Khirad: Yādnāmi-yi Marḥūm-i 'Allāmih Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, Qum: Buūstān-i Kitāb, p. 670.
[88] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Tabātabā'ī, 2008, *Majmū'a Rasā'il 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, prefaced by Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī, vol. 3, p. 9.
[89] Ibid. p. 62.

2.2. Philosophical and Mystical Books

2.2.1. Bidāyat al-Ḥikma (The Beginning of the Wisdom)

This is a one-volume introductory text concerning Islamic philosophy. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī wrote it at the age of 67.[90] The book was published by Publications of Jāmi'i-yi Mudarrisīn (Society of Seminary Teachers of Qum), which publishes the main texts of Shiite seminaries. This sent a strong message to opponents of philosophy in Iran. The bulk of the book is written in the style of the philosophical school of Transcendent Wisdom (*al-Ḥikmat al-Muta'āliya*), but in some cases, it contains 'Allāma's novel theories or the more popular ideas as well. The book was written for people who want to learn Islamic philosophy, but it seems to be approachable only by a seminary student; in fact, it is not intended as an introduction to Islamic philosophy. The book was translated into English by 'Ali Qulī Qara'ī and was published as *The Elements of Islamic Metaphysics (Bidayat al-Hikmah)* in 2019.

2.2.2. Nihāyat al-Ḥikma (The Ultimate Wisdom)

This is another introductory book about Islamic philosophy, written by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and published in three volumes. It is more sophisticated and more elaborate than *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*. Presently, seminary students in Iran are taught *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma* at first and then *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma* as their main textbooks in philosophy. The book has not yet been translated into English.

2.2.3. Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālism (Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism)

This is one of the most important works by 'Allāma, written in response to materialistic philosophy, in general, and dialectical materialism, in particular. These philosophies were promoted in Iran at the time. The book, written in Persian, contains 14 articles: the first article concerns the subject-matter of Islamic philosophy, articles 2-6 are concerned with realistic epistemology, articles 7-13 are about ontology (e.g. existence, unity, motion, and causation), and the last article is about God, His relation with creatures, and the creatures' relation with Him. The book establishes the foundations of Islamic epistemology. His theory of constructed concepts (*al-mafāhīm al-i'tibāriyya*) is one of his philosophical innovations. The book was first published in 1995 as annotated by Āyatullāh Murtażā Muṭahharī's comments and discussions. Āyatullāh Javādī Āmulī, a student of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, says the following about Muṭahharī's commentaries on the book: "these commentaries were indeed formulations and revisions of lectures given by late 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī when he taught the text." In his preface to the book,

---

[90] See 'Alī Shīrvānī's preface to his *Translation and Exhibition of Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*, vol. 1, p. 15.

written in 1945, Murtażā Muṭahharī writes the following about one purpose of writing the book as well as how it was written:

> Since a few years ago, ['Allāma] began to establish a circle of philosophical discussions and critiques—participated by a number of scholars—and since two and a half years ago, His Excellency was supposed to prepare materials during the week, which were read out in the circle's assemblies—which met two nights a week—and then everyone commented on those writings. I had the honor of attending these assemblies until one and a half years ago when [those assemblies] met in Qum. These assemblies still continue.[91]

Āyatullāh Javādī Āmulī (1933-) traces the Iranian society's serious encounter with the elements of Western thought to nearly one century ago, making the following comments on this book's significance: "the book, *Principles of Philosophy*, was a consequence of the first encounter between Islamic philosophy and philosophies imported to the written culture of the Iranian society from the Western world."[92] He says that, when the book was written, people whose views were criticized in the book passed over the critiques in striking silence. They never wanted to, or could, open the doors of dialogues.[93] The book has not yet been translated into English.

2.2.4. Commentaries on al-Ḥikmat al-Mutaʿāliya fī-l-Asfār al-ʿAqliyyat al-Arbaʿa (The Transcendent Wisdom in the Four Intellectual Journeys)

Al-Ḥikmat al-Mutaʿāliya is the most important book written by Ṣadr al-Mutaʾallihīn Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī, the founder of the philosophical school of Transcendent Wisdom. It greatly reshaped Islamic philosophy because of its novel theories and its attempts at reconciling the findings of reason, revelation, and mystical intuition. ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī was a follower of this philosophical school, although he was dubbed the founder of a new philosophical school, called "neo-Sadraean," given his remarkable philosophical innovations. ʿAllāma wrote numerous commentaries in exposition, and sometimes in critique, of Ṣadr al-Mutaʾallihīn's views. They were first published in 1959 as footnotes to the 9 volumes of *al-Asfār*. He refused to write commentaries on some parts of the book, such as its discussion of resurrection, because of his

---

[91] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabāʾī, 1985, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Riʾālism,* Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i ʿĀm), vol. 1, p. 13.
[92] ʾAbullāah Javādī Āmulī, 2008, *Sharīʿat dar Āyini-yi Maʿrifat* (Sharia in the Mirror of Knowledge), Qum: ʾIsrāʾ Publication, pp. 18-19.
[93] See: Ibid, pp. 18-20.

fundamental disagreements with Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn.[94] No English translation for these commentaries was found.

2.2.5. *Risāli-yi 'Ali 'Alayh al-Salām va Falsafi-yi Ilāhī (Essay on 'Ali (a.) and Divine Philosophy)*

The essay provides a general account of the purpose of philosophy; in particular, it accounts for the purpose and subject-matter of Islamic philosophy and its relation with Islam. In this essay, he tries to reconcile philosophy and religion—to make a harmony and agreement between the two. He offers philosophical arguments to show that there is no contradiction or conflict between religion and philosophy; instead, they have common goals. 'Allāma cites Imam 'Alī's (a.) words, from which he derives a number of philosophical points, accounting for their relation with Islam.[95] Early in the essay, 'Allāma says: "it is, indeed, a great injustice to divide the divine religion and the divine philosophy." No English translation was found for the essay.

2.2.6. *Al-Rasā'il al-Sab'a (Seven Essays)*

Six of these essays were written by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī during his stay in Tabriz, and "Risālat al-Quwwa wa-l-Fi'l" was written in Qum. Here are the essays: 1. "Risālat al-Burhān" (Essay on Proof), 2. "Risālat al-Mughālaṭa" (Essay on Fallacy), 3. "Risālat al-Tarkīb" (Essay on Composition), 4. "Risālat al-Taḥlīl" (Essay on Analysis), 5. "Risālat al-I'tibārāt" (Essay on Constructs), 6. "Risālat al-Manāmāt wa-l-Nubuwwāt" (Essay on Dreams and Prophecies), and 7. "Risālat al-Quwwa wa-l-Fi'l" (Essay on Potentiality and Actuality). Generally speaking, the first four essays are concerned with logic, and the most important among these is "Risālat al-Burhān," because it discusses philosophy of knowledge and the criterion of certainty. "Risālat al-I'tibārāt" involves a philosophical discussion, and the sixth essay is based on the problem of constructs. The last essay deals with potentiality and actuality as well as motion. In fact, this collection of essays is an interdisciplinary study of philosophy and logic directed at a shared subject-matter between the two. What connects these issues, in 'Allāma's view, seems to be the problem of constructs. In the four logical essays, 'Allāma talks about constructs, and in the essay on constructs, he elaborates on the issue. The essay on dreams is based on the conclusions

---

[94] See: *A group of writers, 2002, Marzbān-i Vaḥy va Khirad: Yādnāmi-yi Marḥūm-i 'Allāmih Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, Qum: Buūstān-i Kitāb, p. 106-107.

[95] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Tabātabā'ī, 2009, "'Alī (a.) va Falsafi-yi Ilāhī," Qum: 'Intishārāt-i Jāmi'i-yi Mudarrisīn, p. 8.

of the essay on constructs. *Prima facie*, the essay on potentiality and actuality seems to be irrelevant to the problem of constructs, but given 'Allāma's account of the role of constructs in human actions and the human motion toward perfection, the relevance becomes obvious. Thus, all these essays are more or less related to the issue of constructs. These essays were first published in 1983 by 'Allāma Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī Scholarly and Intellectual Foundation. They were later edited and reprinted together with some other essays by 'Allāma under *Majmū'a Rasā'il al-'Allāmat al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī* (Collection of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's Essays). No English translation for these essays was found.

2.2.7. Risālat al-Wilāya

Given the definitions of philosophy, mysticism, and theology (*kalām*), which will be elaborated later, this seems to be 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's only essay concerning theoretical mysticism. Theoretical mysticism has two essential pillars: (1) personal unity (*al-waḥdat al-shakhṣiyya*) of existence, and (2) perfect human (*al-insān al-kāmil*).[96] In this work, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī is mostly concerned with the second pillar, and in other works, such as *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya* (Essays on Monotheism), he talks about unity of existence.[97] Āyatullāh 'Abdullāh Javādī Āmulī published an exposition for this essay under *Shams al-Vaḥy-i Tabrīzī* (The Sun of Revelation from Tabriz), which is indeed a compilation of his own lectures on the essay. One of 'Allāma's students asked him to give him permission for translating the essay into Persian, 'Allāma replied: "do not do this; the book is not intended for the public, so some people might not accurately understand it and get deviated."[98]

The essay has been translated into different languages. M. Dasht Bozorgi and F. Asadi Amjad have translated it as *The Return to Being: A Translation of Risalat al-Walayah*.

2.2.8. Risāla Lubb al-Lubāb fī Sayr wa Sulūk Uli-l-Albāb (The Kernels of Kernels in Wayfaring and Journeying of the People of Intellect)

This essay consists of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's ethical and mystical lectures in 1970-1971, written and edited by Āyatullāh Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ḥusaynī Ṭihrānī. It has been translated into English by 'Ali Quli Qara'i as "Lub al-Lubab (the Kernels of Kernels), A Short Treatise on Wayfaring."

---

[96] See: Ḥasan Ramażānī, *2013,* Compiled by Javān, Vaḥīd Vāḥīd, *'Irfān-i 'Allāmih Ṭabāṭabā'ī dar Bayān-i Ustād Ḥasan Ramażānī*, Qum: Sībṭ al-Nabīyy, p. 119.
[97] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Tabātabā'ī, 1999, *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*, Beirut: Mu'ssisa al-Nu'mān, p. 5-7; also see *Barrasī-hāyi Islāmī*, vol. 2, p. 14.
[98] Sayyid 'Alī Tihrānī, 2010, *Zi Mihr Afrūkhtih* (Blazed by Sun), Tehran: 'Intishārāt-i Surūsh, p. 95.

2.3. Works in Theology and Kalām

2.3.1. Shi'ih dar Islām (Shī'ā in Islam)

This was part of a project to introduce Shiism to the West by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and some of his students.[99] In this book, he surveys the history of development of Shiism and its sects. It provides an account of the characteristics of Shiism as well as the Shiite perspective on principles of Islamic belief. It was translated into English by Seyyed Hossein Nasr and was published with his introduction in 1975.

2.3.2. Shi'ih: Majmū'ih Muẕākirāt bā Prufusur Hānrī Kurban (Shī'ā: Dialogues with Professor Henry Corbin)

This is a collection of dialogues and correspondences between Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī and Professor Henry Corbin in 1959. It was first published under *Maktab-i Tashayyu'* (The School of Shiism). In these correspondence and dialogues, 'Allāma deals with issues concerning how Shiism emerged and problems faced by Shī'ās after the demise of Prophet Muḥammad (s.). In one part of the book, Corbin's questions and 'Allāma's answers to them are cited. Corbin's questions can be summarized as follows:

1. What is the spiritual and internal comprehension of the Qur'an in the inner truth of the Shiite denomination?
2. How does this spiritual and internal comprehension imply knowledge of the Imam?
3. Why did Islamic philosophical ideas find a new life only in Iran, rather than other parts of the Islamic world?

Henry Corbin was a French philosopher and a professor of Shiite studies in Sorbonne University. He met 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and had dialogues with him since 1959—their interactions lasted for twenty years.[100] He believes that the only living and authentic denomination in the world is Shiism, because it believes in a living Imam as a foundation of its beliefs. "Shiism is always alive in virtue of its reliance on Imam al-Mahdī (a.) who is alive."[101] Dialogues between 'Allāma and Corbin have been translated into five languages: Persian, Arabic, French, Italian, and English.

---

[99] See Seyyed Hossein Nasr's introduction to the book.

[100] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusaynī Ṭihrānī, 2005, *Mihr-i Tābān* (The Shining Sun), Mashhad: Nūr-i Tābān-i Qur'an, pp. 75-76.

[101] Ibid., pp. 74-75.

2.3.3. Risālat-i Tashayyu' dar Dunyā-yi Imrūz (The Mission of Shiism in the World Today)

This book consists of more dialogues between 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and Henry Corbin in 1961. In fact, it counts as a second volume for *Shī'ā: Dialogues with Professor Henry Corbin*. It deals with the condition of the Shī'ā in the world today, considers certain Christian doctrines such as Immanence, and explores Shiite doctrines in spiritual and mystical terms. It seems that the book has not been translated from Persian into English.

2.3.4. Gulchīnī az Ma'ārif-i Tashayyu' (An Anthology of Shiite Doctrines) or Gulchīn-i Adabī-yi Shi'ih (A Literary Anthology of the Shī'ā)

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī wrote this book in Arabic. It contains excerpts from supplications and spiritual words of Shiite Imams, short biographies of Shiite Imams, and the text of Imam 'Alī's Letter to Mālik al-Ashtar. *A Literary Anthology of the Shī'ā* is the third and the last book in the series of books written by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī as introductions of Shiism to people in Europe and the USA: it was preceded by *The Qur'an in Islam* and *Shī'ā in Islam*.[102] This book has been translated by William C. Chittick from Persian into English as *A Shi'ite Anthology* and was published with an introduction by Dr. Seyyed Hossein Nasr in 1981.

2.3.5. Ta'ālīm-i Islām (The Teachings of Islam)

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī wrote the book in 1963 as a textbook of Islamic doctrines for teenagers (students of primary 5 and 6) in 'Alavī School. In the first year, 10,000 copies of the book were published and distributed free of charge by some philanthropists—the book was received well by people.[103] It is written in Persian and has been published under different headings, such as *Āmūzish-i 'Aqā'id va Dastūrāt-i Dīnī* (Teaching the Beliefs and Religious Commands), *Khulāṣi-yi Ta'ālīm-i Islāmī* (A Summary of Islamic Teachings), and *Āmūzish-i Dīn* (Teaching the Religion). It consists of four essays concerning beliefs, ethics, rulings, and social relationships. Āyatullāh Javādī Āmulī wrote an introduction to a version of the book published by Jānbāzān Publications in 1991. In this introduction, he says: "although the contents of the book are formulated in simple words, it is not easy to comprehend its depth. Of course, it is not difficult to have an acquired understanding of the book."[104] There are two English translations

---

[102]Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1981, *A Shi'ite Anthology*, Introduction by Sayyid Hossein Nasr, The Great Britain: Muḥammadi Trust of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

[103] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2008, *Ta'ālīm-i Islām*, introduction by Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī, Qum: Buūstān-i Kitāb, pp. 19-20.

[104] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1991, *Āmūzish-i 'Aqā'id va Dastūr-hāyi Dīnī*, Tehran: Mustaz'afān va Jānbāzān Publication, p. 12.

of the book: one under *Islamic Teachings in Brief* and the other under *Islamic Teachings: An Overview*. The latter was translated by R. Campbell in 2015.

2.3.6. Al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya (Essays on Monotheism)

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī wrote this book in Arabic based on his own favored account of theological method. It was posthumously published in 1995. As to its contents, the book can be divided into two sections: the first section includes four essays on the principle of monotheism, and the second includes three essays about the human being before this world, in this world, and after this world. In these latter essays, 'Allāma deals with different issues concerning the human development from the beginning to the end. It should be noted that the essay, "al-Insān ba'd al-Dunyā" (The Human After This World), is the only work by 'Allāma exclusively devoted to resurrection.

In the first section of the book, 'Allāma draws on many Quranic verses and hadiths to articulate several fundamental issues concerning the principle of monotheism. He presents different philosophical arguments to support his own interpretation of the transmitted evidence. In line with his favored theological method, 'Allāma tackles some mystical issues based on Quranic verses and hadiths. Although 'Allāma discusses monotheism more or less in almost all of his work, some issues addressed in this book cannot be found in any other works of his. This book has not been translated into English.

2.4. Social and Political Work

2.4.1. Barrasī-hāyi Islāmī (Islamic Investigations)

This book is a collection of articles as well as questions and answers by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī—the articles were written on different occasions and the correspondences were made during years. The book was edited and published in two volumes by Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī—who was 'Allāma's student from a young age and made extensive efforts to compile and publish 'Allāma's work in Persian. As Khusroshāhī says in his introduction to the book, "some materials of the book were previously published in journals such as *Yādnāmi-yi Mullā Ṣadrā* (Mullā Ṣadra's Memorandum), *Muḥammad Khātam-i Payāmbarān* (Muḥammad the Last Prophet), *Maktab-i Islam* (The School of Islam), *Majalli-yi Dānishkadi-yi Adabiyyāt* (The Journal of the College of Literature), *Faṣlnāmi-yi Maktab-i Tashayyu'* (The School of Shiism Quarterly), *Rāhnamā-yi Kitāb* (The Book Guide), and the like. Some other materials were not

previously published and the master himself [i.e. 'Allāma] handed them to me—these are published in this volume for the first time."[105]

The book encompasses various philosophical and social issues. I have classified the book as a work concerning social and political studies, because some of 'Allāma's views concerning political and social issues, particularly the place of woman in Islam, are exclusively discussed in this book. Some chapters of the book were translated into Persian under *Islām va Insān-i Muʿāṣir* (Islam and the Contemporary Man). Dawud Sodagar has translated the book into English under *Islam and the Contemporary Man* in 2010.

2.4.2. Ravābiṭ-i Ijtimāʿī dar Islām (Social Relationships in Islam)

This is, indeed, a Persian translation of some of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's lectures of Quranic exegesis (in Arabic), written down and edited by Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī and Muḥammad Javād Ḥujjatī Kirmānī. Part of the book—the discussion of *tafwīḍ* (God's delegation of actions to people) from a Quranic perspective (as well as some other Quranic issues), which were reviewed and endorsed by 'Allāma himself. The book is derived from *Ashīʿāt al-Qurʾān* (The Rays of the Qur'an), which is not completely published yet.[106] The book talks about different issues concerning the nature of society, relations between individuals in a society, and Islamic consideration of social problems. The book has not been translated into English.

2.4.3. Risāli-yi Wilāyat va Ziʿāmat (Essay on Guardianship and Rule)

This is one of the most important social-political essays by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī. The issue of *Wilāya* (guardianship) in the society in general and *al-faqīh* (guardianship of the jurist) in particular are explored in this essay from an Islamic social philosophical (rather than a jurisprudential) perspective.[107] The essay was written when Grand Āyatullāh Burūjirdī—the undisputed authority of Shīʿās in Iran—had passed away, the Shiite society had become upset and troubled, and controversies had broken out about "Marjaʿiyya" (Shiite authority) and its role in the society. Some Muslim scholars and intellectuals began to co-author a book under *Baḥsī darbāri-yi Marjaʿīyyat va Rūḥāniyyat* (A Discussion of Authority and Clergymen). The book contains 9 articles by different people some of whom—including 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and Murtażā Muṭahharī—authored more than one article in the book. The book was first published by Shirkat-i Sahāmī-yi Intishār in December 1962, and was later reprinted. Finally, its

---

[105] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2009, *Barrasī-hāyi Islāmī*, Qum: Buūstān-i Kitāb, vol. 1, p. 11.
[106] See Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī's introduction to this book, p. 9-19 and Muḥammad Javād Ḥujjatī Kirmānī's introduction to the chapter on Predestination (*jabr*) and Delegation, p. 147-148.
[107] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2018, "Wilāyat va Ziʿāmat," *Baḥsī darbāri-yi Marjaʿiyyat va Rūḥāniyyat*, Qum: Ṣadrā, p. 162.

copyright was transferred to Sadra Publications. To my best knowledge, there is no English translation of the essay.

2.4.4. Ijtihād va Taqlīd dar Islām va Shī'ih (Ijtihad and Emulation in Islam and Shiism)

This is another essay written by 'Allāma in the book, *Baḥs̱ī darbāri-yi Marja'iyyat va Rūḥāniyyat*. In this essay, 'Allāma restricts emulation (*taqlīd*) to practical rulings and commands of Islam. He investigates the religious validity of emulation and ijtihad, maintaining that the most important reason for permissibility of emulation for a person who is ignorant of practical rulings is the continuous practice of Muslims from early Islam until today—they have always practiced in this way. Moreover, he considers the issue of emulation in the background of social relationships: he takes the necessity of emulation as an innate idea built in humans, exercised by people as a way of meeting their needs. No English translation for this essay was found.

2.5. Works in Jurisprudence and Its Principles

Two points about 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's work in jurisprudence and its principles are in order:

1. 'Allāma wrote commentaries on *Nihāyat al-Dirāya* (The Ultimate Cognizance) by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Gharawī Iṣfahānī[108] (1879-1942), which are not published yet.

2. 'Allāma has no published work concerning jurisprudential issues, but in his Quranic exegesis, *al-Mīzān*, he seriously discussed verses concerning jurisprudential issues, elaborating upon his views.

2.5.1. Ḥāshiyat al-Kifāya (Commentaries on al-Kifāya)

'Allāma wrote commentaries on *Kifāyat al-Uṣūl* (The Sufficiency in the Principles)—one of the most important Shiite work in Principles of Jurisprudence—by Muḥammad Kāẓim Khurāsānī[109] (1839-1911) during his residence in Najaf, but these commentaries have not been published yet. He wrote other commentaries on this book during his residence in Qum. These latter commentaries were published under *Ḥāshiyat al-Kifāya* in Arabic in two volumes. 'Allāma wrote the commentaries in 1948-1949, but the date of their publication is not precisely known. This is not translated into English.

---

[108] Muḥammad Ḥusayn Gharawī Iṣfahānī, known as Kumpānī, was a well-known Shiite philosopher and scholar of jurisprudence and its principles in 19th and 20th centuries. He was one of the most important teachers of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī in Najaf in Principles of Jurisprudence.
[109] Muḥammad Kāẓim Khurāsānī, known as Ākhūnd Khurāsānī, was a Shiite jurist, philosopher, and politician. He undertook the general authority of the Shī'a after the demise of Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Shīrāzī (1815-1895).

Of the work mentioned above, *Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism* is the major and most-cited philosophical work by ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī dealing with philosophical schools that have been influential on intellectual movements referred to in the preceding chapter. The first five volumes of *al-Mīzān* contain many discussions of the political and social system of Islam as well as profound discussions of Islamic sociology which crucially contributed to the portrayal of the ideal Islamic society in Iran in the twentieth and the present centuries. The book *Philosophical Investigations* contains many of the so-called intellectual views of ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī. In this book, while he insists on Islamic regulations, he takes issue with traditional ideas and customs that are not in fact originated in Islam, but in the culture of Muslims, coming closer to certain human values in modernity, including the freedom of speech and women's civil rights. What is relevant to the main subject-matter of this dissertation appears in ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī's philosophical books, including *Bidāyat al-ḥikma*, *Nihāyat al-ḥikma*, *Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism*, as well as some of his theological books, including *Al-rasāʾil al-tawḥīdiyya* and his Quranic exegesis *al-Mīzan*. Since the issue plays a fundamental role in the study of Islamic doctrines, ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī offers elaborate discussions of the relation between reason, intuition, and revelation in different guises.

3. Intellect

3.1. Introduction

The aim of this section is to consider and analyze 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's definition of reason and his view of its palce and order so as to arrive at an understanding of its relation with intuition and revelation. Although the word *'aql* (reason or intellect) is not used as a noun in the Qur'an, its verbal form frequently occurs in the Qur'an. In his *al-Mīzān*, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī explains the meaning of the word as follows: "*'aql* is an infinitive form of the verbs *'aqal, ya'qil*: comprehension and full understanding of something."[110] He believes that it is lax to refer to reason as a faculty, since reason is identical to the human "perceptive soul."[111] 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī is among the scholars who are committed to a sharp demarcation of sciences, which is why he considers and defines reason once in the Quranic literature, and once again he deploys philosophical arguments to examine the nature and features of reason. In his philosophical articulation, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī offers a definition of reason similar to the one he offers in the Quranic literature. He considers what serves as objects of cognition to prove different realms of existence, and then he presents a philosophical argument to show the extent to which the realm of reason can be extended and the entities which it might know, and how it might know them.

3.2. Definition and Types of Intellect in 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's View

In this section, I deal with the definition and degrees of intellect or reason (*'aql*) as well as types of intellectual perceptibles (*al-mudrakāt al-'aqlīyya*) in 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's view.[112]

3.3. Intellect in 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's Philosophy of Mind

According to 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, the human existence consists of two closely connected dimensions: material and immaterial (*mujarrad*).[113] It is their connection that guarantees the human continued life and evolution in this world. In his view, the human being is analogous to a sea that has both shallow and deep areas. Just as the shallow area of a sea involves less water, the material dimension of human beings enjoys a lower degree of existence, and just as the deep area of the sea involves more water, the immaterial dimension of human beings enjoys a higher degree of existence. In line with Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn, Ṭabāṭabā'ī believes in gradation

---

[110] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān,* Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 1, p. 404.

[111] "And it is the human cognitive soul, rather than a faculty which is a branch of the soul such as the faculties of memory, vision, and the like" (see Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, vol. 1, p. 404; vol. 2, p. 251).

[112] As a prelude to this discussion, it should be noted that some issues discussed in this part of the dissertation are prerequisites of "intuition and its types" and "revelation and its types." I have followed 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's approach to issues of intellect, intuition, and revelation in discussion of preliminary ontological issues in his discussion of intellect. Thus, the section on "intellect and its types" is more elaborate than the other two.

[113] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, third article, Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i 'Ām). Also see: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, 11th stage, chapter 1, Qum: Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn Publishers.

(*tashkīk*) of existence in the sense that it has weak and strong degrees: it is stronger in certain entities and weaker in others. Even the same human individual has existential strength and weakness at the same time, their material dimension having a weaker existence and their immaterial dimension having a stronger existence.[114]

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī divides the whole world of existence into four, and the whole created world into three, layers: material, imaginal (*mithāl*) or imaginational (*khayāl*), and intellectual. As to existential strength, the imaginal world is above the material world, and the intellectual world is above the imaginal world. In addition to these created worlds, he believes in a world pertaining to God, to which he refers as the world of divine names and attributes.[115] On his account, all human and non-human animals live in material and imaginal realms, their existence partaking that of the two realms. Put alternatively, the human or animal existence involves both material and imaginal immaterial dimensions.

The intellectual world shares the immateriality of the imaginal world—as to existential strength, the former is above the latter; it is "pure actuality," so to speak, and is attainable only by some human beings. As I shall elaborate below, 'Allāma maintains that, unlike non-human animals, human beings have a faculty to which 'Allāma refers as the rational faculty.[116] If it goes from potentiality to actuality, then the person can be admitted to the rational world and apprehend the truths of this world to the extent of the actualization of their faculty. For the sake of clarity, in this dissertation, I will refer to this particularly human faculty as "peculiar intellectual faculty" so as to distinguish it from other rational faculties.[117]

According to 'Allāma, the strongest existential dimension of a human being is their intellect, which governs other degrees of their existence. The most remarkable capacity of this supreme degree of human existence is its power to understand and to develop its existence through knowledge and truths that it obtains, whereby it comes to possess higher existential existence. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī refers to the human capacity for understanding the truths as "intellect," regardless of whether it can acquire knowledge of the truths of material and imaginal worlds

---

[114] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1994, *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, pp. 14-17, and Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn, pp. 17-20.

[115] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1999, *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*, "Risālat al-Wasa'iṭ," Beirut: Mu'assisat al-Nu'man, pp. 101-104.

[116] In some of his works, 'Allāma refers to this faculty as "al-Quwwat al-Nāṭiqat al-Qudsiyya"; see Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al-'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 2, p. 148.

[117] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al-'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 11, pp. 271-272.

(shared by human and non-human animals) or it can have knowledge of all three worlds: material, imaginal, and intellectual. His use of the same term for reference to all these different kinds of understanding has posed a challenge to scholars seeking to arrive at an accurate analysis of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's definition of intellect and the distinction between human beings and other animals. I will point to some of these challenges in what follows.

The reason why 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī refuses to use different terms for different intellectual dimensions, using instead the same word, "intellect," to refer to them all, seems to be that, firstly, he applies "intellect" to the degree of human existence that has the capacity to understand the truths; in fact, this existential degree is a matter of knowledge, flourishing only through acquisition of knowledge, and secondly, he wants to note the fact that the human existence is a unified reality with distinct existential degrees. The unity exists more perfectly in higher degrees of intellect. The reason why unity is stronger and more perfect in higher degrees of intellect is that, according to Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn and 'Allāma, existence is coextensive (*musāwiq*) with unity, and the stronger the existential degree is, the stronger will be the unity.

3.4. Definition of Intellect

The word, *'aql* (intellect or reason), is one of the most complex and complicated notions appearing in the literature on religion and Islamic philosophy. The word is predicated of so many different things that some people, such as Mullā Ṣadrā, believe that it is a homonym, rather than a word with one and the same meaning with different extensions. The meaning of the word is not exhausted by the human perceptive faculty. In Islamic sources, the word is also used to refer to a variety of immaterial entities, such as the Active Intellect (*al-'aql al-fa''āl*) and intellect (as the first creature). Moreover, there is a world of existence called the intellectual world. In his work, 'Allāma uses *'aql* in most of its various meanings, but in this dissertation, I mainly focus on the intellect, its degrees, and its objects in order to be in a position to consider its relation with intuition and revelation.

'Allāma provides a general definition of intellect as a perceptive faculty[118], referring to every being that has a capacity to perceive as an "intellector" ('*āqil*).[119] In line with this general definition, he believes that both humans and animals share intellect as a perceptive faculty, although the former possesses a peculiar intellectual faculty that can be actualized and attain transcendent truths—which he calls the truths of the intellectual world.[120] In some of his works, he refers to the shared intellect between humans and animals as "intelligence," suggesting that humans are typically more intelligent than other animals except that humans have a peculiar intellectual faculty as well. [121] In its natural state, this peculiar intellectual faculty is a

---

[118] Note that by "faculty" here we do not mean a state accidental to the human soul, such as the visual faculty—that is, a state without which the soul can still exist. To the contrary, by "faculty" here we mean a stage of the human soul that is capable of perception. See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al-'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 1, p. 405.
In the 11th stage of his *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, he extends the domain of intellect beyond its terminological sense (i.e. perception of universals).

[119] Whenever the word, "intellect," is used in this dissertation, I mean the general notion articulated by 'Allāma in his general definition of intellect, unless otherwise specified.

[120] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1999, *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*, "Risāla fī Af'āl Allah" (An Essay on God's Actions), Lebanon: Mu'assisat al-Nu'man, p. 71.

[121] In the article concerning causes and effects in his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī takes humans, and even all sentient animals, to be able to perceive the law of causation, suggesting that they have such perception in virtue of their intelligence. From this it follows that, on the one hand, both humans and other animals have a degree of intellect as sentient living creatures—it is to this degree of intellect that 'Allāma refers as "intelligence," and on the other hand, it is in virtue of their intelligence that they are capable of perceiving universal intellectual concepts. The quote from *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm* seeks to demonstrate that both humans and other animals enjoy intelligence. As to their difference in degrees of intelligence, however, 'Allāma provides a detailed discussion in his exegesis of verse 70 of Sura al-Isra'. The verse alludes to two advantages of humans over many other creatures in the material world—the advantage is articulated in terms of "honor" and "preference":

> Certainly We have honored the Children of Adam, and carried them over land and sea, and provided them with all the good things, and preferred them with a complete preference over many of those We have created.

In his interpretation of the difference between "honoring" and "preferring," 'Allāma points to two features that distinguish humans from many other creatures, including non-human animals. Note that the following quote from 'Allāma does not include the peculiar intellectual faculty of human beings, because it exists in the form of a potentiality, which has such a small share of existence that cannot count as an advantage of "Children of Adam" over other creatures. 'Allāma writes:

> Either of the two terms, "honoring," and "preferring," refers to a class of divine endowments to human beings—the honoring consists in bestowing human beings with intellect, which has not been given to any other creature. It is in virtue of intellect that the human being can discriminate the good from the evil and the useful from the harmful and the right from the wrong. Other endowments, such as dominance over, deployment, and control of other creatures in order to achieve goals, as well as language, writing, and the like can be obtained only via intellect.
> The preference of humans over other creatures consists in giving the former more of what is given to the latter. Thus, although animals eat food, their food is very simple—meat or fruits and vegetables—humans share this power in addition to its power to take these nutritious materials and make a variety of cooked or raw foods in an infinite range of tastes and pleasures. The same is true of drinking, clothing, satisfying the sexual instincts, accommodation, and social behavior in animals and humans.

If the two pieces of writings from *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm* and *al-Mīzān* are juxtaposed with fragments in which 'Allāma takes humans as kinds of animals, it can be obviously concluded that 'Allāma takes humans as animals that are more intelligent than other animals. This is one distinguishing feature of humans from other animals, and the other is the intellectual faculty that potentially exists in humans: whenever it is actualized, the human being can be admitted to the intellectual world. More on this below.

disposition in need of actualization. 'Allāma suggests that it can be actualized through servitude of God. Thus, humans are the most intelligible animals that can actualize their peculiar intellectual faculties and be admitted to the human realm. In a variety of his works, 'Allāma talks about the difference between humans and animals. In some cases, he proceeds in line with majority views, without noting that he is committed to them. This leads to troubles in understanding 'Allāma's own position.

In his view, humans and other animals only differ in certain stages of their intellects. In order to be in a position to understand 'Allāma's view of intellect, we need to know the definition of the intellect shared between humans and other animals, on the one hand, and on the other, we need to see the degree of intellect, and the perceptibles, considered by 'Allāma as exclusive to humans. Below are the principles required for an accurate understanding of 'Allāma's view of the difference between humans and other animals:

1. Both human and non-human animals perceive universal concepts. Nevertheless, humans are capable of perceiving much more complicated concepts and attaining more complex kinds of knowledge. This was rejected by 'Allāma's student, Ayatullah Muṭahharī, who regards non-human animals as incapable of perceiving universal concepts, such as unity and causation,[122] accounting for all their activities in terms of their animal instincts. On the contrary, 'Allāma believes that non-human animals would not be able to do anything had they lacked such knowledge. For if animals failed to understand the law of causation, they would not embark on any action, because in this case they would not know whether the food can be ground by chewing, whether food can be obtained by hunting, or whether it can see by opening its eyes.[123]

2. According to 'Allāma, both humans and other animals have free will, rejecting the view that free will is distinctive of human individuals. Notwithstanding this, he believes that the animal free will is weaker than the human free will. His reason for this seems to be that free will is a result or effect of perceptive faculties, or the extent of knowledge, and since humans enjoy much more intellection and knowledge, they have more free will. This has also been called into question by Ayatullah Muṭahharī: he takes all animal actions to be instinctive.[124] 'Allāma's

---

[122] In a footnote to *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, Ayatullah Muṭahharī presents a detailed discussion of animal knowledge and instinctive animal actions, considering and criticizing a variety of theories in this respect. For more, see: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i ʿĀm), Ayatullah Muṭahharī's footnotes, vol. 2, pp. 168-194.

[123] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i ʿĀm), article 9, pp. 492-493.

[124] Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 168-194.

position seems more accurate, because regardless of whether we call it an instinct or whatever else, what really matters is that, for one thing, experience shows that humans make choices, and this cannot be deterministic, since determinism is essentially at odds with free choice, and for another, free will is a consequence of knowledge: every entity has free will to the extent of its knowledge. Thus, if there are two different pieces of meat before a cat, and it can only pick one, it will certainly *choose* one of the two pieces. The choice will be based on its discernment of which piece is more useful for it. In fact, to choose is to give priority to one option among a host of options. One might object, however, that angels do have knowledge, although they do not have free will, and according to the Qur'an, they never commit sins. The answer is that angels do have free will, but as noted by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, jurisprudential duties are limited to this world where people live in communities: God has established (or constructed) the religion primarily and essentially for communities, while in the immaterial world where angels live, there is no social life as there is in this world. This is why they are not subject to types of laws and obligations that apply to this world. Instead, they have existential (*takwīnī*) obligations that they never violate, because they are well aware of the consequences of such violation and the advantages of compliance with existential commands. On this account, 'Allāma believes that angels have free will because they are subject to duties, and one can be subject to duties only if they have free will—otherwise, "having duty" would make no sense. This is why the Qur'an says: "angels … do not disobey Allah in what He commands them but do what they are commanded,"[125] and obviously, one can be commanded and obligated only if they have free will.[126]

3. As pointed out before, 'Allāma believes that human and animal existences have varying stages distinct from one another in their existential weakness and strength, with intellect (in the general sense of perceptive faculty) being at the highest stages of human/animal existence. The defining feature of humans and other animals is their intellect and its products, such as free will. That being so, when we talk about human souls and animal souls, we need to note that the difference between them lies just in the extent of their intellect (or intelligence)—in addition to the difference in their intellects, there is no particular difference between animal and human souls.[127] In fact, the difference between the human rational soul and the animal soul is

---

[125] Al-Taḥrīm: 6.
[126] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 19, pp. 334-335.
[127] See: Ibid., vol. 1, p. 413.

exhausted by that between the human intellect and the animal intellect, and the latter difference lies in the degree of their understanding and their power of analysis.

From the three premises above, we can draw the following conclusion: when 'Allāma says in his *al-Mīzān* that the difference between humans and other animals lies in "intellect and the rational soul," what he means is that the main difference between them is in intellect—the human rational soul is distinct from the animal soul in virtue of enjoying the degree of intellect it does. The analysis rests upon the assumption that 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī uses "human," "intellect," and the "rational soul" in their dominant sense. However, if he uses them in accordance to his own principles, the above remark will amount to saying that human beings are distinct from other animals in virtue of having a peculiar intellectual faculty. A human becomes human when they actualize this potentiality. Such a human being has a soul distinct from the animal soul in virtue of having an intellect (a peculiar intellectual faculty that is actualized), because intellect is a degree of the soul, and the highest degree, for that matter. Such a human being will, therefore, be distinct from other animals in virtue of both the intellect and the soul, although the difference in soul is grounded in the difference in intellect. Nothing hinges on stating the difference between human and animal souls, because the main difference between them boils down to their intellect. The reason why 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī does not rest content to intellect as the distinguishing feature of humans and other animals in the above fragment of his *al-Mīzān*—alluding to the rational soul as what distinguishes humans from animals aside from intellect—seems to be that he intends to note the relation between intellect and the soul in human and animal existence. For the human soul (in the narrow sense of the term) is dominated by intellect, and intellect is a degree of the soul's existence, which is why the human soul is different from the animal soul. More on this in the discussion about the realms of the human existence below.

3.5. Kinds of Intellects

In a number of his books, including *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān* [The Balance in Exegesis of the Qur'an], *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma* [The Beginning of the Wisdom], and *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma* [The Ultimate Wisdom], 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī offers different classifications of intellect from four points of view: (1) in terms of theory and practice, (2) in ontological terms, (3) in terms of intellectual perceptibles, and (4) in terms of intellect's functions in different sciences. The most relevant to the present dissertation are the first three classifications. As to the last classification, I will rest content to the account provided by a student of 'Allāma who has offered a similar classification to 'Allāma's.

3.5.1. Theoretical and Practical Intellects (al-ʿAql al-Naẓarī wa al-ʿAql al-ʿAmalī)

ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī rejects the established classification of intellect (or reason) into theoretical and practical. According to the established classification,[128] theoretical intellect is deemed responsible for knowledge of what exists, distinguishing what exists from what does not exist, and practical intellect is deemed responsible for stating what ought to, and what ought not to, be done. Where the difference between this classification and his espoused classification does not undermine the main issue he considers, ʿAllāma deploys the distinction between theoretical and practical intellects. In some of his books, nevertheless, including the sixth article of his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Riʾālīsm* [Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism], he elaborates his view of the distinction in detail. One reason why ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī rejects the distinction—although he has never made it explicit anywhere—seems to be that the type of intellect which has been divided into theoretical and practical is one that has to do with knowledge by certainty. In fact, knowledge that does not reach the point of certainty (that is, probabilistic opinion [*al-ẓann al-iṭmīnānī*]) falls outside the scope of the distinction. However, ʿAllāma writes: "in addition to knowledge, what is central to human action is probabilistic opinion which is construed by humans as knowledge."[129] To put it the other way round, the distinction is problematic in that the kind of intellect identified as theoretical cannot be the same kind of intellect as what is identified as practical, because the scope of the former is limited to certainty-conferring knowledge. To elucidate the main reason why the classification of intellect into theoretical and practical is deemed wrong by ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī, we need to consider his espoused classification.

He is not the first Muslim intellectual who rejects the distinction of intellect into theoretical and practical, but his proposed alternative for the old classification is innovative. He distinguishes human perceptions into three categories: real, constructed (*iʿtibārī*) in the general sense, and constructed in the specific sense.[130] Consequently, he divides intellect as the

---

[128] The division of reason into theoretical and practical in Islamic philosophy traces back to Fārābī. After him, many philosophers and intellectuals discussed the two types of reason, including Ibn Miskawayh, Avicenna, Ghazālī, Ibn Maytham Baḥrānī, and Mullā Ṣadrā, although they articulate the division in different ways. For instance, Avicenna talks about "a cognitive faculty and a moving agential faculty," and ʿUbayd Zākānī attributes epistemic (*ʿilmiyya*) and practical faculties to the human soul. (For more about the history of the issue, see Muḥammad Hidāyatī and Muḥammad Shumālī, "Justārī dar ʿaql-i naẓarī va ʿamalī", *Maʿrifat-i Falsafī*, vol. 3, 2009).

[129] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabāʾī, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Riʾālīsm*, Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i ʿĀm), article 6, pp. 326-327.

[130] Riżā Dāvarī Ardakānī believes that the term, "constructed" (*iʿtibāriyyāt*), has been used by ʿAllāma for the first time, but the core idea is not unprecedented in the Islamic world. In fact, Ibn Khaldūn has divided knowledge into intellectual (*ʿaqlī*) and conventional (*waḍʿī*). ʿAllāma's alternative classification, however, is different from

perceptive faculty into three categories: "perceptive of real knowledge," "constructing constructed knowledge in the general sense," and "constructing constructed knowledge in the specific sense."[131]

Instead of the term, "perceptive of real knowledge," we might use the standard term, "theoretical intellect." Following Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī, 'Allāma does not believe that knowledge is produced by intellect or senses. Instead, he thinks that senses are preparatory causes with the help of which intellect can receive knowledge from imaginal or intellectual entities in virtue of the soul's attachment to material senses, as elaborated before. Theoretical intellect is, therefore, a receiver of knowledge, rather than a producer thereof, and all quiddity-based concepts as well as logical and philosophical secondary intelligibles (*al-ma'qūlāt al-thāniya*) and all propositions concerning an existing relation between objects fall within the domain of theoretical intellect.

Unlike theoretical intellect that is just a receiver of knowledge, practical intellect has a productive role in its knowledge of what ought and what ought not to be done. Instead of using the term, "practical reason," 'Allāma uses terms such as the "constructing faculty." The faculty performs two tasks, given which 'Allāma distinguishes it into two types: (1) constructing constructed knowledge in the general sense, and (2) constructing constructed knowledge in the specific sense.

Constructed knowledge in the general sense is contrasted to quiddities. Thus, when our mind judges that there exists a relation between two things—e.g. by saying that "A is B"—the judgement ("is") is a product of the mind. The concept of judgment is, therefore, one that the mind has derived from the relation it has held between the two things.

Constructed concepts in the specific sense of the term—to which 'Allāma refers as practical constructs as well—are those that the mind formulates to secure its natural needs. And these concepts are divided, in turn, into constant (pre-social constructs) and variable (post-social constructs) concepts. Concepts such as necessity, goodness and badness, ownership, headship, and subjugation fall under constructed concepts in the specific sense of the term.

Ibn Khaldūn's. See Dāvarī's paper, 1984, *Duvvumīn Yādnāmi-yi 'Allāmih Ṭabāṭabā'ī* [The Second Festschrift of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī], Tehran: Publications of Iranian Research Institute of Philosophy, p. 137.

[131] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i ʿĀm), article 6. Also see: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2007, *Majmū'a Rasā'il al-'Allāmat al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, "Risālat al-Wasa'iṭ," Qum: Baqiyat Publishers, Risālat al-I'tibāriyyāt.

3.5.2. *Kinds of Intellect in terms of its Perceptibles*

Another classification of intellect made by 'Allāma in some of his philosophical books, such as *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*, is a distinction in degrees of intellect with respect to intelligibles that it is able to grasp. It should be noted, however, that he talks about the classification as follows: "intellect has been said to have four degrees." One just needs to be familiar with 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's writing style to see that such phrasing implies his disagreement with the stated view. In such cases, he often presents the majority view. Here are the degrees 'Allāma introduces as the majority view.[132]

1. Material intellect or *intellectus materialis* (*al-'aql al-hayūlānī*): this is the lowest degree of intellect which is a mere potentiality for all ideas and intelligibles.

2. Dispositional intellect or *intellectus in habitu* (*al-'aql bi-l-malaka*): this is a degree of intellect that perceives self-evident concepts (*taṣawwur*) and assents (*taṣdīq*). For instance, this degree of intellect is capable of perceiving self-evident concepts such as the general notion of "being" as well as "unity and multiplicity" and self-evident assents such as "existence and nonexistence are mutually exclusive." Intellect can in this degree acquire self-evident concepts and the disposition for moving from them to theoretical intelligibles will become habitual in the soul; hence the epithet *intellectus in habitu*.[133]

3. Actual intellect or *intellectus in actu* (*al-'aql bi-l-fi'l*): intellect in this degree apprehends theoretical materials by means of self-evident knowledge.

4. Acquired intellect or *intellectus adquisitus* (*al-'aql al-mustafād*): in the last stage of its development, intellect arrives at a degree at which all self-evident and theoretical intelligibles, corresponding the external world, that it has acquired are present to it. The main difference between this and actual intellect is that, in the latter, although intellect has acquired a great deal of knowledge, the body of knowledge is not present to it—that is, all pieces of knowledge are not present in the soul at the same time in that the soul is not attentive to all of them. Instead, it has the power to summon any piece of knowledge whenever it wants to. Acquired intellect has all these pieces of knowledge actually present to it. In his *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī says the following about this degree of

---

[132] The most important advocate of the classification is Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī. See: Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī, 1989, *al-Ḥikmat al-Muta'āliya fī-l-Asfār al-'Aqliyyat al-Arba'a* (with 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's commentaries), Qum: Maktabat al-Mustafawi, vol. 3, pp. 419-421.
Explanations of the four degrees of intellect provided below are partly translations of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's words and partly elucidations thereof.
[133] In his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī provides a detailed account of how original self-evident conceptions and assents are formed, suggesting that they are obtained in early childhood. For more, see article 5 of this book.

intellect: if the human intellect (the human rational soul) arrives at the degree of full-fledged immateriality—partly evidenced by his intellect not being engaged when administrating the body—all intellectual knowledge will actually be acquired by it and its intellect becomes acquired.

'Allāma believes that all these types of intelligibles can be acquired by intellect, although his espoused classification of intellect should be looked for in his accounts of different created worlds.[134] 'Allāma never takes issue with the above classification, but, given his philosophical principles, his possible objection to the classification can be articulated as follows: 'Allāma's point of disagreement with this classification—which is endorsed by Mullā Ṣadrā—is that in his view self-evident and theoretical perceptibles that fall within degrees of dispositional and actual intellects in terms of this classification are not indeed evidence of difference in degrees of intellect as suggested by Mullā Ṣadrā. According to Mullā Ṣadrā, in order for the soul to perceive these perceptibles, it is unified with different truths in imaginal and intellectual worlds. Indeed, intellect (or the soul) becomes existentially so expansive that it is unified with those truths. On 'Allāma's account, however, the soul (or intellect) need not be unified with these truths in order to apprehend the perceptibles in question. Instead, it comes to hold a particular unificational relation (a union of the same type as that between an attribute and the attributed) with those truths. The degrees ascribed by Mullā Ṣadrā to intellect in virtue of its apprehension of self-evident and theoretical perceptibles are not, in 'Allāma's view, evidenced by such perceptibles—the only thing that the soul's ability to apprehend these entities indicates is the existence of imaginary and intellectual worlds. I will say more on this in my discussion of the unity of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected (*ittiḥād al-'aql wa-l-'āqil wa-l-ma'qūl*).

In the third classification below, 'Allāma's espoused view of the matter will be elaborated.

3.5.3. *Kinds of Intellect from an Ontological Viewpoint*

In his ontological consideration of intellect, he sometimes regards it as a degree of the human existence and discusses its features. Early in this chapter, I have provided an account of 'Allāma's view of the matter. And sometimes, he sees intellect as a degree of the human existence, which is, or can be, in relation with other degrees of the world of being. In this second ontological view, he seeks to know the place of intellect in the world of being and its relation with the created world. To do so, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's account of the world of being needs to be studied. As pointed out before, 'Allāma divides the created world into three worlds:

---

[134] More on his espoused view of different degrees of intellect in the chapter on "Intuition and its types."

material, imaginal, and intellectual. Intellects of all people are in contact with the first two worlds, and they have the potentiality for reaching the intellectual world as well. Moreover, he believes that there is another world beyond these three, which he calls the world of *Lāhūt* or Divinity, which is a world of divine names and attributes. In his "Risālat al-Wasā'iṭ" (Essay on Intermediaries) from his *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥidiyya* (Monotheistic Essays), 'Allāma's method in consideration of the relation between intellect and the three created worlds (material, imaginal, and intellectual) is not based on proving or presupposing the existence of these worlds and then assessing their relation with intellect. Instead, he considers different kinds of knowledge attainable by human beings and concludes that these kinds of knowledge pertain to three different worlds—the material world (senses), the imaginal world (imagination), and the intellectual world (full-fledged immateriality). He makes a case for the existence of the world of divine names and attributes through a different argument in another essay in the same collection called "Risālat al-Tawḥīd" (Essay on Monotheism).

Here is how he conceives these four worlds:[135]

There are four worlds in the realm of being, ordered in accordance to their varying degrees of existential strength,[136] which correspond to one another:

> First: the world of divine names and attributes, called *Lāhūt* or Divinity.
>
> Second: the world of full-fledged immateriality called intellectual world, or the spiritual world, or *Jabarūt* or Almightiness.
>
> Third: the imaginal world, which is also called the world of imagination, suspended forms (*al-muthul al-mu'allaqa*), intermediary or purgatory (*barzakh*), and *Malakūt* or Dominion.
>
> Fourth: the natural world, also called *Nāsūt* or the World of Mortals, among other thing.

According to 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, one acquires knowledge when one's intellect makes contact with imaginal or intellectual truths of beings. This is true both of knowledge of entities in the material world and of knowledge of entities in imaginal and intellectual worlds. Since the issue

---

[135] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2007, *Majmū'a Rasā'il al-'Allāmat al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, "Risālat al-Wasā'iṭ," Qum: Baqiyat Publishers, p. 141.

[136] To say that these worlds are ordered in accordance to degrees of existential strength is to say that the intellectual world is the cause of the imaginal world, and the imaginal world is, in turn, the cause of the material world. For more, see: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1994, *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, p. 172.

is tightly intertwined with issues of the unity of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected, it is necessary to discuss the worlds of being and how they can be known in order to consider 'Allāma's view of intellect and its degrees, because on his view our knowledge of different worlds of existence determines different degrees of our intellect. To have a better understanding of the issue, let me explicate how material entities are known.

'Allāma believes that every material entity has imaginal truth in the imaginal world; [137] otherwise, knowledge by certainty would be impossible for human beings—which leads to skepticism. His elaborate argument for this claim consists of two sections: (1) knowledge is immaterial because an intrinsic property of the matter is its constant changeability and divisibility, whereas change and division are impossible in the case of knowledge (when you change your view, your previous knowledge does turn into new knowledge; new knowledge is added to you, which is the reason why you can still remember your previous knowledge.) The same is true when you divide an apple image in your mind, for instance. You do not, in fact, divide the apple image into two, but rather create a new image of two halves of an apple. This is why you can still present the undivided apple to your mind whenever you want to), and (2) what is transmitted to us via our bodily senses are mere impingements on the body in its encounters with different entities. There is no evidence for correspondence between images (pieces of knowledge) acquired in this way and external entities.[138]

The two ideas above imply that since knowledge is immaterial, and immaterial entities have stronger existence than material entities, matter cannot cause the existence of an immaterial entity. For, according to a rational principle, a cause always has a stronger and higher existence than its effect, and since we know by certainty that at least part of our knowledge corresponds to facts (pace skeptics), our knowledge of, say, this horse should have been acquired through a relation (of unity) with an immaterial entity which is the existential cause of the horse. To put it the other way round, when we sensibly encounter a horse—e.g. by seeing or touching it— our intellect identifies its immaterial truth (called the horse's imaginal truth), establishes a

---

[137] It should be noted, however, that 'Allāma does not believe that there is an entity in the imaginal world corresponding to every entity in the material world. Indeed, he suggests that there is an imaginal entity in the imaginal world in which the imaginal truth of all entities in the material world exists (in a simple unified way), and it is through contact with this entity that the human soul can acquire knowledge to the extent of its capacity. In other words, unlike Mullā Ṣadrā, Peripatetic philosophers, and Illuminationists, 'Allāma does not endorse latitudinal multiplicity (al-kathrat al-ʿarḍiyya) in the intellectual world, which is also conceived in terms of Platonic Forms, just as he rejects such multiplicity in the imaginal world. See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabāʾī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmiʿat al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, pp. 250, 316, and 322-323.

[138] 'Allāma offers a host of arguments for immateriality of knowledge, considering objections to them, and replying to the objections. For more, see: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabāʾī, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Riʾālīsm*, Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i ʿĀm), third article.

relation of unity with that truth, and as a consequence of such unity, our intellect finds the truth present to it. This presence is of a kind known as knowledge by presence (*al-ʿilm al-ḥuḍūrī*).

Let me explicate knowledge by presence at this point. Following many other philosophers, such as Mullā Ṣadra,[139] ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī classifies knowledge into knowledge by presence and knowledge by acquisition (*al-ʿilm al-ḥuṣūlī*). Knowledge by presence consists in the presence of an immaterial entity to another immaterial entity.[140] In this definition, the first immaterial entity refers to imaginal or intellectual truths, and the second refers to the human soul, or more precisely speaking, to the human intellect, which is immaterial in ʿAllāma's view. When there is a relation of unity between the human intellect and (imaginal or intellectual) truths, the human soul finds the latter present to it, and from this presence, it gleans an epistemic form which is known as knowledge by acquisition. As a matter of fact, all quiddity-based concepts we have in our minds—such as apple, horse, human, etc.—are of this kind. We might be able to have a better understanding of the difference between knowledge by presence and knowledge by acquisition if we consider the example of love or hatred. We can introspect the existence of love inside us, where love is according to ʿAllāma's philosophy an immaterial entity. Notwithstanding this, the existence of love inside us is one thing and the concept we have constructed for love in our minds is another. The former is present to our soul and the latter is gleaned by our minds from this entity (love).

There is another issue that we need to discuss so as to shed more light on ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī's account of how knowledge by presence is obtained: unity of knowledge, the knower, and the known, or unity of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected. The problem of such unity might arise only if all the above assumptions are endorsed. This is a problem over which ʿAllāma disagrees with Ṣadr al-Mutaʾallihīn Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī: the disagreement is not limited to the claim itself; it extends to the philosophical argument for it as well.

In order to be in a position to articulate the difference between ʿAllāma's and Mullā Ṣadrā's views, we need to consider eight preliminaries. Among the many objections levelled by ʿAllāma against Mullā Ṣadrā's principles and views regarding unity of knowledge, the knower, and the known, two are more crucial than others. One is an objection to the principle of correlation (*aṣl al-taḍāyuf*), on which Mullā Ṣadrā draws to support his claim, and the other is

---

[139] Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ṣadr al-Mutaʾallihīn al-Shīrāzī, 1989, *al-Ḥikmat al-Mutaʿāliya fī-l-Asfar al-ʿAqliyyat al-Arbaʿa* (with ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī's commentaries), Qum: Maktabat al-Mustafawi, vol. 8, p. 47.

[140] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabāʾī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmiʿat al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, p. 240.

an objection to how knowledge is obtained by the soul. In the following preliminaries, I point to these two objections as well as ʿAllāma's argument for unity of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected. I will summarize the points in the end.

1. According to Mullā Ṣadrā, every entity in this world has three kinds of existence: in the material world, in the imaginal world, and in the intellectual world, although matter does not exist in the imaginal world and only material effects, such as colors and shapes, exist there, and in the intellectual world, we have archetypes or lords of species (*arbāb al-anwāʿ*), such as the human type, the horse type, etc. In other words, we have both multiplicity of types and multiplicity of individuals under those types in the imaginal world, whereas we have only multiplicity of types in the intellectual world. [141] ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī rejects latitudinal multiplicity in imaginal and intellectual worlds.[142] He believes in longitudinal multiplicity in the sense that every intellectual being is the cause of the existence of, and existentially higher than, another intellectual being.

2. Whatever is the case in unity of knowledge, the knower, and the known is more or less true of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected as well, because according to ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, intellect is existentially unified with knowledge, as is the intellector with the knower and the intellected with the known. The only difference between them lies in relative respects in which they are true of something, which is immaterial to our present discussion.

3. Unity is broader than identity. Identity amounts to self-sameness and existential oneness. Unity might mean identity (self-sameness) or a mode of existential relation which is regarded by ʿAllāma as illuminational. [143] ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī believes that there is identity (self-sameness in existence) between knowledge and the known, while there is unity between the knower and the known.[144] He sees the union between the knower and the known as that of an attribute and the attributed in the sense that the attribute becomes a degree of the existence of the attributed once it is attached to it; the knower and the known do not become one in all of

[141] Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn Shīrāzī, 1989, *al-Ḥikmat al-Mutaʿāliya fi-l-Asfar al-ʿAqliyyat al-Arbaʿa* (with ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's commentaries), Qum: Maktabat al-Mustafawi, vol. 3, p. 506.
[142] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmiʿat al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, pp. 315-321.
[143] See Kamal Haydari, 2010, *Sharḥ Nihāyat al-Ḥikma: al-ʿAql wa-l-ʿĀqil wa-l-Maʿqūl*, Qum: Dar Faraqud, p. 126.
[144] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmiʿah al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, p. 240.

their degrees. Therefore, he rejects unificational combination in the sense of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected being identical.[145]

'Allāma maintains that this type of unity results in a graded existence with a strong degree (reality or *ḥaqīqa*) and a diluted degree of existence (*raqīqa*).

4. When 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī talks about the relation between the truths of the imaginal world and those of the intellectual world, he talks about two types of relations indeed: (A) an illuminational relation, where the human soul makes contact with an imaginal or intellectual truth, participating of the manifestations of that truth to the extent of its capacity. In this type of relation, knowledge is acquired, although it might not encompass all features and properties of the imaginal or intellectual entity. There is no relation of identity in this illuminational relation. There is, instead, a relation of unity in the sense that two entities are involved here—one at a lower degree and the other at a higher degree—and they are in a relation with one another. More on this in 4 below. (B) When the human soul grows and begins to move in the so-called "arc of ascent" (*qaws al-ṣuʿūd*), it can achieve full-fledged immateriality. This takes place when administration of physical aspects does not preclude its growth and does not distract it. In this case, the human soul can make contact with imaginal and intellectual truths. This unity is an instance of identity, because 'Allāma endorses the principle that "from one, no more than one can issue forth" (*al-wāḥid la yaṣdur ʿanhᵘ illa-l-wāḥid*)—that is, only one effect can be caused by a perfect cause—and there is no latitudinal multiplicity in longitudinal degrees of the existential hierarchy (except in the material world), because every degree is an effect of the higher degrees, and in each degree there is but one existing entity. Now when the human soul evolves and passes through the degrees of imaginal and intellectual worlds, it will be unified with the truths of the relevant degrees at each stage of its development, because only one entity might exist at each degree.

5. This preliminary point is about knowledge of entities in the intellectual world. The intellectual world is the cause of the existence of the imaginal world, and the imaginal world is, in turn, the cause of the existence of the material world. Unity of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected is acquired by two groups of human beings, albeit in different ways. To illustrate, the human soul is immaterial in its essence and material in its action in the sense that it needs to deploy the body to perform its actions. According to 'Allāma, for such a soul, unity

---

[145] See 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's commentary on *al-Ḥikmat al-Mutaʿāliya fi-l-Asfār al-ʿAqliyyat al-Arbaʿa*, Qum: Maktabat al-Mustafawī, vol. 3, pp. 313 and 319.

of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected obtains only with respect to its knowledge of its own self. In order for it to know other intellectual immaterial entities, it has to actualize its peculiar intellectual faculty. The more it actualizes this faculty, the more it can have contact with intellectual immaterial entities in the intellectual world.[146] The second group are those who have actualized the peculiar intellectual faculty and achieved the degree of full-fledged immateriality (in both essence and action). (This is the idea I have alluded to in 4.) In the case of these people, unity of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected is fully the case. In other words, they have condensed (*ijmālī*) knowledge of all intelligibles as a result of the unity of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected. This degree of intellect which can be acquired by an individual is that of the acquired intellect mentioned by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī as a view advocated by others.[147]

6. According to 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, all epistemic forms acquired by the human being are either particular (of a sensory or imaginal kind) or intellectual (i.e. universal). The forms are derived from knowledge by presence acquired in virtue of the soul's relation with immaterial entities. Particular forms are acquired by the human being in virtue of the soul's relation with an imaginal entity in which the truth of all material entities lies, and intellectual (universal) forms are acquired in virtue of the soul's relation with an intellectual entity in the intellectual world (or different intellectual entities in the intellectual world standing in longitudinal relations to one another). The intellectual entity—an intellectual immaterial substance—has the lowest existential degree in the hierarchy of the intellectual world. In other words, the closest entity in this world to the imaginal world, and consequently to the human soul, is this intellectual substance, referred to by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, Mullā Ṣadrā, Illuminationists, and Peripatetic philosophers, as the Active Intellect. In the intellectual world, there are different intellectual entities standing in longitudinal relations to one another—some being higher than, and causes of, others—and the hierarchy begins from the First Emanation (*al-Ṣādir al-Awwal*), also known as the First Intellect,[148] and ending in the Active Intellect, which is the lowest entity in the intellectual world. The main point of disagreement between Mullā Ṣadrā and 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī lies in how they account for the relation between the soul and this intellectual entity for purposes of gaining intellectual knowledge. Although they focus the debate on knowledge

---

[146] See: Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn al-Shīrāzī, 1989, *al-Ḥikmat al-Muta'āliya fi-l-Asfār al-'Aqliyyat al-Arba'a* (with 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's commentaries), Qum: Maktabat al-Mustafawi, vol. 3, p. 319.
[147] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'ah al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, p. 216.
[148] Ibid., p. 316.

of entities in the intellectual world, it seems that a similar issue can arise, *mutatis mutandis*, as to how the soul is related with imaginal entities to gain particular pieces of knowledge. The disagreement can be summarized as follows: first, according to 'Allāma, for the soul to gain knowledge from the Active Intellect, it suffices for it to be unified therewith, whereas Mullā Ṣadrā requires an identity between the soul and the Active Intellect for acquisition of intellectual knowledge, maintaining that unity is not sufficient. Second, according to 'Allāma, in order for the soul to gain universal intellectual concepts, such as the human and the horse, it needs to make contact with an entity, whereas Mullā Ṣadrā believes that the soul makes contact with lords of species (or archetypes) existing in the intellectual world at the stage of the Active Intellect.

7. One objection raised by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī against Mullā Ṣadrā's view of the soul's unity with intelligibles can be articulated as follows: an intellectual immaterial entity is a substance, and a substance does not depend on anything else for its existence—it is self-subsisting indeed. Since intellectual entities perceive their own selves, they are both intellectors and intellected. Now if we say that the human soul—which, according to Mullā Ṣadrā, depends on something else for its existence (because of its relation with the body)—has a relation of unity with an intelligible which is an intellectual immaterial entity, it will follow that the intelligible as a self-standing substance be identical with the soul as a dependent entity, which is impossible. For dependence on something else is essential to the soul, and essential properties of things never change. Therefore, the soul can never turn into a self-subsisting substance.

8. Mullā Ṣadrā accounts for the identity in question in terms of correlation (*taḍāyuf*).[149] In his view, although two correlated concepts, such as *Father* and *Son*, are distinct from one another, they can nevertheless be identical. Thus, when the human intellect is unified with the Active Intellect, the unity is, according to Mullā Ṣadrā, a matter of the unity of two correlated concepts. As a result of this unity, intellect, the intellector, and the intellected—all of which are presumably immaterial—will be identical with one another. For when intellect finds the intellected present to it, it means that it is unified with the intellected, and since intellect is the highest degree of the soul's existence, and the soul (the intellector) is immaterial, intellect, the intllector, and the intellected will be unified. The same is true of knowledge, the knower, and the known. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī raises an objection to this argument by Mullā Ṣadrā in his commentaries on *al-Ḥikmat al-Muta'āliya fi-l-Asfār al-'Aqliyyat al-Arba'a*: mutual

---

[149] Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī, 1981, *al-Ḥikmat al-Muta'āliya fi-l-Asfār al-'Aqliyyat al-Arba'a*, Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Turath, vol. 3, p. 315.

exclusiveness of two correlated entities is essential to them—it is impossible for them to be compatible. 'Allāma's argument for unity of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected in his *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma* is based on three principles: the principle that from one, only one can issue forth, the principle of gradation of existence, and the principle of unity of the attribute-giver and the attributed (*ittiḥād al-nā'it wa-l-man'ūt*). According to the principle of gradation, existence has different degrees of varying strength and weakness, where higher degrees are causes of lower degrees. When the human soul makes contact with an imaginal or intellectual truth of something, their relation will be in accordance with this causal principle, on which 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī draws in the principle of the attribute-giver and the attributed. The attribution framework is grounded in the fact that since the imaginal or intellectual truth has a stronger existence than the human soul, its relation of unity (or illuminational relation) with the human soul (or intellect) will be graded; that is, one (the attribute-giver) gives existence (that is, knowledge), and the other (the attributed) receives knowledge as an attribute—this piece of knowledge is accrued by the attribute-giver as a degree of its existence, rather than something accidental to the essence of the attribute-giver (that is, the soul).[150]

'Allāma's objection to Mullā Ṣadrā seems plausible, firstly because even Mullā Ṣadrā himself implies in other parts of his *al-Asfār* that two correlated entities are essentially incompatible, and in his footnotes to those parts, 'Allāma endorses Mullā Ṣadrā's view,[151] and secondly, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī is careful to take the difference between "identity" and "unity" into account. Identity is self-sameness—all existential degrees of an entity is just the same as all or some existential degrees of another entity such that it is not possible to talk about two things—in fact, only one thing exists. In unity, however, although there is an existential relation between the two things, their distinctness is still preserved in terms of gradation. In other words, when two things are unified, one of them will be a strong existence and the other a weak existence in continuity with the strong existence. In Islamic philosophical jargons, one becomes diluted (*raqīqa*) and the other becomes reality (*ḥaqīqa*) or thick (*shadīda*).[152] This is, in fact, an objection to the theory of latitudinal multiplicity in intellectual and imaginal worlds, which is

---

[150] 'Allāma believes that the existence of the attribute-giver is unified with that of the attributed; that is, the latter's existence is not a degree of the former's, regardless of whether the attribute-giver and the attributed are one and the same thing, such as the soul's knowledge of itself, or they are distinct, albeit the attributed is present at the stage at which the attribute-giver exists, such as an effect's knowledge of its cause, and vice versa.

[151] In a footnote in vol. 3, p. 355, 'Allāma says that what Mullā Ṣadrā has said is true, making it explicit that in cases of correlation, the two terms are incompatible, whereas in his discussion of unity of intellect, the intellector, and the intellected, Mullā Ṣadrā's words seem at odds with what he says here.

[152] See: Sayyid Muḥammad ḤusaynṬabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'ah al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, 11th stage, chapter two.

endorsed by Mullā Ṣadrā and rejected by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī. Moreover, it involves philosophical impossibility of the soul's transformation from a dependent existence to a self-subsisting substance, as pointed out before.

On this account, the human soul comes to have a relation of unification (or illumination) with different imaginal or intellectual entities in the course of its development, finding them present to it (the same kinds of presence as that of a cause to its effect). And from this knowledge by presence, it constructs particular, and then universal, mental images, which amounts to knowledge by acquisition.

Most of what I have said in this section was concerned with knowledge acquired by the human being in virtue of its unification with the truths in imaginal and intellectual worlds. In particular, I did not talk about knowledge acquired by the human being in the intellectual world. To have a better understanding of 'Allāma's view of the matter, let us take note of a classification of the means for knowledge acquisition. In a general classification, 'Allāma discusses two means for knowledge acquisition—or more precisely speaking, a means and a freedom from deploying the means:

1. Knowledge acquired via the five senses: according to 'Allāma, all knowledge acquired by human beings (except knowledge pertaining to the intellectual world) is acquired via direct or indirect involvement of senses, regardless of whether the knowledge in question is particular or involves universal concepts and regardless of whether the universal concepts count as logical secondary intelligibles (*al-maʿqūlāt al-thāniya*), such as the concept of the human, the horse, and the apple, or philosophical secondary intelligibles, such as the concepts of existence, unity, cause, and effect, and regardless of whether they are real entities such as the animal and the tree or constructed entities such as ownership and headship. In 'Allāma's view, humans and animals are capable of perceiving such concepts, although the animal perception of some of these concepts are characteristically weaker than the human perception.[153] All knowledge people have concerning themselves as well as their surrounding objects and entities fall within this category. That is to say, all empirical and human sciences are included here.

---

[153] 'Allāma seems to believe that animals are incapable of perceiving certain constructed concepts. He argues for this claim as follows: animals do not deploy one another in their social lives, their lives being simple and primitive in this respect. However, the human mind construes other human beings as metaphorical parts of its own existence and treats them as its active existential faculties with which it can meet its needs. This is the principle concerning constructed concepts in the specific sense of the term, to which 'Allāma refers as the principle of deployment (*aṣl al-istikhdām*).

2. Knowledge that can be acquired by intellect in virtue of its inattention, or low attention, to the weaker dimension of the human existence (that is, the human body and the imaginal degree of the human existence that is directed at the material world): this type of knowledge *can* be acquired by intellect in that the truths of the intellectual world can be acquired by human beings only if they have actualized their peculiar intellectual faculties and have access to the intellectual world. As a matter of fact, when this peculiar faculty begins to be actualized, the human soul is admitted to the intellectual world, and as this peculiar faculty develops more and more, the soul achieves higher degrees of the intellectual world. This is a world of pure immateriality, whereas the imaginal world is semi-immaterial—the multiplicity that exists in the imaginal world does not exist in this world. In the imaginal world, although imaginal entities are detached from matter, they still display certain effects of matter, such as colors and shapes, while entities in the intellectual world are free from such modifications. Therefore, the multiplicity that exists in virtue of different colors, shapes, and times cannot be found in inhabitants of the intellectual world.[154] In fact, there is no potentiality or disposition in the intellectual world that might be actualized—whatever there is in this world is pure actuality.[155] It should be noted that the intellectual world has within itself a variety of degrees, just like the imaginal and material worlds. The more actualized the human peculiar intellectual faculty becomes, the higher degrees of the intellectual world it can have access to.

3.5.4. Kinds of Intellect in terms of its Functions in Various Sciences

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's classification of intellect with regard to its functions in different sciences is scattered hither and thither in his work. The best summary of this classification is provided by one of his prominent students, Ayatullah Javādī Āmulī, who is greatly influenced by 'Allāma in his mystical, philosophical, and exegetical positions. In his book, *Manzilat-i 'Aql dar Hindisi-yi Ma'rifat-i Dīnī* [The Status of Intellect in the Geometry of Religious Knowledge],[156] he enumerates four types of intellect in this regard based on 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's view of intellect's functions in different sciences:

1. Pure abstractive (*tajrīdī*) intellect: one that is deployed in theoretical arguments in philosophy and theology.

---

[154] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1994, *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'ah al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, p. 281.
[155] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn, 1994, *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn Publishers, p. 142.
[156] See: 'Abd Allāh Javādī Āmulī, 2017, *Manzilat-i 'Aql dar Hindisi-yi Ma'rifat-i Dīnī*, Qum: 'Isrā' Publication, pp. 25-33.

2. Empirical intellect: one that is deployed in empirical and human sciences.

3. Semi-abstractive intellect: one that is deployed in mathematics.

4. Pure intellect: one that is deployed in theoretical mysticism.

These types of intellectual knowledge that are deployed in various sciences are matters of assent (*taṣdīq*), rather than conceptions (*taṣawwur*), because philosophy undertakes the rational proof of the existence of subject-matters of these sciences. Now in order to provide a comprehensive classification of intellect in ‘Allāma Ṭabāṭabā’ī’s view, we need to reflect upon the first category of intellect in Ayatullah Javādī’s classification above—abstractive intellect— and divide it in turn to its own subcategories—as pointed out before. Moreover, as Ayatullah Javādī makes it explicit in his book, the classification is concerned with certainty-conferring sciences—those that provide us with epistemic confidence—rather than probabilistic sciences. These are not objections to Ayatullah Javādī Āmulī’s classification, because for one thing, he notes these limitations in his classification, and for another, the purpose of this classification is different from that of other classifications—for example, it is not ontological.

3.6. Conclusion

Following a number of Islamic philosophers such as Mullā Ṣadrā, ‘Allāma Ṭabāṭabā’ī believes reason to be immaterial and to be the highest degree of the human existence, which perceives the human existence as well as entities external to the human existence. In conformity with Mullā Ṣadrā’s philosophical school, he classifies knowledge into knowledge by presence and knowledge by acquisition, believing that all knowledge goes back to knowledge by presence in the sense that in order for human reason to know something is for it to be unified with the imaginal reality of the material thing in one way or another, and it is in virtue of this unification that it finds the imaginal reality within itself, and this is what he refers to as knowledge by presence. Having considered the types of knowledge gained by human beings, ‘Allāma Ṭabāṭabā’ī shows that there are worlds other than the material world, which are known in the language of Islamic philosophy as imaginal and intellectual worlds. ‘Allāma Ṭabāṭabā’ī believes that human reason or intellect has various degrees which might be actualized, goes beyond the imaginal world, and then be identified with the realities of the intellectual world. Furthermore, in some of his works such as "The essay on monotheism", ‘Allāma Ṭabāṭabā’ī admits that the human intellect can arrive at, and become unified with, the stage of divine names and attributes (which, in Islamic mysticism, corresponds to the highest degree of reason in Islamic philosophy). In the next chapter we shall address the question of how the human

being (human reason) and different degrees of divine manifestation are related—a question discussed in in Islamic mysticism, as well as exegeses of the Qur'an.

4. Intuition[157] (*Shuhūd*) and Revelation (*waḥy*)

This chapter has two sections: intuition (*shuhud*) and revelation (*waḥy*). I begin with an overview and consideration of ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī's theory of intuition, and then his definition and characterization of revelation.

4.1. Intuition

In this section, I address ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī's elaborate discussion of intuition, its domain, and its features. The problem of intuition falls within the scope of mysticism. For this reason, before embarking upon a definition and characterization of intuition, a few remarks about ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī's practical mysticism are in order.

4.1.1. ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī's Practical Mysticism

ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī was an author and expert in theoretical as well as practical mysticism. According to his students, he was engaged in mystical practices and journeys. As to theoretical mysticism, he wrote two essays under "*Risāla Muḥākamāt*" and "Risālat al-Wilāya." In the latter essay, he presents some of his particular views. And as to practical mysticism, he was a student of Ḥājj Sayyid ʿAlī Āqā Qāḍī Ṭabāṭabāʾī (1869-1974)—an outstanding Shiite mystic who displayed many supernatural acts—keeping his company in Najaf for ten years.[158] ʿAllāma says the following about his relations with Ḥājj Sayyid ʿAlī Āqā Qāḍī Ṭabāṭabāʾī:

> In 1304 SH (1925) when I was honored to move to Najaf for education, on the first days of my visit and before attending any lectures, I was sitting at home, thinking about my future. Suddenly, there was a knock on the door. I opened the door and I saw a great scholar who greeted me and entered the house. He sat in the room and welcomed me. This scholar had an attractive, bright face. He began to talk to me and got acquainted with me, and in his talks, he told me: "people who come to Najaf to study had better think of their own refinement and perfection along with their education; they should not be oblivious to their souls." He said this and left the house. His words infatuated

---

[157] The word "shuhūd" in Arabic comes from the root "sh-h-d," which means witnessing, seeing, and directly experiencing something. In mystical terminology, the word has found a specific albeit relevant use, referring to direct mystical knowledge of hidden realms. In English, a variety of terms were used as equivalents of the mystical sense of "shuhūd": apprehension, witnessing, vision, and intuition. I have refused to use "apprehension" for *shuhūd*, because it implies knowledge by acquisition (understanding), rather than knowledge by presence associated with *shuhūd*. Moreover, I set aside "witnessing" and "vision" because, although they imply immediate experience, they cannot be easily inflected as adjectives and/or verbs. In English, "intuition" means direct experience of something, and it can be inflected as an adjective ("intuitive") as well as a verb ("intuit"). Moreover, in English, the term "mystical intuition" is already used to refer to an experience closely related with what Muslim intellectuals mean by *shuhūd*. Taken together, these considerations led me to use "intuition" for *shuhūd*.

[158] See Shaykh Āghā Buzurg Tihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt Aʿlām al-Shīʿa*, Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, pp. 87-88.

me, and eventually, he let me know his curricula. As long as I was in Najaf, I kept his company.[159]

Ayatullah Subḥānī quotes Ayatullah Muṭahharī about ‘Allāma Ṭabāṭabā’ī’s mysticism: “His Excellency Mr. Ṭabāṭabā’ī is at the degree of intermediary immateriality [or detachment] as far as his spiritualperfections are concerned. He can see hidden forms which cannot be seen by ordinary people.”[160] There are anecdotes about ‘Allāma’s mystical intuitions. For example, Ayatullah Subḥānī says: “when he trusted people around him, he recounted certain stories, ‘unveiling’ (*mukāshafāt*) so to speak, in a vague fashion and with his characteristic reticence. Thus, one day he said, ‘when I was in Najaf, one day after performing my Morning Prayer on my house’s roof, Prophet Idris appeared before me, talking with my late brother Mr. Ḥājj Sayyid Ḥasan Ilāhī, and I understood his words through my brother’s talk.’ He recounted many such stories in proper assemblies.”[161] Ayatullah Javādī Āmulī, a close student of ‘Allāma Ṭabāṭabā’ī, says in a book about ‘Allāma and his practices called *Shams al-Waḥy-i Tabrīzī* that, just like some prominent mystics, ‘Allāma divided the travelers of God’s path into four groups: “perfectly attracted,” “pure traveler (*Sālik*),” “traveling attracted,” and “attracted traveler.” Ayatullah Javādī believes that, based on his autobiography, ‘Allāma Ṭabāṭabā’ī was an attracted traveler: those who begin by going on a mystical journey, traveling the path with toil and struggle, and during their journey, they are suddenly endowed with the spark of Divine love, which enlightens their souls. They travel the rest of the path with the divine attraction (*jadhba*).[162]

4.1.2. Intuition (Shuḥūd) from the viewpoint of ‘Allāma

‘Allāma Ṭabāṭabā’ī considers intuition, along with intellect and the revelation, as instruments for knowledge acquisition, specifically deployed in Islamic mysticism.[163] In his view, intuition is in fact knowledge by presence, which is defined as the “presence of an immaterial entity— one detached from matter—to an immaterial entity.”[164] A careful consideration of ‘Allāma’s

---

[159] A group of writers, 1984, *Duvvumīn Yādnāmi-yi ‘Allāmih Ṭabāṭabā’ī*, Tehran: Anjuman-i Islamī Ḥikmat wa Falsafiye Iran, pp. 295-296.
[160] A group of writers, 1982, *Yādnāmi-yi Mufassir-i Kabīr*, Qum: Shafaq, p 59-62.
[161] Ibid.
[162] ‘Abd Allāh Javādī Āmulī, *Shams al-Waḥy-i Tabrīzī, Sīri-yi ‘Ilmī-yi ‘Allāmih Ṭabāṭabā’ī*, Qum: ’Isrā’ Publishers, p. 301.
[163] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā’ī, 2008, *Risālat-i Tashayyu‘ dar dunyā-yi Imrūz*, Qum: Bustan-i Kitab, p. 101.
[164] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā’ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān*, Beirut: Mu’assisa al- ’Alamī Li al-Maṭbū‘āt, vol. 6, p. 171. Also see Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā’ī, 1941, “Risālat al-Wilāya”, Qum: Mu’assisa Ahl al-Bayt, p. 25.

words reveals that although he regards knowledge of, say, love or hatred inside us as cases of knowledge by presence, he uses the term, "*shuhūd*" (intuition), in a particular sense. In some of his writings, he refers to two types of intuitions: intuition of the exterior and intuition of the interior.[165] Intuition of the exterior has the hidden world as its object. The hidden world is a religious term frequently used in the Qur'an,[166] referring to truths that are normally hidden from humans—in normal conditions, that is, they do not observe such truths.[167] Moreover, 'Allāma divides the hidden into two categories: absolute and relative. Drawing on Qur'anic verses and philosophical exegeses, he suggests that all events of the material world—which are confined to time and place—exist in the divine treasure in a vague and undetermined way. To this kind of the hidden, which is not present in the realm of the intuition, 'Allāma refers as the absolute hidden, and what lies outside this treasure of knowledge is called the "relative hidden" as long as it is not intuited by someone, because it is not visible and apparent to that person or other individuals.[168]

In his philosophical textbooks, that is *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma* and *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, as well as his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī does not draw on what is known via intuition in the proper sense as materials or presuppositions of his discussions. More interestingly, he has never used the term, "intuition," in his philosophical textbooks. This is because he is strongly committed to the demarcation of sciences and disciplines, and since, in Islamic philosophy, intellect is deployed as the only instrument for knowledge acquisition, discoveries of interior intuitions are never deployed in philosophy as premises of arguments. It should be noted, however, that Islamic wisdom—also known as Transcendent Wisdom (*al-Ḥikmat al-Muta'āliya*)—involves considerations and comparisons of what is discovered by intellect, intuition, and the revelation. The philosophical school of Transcendental Wisdom, founded by Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī, has done its utmost to reconcile intellect, intuition, and the revelation by deploying philosophical arguments. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī counts as a follower of this philosophical school.[169]

---

[165] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al-'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vo. 7, p. 126.

[166] For instance, see: 2:3; 3:179; 6:50; 6:73; 7:188.

[167] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al-'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 7, p. 125.

[168] Ibid, pp. 125-126.

[169] It should be noted that 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's discussions in his commentaries on *al-Ḥikmat al-Muta'āliya fi-l-Asfār al-Arba'at al-'Aqliyya* were based on Islamic wisdom, rather than Peripatetic philosophy. This is why, they involve a great deal of reference to intuition and intuitive knowledge.

Since 'Allāma identifies the reality of intuition as a kind of knowledge by presence, what I said about knowledge by presence applies to intuition as well. And since 'Allāma has considered the nature of knowledge, and in particular knowledge by presence, with a philosophical method and largely under issues of intellect, I followed suit and discussed issues of the nature of knowledge by presence and intuition under my discussion of intellect. This section of the dissertation is a supplement to the discussion of intuition, focusing on the scope of intuition, its quality, divine and human intuitions, and the object of intuition in 'Allāma's view. It should be noted that this dissertation aims to consider the relation between intellect, intuition, and the revelation, and discussions of each of these are just preliminaries to 'Allāma's account of how the three are related. A full-blown discussion of these phenomena that do justice to them requires an independent research which will certainly go beyond three volumes.

4.1.3. The Scope of Intuition

Sometimes in his *al-Mīzān*, 'Allāma refers to another faculty, in addition to intellect, by means of which exterior and interior intuitions take place: *fu'ād*. The word, "fu'ād" (literally, heart), has occurred five times in the Qur'an, and in at least three of these cases, it is used to refer to what perceives the truths. 'Allāma delineates the difference between knowledge by acquisition and knowledge by presence (intuitive knowledge)—obtained by heart—through vision. In his view, what we acquire via vision (seeing with our eyes) as well as imaginative forms and thoughts we entertain based on our vision are different from vision. The difference between intuition[170] and knowledge by acquisition can be discerned from that of "our knowledge of our visual ability" and "what we see with our eyes"—the former is acquired through our heart and our knowledge by presence of our soul and the latter is acquired with the mediation of our eyes.[171]

---

[170] The word *shuhūd* literally means to see or observe something, and in philosophical jargons as used by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī it is defined as the presence of an immaterial entity before another immaterial entity, as explained before. To rule out the idea that by *shuhūd* mystics might mean observation with physical eyes, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī writes in his "Risālat al-wilāya": "Those believing in vision and intuition do not mean vision with eyes and sensory intuition. Instead, they believe in another type of intuition, which consists in a contingent being intuiting its poverty, need, and the dependence of its essence, and the pure richness of its creator and inventor with all its contingent existence, rather than with its sensory eyes, or at the stage of its mind and thought. This has been established by rational arguments and evidenced by appearances of the Book [i.e. the Qur'an] and the Tradition. In fact, rational arguments imply that it is impossible for a contingent being to lack such an intuition, and what is desired is knowledge of the intuition, rather than the necessary intuition itself, which is knowledge by presence." (Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1981, "Risālat al-Wilāya", Qum: Mu'assisa Ahl al-Bayt, p. 25)

[171] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 6, p. 171. Also see: ibid, vol. 19, pp. 29-30.

According to 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, intuition is first developed in humans since childhood when they gain knowledge by presence of their own existence as well as the existence of their faculties. Moreover, he maintains that humans can intuit the truths of imaginal and intellectual worlds, as pointed out in philosophical and Transcendental discussions in the chapter on intellect. When 'Allāma provides mystical discussions of mystical issues, he also talks about the possibility of acquiring knowledge of another world (other than imaginal and intellectual worlds), known as the world of divine names and attributes. In none of his work does he explain why he does not discuss knowledge of the truths in this world under issues of intellect. However, the reason seems to be that, unlike Mullā Ṣadrā, 'Allāma does not see knowledge by presence of intelligibles in imaginal and intellectual worlds as contingent upon existential expansion and the obtaining of existential degrees of these two worlds. Instead, he believes that, depending on their spiritual power, people can gain knowledge of certain respects of these truths, via an illuminational unification with these truths—such knowledge can, indeed, be gained by humans. In other words, the origin of 'Allāma's discussion of these issues was the fact that humans typically have three kinds of knowledge; that is, material and imaginal forms as well as intellectual concepts. From the existence of these three kinds of knowledge, 'Allāma argues for the existence of three worlds: material, imaginal, and intellectual. Notwithstanding this, he does not deploy this argument in order to prove the world of divine names and attributes. Instead, he begins by a proof of God's existence, whereby he demonstratively argues for the existence of the world of divine names and attributes.[172] Taken together, these points lead us to the conclusion that knowledge by presence of this world is taken by 'Allāma as restricted to those who have reached the world in the course of their spiritual development and have had a particular relation—that of "annihilation"—with the names and attributes. This particular way of relatedness will be elaborated in the next section.

4.1.4. Intuition of one's own self and God

In this section, I provide answers to two questions: (1) what is the relation between the soul and the world of divine names and attributes, and how does it differ from Mullā Ṣadrā's relation of unification (or identity) concerning our knowledge of entities in the intellectual world and the illuminational relation maintained by 'Allāma? And (2) is any knowledge of God's attributes contingent upon having this particular relation?

---

[172] For more on how he proves the world of divine names and attributes, see his essays, "al-Tawḥīd" and "Asmā' Allāh" in his *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*. Note that the world of divine names and attributes involves various degrees, in turn.

As pointed out before, 'Allāma believes that any knowledge by acquisition (encompassing all our mental ideas and concepts) is originated and derived from some knowledge by presence—in fact, without knowledge by presence, no knowledge by acquisition can be obtained of any truth in the world.[173] 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī claims that his answer to these two questions in his "Risālat al-Wilāya" is innovative and not found in other works of his.[174]

For a more lucid portrait of these answers, I will address 'Allāma's answer to the second question first. The answer rests upon the concepts of "absolute truth" and "nonexistential constraints (al-quyūd al-'adamiyya) or quiddities (māhiyyāt)." I will elaborate this within the following premises:

1. Following Mullā Ṣadrā, 'Allāma believes in the primacy of existence (aṣālat al-wujūd),[175] unlike Mullā Ṣadrā, he sees quiddities as nonexistential and abstract things that can be imagined contingently upon the existence of an existent.[176] According to the primacy of existence, what exists is just "existence." Alternatively put, what is real is existence.

2. God is a self-contained and absolute existent, from Whom other existents derive their existence. This is to say that other existents do have reality.[177] When we have a glance at the whole world of existence, we see the reality. Existence exists or any existent is existence, so to speak.[178]

3. The reality spreads throughout the world, but when restricted by nonexistential constraints, it becomes specified, and the specification is the same as individuation, which individuates every human being and discriminates them from one another. In fact, these nonexistential constraints are limits that specify the extent of reality possessed by every existent.

---

[173] See: 'Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jami'at al-Mudarrisin Publishers, p. 237. Also see *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i ʿĀm), vol. 1, pp. 189-191.

[174] What is cited here is part of arguments presented by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī on pages 31-34 of his "Risālat al-Wilāya." Since his own articulation is highly succinct and based on other arguments he has offered in other works, I have sought to provide clarifications and implicit grounds of his argument. For the original argument see: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1981, "Risālat al-Wilāya", Qum: Mu'assisa Ahl al-Bayt, p. 31-34.

[175] , Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1999, *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*, Beirut: Mu'assisat al-Nu'man, p. 6. Also see: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn, p. 9.

[176] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn, p. 9.

[177] The proposition that God's creatures have existence is a philosophical proposition. In Islamic mysticism, only God exists and the rest is just God's manifestations.

[178] According to the principle of Islamic mysticism that existence is exclusive to God, the proposition that any existent is existence is true, where "existence" refers to God, and the proposition amounts to saying that what exists is God. From an Islamic philosophical perspective, particularly the Transcendental Wisdom, which sees everything other than God as relational (rābiṭ) existences, the proposition that existence exists is true and is tantamount to saying that God exists, remaining silent on other existents.

4. Since these constraints (quiddities) are nonexistential, hence nonexistent, every existent sees only the reality when it looks at itself, which is to say that every existent sees in it God's attributes and perfection.[179]

5. Depending on how much one's nonexistential constraints are, the observation of (God's) reality will be close to, or far from, the absolute perfection; that is, God. In 'Allāma's own words, "the Exalted God is the ultimate reality of every perfection. For He has all pure and unsullied perfection and beauty, and any existent's proximity or closeness to Him is to the extent of its nonexistential constraints and limits."[180]

6. From these five premises, we can conclude that one's knowledge by presence of one's own self is one's knowledge by presence of God's attributes to the extent that one's soul partakes existence (or reality). From this item of knowledge by presence, the human mind constructs knowledge by acquisition, conceiving divine attributes to the extent of its knowledge by presence. Therefore, given their knowledge by presence of existential perfections of their own souls, human beings can perceive divine attributes. In his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, 'Allāma suggests that we retain concepts of divine names and attributes in negative forms, which is how we can perceive these infinite and unlimited attributes. Thus, we say God is great, where the greatness is not of a type we know. In other words, He is great and His greatness has no limits or boundaries.[181]

To recapitulate 'Allāma's view in "Risālat al-Wilāya" and *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*: of any perfective attribute we see in ourselves, we can say that God has the attribute. For every perfection is existence, and God is mere existence, and since our existence is bound with nonexistential limits, our perception of the reality of a perfection will be restricted by the attribute's limits in our own selves. This is why we need to entertain attributes in a negative form, negating its nonexistential limits, before we can conceive it in an infinite way that is worthy of God's status.

---

[179] 'Allāma does not regard the intuition of a specified entity (a soul that is specified, individuated, and limited in virtue of its nonexistential limits) as different from that of the absolute. This means that when a person observes its limited existence, they see God's existence which is pure and absolute, and therefore, they can observe their portion of existential reality in their own selves, because the existence they see has reality, and only existence has reality or primacy and it is impossible to see nonexistence (nonexistential limits). The reason for this is a philosophical argument to the effect that every specified (or constrained) entity is derived from an absolute entity. See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1999, *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*, Beirut: Mu'assisat al-Nu'mān, p. 17.

[180] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1981, *Risālat a-Wilāya*, Qum: Mu'assisa Ahl al-Bayt, p. 33.

[181] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, Qum: Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i ʿĀm), pp. 103-108.

Now in his answer to the first question, 'Allāma says that every person has a specific perfection they move toward. The perfection is the degree from which the person was emanated during creation, and to which it shall return. The reality of every perfection is God in that He has all perfections and is exalted from any flaw and nonexistence.[182] 'Allāma notes that some people obtain such degree of spiritual development in virtue of their struggles toward God's servitude—they reach and become related to the world of divine names and attributes. To such relation 'Allāma refers as "annihilation" (*fanā'*). [183] 'Allāma expounds the notion of annihilation as emancipation from the nonexistential constraints that grounded one's individuation: the less individuation, the more annihilation and the greater manifestation of the absolute truth. The annihilation takes place without one's immanence (*ḥulūl*) in, and unification (*itīḥād*) with, God as well as His names and attributes. While one is annihilated in God, they intuit their own conditions, seeing their own annihilation. There are three kinds of annihilation: annihilation in essence, annihilation in attributes, and annihilation in acts. Annihilation in essence means the intuition of the stage of Unicity; annihilation in attributes means the intuition of God's stage of Oneness; and annihilation in acts means the intuition of God's attributes of acts (or conative attributes), in the sense that the mystic observes that any action that is done only has God as its subject. 'Allāma says the following about annihilation: "this position [i.e. annihilation] consists in the fact that one finds with his intuition that there is no essence, attribute, or act except by the Exalted God in a way that is worthy of the sanctity of His

---

[182] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1981, "Risālat al-Wilāya", Qum: Mu'assisa Ahl al-Bayt, p. 33.

[183] The term *fanā'* (annihilation) was already used in Islamic mysticism, and 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī was by no means the first to use the term to explain the relation of close servants with God. His contribution here—which he says is novel—is his account of the relation between self-knowledge and annihilation in God. This is a complicated issue, falling outside of the scope of this dissertation, and I have just outlined the premise of his argument concerning the relation between self-knowledge and knowledge of God. Here is a summary of the argument: the reality is absolute. What we consider as determining factors with which we are discriminated from other beings are nonexistential quiddities (note that Mullā Ṣadrā does not believe that quiddities are nonexistential), and the more we are free from the nonexistential and figurative constraints we are entangled in, the more we find in ourselves the absolute reality and the unity of existence, and this existential expansion can reach a point which includes divine names and attributes as well. This is what mystics refer to as annihilation. Alternatively put, annihilation is to see God and to turn a blind eye to one's nonexistential constraints by which we are individuated by using the word 'I' to refer to ourselves. In the final part of this discussion in his "Risālat al-wilāya", 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī writes: "Thus, the genuine perfection of man is his attainment of his genuine perfection with respect to the essential and to essential accidents, or attainment of his final perfection with respect to 'essence,' 'attribute,' and 'act,' where the end is 'essential,' 'attributive,' and 'conative' annihilation in the exalted God, which is referred to as essential, nominal, and active monotheism. This is the stage at which one finds through intuition that there is no essence or attribute or act except for the exalted God in such a way that is deserved by His sacred realm, may His greatness be esteemed, and this occurs without leading to 'immanence and unification,' from both of which God is exalted. And this argument is a divine endowment exclusive to this essay. And thanks to God."
(Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn, Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1981, "Risālat al-Wilāya", Qum: Mu'assisa Ahl al-Bayt, p. 33-34)

presence—may His greatness be glorified—without it leading to immanence (*ḥulūl*) and unification (*itīḥād*) from both of which God is exalted."

Therefore, knowledge of those who have reached the world of divine names and attributes and are annihilated therein, so to speak, is different from knowledge of other people, not in the strength or weakness of the knowledge or perception, but in the way they know.[184]

4.1.5. The Object of Intuition (The Intuited)

According to 'Allāma, God has three stages: that of the essence and that of the names and attributes, to which I have been referring as the world of divine names and attributes, and that of the attributes of acts. The divine stage of names and attributes has two levels:[185] the stage of Unicity and the stage of Oneness. The former is the first divine manifestation, and the latter is the manifestation of the stage of Unicity. Both are sometimes referred to as the stage of divine names and attributes, but in the language of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī the stage of Unicity is often called the stage of divine names and attributes. The stage of the essence has no token and conceptual specification (it has no limits and boundaries) and is pure from any relation with others. Any specification or relation should be considered as restricted to stages lower than the stage of the essence.[186] Therefore, God's essence cannot be intuited by any entity other than God Himself. Based on certain philosophical arguments as well as his exegesis of certain Qur'anic verses,[187] 'Allāma believes that God intuits His own essence, where such intuition is impossible for entities other than God. In his view, God is a pure existence having all existential perfections, and things other than God that are intuited are relational existences[188] which depend on God, or in mystical terms, are His manifestations. 'Allāma refers to these relational existences sometimes as God's lights.[189] Since what exists is God or His manifestation, what is intuited by human beings is indeed God's lights and manifestations diffused in different entities all of which depend on God for their existence. From this it follows that the object of intuition

---

[184] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1981, "Risālat al-Wilāya", Qum: Mu'assisa Ahl al-Bayt, p. 20.

[185] Although the stage of Attributes of Acts is also about the attributes of God, but because of its respective lower degree, is not usually included in the stage of Divine Names and Attributes in the writings of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, rather he mentions it after the stage of Divine Names and Attributes.

[186] For more, see Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1999, *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya,* Beirut: Mu'assisat al-Nu'man, pp. 40-43.

[187] Such as verse 18 of Sura Al-i-'Imran.

[188] For more about "relational existences (*al-wujūdāt al-rābiṭa*), see Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jāmi'ah al-Mudarrisīn, pp. 28-30.

[189] The Qur'an also characterizes God as the light of the skies and the earth (the Qur'an 24:35).

consists in divine perfections manifested in different entities, including humans.[190] There are three points that should be noted here:

First: When 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī engages in mystical issues and talks about intuitive findings of mystics as well as Quranic verses, he talks about four kinds of monotheism:[191] (1) the stage of essence (essentialist monotheism): God's absolute and limitless essence cannot be grasped by reason, and He is even exalted from the description that He is absolute. This is the stage referred to as *lāhūt*, which 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī characterizes as the stage of essence by citing evidence from certain hadiths and Quranic verses. His words in *Risālat al-tawḥīd* imply that although this is originally a mystical issue, he has managed to present a rational argument for it, claiming that a rational argument for this stage of monotheism is an exclusive characteristic of his theoretical mysticism. As to what has been done by philosophers before him, he says: "God, may His name be esteemed, is the essence involving all perfections and exalted from all imperfections, and all of His attributes are identical to His essence, and this is the heritage of earlier religions to which earlier prophets have called. This is what can be obtained from the teachings of divine philosophers of ancient Egypt, Greece, Iran, and other areas, and it is what has been elaborated by prominent Islamic philosophers, such as the Second Teacher Abū Naṣr Fārābī, and the head of intellectuals Bū 'Alī Sīnā [Avicenna], and what Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn [Mullā Ṣadrā] sought in his work".[192] This stage of monotheism, as in the words of prominent thinkers such as Mullā Ṣadrā, is inferior to the stage of monotheism explained by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and referred to as the stage of essence; (2) the stage of Unicity (aḥadiyya): this is posterior to, and is in fact a manifestation of, the stage of essence. At this stage, all divine names and attributes have a dense manifestation. For instance, there is a power at this stage which is knowledge in that it is power, and there is knowledge which is life in that it is knowledge. All names and attributes are, at this stage, true of one another;[193] (3) the stage of

---

[190] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1999, *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*, Beirut: Mu'assisat al-Nu'man, p. 29.

[191] 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī sees mysticism and philosophy along, rather than besides, each other in the sense that what is proved by arguments can be in line with mystical findings and account for them in philosophical terms, in which case there will be no contradiction between them. This is not to say, however, that whatever is intuited by a mystic can be argued for in philosophy. Instead, there are issues for which no philosophical argument can be adduced, including the problem of manifestation (*tajallī*) and connective or relational existence, where philosophers see everything but God as relational existences that only have a trace of existence, whereas mystics believe in the personal unity of existence, claiming that talk of existence of anything other than God is merely figurative in that things other than God are His manifestations. And manifestation is not a feature of existence, and so, it falls outside of the scope of philosophy.

[192] See Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1999, *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*, Beirut: Mu'assisat al-Nu'man, pp. 6-14.

[193] Ibid., p. 15.

Oneness (*wāḥidiyya*): this is posterior to the stage of Unicity. At this stage, divine names and attributes have independent manifestations. Here is a philosophical articulation of the difference between stages of Unicity and Oneness: "the stage of Oneness is the stage of God's possession of perfections in the manner of token identity and conceptual plurality. This is contrasted to the stage of Unicity which is the stage of dense manifestation of perfections, without involving any conceptual plurality";[194] and (4) conative monotheism: it says that no action is done in the world which is not an act of God.[195]

Second: What 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and others say about different stages of God's existence does not mean that God has a number of stages within His essence. Rather, all this talk is relevant to God's manifestations and appearances. On this account, when we talk about, say, the stage of Unicity, we mean the first and the highest stage of God's manifestation. It should be noted that talk of God's stages is a purely mystical issue, because talk of God's manifestations and appearances is outside of the scope of philosophy. Philosophy is, indeed, concerned with existence and its general features, and when it comes to consideration of the relation between creatures and God's essence, it treats the former as connective or relational existence (according, of course, to the Transcendent philosophy). That being the case, although 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī presents a rational argument for the stage of essential monotheism, it does not render the issue philosophical. His statement that philosophers from the Second Teacher to Mullā Ṣadrā have failed to adduce an argument for essential monotheism implies that mysticism is superior to philosophy in that it can provide an argument for the highest stage of monotheism. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī has gleaned the argument from Quranic verses and hadiths, or alternatively put, he cites supports for this from the Qur'an and hadiths in his *al-Rasā'il al-tawḥīdiyya*.

Third: What philosophers say about different realms of existence—which I have explained in the chapter on 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's view of reason—has to do with the world of creatures, and all this counts as philosophical, rather than mystical, discussion. It has also been pointed out that 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī raises a discursive (philosophical) argument for the existence of these realms by way of analysing mental concepts. On this account, different realms of the world of creatures and God's stages in mystical issues should not be conflated. For instance, Platonic forms,[196] which have been accepted by Mullā Ṣadrā in parts of his book *al-Asfār* and rejected

---

[194] Ibid., p. 29.
[195] Ibid., p. 58.
[196] Although the word *muthul* is used in Arabic to refer to Platonoc forms, and *muthul* is cognate with *mithāl*, one should not confuse Platonic forms (*muthul*) and the imaginal (*mithāl*) world, and say that all Muslim philosophers

by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī in his *Nihāyat al-ḥikma*, have to do with latitudinal intellects (*al-'uqūl al-'arḍiyya*) which lie at the lowest stage of the world of intellects, where the world of intellects is a created world.

4.1.6. *'Allāma's contributions to theoretical mysticism*

A question tackled by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī in his "Risālat al-Wilāya" is the following: is the position of *wilāya* exclusive to certain people, such as the prophets, or can it be attained by others as well? In response, 'Allāma says that the position is not exclusive—it can be achieved by everyone. To substantiate the claim, he offers a philosophical argument which counts as his own contribution. The argument was partly expounded above. Put in a nutshell, the argument says that the relation between this realm and the realm beyond it is that of effect and cause or imperfection and perfection, dubbed by 'Allāma as the relation between the interior and the exterior. Since the exterior is necessarily intuited, and since the intuited involves an intuition of the interior, it follows that the interior is intuited, since the existence of the exterior is a degree of the existence of the interior. In fact, the existence of the exterior with respect to that of the interior is a relational existence. This argument by 'Allāma is very helpful in discussion of knowledge of one's soul and questions of self-knowledge and knowledge of God. It accounts for how one's knowledge of his or her own restricted existence is indeed knowledge of God (the absolute being) to the extent to which they partake of existence. Moreover, this is a

---

attributed the belief in the imaginal world to Plato. For the attributes ascribed to Platonic forms by Plato match entities existing in the world of intellects, and Mullā Ṣadrā and many other Islamic philosophers have rightly counted these forms as entities of the world of intellects. In fact, no Islamic philosopher before Shahāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī (1154-1191) could prove the existence of the imaginal world, and thus, they used to divide the created world into two parts: the material world and the world of intellects (see Sayyid Ḥasan Aḥmadī, Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā Ḥusaynī Khāmina, 'Jāygāh-i 'ālam-i mithāl dar falsafih-yi Suhrawardī' [The place of the imaginal world in Suhrawardī's philosophy], *Khiradnāmih-yi Ṣadrā*, no. 56). There are serious disagreements among Islamic philosophers as to Plato's work and opinions, and these extend to his account of Platonic forms as well. Different interpretations of Platonic forms can be classified into three general groups with respect to the existential stage of Platonic forms: (1) Forms are abstract quiddities of things subsisting by God as His imprinted images and elaborate knowledge of the creatures. In his *Al-jam' bayn al-ra'yayn (The reconciliation of the two opinions)*, Fārābī rejects certain interpretations of forms attributed to Aristotle, and then espouses this exegesis (pp. 106-10). In his *Shawāriq*, 'Abd al-Razzāq Lāhījī defends Fārābī in his reduction of forms to imprinted images, but Mullā Ṣadrā rejects Fārābī's account of God's elaborate knowledge; (2) forms are latitudinal intellects in the world of intellects. This interpretation has been advocated by people such as Mīr Dāmād, Mullā Ṣadrā, Mullā Hādī Sabzawārī, and 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī. What they all agree on is that Platonic forms are intellects, but their versions of this view remarkably vary. The first three philosophers formulate their versions of Platonic forms and attribute it to Plato, but 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī elaborates Platonic forms and then rejects them. Suhrawardī and Avicenna have also interpreted Platonic forms as intellects or belonging to the world of intellects. Platonic forms are rejected by Avicenna and other Islamic Peripatetic philosophers. Suhrawardī agreed with Avicenna at first, but he says that he later intuited Platonic forms as a result of his mystical asceticism and then provided a rational argument for them; (3) forms are imaginal images in the imaginal world. This interpretation was offered by Dawānī and was criticized by Mullā Ṣadrā. (The discussion is wide-ranging, and it is not possible to consider all accounts of Platonic forms in this dissertation. For more on this see pp. 268-314 of chapter nine of volume two of *Raḥīq makhtūm*—'Abd Allāh Jawādī Āmulī's exposition of *al-Asfār*.)

philosophical argument that can be drawn on to justify what some mystics said to the effect that they only saw God in whatever they saw.

Conclusion

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī takes intuition to be the presence of an immaterial entity to another immaterial entity, believing that objects of intuition are immaterial entities existing in the imaginal world and the world of intellects. In his mystical discussions, following the lead of mystics, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī talks about God's manifestations and the possibility of their intuition. In the religious language, revelation is a kind of relation with God. In the next section, I will provide a definition and characterization of revelation according to 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī.

4.2. Revelation

In his *al-Mīzān*, 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī defines and explains various types of revelation (*waḥy*) in terms of difference senses in which the word, *waḥy*, is used in the Qur'an.[197] One type of revelation, dealt with in this dissertation, is concerned with meanings revealed or inspired by God to particular individuals, i.e. prophets, who have particular characteristics, in the form of words and meanings. Taking all words and philosophical principles of 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī into account, it might be concluded that he takes the reality of revelation to consist in a graded (*mushakkak*) entity, having different existential degrees—one end of which lies in God's essence and the other in the lowest degrees of the soul in a verbal form.[198] In my discussion of

---

[197] In the Qur'an, the word, *waḥy*, has been used in five senses: (1) revelation to prophets, to which a major part of this dissertation is devoted, (2) guidance revelation (*waḥy al-tasdīd*): according to verse 73 of Sura al-Anbiya': "And We revealed to them the doing of good deeds." In his delineation of this type of revelation, 'Allāma says that this is different from legislative revelation, which precedes the action. Guidance revelation is simultaneous or concurrent with the action, consisting in a divine interior guidance to the righteous action. To the contrary, legislative revelation precedes the action, and the Prophet acts upon its commands and doctrines, asking people to do the same (*al-Mīzān*, vol. 14, p. 305), (3) *waḥy* in the sense of general existential guidance: according to the Qur'an, "And your Lord revealed to the bee, 'Take for yourself among the mountains, houses, and among the trees and [in] that which they construct'" (16: 68). Given the literal meaning of *waḥy* (to stealthily communicate something to someone), 'Allāma says about the revelation to the bee that to inspire something to an animal so that it can instinctively learn it is a revelation of some kind (*al-Mīzān*, vol. 12, p. 292), (4) *waḥy* in the sense of inspiring something to someone in their dreams: of Moses's mother the Qur'an says in verse 7 of Sura al-Qisas: "And We revealed to the mother of Moses, 'Suckle him'." This type of revelation is different from legislative revelation to prophets and is a matter of inspiring a meaning to one's heart in a nonverbal form. 'Allāma refers to a person who receives this type of revelation as *muḥaddath* (one to whom God talks) (*al-Mīzān*, vol. 3, p. 220), and (5) *waḥy* as devilish temptation: of Satan's temptation to his followers, the Qur'an says: "And indeed do the devils reveal their allies [among men] to dispute with you" (6: 121). This revelation is not from God and it might be verbal or nonverbal.

[198] 'Allāma believes that to say that revelation is purely a matter of meaning is to contradict Qur'anic verses, suggesting that if we espouse such esoteric interpretations of the Qur'an and identify revelation with perceptibles imparted to the individual by human intellectual faculties that lead to the good, then we need to adopt the same

the gradation of existence, I pointed out that the truth of material beings exists in the imaginal world, and the truth of imaginal beings exists at the stage of the intellectual world, and the chain continues until it ends in God's essence, which is comprehensive of all existential perfections. The revelatory truth, imparted to the prophet in its lowest degree (in the minor imaginal world; that is, the human soul) in a verbal form,[199] exists at the highest stage of the existential chain; that is, the stage of the divine essence, in a more perfect way, and God inspires it to the prophet's heart. On this account, the reality of revelation consists in particular immaterial meanings, of an epistemic character, although at the lowest degrees of existence they appear in verbal forms. No one, including the receiver of revelation, has an agential role with respect to any stage of revelation,[200] and no one can make any changes in its meaning or words.[201] Therefore, 'Allāma would disagree with those who say that prophets received only the meanings from God, and then articulated them in their own words.

'Allāma takes the reality of revelation to be a matter of meaning[202] (although the meaning is inspired to the prophet via God's words), maintaining that God is the origin of revelation—sometimes He directly talked to prophets; sometimes He talked to them with the mediation of

---

position in the case of all supernatural entities, which is contrary to *prima facie* meanings of the Qur'an. In his discussion of miracles and extraordinary acts in his *al-Mīzān*, 'Allāma responds to such interpretations (*al-Mīzān*, vol. 2, p. 314). It should be noted, however, that, as shall be elaborated later in this section, the words received by prophets are not material sounds—in order for them to be communicated, God and revelation-carrying angels do not need to have larynxes or move a lip or mouth. Moreover, the receiver—the prophet—does not need to have material ears. Prophets absorb the words just as we hear words in our dreams.

[199] In his *al-Mīzān*, 'Allāma cites a hadith transmitted by Zurāra from Imam al-Ṣādiq about the difference between *rasūl* (messenger) and *nabiyy* (prophet) and *muḥaddath* (one to whom God talks). The Imam explains: "*rasūl* is the one who sees the angel who brings the message from his Lord and says: 'your Lord has commanded such and such. A *rasūl* is also a *nabiyy*. A *nabiyy*, on the other hand, does not see the angel who comes to him. The angel just inspires the divine message to his heart. At the time of receiving the message, the *nabiyy* goes unconscious or sees things in his dreams." It should be noted that, either case (seeing the angel or receiving the message in the dream), *words* are imparted to the prophet and the messenger (*al-Mīzān*, vol. 3, p. 219). The reason why this is the case should be sought in 'Allāma's philosophical principles. Revelation involves a great plurality of words, just as any other verbal phenomenon, and such plurality is only compatible with the material world as well as the minor imaginal world (that is, the imaginal world of the human soul insofar as it is related with the material world), and dreams are, indeed, instances of this imaginal dimension of the human soul. In higher worlds such as the intellectual world and the divine essence, however, there is no such accidental plurality—indeed, plurality gives way to unity. Therefore, the reality of revelation in God's essence is simple (noncomplex), and in the world of essential names, it comes to have conceptual (rather than token) plurality.

[200] In his interpretation of verse 97 of Sura al-Baqara, 'Allāma says: "Just as Gabriel has no autonomous role in bringing the Qur'an down, and is but a compliant messenger, he does not have such role in receiving and delivering the Qur'an to the Messenger of God. To the contrary, the Messenger's heart is a container of divine revelation, without it being manipulated by Gabriel. To sum, Gabriel was just charged with the task of delivering the message, period" (*al-Mīzān*, vol. 1, p. 230). This point is not restricted to the Qur'an; it extends to all revelation in general.

[201] See: Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2009, *Qur'an dar Islam*, Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb, p. 92.

[202] Ibid., 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al-'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 2, p. 316.

an angel, and sometimes "from behind a veil."[203] Since 'Allāma regards the human perceptive faculty as immaterial, the reality of revelation and its origin as well as its possible intermediaries and its receiver (the prophet's soul) are also immaterial.[204] In the section on intellect, I pointed out that 'Allāma believes that all knowledge acquired by people in virtue of their relation with immaterial worlds is knowledge by presence, taking the presence of an immaterial entity to another immaterial entity as a matter of intuition. From these premises, as well as certain remarks by 'Allāma in his work, to some of which I shall return soon, it follows that knowledge of revelation is a matter of knowledge by presence—it is a specific type of intuition acquired by certain human souls. What follows is restricted to a definition of revelation, its properties, and ways of receiving it. I will only discuss what helps us to identify the relation among intellect, intuition, and revelation from 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's perspective.

4.2.1. Definition of Revelation and Its Properties

'Allāma provides a number of similar definitions of revelation in his works, the most elaborate of which is the following: "revelation is a kind of heavenly (immaterial) speech not perceived via senses and intellectual thinking, but via another sentience and cognition found in certain individuals with the grace of God, whereby they receive hidden commands—concealed from senses and intellect—from revelation and divine teaching. Prophethood (*nubuwwa*) is to undertake such a task."[205] Given the preliminaries above as well as 'Allāma's explicit words to the effect that revelation comes in a verbal form as well, paradigmatically exemplified by the Qur'an, it becomes obvious that when 'Allāma says that revelation is not perceived by intellect, he talks about the reality of revelation pointed out above; he does not intend to say that revelation is a just a matter of meaning, and the prophet can perceive the words of revelation without deploying intellectual faculties.

A crucial issue concerning divine speech—which we should take into account in order to be able to understand 'Allāma's view of revelations articulated here and there in his various works—is that, according to 'Allāma, the Qur'an endorses God's verbal speech. He provides an elaborate discussion of *kalām* (word), *qawl* (statement), *waḥy* (revelation), and other similar Qur'anic words.[206] What concerns us in this dissertation is that *kalām* literally means the communication of meaning to the addressee, where the communication is verbal, although it

---

[203] Ibid., vol. 18, p. 107.
[204] Ibid., 2009, *Qur'an dar Islam*, Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb, p. 103.
[205] Ibid., p. 102-103.
[206] See: Ibid., 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, vol. 2, pp. 314-327.

can also be used in nonverbal communications. ʿAllāma suggests that humans have invented words in order to obviate their needs; otherwise, they would not do so. Uttered words are material entities, generated by body parts, such as larynxes and tongues, and their receiver should also be equipped with material ears. God is exalted from having a material body, and so are angels who undertake to carry and deliver divine messages. Therefore, divine and angelic speech should not be conceived as requiring material bodies and material words generated therefrom. But not all words are material—there may be immaterial words, which still count as words in a literal, rather than metaphorical, sense of the term. This is the case when we hear words and find meaning in them in our dreams, whereas these words are not material, having material forms only. In his exegesis of verse 17 of Sura Maryam, ʿAllāma comments on the word, *tamaththul* (representation), as follows: "how is it possibly conceivable that an angel appears as a human being and then returns to its original form given that humans and angels have distinct identities, without there being a relation between the two with respect to their essences or effects? When we say 'something has represented itself to something else in such and such a way,' it is tantamount to saying that the former has appeared in such and such a form to the latter; that is, the latter has conceived the former in such and such a way, rather than being transformed into something else. Therefore, an angel's representation as a human is its appearance to an observer in a human form, without it really turning into a human being; otherwise, it would follow that something is transformed into something else, instead of appearing in a different form."[207] The same is the case with the appearance of Gabriel (the carrier of revelation) to the prophet. Thus, Gabriel comes to have a human form, without having a material body, and consequently, the angel does not turn into a human being, and without a body, there will be no sounds or material utterances. The communication of such words to the prophet is analogous to what one undergoes during a dream: one hears the words from someone without their physical ears being engaged in the audition. ʿAllāma provides no further illumination of what these words really are and how they are communicated. He just says that this is hidden from us—we do not know anything more about the reality of revelation.

In a key essay on revelation, as well as his *al-Mīzān*,[208] ʿAllāma elucidates the peculiar sentience or sense possessed by the prophets, by means of which they have received revelations. In his view, revelation is a special type of speech, which requires its receiver to be equipped

[207]Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbūʿāt, vol. 14, p. 36.
[208] Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 152-158.

with a peculiar sense not possessed by ordinary people. To this peculiar power of the prophets 'Allāma refers as the "mysterious sense," which is the ground of their ability to receive revelations. He says: "prophethood is a mysterious non-intellectual sense, and revelation consists in truths received through this sense."[209] By "non-intellectual" 'Allāma does not intend to say that the message of revelation is irrational; what he means is that people do not come to have the ability to receive revelation merely in virtue of having intellect or an intellectual faculty. To receive God's words, one needs to be equipped with a peculiar mysterious sense outside the scope of the human intellect. There should, therefore, be a homogeneity among revelation, its sender, and its receiver, without which it would be impossible for a prophet to receive revelations.

In his essays, "al-Tawḥīd" (monotheism), and "al-Asmā' wa-l-Ṣifāt" (the names and the attributes), 'Allāma refers to three divine stages: the essence, essential names, and names of actions. From 'Allāma's words it is implied that the first revelation received by all prophets was unmediated;[210] that is, they partake in the stage of essence (or essential names) as annihilated in divine essence (or essential names). Thereafter, the prophets need not reach the threshold of annihilation; they can stay at the stage of union with God's names of actions. In any event, regardless of whether or not they reach the stage of annihilation in the essence or essential names, they never doubt whether the meanings communicated to them are from God, since they intuit God's essence or His essential names or His names of actions.[211] With respect to unmediated revelation being known by certainty, 'Allāma suggests that the divine origin of revelation is as evident to the prophet[212] as ordinary pieces of self-evident knowledge (such as knowledge of the proposition that two is half of four).[213] In his exegesis of verse 14 of Sura Taha, 'Allāma makes it explicit that revelation can be received when intuiting the stage of divine essence. In his account of the first revelation sent down to Moses and why God

---

[209] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2008, *Majmū'a Rasā'il ('Allāma-ye Ṭabāṭabā'ī)*, "Risālat al-Wasa'iṭ," Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb, vol. 1, p. 150.

[210] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 14, p. 138.

[211] Ibid.

[212] Here is how 'Allāma supports his claim: "this condition [unmediated reception of revelation] is shared by all prophets in their initial revelation in which their prophethood or messengership was announced to them. Here, they have no doubts that the revelation is from the Exalted God, and in order to see this, they need no reflections, reasons, or proofs. For if they needed any of these, they would still not have certainty that they became a prophet, indeed, because the confidence they would thus develop might be resulted from reasons deployed by their intellectual faculty, rather than an unmediated reception from the hidden" (*al-Mīzān*, vol. 4, p. 138).

[213] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 3, p. 220.

introduced Himself to him as "Indeed, I am Allah. There is no deity except Me" (20:14), 'Allāma writes: "when He says 'Indeed, I am Allah. There is no deity except Me,' He introduces Himself with His name and says 'Indeed, I am Allah,' rather than 'Allah is Me.' For acquaintance implies that one is introduced to attributes of the essence through observation of the essence, and not the other way round." It should be noted that, as I pointed out in the section on intuition, according to 'Allāma's suggestion on page 16 of his "Risālat al-Wilāya," one can reach the stage of essential annihilation in the sense that "one becomes annihilated in God's transcendental essence and then becomes hidden in virtue of God's hiddenness—being annihilated in virtue of the essence's annihilation and surviving in virtue of the survival of the Exalted God Who is pure from any flaws and imperfections."

4.2.2. Ways in which Revelation is Received

'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī cites Qur'anic verses, including verse 51 of Sura al-Shura to show that there are three ways in which revelation is inspired to the prophets. First: the prophet directly receives revelation from God without a mediation or without a veil between him and God.[214] According to 'Allāma, initial revelations received by all prophets were of this type, and their subsequent revelations were sometimes in this way as well. Second: by the mediation of specific angels, including Gabriel. And third: reception of revelation from behind a veil between God and the prophet.

'Allāma maintains that God's speech is one of His attributes of actions, rather than an essential attribute, and since God performs His actions via intermediaries, God's speech takes place in mediated ways.[215] This supports my construal of 'Allāma's account early in this section: that he takes revelation to be a graded reality. To illustrate, on the one hand, 'Allāma suggests that all divine actions, including revelation, are performed in mediated ways, but, on the other, he says that there is an unmediated type of revelation. To reconcile the two propositions, we can say that when 'Allāma talks about unmediated or direct ways of receiving revelations, he talks about the strongest and the highest degree of the reality of revelation, and when he talks about mediated revelation, he talks indeed about lower degrees of the same revelation, that is, the words of revelation.

---

[214]Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 18, pp. 72-73.
[215] Ibid., vol. 14, p. 139.

Later in this discussion, 'Allāma suggests that even when a mediating angel delivers the message, unmediated revelation might still take place, depending on whether the receiver of revelation is fixated on God or the revelation-carrying angel.[216] In other words, if the prophet is fully attentive of the carrier of revelation, he will receive the revelation in a mediated way and from behind the veil (where the angel serves as a veil between him and God), but if he turns his attention away from the carrier of revelation to God Himself, he would receive an unmediated revelation. This is to say that if the prophet reaches a stage at which he can intuit the divine essence or God's essential names—that is, the stage of annihilation—then he will receive the higher reality of revelation from God, while, at a lower stage, his soul is still engaged in receiving the words of revelation from the revelation angel. In its higher stage, therefore, revelation is proportionate to the existential degree (that of God's essence) where it exists, and at its lowest stage, it is proportionate to the existential degree (the minor imaginal world) where it exists. Now depending on which of these degrees the prophet's soul is attentive of, he receives revelation in that degree, in addition to the lowest degree of his soul also receiving the lowest degree of revelation (its words). Such a graded picture of revelation is well-matched with the word, *inzāl* (sending down), used about revelation in the Qur'an, because *inzāl* involves, for example, the holding of one end of a rope at a higher floor and then sending the rest of the rope down to lower floors. This is contrary to *nuzūl* (descending), which is a case where something goes down through and through. Thus, the Qur'an—as an instance of revelation—extends from the stage of divine essence all the way down to that of the minor imaginal world, existing at each stage of the longitudinal chain of existence as proportionate to that degree of existence.

---

[216] Ibid.

5. The Relation between Intellect, Intuition, and Revelation

After our consideration of the definition and properties of intellect, intuition, and revelation, we are now in a position to deal with the main question of the dissertation: what is 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's view of the relation among the three? To elucidate 'Allāma's view of the matter, we need to consider five epistemological preliminaries.

5.1. The preliminaries

1. The human cognitive faculty consists of five distinct faculties, each of which has the ability and function to perceive a given category of the knowable. The five faculties are: sense, imagination, estimation (*wahm*), intellect, and peculiar intellectual faculty. I have already introduced some of these faculties. The peculiar intellectual faculty is the one whose actualization is tantamount to one's admission to the intellectual world. Moreover, I have pointed out that, for 'Allāma, the difference between humans and other animals boils down to the latter's deprivation of this type of intellectual faculty. According to 'Allāma, the faculty in charge of perceiving universal concepts in animals is the estimative (*wāhima*) faculty. The estimative faculty is, indeed, at the lowest intellectual degree [217] —where intellect is characterized by perception of universals—and if the peculiar intellectual faculty is actualized, it will constitute the highest intellectual degree. Between estimative and peculiar intellectual faculties, there lies the intellective (or intellectual) faculty, in virtue of which one perceives complicated theoretical objects of knowledge, which cannot be perceived by animals. Moreover, it is on account of this faculty (the practical intellect) that one can discern the good and the evil. This is the faculty owing to which the human species is superior to other animal species—indeed, it counts as the distinguishing feature of humans and other animals.[218] It should be noted, however, that the difference between intellective and peculiar intellectual faculties lies in the fact that the former never partakes of the intellectual world even upon its full-scale actualization, whereas the latter begins to be actualized only when the human soul is admitted to the intellectual world, or more precisely speaking, its actualization is tantamount to one's entry in this world. Just as the estimative faculty is at lowest degree of intellect, senses constitute the lowest degree of perceptive faculties. On this account, (1) the sensory faculty is

---

[217] For more about 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's view of animal knowledge and animal cognitive faculties, see the following (his words on the matter in the following references should be placed side by side to yield the desired conclusion): Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2007, *Majmū'a Rasā'il al-'Allāmat al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, p. 345, fn. and p. 346; also see Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, Tehran: Shirkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīy-i 'Ām), pp. 489-493, and Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1970, *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al-'Alamī Li al-Maṭbū'āt, vol. 13, pp. 158-160.
[218] Ibid.

the weakest human cognitive faculty, (2) the estimative faculty is the weakest human intellectual faculty; that is, the faculty that perceives the universals, (3) the intellective faculty is the strongest faculty that is actualized in all human beings, and (4) the strongest human intellectual faculty that is actualized only in some people, such as the prophets, is the peculiar human intellectual faculty. Each of the five human senses (that is, tactile, olfactory, gustatory, auditory, and visual) are impinged on by different things when exposed to them in one way or another. Thus, a hot cup of coffee impinging on one's fingers is perceived by one's tactile faculty, where the perception occurs in virtue of the cup's contact with one's hand. The resulting sensible form exists as long as the impingement persists, it is renewed with modifications in the impingement, and it disappears as soon as the impingement ceases. The imaginative faculty creates an imaginative form out of this sensible form, where the former is a particular form just like the latter (that is, it cannot apply to a plurality of objects), but they differ in that the former lacks certain constraints, such as time and place. Thus, when you watch the Eiffel Tower, the light emanating from the tower toward your eyes impinges on parts of your visual system, as a result of which you come to have a form—viz. a sensible form—based on the impingement. When you close your eyes, you can still imagine the Eiffel Tower while you are in London, since your imaginative faculty has constructed an imaginative form from the tower's sensible form, which cannot apply to all towers in the world (that is, it is particular), although you have imagined the tower without temporal, spatial, and other constraints, which is the reason why you can still imagine it in London or in your local park.

2. As pointed out before, in 'Allāma's view, there are two existential dimensions in a human being: material (the body) and imaginal. Now if the human soul develops existential expansion and is admitted to the intellectual world, it will also have a third dimension—that of intellect. None of the cognitive faculties exists in the material dimension of human bodies, because knowledge is immaterial, and the faculty that perceives knowledge should, on account of homogeneity between the perceiver and the perceived, be immaterial. The sensible faculty has the strongest tie to the body, and it is through this that other faculties are related to the material world. All of the five cognitive faculties, referred to in (1), exist in the imaginal world (that is, the imaginal dimension of the human existence) and are in contact with imaginal inhabitants of the world. The only exception is the peculiar human faculty that will exist in the intellectual world upon its actualization.

3. 'Allāma believes that[219] the generation of universal concepts (such as that of the human which applies to different human individuals) depends on the realization of a corresponding imaginative form, which depends in turn on the realization of a corresponding sensible form, and there is a constant relation among these. He offers this account in Article Four of his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm* to show that no error occurs in any of these sensible, imaginative, and intellectual (universal) forms—indeed, errors take place at the level of judgement. He provides a lengthy discussion of the issue, which I shall not tackle here. I just wish to illustrate his claim with an example. Consider the sentence, "a burglar broke into my house," and suppose that it is false. The sentence consists of three parts: a subject, a predicate, and a judgment. The judgment is not a matter of knowledge by acquisition—one that is acquired by the soul as a result of a contact with the external (or extra-mental) world—but is an item of knowledge created by the human soul, which is a matter of knowledge by presence. Since judgment is an action (an existing entity) created by the human soul, it cannot possibly be characterized as false, because actions cannot by nature be false. Accordingly, the error lies in the subject or the predicate or both. Now if the error lies in the subject, then it might have arisen from similarities between features I generally attribute to burglars and to those I identify my brother with. Thus, if I identify burglars with tallness, thick hair, and black clothes, and as it happens, these are the very features with which I identify my brother with, then I might be susceptible to errors about the person who has entered my house. Two cognitive faculties are involved in this scenario neither of which is erroneous: (i) the sensory faculty: it sensibly perceives whatever is reflected in the eye, according to which the human soul judges that a tall, thick-haired person in black has entered the house. No error occurs at this stage, and (ii) the imaginative faculty: it judges that these attributes are identical to my brother's, and therefore, my brother and burglars are identical in these features. This is also an accurate judgement. Moreover, the imaginative faculty which can identify something with something similar makes an identity judgment between a burglar and my brother (the one who has actually entered the house). This judgment is also accurate in the domain of our imaginative faculty, because the correspondence domain of imaginative forms created by the soul is the imaginal world, rather the external world. This is like imagining that Ali is an instance of lion (in that he is brave) and say that the lion has come (where you mean that Ali has come). To put it the other way round, the error occurs when I compare the imaginative judgment that "my brother (the tall, thick-

---

[219] The ideas in preliminaries (3) and (4) were discussed by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī in Article Four of his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm* and elaborated by Ayatullah Murtaza Mutahhari in his commentaries on the book.

haired man in black) and the burglar (the tall, thick-hair man in black) are identical" to the sensory judgment, because "the burglar (the tall, thick-hair man in black) who has entered the house" does not correspond to the judgment that "the burglar and my brother are identical" because the tall, thick-hair man in black might be my brother or a burglar or a neighbor or any other person with these features. Therefore, it is erroneous to judge that a sensory judgment (which is always true) corresponds to an imaginary judgment (which is always true in the imaginative domain).

4. The same error that might occur in comparing a sensory judgment to an imaginative judgment might also occur when comparing an imaginative judgement to an intellectual judgment or judgements by other cognitive faculties. As pointed out before, all concepts and assents take place in the imaginal dimension of the human existence, which is to say that all empirical, human, and other sciences are acquired in this dimension. Now errors that take place in these sciences do not lie in what is perceived by these faculties. They occur as a result of an error in comparing a judgment issued by one faculty, say the imaginative faculty, with that of another faculty, say the intellectual faculty. The error might even take place in comparing the perceptibles of the peculiar intellectual faculty and those of intellective, imaginative, estimative, or sensory faculties. Thus, a mystic who is admitted to the intellectual world might make errors if he wishes to compare his mystical intuitions from the intellectual world to the rest of his perceptibles—perceived by other faculties such as the intellectual faculty.

From the four premises above, we can imply that, in 'Allāma's view, judgments of our cognitive faculties are never susceptible to errors, since they are always true in their respective domains (e.g. in imaginative or intellectual domains). In fact, errors occur when comparing the judgment of a faculty to that of another.

5. 'Allāma discusses errors in knowledge in his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*. Since his primary addressees in this book were idealist[220] materialists, he did not engage in how such knowledge is acquired by human beings. Instead, he does his utmost to support realism. As pointed out before, 'Allāma believes that since the human soul is immaterial and since immaterial entities have a higher degree of existence than material entities, matter cannot create anything in the soul; that is to say, contacts with material beings and their impingements on the

---

[220] In 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's jargons, 'idealism' is the denial of reality or denial of the possibility of obtaining knowledge of the reality. In twentieth-century Iran, it was common to refer to these views under the label of 'idealism.' It is evidently distinct from 'idealism' as in Western philosophy and ancient Greek philosophy. What 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī calls 'idealism' is in fact what is known as 'skepticism' in Western philosophy.

human soul, transmitted by nerve cells to the brain, cannot produce knowledge in the soul. They just play a preparatory role in the sense that when one makes a contact with something via the five senses, their soul will be directed at the imaginal truth of the thing in the imaginal world, and will come to have a relation with it. It will then obtain knowledge by presence through this illuminational relation, and subsequently, the human soul (or mind) will abstract knowledge by acquisition—viz. the form of the thing—from this item of knowledge by presence.

5.2. The Relation among Intellect, Intuition, and Revelation in terms of Knowledge by Presence

As I have explained at length, the intellect has different existential degrees, each of which is in charge of acquiring different kinds of knowledge. These kinds of knowledge are acquired by humans through some relation of unification with different entities in different worlds of existence. To establish a relation of unification, also known as illuminational relation, is to have knowledge by presence, which is defined as the presence of an immaterial entity (the known) to an immaterial entity (the soul). The presence amounts to an intuition of different entities in different worlds, acquired by the soul through its relation of unification with other entities such that the soul finds and intuits them in its own existence. When the five cognitive faculties of humans have a relation of unification with entities in imaginal or intellectual worlds, the human soul finds them in its own existence to the extent of its relation with them, and this finding is indeed knowledge by presence. For 'Allāma, to intuit is to find other entities in one's soul, which is a matter of knowledge by presence. The only conceivable difference between intuitions and intellectual perceptions (that is, all perceptions via the five faculties) is the intuition of the stage of Oneness (waḥidiyya), as well as the intuition of the stage of Unicity (aḥadiyya), where the soul reaches the stage of annihilation in divine attributes. As delineated before, these two stages are the highest degrees of intuition where the human being intuits itself without the nonexistential constraints with which the soul is individuated in other worlds of existence (viz. intellectual and imaginal worlds) and sees only God and His attributes, "without leading to immanence (ḥulūl) and unification (itiḥād), from both of which God is exalted."[221] On this account, the reality of intuition is knowledge by presence of one's own self even at its highest degrees. The highest degree of knowledge by presence is that of the soul's self-intuition at the stage of Unicity (aḥadiyya) and the stage of Oneness (waḥidiyya), and it is at the next stages that the soul intuits other beings through the unification of intellect, the intellector, and

---

[221] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn, Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1941, "Risālat al-Wilāya", Qum: Mu'assisa Ahl al-Bayt, p. 34.

the intellected. To put it in a nutshell, the relation between intuition and intellect with respect to their perceptibles is that of absolute general-specific relation (*al-ʿumūm wa-l-khuṣūṣ al-muṭlaq*)—that is, intellectual perceptibles include knowledge of all entities in material, imaginal, and intellectual worlds, and intuitive perceptibles share these intellectual perceptibles with the difference that the latter include the intuition of the stage of Unicity (aḥadiyya) and Oneness (waḥidiyya) as well.[222] It should be noted that, even at the stage of divine essence and attributes, it is the intellect that perceives, but since the perfection of intellect is, at this stage, to be annihilated in the divine essence and attributes, it no longer has an identity to be known with. This is the reason why it is said that the intellect cannot find a way in this world, because whatever exists and is observed in this world is God. Notwithstanding this, since intellect is the highest degree of the human soul, the human annihilation occurs in intellect as its utmost perfection.

In the section on revelation, I pointed out that revelation is a matter of knowledge (meaning), and one who receives the revelation intuits it in virtue of his mysterious peculiar sense. Moreover, revelation has different existential degrees: its origin is God, and then the prophet intuits different degrees of revelation. In fact, in his initial reception of revelation, the prophet

---

[222] This is because ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī says in his *Risālat al-tawḥīd* and "Risālat al-wilāya" that the intuition of different stages of God (namely, stages of Unity or *Aḥadiyya* and Oneness or *Wāḥidiyya*) consists in annihilation in these stages, where annihilation is a mystical notion, which does not appear in philosophy except as a mystical issue. That being so, the intuition of the stages of Unicity and Oneness falls outside of the scope of philosophy, and philosophical discussion of the kinds of knowledge—knowledge by presence and knowledge by acquisition—does not pertain to these two stages (that is, Unicity and Oneness), since philosophy is not concerned with divine manifestations. Instead, in philosophy creatures are considered as connective or relational beings with respect to God. According to ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī, as pointed out before, the ultimate degree of monotheism proved by philosophers so far was that God has all perfective attributes and is exalted from all imperfections. It is noteworthy that arguments presented by philosophers are very close to what is referred to in mysticism as the stage of Oneness—the stage in which all attributes exist independently and objectively. The main difference between philosophy and mysticism lies in the fact that philosophers see God as a necessary being that has all perfective attributes and is exalted from all imperfections, where they derive all these attributes through a rational analysis of divine existence; otherwise, God's existence is simple and free from any composition. Mystics, on the other hand, are concerned with four stages of essence, Unicity, Oneness, and conative attributes (or attributes of action), as discussed before, without rejecting what philosophers say on the matter (e.g. without suggesting that God is composite or imperfect). Although what philosophers say is remarkably similar to what Islamic mystics say about the stage of Oneness, philosophers talk only about one essence that has effects, where these effects enjoy existence and are wholly dependent on their causes in their existence. However, mystics believe that things other than God are God's manifestations, considering divine stages as His manifestations and appearances. Thus, when it comes to intuition and annihilation, mystics talk about annihilation in God's manifestations, while philosophers talk about an effect's knowledge by presence of its cause, taking the world of intellect (with its various degrees and stages) and its denizens as the closest world to God. On this picture, annihilation in the mystical literature has to do with the intuition of various stages of divine manifestations, and in philosophy (although it is not referred to as 'annihilation' and is instead characterized as knowledge by presence) it has to do with knowledge by presence of different stages of the world of intellect. (It should be noted, however, that the knowledge by presence is not limited to inhabitants of the world of intellect and indeed it includes inhabitants of the imaginal world as well, but if we want to find a counterpart for the mystical divine manifestations and various degrees of existence in philosophy, our candidate will be the denizens of the world of intellect.)

intuits it at the stage of the divine names and attributes. This is the point of 'Allāma's idea that, in their first revelation, all prophets receive it in an unmediated way, and elsewhere, he suggests that mediators of revelation include angels of revelation who are intellectual immaterial entities whose home is the intellectual world. After the first revelation, the prophet might perceive the revelation in a mediated way or from behind a veil or again in an unmediated way. According to our definition of intuition, the intuition of revelation amounts to saying that the prophet finds the revelation inside himself in virtue of the unification of his peculiar sense with different degrees of revelation. The intuition of revelation is, therefore, a matter of knowledge by presence.

To sum up, 'Allāma's view of the relation among intellect, intuition, and revelation is as follows: all of these are perceived by way of knowledge by presence, although intuitive perceptibles include knowledge by presence of the stage of divine names and attributes, whereas intellect can at best have knowledge by presence of all entities in the intellectual world. Prophets are able to have knowledge by presence of different degrees of revelation and to introspect revelatory truths inside their souls in virtue of their mysterious sense.

5.3. The Relation among Intellectual Perceptibles, Intuitive Objects of Knowledge, and Transmitted Knowledge in terms of Knowledge by Acquisition

As discussed before, there are two kinds of knowledge: knowledge by presence and knowledge by acquisition, and in 'Allāma's view, the latter goes back to the former. By "intellectual perceptibles" (in the title of this section) I mean the kind of theoretical knowledge (concepts and assents) that is derived from knowledge by presence, and by "intuitive objects of knowledge" I mean the kind of knowledge by acquisition acquired by the intuitive subject after having knowledge by presence of hidden knowledge; in other words, the knowledge by acquisition is derived from knowledge by presence of the hidden world (the intuition). The reason why I used the term, "transmitted knowledge," instead of "revelation" is that, on 'Allāma's account, intellectual and revelatory knowledge is acquired by humans by way of knowledge by presence, and objects of intellectual and revelatory knowledge are both immaterial and both have different degrees, and no error occurs at any stage of knowledge by presence, because such knowledge is nothing but finding the object of knowledge in one's soul, and finding can never be mistaken (otherwise, it would not be *finding*). This is unlike the relation between intellectual theoretical knowledge and transmitted knowledge in which error

is possible, as pointed out before. Thus, irrespective of whether one can find about God's existence via intuition or rational argument, it is taken as granted in religious texts such as the Qur'an that "God exists." According to 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, when a materialist says "God does not exist," he makes a false statement, but in the domain of their own imagination, the sentence is true, because the speaker either construes "God" in such a way (e.g. as an entity which serves as a placeholder for unknown material causes and the like) that is different from the god whose existence is proved by purely rational arguments or perceived by intuition,, or alternatively construes "exist" in such a way that is incompatible with the reality of God, such as "matter = existence" or "existence = matter plus time and space." Upon analysis, it will turn out the speaker of the above statement makes an error in comparing their own true imaginative meaning (acquired by their imaginative faculty) to the external reality that is believed in by theists on the basis of purely rational arguments (without drawing on empirical premises) or intuitions. That is to say, they make an error in comparing two judgments which are issued by two different faculties—imagination and intellect—and are true in their own domain—i.e. imaginative and intellectual domains. In fact, a materialist says that "a god with such and such attributes does not exist," which is a true statement: even a theist does not believe in a god with those attributes—in their imaginations, theists also acknowledge that "a god with such and such attributes does not exist." The theist has another faculty, however, which issues the following judgment: "a god exalted from imperfections and matter exists," which is true in the domain of their cognition, namely the intellectual faculty, as well as the domain of existence, namely the extra-mental world. The mind is deceived by the similarity between the god that serves as a subject in the proposition, *God does not exist* and the god that serves as a subject in the proposition, *God exists*, and consequently, extends the "does not exist" judgement, which truly applies to the god in the materialist's imaginative faculty, to the god of theists, saying that "God does not exist."

In addition to the possibility of errors when comparing the judgment of a faculty to that of another, there are two more difficulties in the case of transmitted knowledge: (i) the chain of the transmission might not be known by certainty; that is, what is ascribed to the prophet and revelation might not be genuine, and (ii) the researcher might not be able to home in on the right meaning of the transmitted knowledge, in which case errors might occur when comparing the judgment of a faculty to that of another.[223]

---

[223] In his *al-Mīzān*, particularly in its introduction, 'Allāma provides a detailed account of how revelation in general, and the Qur'an in particular, should be understand.

The final point concerning the relation among intellect, intuition, and revelation with which I deal in this dissertation is that the human intellect draws on arguments to discover and prove general laws in the realm of knowledge by acquisition. 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī believes that discursive (*burhānī*) arguments yield certainty:

> Once it has been discovered, through a scholarly argument, that human faculties are veridical, and it has been proved that indubitable human perceptions represent the outside reality, there will be no difference between a certainty-yielding argument and a decisive intuition, and truths acquired via decisive revelation and intuition are like the truths gained via syllogistic thinking. Moreover, once a certainty-yielding argument confirms the accuracy and reality of revelation, there will be no difference between genuine religious materials that describe the truths of the origin and the resurrection, on the one hand, and what is demonstrated by arguments and discoveries, on the other hand.[224]

'Allāma says the following about Mullā Ṣadrā who has drawn on the three apparatuses of intellect (discursive argument), intuition, and revelation to discover the truths in a variety of his books, including *al-Asfār al-'Arba'at al-'Aqliyya*:

> As a result of this mental awareness and recognition [of the point appearing in the above quote from 'Allāma], Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn established his scholarly and philosophical inquiries on the reconciliation among intellect, revelation, and divine legislation [Shari'a], and in order to discover the truths of theology, he drew on discursive premises, revelatory materials, and indubitable religious materials. Although origins of this approach can be found in the words of the Second Teacher, Abū Naṣr Fārābī, Avicenna, Shaykh al-Ishrāq, Shams al-Dīn Turka, and Khwāja Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī, it was Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn who succeed to accomplish the enterprise.[225]

---

[224] Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2009, *Barrasī-hāyi Islāmī*, Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb, vol. 2, p. 15.
[225] Ibid.

6. The Conclusion

'Allāma Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī was a prominent Shiite scholar in the twentieth century who wrote many books and essays and trained many students. He was influential in the Seminary of Qum and indeed in all seminaries throughout Iran to such a great extent that his immigration from Najaf to Qum should count as a landmark in the history of the Seminary of Qum. A glimpse of the educational system of the Seminary of Qum as well as its regular courses and scholarly disciplines and branches since its foundation in 1922 until today reveals the remarkable difference between the period before and the period after 'Allāma's immigration to Qum. Undeterred by vigorous opposition to his lectures and writings on part of more traditional scholars in the seminary who typically harbored suspicions about philosophy and rationalism (as was advocated by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī and Ṣadr al-Muta'allihīn Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī before him, which was drawn upon to understand religious texts and defend Islamic beliefs), 'Allāma managed to turn Islamic philosophy into an inextricable discipline in seminary studies and establish the deployment of intellect and rational arguments as means of understanding religious texts in a large section of the Seminary of Qum.

Another factor which contributed to this success was the turbulent political and social context in the years leading up to the Revolution and a few years afterwards—the turmoil, concerns, and the new challenges had affected the seminary and had, to some extent, taken the edge off critical attitudes to 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī. 'Allāma exploited the opportunity and vehemently concerned himself with propagating his views and training his students. It should be noted, however, that the trouble faced by 'Allāma in his encounters with traditional scholars and the predominant atmosphere of the seminary, which was dedicated to research in Shiite jurisprudence (*fiqh*) and related disciplines, was to such a great extent that these intervals of peace pale in comparison to them. In the first chapter of this dissertation, I pointed out that there were points at which 'Allāma had to temporarily or permanently terminate his lectures or leave some of his writings, such as his commentaries on *Biḥār al-Anwār*, unfinished. In the face of all these problems, however, we see that his textbooks for Islamic philosophy are now official textbooks of the seminary and rational studies have found a prominent place in seminary research. Today, there are seminary institutes, such as Imam Khomeini Education and Research Institute in Qum, in which Islamic philosophy and other rational disciplines are taught and researched. Moreover, these institutes adopt a rational and philosophical approach to carry out research about Islamic texts so as to expand the boundaries of knowledge in a

variety of disciplines such as sociology, psychology, management, political sciences, ethics, and so on.

Indeed, 'Allāma picked up the threads of Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī's enterprise of reconciling intellect, intuition, and revelation. One might say that the relation among the three as conceived by 'Allāma was the main principle predominating all writings by 'Allāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī, although in his teachings he was extremely careful not collapse the boundaries of philosophy, mysticism, and theology (*kalām*). The main question of this dissertation was 'Allāma's account of the nature of the relation among intellect, intuition, and revelation—I began with a short introduction to 'Allāma and his work, and then considered, defined, and analyzed each of the three sources within three chapters. Finally, I considered the relation among the three in 'Allāma's view.

Following Mullā Ṣadrā, 'Allāma believes in the primacy of existence (*aṣālat al-wujūd*) and its gradation (*tashkīk*). Drawing on these two principles, he believes in homogeneity of the existential degree of knowledge with that of the knower. That is to say, knowledge has existential degrees obtained by the knower in virtue of the unity of knowledge, the knower, and the known, where this obtaining of knowledge amounts to the presence of the known to the knower. For 'Allāma, the human mind abstracts knowledge by acquisition from knowledge by presence acquired in virtue of the illuminational union of the knower's soul with different truths of existential worlds. These items of knowledge are sometimes sensory (particular and bounded to time and space); that is, representations of material entities, where this feature—the ability to represent and veridically present the facts—is essential to, and shared by all types of, knowledge. Sometimes they are imaginative (particular, though unbounded to time and space and the like). And sometimes they are rational (universal). Since these items of knowledge by acquisition are homogeneous with knowledge by presence from which they are derived, 'Allāma provides philosophical arguments, mainly presented in his *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*, to the effect that corresponding to these items of knowledge by acquisition (abstracted from knowledge by presence) there must be different existential worlds in relation to which the soul has acquired the relevant items of knowledge. One argument he briefly puts forward in favor of this claim in his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm* is that, on the whole, we know that the reality exists, and we have some knowledge of it. Since it is impossible to have direct knowledge of the extra-mental material world, and we are certain that some of our beliefs are true and correspond to the external reality, material entities must have other immaterial realities in other worlds, in virtue of the relation to which the human soul can have knowledge of

material entities. He presents this argument after he has proved, through a number of rational arguments, that knowledge cannot be of a piece with matter. As I have briefly outlined in the chapter on intellect, knowledge is indeed an immaterial entity.

As is obvious from this short outline, knowledge by presence is pivotal to the main issues of intellect. Moreover, knowledge by presence is key to definitions of intuition and revelation. Indeed, it plays a crucial role in the answer given in this dissertation to the question of the nature of intellect, intuition, and revelation. 'Allāma takes intuition to consist in the presence of an immaterial entity to another immaterial entity (which is his definition of knowledge by presence). In his view, intuition has different degrees discriminated in virtue of existential degrees of the intuited. He believes that all realities in material, imaginal, and intellectual worlds are intuited in this way. As to the stage of divine attributes and names, 'Allāma draws on an alternative method in accounting for its intuition: he explains the relevant intuition in terms of annihilation; that is, the emancipation of the human soul from all nonexistential constraints with which it is individuated from other entities—it is annihilated in the reality, seeing nothing but God and His attributes. 'Allāma provides a similar account for revelation, suggesting that revelation is a matter of meaning (immateriality and knowledge), having different degrees extending from God's essence all the way down to the imaginal world. The prophets are capable of receiving and grasping these meanings in virtue of their peculiar, and in 'Allāma's word, mysterious sense.

To sum, 'Allāma identifies an existential relation among intellect, intuition, and revelation. All knowledge acquired via these sources are primarily and essentially a matter of knowledge by presence, from which the human soul can abstract knowledge by acquisition. It should be noted, however, that revelation is from God even at the degree in which it is manifested as words communicated to the prophet in the imaginal world—it is by no means abstracted by the prophet's mind from his knowledge by presence of the higher degrees of revelation. According to 'Allāma's principles that I briefly introduced based on Article Four of his *Uṣūl-i Falsafih va Ravish-i Ri'ālīsm*, errors are impossible both in knowledge by presence and knowledge by acquisition, and errors in the latter emerge only when the human mind compares a judgment issued by a particular cognitive faculty, such as the imaginative faculty, which is true in its own domain, to a judgment issued by another faculty, such as the intellective faculty, which is also true in its own domain—the possibility of errors lies in such comparisons, since it is impossible for the human cognitive faculties to make errors. This is the version of realism to which 'Allāma is committed.

Bibliography

A group of writers, 1982, First cultural conference in the death anniversary of late 'Allāma Muḥammad Ḥusayn Tabātabā'ī, *Memorial of 'Allāma Ṭabātabā'ī*, Tehran: Iran Research Institute of Philosophy

A group of writers, 1982, *Yādnāmi-yi Mufassir-i Kabīr*, Qum: Shafaq

A group of writers, 1984, *Duvvumīn Yādnāmi-yi 'Allāmih Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, Tehran: Anjuman-i Islamī Ḥikmat wa Falsafiye Iran

A group of writers, 2009, *Hizb-i tūdih az shikl-gīrī tā furūpāshī*, Tehran: Political Studies and Research Institute

A group of writers, 2018, *Baḥthī darbārih-yi marjaʿīyyat*, Qum: Intishārāt-i Ṣadrā

A group of writers, 2002, *Marzbān-i Vaḥy va Khirad: Yādnāmi-yi Marḥūm-i 'Allāmih Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, Qum: Buūstān-i Kitāb

Abulhasanī (Munzir), ʿAlī, 1983, *Shahīd Muṭahharī, Ifshāgar-i tuti'ih*, Qum: Islamic Publication Office and Society of Seminary Teachers of Qum

Ādamīyyat, Friydūn, 1970, *Andīshihāy-i Mīrzā Fatḥʿalī Akhūnzādih*, Tehran, Nashr-i Khārazmī

Afrūgh, Imād, 2008, *Inqilāb-i Islāmī va mabānī-yi bāztulīd-i ān*, Tehran: Sūriy-i Mihr

Akhūnzādih, Mīrza Fatḥʿalī, 1978, *Alifbāy-i Jadīd wa Maktūbāt*, Compiled by Ḥamīd Muḥammadzādih, Tabriz: 'Iḥyā

Al-Ḥaydarī, Kamāl, 2010, *Sharḥ Nihāyat al-Ḥikma: al-ʿAql wa-l-ʿĀqil wa-l-Maʿqūl*, Qum: Dar Faraqud

Algar, Hamid, "Allamah Muḥammad Ḥusayn Tabataba'i: Philosopher, Exegete and Gnostic", *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3, Oxford University Press.

Āli Aḥmad, Jalāl, 2019, *Dar khidmat va khīyānat bi rushanfikrān*, Tehran: Firdus

Amīnī, Dāwūd, 2002, *Jamʿīyyat-i Fadāʿīyān-i Islam*, Tehran: Markaz-i Asnād-i Inqilāb-i Islāmī

Burūjirdī, Mihrzād, 1996, *Iranian Intellectuals and the West: The Tormented Triumph of Nativism*, Syracuse University Press, New York

Dabāshī, Ḥamīd, 1951, *Theology of Discontent; The Ideological Foundation of The Islamic Revolution in Iran*, New York University Press

Darābī, ʿAlī, 2011, *Jaryān Shināsī Sīyāsī dar Iran*, Tehran: Islamic Culture and Thought Research Institute

Fasāʾī, Muhsin, May 1992, "Majmuʿa Athār ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī", *Āyini-yi Pazhuhish Journal*, No. 13-14

Guénon, René, 2004, *The Reign of Quantity and The Signs of the Times*, Translated by Lord Northbourne, Sophia Pereniss

Ḥakīmīyān, ʿAbulḥusayn, 1982, The second section of *Muṭahḥarī: pāyiguzār-i nahzat-i novīnī dar bazshināsī-yi Islām-i Asīl*, Tehran: Sāzmān-i Mujahidīn-i Inqilāb-i Islāmī

Ḥaqqānī Zanjānī, Ḥusayn, 1982, Darshāʾī az Maktab-i Islam, No. 10, "Naqsh-i ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabāʾī dar Zībanāy-i Inqilab-i Islamī", Qum, Muʾassisiy-i Imam Sādiq

Hidāyatī, Muḥammad and Shumālī, Muḥammad, 2009, "Justārī dar ʿaql-i naẓarī va ʿamlī", *Maʿrifat-i Falsafī Journal*, vol. 3

Ḥusaynī Bihishtī, Sayyid Muḥammad, 2012, *Dr. Sharīʿatī: Justijūgarī dar Masīr-i Shodan*, Tehran: Bunyād-i Nashr-i Āthār-i Shahīd Dr. Bihishtī.

Husaynī, Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī, 2000, Khāṭirāt-i Muḥammad Mahdī ʿAbdkhudāyī, Tehran: Markazi Asnādi Inqilāb-i Islāmī

Jaʿfariyān, Rasūl, 1989, *Murūrī bar zamīnih-hā-yi fikrī-yi Iltiqāt-i jadīd dar Iran,* Qum: Sāzmān-i Tablīghāt-i Islāmī

Javādī Āmulī, 'Abullāah, 2008, *Sharīʿat dar Āyini-yi Maʿrifat*, Qum: 'Isrā' Publication

———. 2015, *Shams al-Waḥy al-Tabrizī*, Qum: Isrā' Publication

———. 2016, *Raḥīq makhtūm,* Qum: Isrā' Publication

———. 2017, *Manzilat-i ʿAql dar Hindisi-yi Maʿrifat-i Dīnī*, Qum: Isrā' Publication

Juergensmeyer, M., & Moaddel, 2006, M. *Shi'a Islamic Societies. In the Oxford Handbook of Global Religions.*: Oxford University Press

Kasravī, Aḥmad, 1941, *Mā chi mīkhāhīm*, Tehran: Pāydār publication

———. 1944, *Zindigānī-yi Man*, Tehran: Tārīkh-i Mā

———. 1973, *Pursish va Pāsukh*, Tehran

—————. 2003, *Piymān* (First year), Tehran: Firdus publications

Khusrupanāh, Abdulḥusayn and Latīfī, Ḥusayn, 2008, "Darāmadī bar Jaryān-hā-yi fikri-yi muʿāsir-i Iran", Mishkāt Journal, Qum

Khusrupanāh, Abdulḥusayn, 2010, *Jaryān-shenāsī-yi fikrī-yi Iran-i muʿāsir*, Tehran: Daftar-i Nashr-i Maʿārif

Miṣbāḥ Yazdī, Muḥammad Taqī, 1993, "Ravish-i 'Allāmih Ṭabāṭabā'ī dar Tafsīr-i Qur'ān bih Qur'ān", *Pasdar-i Islam Journal* , No. 393 and 394

Mullāʾī Tavānī, ʿAlī Riżā, 2014, "Kasravī az Naqd-i Dīnhā tā Dāʿīyiy-i Piyāmbarī", Muṭaliʿāt-i Tārīkh-i Farhangī Journal, Number 19, Tehran

Muṭahharniyā, Mahdī, 2008, *Chap va Rāst, az vazhigān tā vāqiʿīyyat-i siyāsī*.Zamāne Journal, No. 78

Muṭaḥḥarī, Murtażā,1998, *Majmūʿih-yi Āthār*, vol. 24, "Nihzat-hā-yi Islāmī dar sad sālih-yi akhīr", Tehran: Ṣadrā publication

—————. 1998, *Yaddashthay-i Ustād Muṭaḥḥarī*, Tehran: Ṣadrā publication

—————. 2003, *ʿĀlim-i Jāwdān Ustād Shahīd Muṭaḥḥarī,* Tehran: Markaz-i Barrasīy-i Asnād-i Tārīkhī

Muẓaffarī, Āyat, 2017, *Jaryān-shināsī-yi siyāsī-yi Iran-i muʿāṣir*, Qum: Zamzam-i Hidāyat

Pārsānīyā, Ḥamīd, 2000, *Ḥadīth-i piymānih: Pazhūhishī Dar Inqilāb-i Islāmī*, Qum: Intishārāt-i Maʿārif

—————. 2013, *Anvāʿ va advār-i rushanfikrī*, Qum: Kitāb-i Fardā

Rahnemā, ʿAlī, 1994, *Pioneers of Islamic Revival*, London and New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd

Ramażānī, Ḥasan, 2013, Compiled by Javān, Vahīd Vāhīd, *ʿIrfān-i ʿAllāmih Ṭabāṭabā'ī dar Bayān-i Ustād Ḥasan Ramażānī*, Qum: Sībṭ al-Nabīyy

Ridgeon, Lloyd, 2006, *Sufi Castigator Ahmad Kasravi and the Iranian Mystical Tradition*, Routledge

Riżā Dāvarī Ardakānī, 1984, *Duvvumīn Yādnāmi-yi ʿAllāmih Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, Tehran: Publications of Iranian Research Institute of Philosophy

Ruhānī, Sayyid Hamīd, 2011, *Nihżat-i Imām Khumeinī*, Tehran: Chāp-u Nashr-i ʿUrūj

Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī, Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm, 1989, *al-Ḥikmat al-Mutaʿāliya fi-l-Asfār al-ʿAqliyyat al-Arbaʿa*; with ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī's commentaries, Qum: Maktabat al-Mustafawi

Ṣanʿatī, Riżā, 2011, *Guftimān-i Miṣbāh*, Tehran: Markaz-i Asnād-i Inqilābe Islāmī

Sharīʿatī, ʿAlī, vol. 2, *Majmū'ih-yi Āthār*, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Chāpakhsh

———. (n.d.), *Chi Bāyad Kard?*, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Kāmil

———. (n.d.) *Tawhīd wa Shirk*, part 2

———. 2001, *Mazhab ʿAlayhi Mazhab*, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Chāpakhsh

———. 2010, Tārikh-I Takāmul-i Falsafih, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Chāpakhsh

Sharīʿat Sanglājī, Muḥammad Hasan**,** 1943, *Kilīd-i fahm-i Qur'ān*, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Dānīsh

Ṭabātabā'ī, S. Muḥammad Ḥusayn, (N.D) *Usūl-i falsafih va ravish-i reālīsm*, Tehran: Sherkat-i Ufsit (Sahāmīyī ʿĀm)

———. 1981, *A Shiʿite Anthology*, Introduction by Sayyid Hossein Nasr, The Great Britain: Muḥammadi Trust of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

———. 1982, "Risālat al-Wilāya", Qum: Mu'assisa Ahl al-Bayt

———. 1985, *Qur'ān dar Islām,* Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb

———. 1991, *Āmūzish-i ʿAqā'id va Dastūr-hāyi Dīnī*, Tehran: Mustaz'afān va Jānbāzān Publication

———. 1994, *Bidāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jami'at al-Mudarrisin Publishers

———. 1996, *Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, Beirut: Mu'assisa al- 'Alamī Li al-Maṭbūʿāt

———. 1996, *Nihāyat al-Ḥikma*, Qum: Jami'at al-Mudarrisin Publishers

———. 1999, *al-Rasā'il al-Tawḥīdiyya*, Beirut: Mu'ssisa al-Nuʿmān

———. 2008, *Majmūʿa Rasā'il ʿAllāma Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, vol. 3, prefaced by Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī, , Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb

———. 2007, *Majmūʿa Rasā'il al-ʿAllāmat al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, "Risālat al-Wasā'iṭ," Qum: Baqiyat Publishers

———. 2008, *Risālat-i Tashayyuʻ dar dunyā-yi Imrūz (Gufugū-yī bā Henry Corbin)*, Qum: Bustan-i Kitab

———. 2008, *Taʻālīm-i Islām*, introduction by Sayyid Hādī Khusrushāhī, Qum: Buūstān-i Kitāb

———. 2009, "'Alī (a.) va Falsafi-yi Ilāhī," Qum: 'Intishārāt-i Jāmiʻi-yi Mudarrisīn

———. 2009, *Barrasī-hāyi Islāmī*, vol. 1 and 2, Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb

———. 2009, *Qur'an dar Islam*, Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb

———. 2012, *Nasab-Nāmi-yi Khāndān-i Ṭabāṭabā'ī: Awlād-i Amīr Sirāj al-Dīn ʻAbd al-Wahhāb,* Qum: Buūstān-i Kitāb

———. 2018, *Sunan al-Nabiyy*, Qum: Būstān-i Kitāb

———. 2018, "Wilāyat va Ziʻāmat," *Baḥs̲ī darbāri-yi Marjaʻiyyat va Rūḥāniyyat*, Qum: Ṣadrā

Ṭihrānī, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusaynī, 2005, *Mihr-i Tābān*, Mashhad: Nūr-i Tābān-i Qur'an

Ṭihrānī, Sayyid ʻAlī, 2010, *Zi Mihr Afrūkhtih*, Tehran: 'Intishārāt-i Surūsh

Ṭihrānī, Shaykh Āghā Buzurg, 2009, *Ṭabaqāt Aʻlām al-Shīʻa*, Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-ʻArabī

Usī, ʻAlī Ramadan, 2002, *Ravish-i ʻAllāmih dar Tafsīr-i al-Mīzān*, Tehran: Sāzmān-i Tablīghāt-i Islāmī

Yazdī, Muḥammad, 2002, *Khātīrāt*, Tehran: Makaz-i Asnād-i Inqilābe Islāmī