

**THE THIRD TAHÂFUT AND AN EXAMPLE OF
PHILOSOPHY-RELIGION
RELATION IN FIFTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL:
'Alâ al-Dîm 'Alî al-Tûsî**

Recep DURAN*

ABSTRACT

The relation between philosophy and religion might be considered one of the oldest problems in the history of thought. The problem was also dealt with in the Islamic world. One and the first of those who was interested in the problem is al-Ghazali (d. 1111) with his book *Tahâfut al- Falâsifa (Incoherence of the Philosophers)*, and after him, with a "response" to al-Ghazali's claims in his book *Tahâfut al- Tahâfut (Incoherence of the Incoherence)* Ibn Rushd (d. 1198) became the second. The third was not a scholar but a state-man. This man was the Sultan of the day Mehmed II, the Conqueror. He ordered two scholars, professors at different "madrasas", that each one should write a book on the issue. One of them was Alaaddin Ali Tûsî (d. 1482), and the other one Muslihuddin Mustafa Brusawi known as Khojazâda (d. 1488). Ali Tûsî, of Tûs, came to the Ottoman lands before Mehmed II took the throne. According to his own explanation in the "Introduction" to his "tahafut" *Kitabu'z- Zuhr*, his aim was to criticise both the philosophers and his fellow believers when he thought that they were wrong. Ali Tusi seriously criticised the philosophers especially in three points, like al-Ghazali: Eternity of the world; causality; God's knowledge of particulars.

Key Terms: Philosophy-religion relation; *Tahâfut al- Falâsifa*; al-Ghazali; Ibn Rushd; Alaaddin Ali Tûsî; Intellectual activity in the Ottoman lands; Creation; Causality; Scientific knowledge; God's knowledge of particulars.

* Doç. Dr., Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, Psikoloji Bölümü

YDÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, C. II, No. 1, (Nisan 2009)

Without the invaluable endless help of the distinguished person, Roger Simpson (MA), whom I wanted to thank this article, would not have seen the light of day. Even though my thanks compared with his help remain inadequate, I wish nevertheless, express publicly my gratitude to him.

ÖZET

Felsefe-din ilişkisi insanlık düşünce tarihinin en eski problemlerindedir. Bu problemle İslam dünyasında da ilgilenilmiştir. Gazali (öl. 1111) *Tehâfütü'l- Felâsife*'siyle bu konuyla ilgilenmiş olan ilk düşünür, Gazali'nin tezlerine *Tehâfütü'l- Tehâfüt*'üyle yanıt veren İbn Rüşd (öl. 1198) ikinci düşünürdür. Bu konuyla ilgilenmiş olan üçüncü kişi bir devlet adamıdır: Fatih Sultan Mehmet (öl. 1481). Devrin sultanı, İstanbul medreselerinde hoca olan iki “müderis”e “Gazali tarzında” birer kitap yazmalarını buyurmuştur. Bu iki düşünürden biri Ali Tusi'dir (öl. 1482), diğeri Hocazâde'dir (öl. 1488). Dünya düşünce tarihinde üçüncü tehafütün yazıldığı coğrafya İstanbul'dur. Ali Tusi'nin *Kitabu'z- Zuhr*'u ve Hocazade'nin *Tehâfüt*'ü dünya literatüründe üçüncü dalgayı oluşturan iki eserdir. Ali Tusi eserinde hepsi aynı derecede önemli olmayan yirmi problem ele alınır. Bunlardan üçü çok önemlidir: alemin kıdemi; nedensellik; ve Tanrı'nın cüz'ileri bilmesi meselesi.

Anahtar Kavramlar: Felsefe-din ilişkisi; *Tehâfütü'l- Felâsife*; Gazali; İbn Rüşd; Ali Tusi; Osmanlı'da düşünce; Yaratma; Nedensellik; Bilimsel bilgi; Tanrı'nın mümkün cüz'ileri bilmesi ve determinizm problemi.

Life

In the Islamic world the problem of the relation between philosophy and religion was attracted the interest of Gazâlî (1508-1111) with his classic *Tahâfut al-Falâsifa*. Gazâlî's claims against philosophers in this book were answered by Ibn Rushd (1126-1198) in his *Tahâfut al-Tahâfut* about 50 years later. If we accept Gazâlî first, and Ibn Rushd second, the third person who was concerned with the problem was a statesman, one of the Ottoman sultans, Mehmed the Conqueror. He ordered the two thinkers, professors at different madrasas, to write each a book; he probably set a deadline. “Hocazâde,” the sources say, “completed his work in four months and Ali Tûsî in six.”¹

There are other *Tahâfuts* apart from Ghazâlî's and Ibn Rushd's. Âghâ Bozorg attributes *Tahâfut* books to Râwandî, Nasîr Tûsî, and Khojazâda.² We

¹ Taşköprülüzâde, *Şakâyik al-Nu'mâniyya fî 'Ulamâ' al-Dawla al-Osmâniyya*, edited and annotated by Ahmed Subhi Furat, Istanbul University Şarkiyât Araştırma Merkezi, Istanbul, 1985, p. 99; Hoca Sa'd al-Din, *Tâc al-Tawârih*, edited and put into today's Turkish by İsmet Parmaksızoğlu, Turkish Cultural Ministry, Ankara 1992, p. 89; Husayn of Bosnia, *Badâyi' al-Vakâyi'*, Facsimile print, Edited and annotated by A. S. Tveritinovaya and A. Petrosyana, Sovyet Bilimler Akademisi Doğu Halkları Edebi Abideleri Metinler (Academy of Sciences of Russia, Eastern Peoples' Literary Monuments, Texts), Series: 14, Doğu Edebiyatı Printing House, Moscow, 1961, f. 189 b.

² *Al-Zaria ilâ Tasânîf al-Shî'a*, Matbaa Majlis al-Shurî, Tahran, 1326, vol. 4, p. 502, cited by Rıdâ Sa'âdah, in 'Alâ al-Din 'Ali al-Tûsî, *Tahâfut al-Falâsifa*, edited by Rıdâ Sa'âda, al-Dar al-Âlamîyya, 2nd impression, Bairut, 1304/1983, p. 9, especially pp. 23 and 24.

have no idea about Râwandî's, but we know that there is a Tusi who has written a *Tahâfut*, but this Tusi, is 'Ala al-Din 'Ali Tusi, one of the theologian-philosophers of 15th century Istanbul.

After Ali Tusi and Hocazade those whose names are connected with *Tahâfut* are Kemal Paşazade (d. 1533), Mestçizade (d. 1735), and Karabaği (d. 1535).³

Concerning the life of Ali Tusi hardly anything is known. The sources which speak of 'Alâ al-Dîn 'Ali Muhammad al-Bârakânî al-Tûsî al-Hanafî, known as Mawlâ 'Arrân,⁴ make no mention of his date of birth or education. They merely state that he came from Persia to the Ottoman lands in the time of Sultan Murad II (d. 1451) and that he was given a post as a teacher in the Madrasa (high school) of Mehmed Çalabî. We don't know the exact date of his arrival in Anatolia.⁵ Rıdâ Sa'âdah gives the date of 1414⁶ as the date of 'Ali Tûsî's birth based on the words of Suyûtî that "he ('Ali Tûsî) died at the age of about seventy years old",⁷ and this seems quite a reasonable proposition. While there is hesitation about the date of his birth there is none about the date that 'Ali Tûsî died. With some exceptions⁸ all the sources give 887 H./1482 CE as the date of 'Ali Tûsî's death.

³ Kasım Dobraca, *Katalog Arapskih Turских i Persijskih Rukopisa*, Gazi Husrev-Begova Biblioteka u Sarajevu, vol. 1, Sarajevo, 1963, p. 6; Mehmet Tahir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, Istanbul 1333, II, 27; Ismail Paşa al-Baghdâdî, *Hadiyya al-'Ârifîn 'Asmâ al-Muallifîn*, vol. I, pp. 483, 800; Mehmet Aydın, "(Philosophy in) The Modern Islamic World, Turkey", in *History of Islamic Philosophy*, ed. by S. H. Nasr and Oliver Leaman, Routledge, London 1996, pp. 1129-1130;

⁴ See, the first folio of the copy of ; Luknavî, *al-Favâid al-Bahiyya fî Tarâcim al-Hanafîyya*, Kahira, 1324, p. 145, cited by R. Sa'âdah, *Tahâfut*, p. 13. R. Sa'âdah reads it as "al-Batârakânî", 'Alâ al-Dîn al-Tûsî, *Tahâfut al-Falâsifa*, ed. by Rıdâ Sa'âdah, 2nd edition, al-Dâr al-'Âlamîyya, Bayrut 1983 p. 13; in the copy of Köprülü Library also is so. If this word is a name of a place, we could not find such a name in Barthold's *Turkistân*, nor in the *Encyclopedia of Islam* (Turkish edition).

⁵ We don't know the exact date of his arrival in Anatolia; but we do know that it coincided with the return of Hıdır Shah from Egypt where he had been to complete his education, so we are in a position to calculate the return of Hıdır Shah, we may have some idea, albeit it an approximate one, of the date of Ali Tûsî's arrival in the Ottoman lands. (*Tâj.*, p. 86, 87).

⁶ R. Sa'âdah, *Tahâfut al-Falâsifa*, p. 13; Suyûtî, *Nazm al-Ikyân fî A'yân al-A'yân*, al-Matbaa al-Suriya al-'Arabiyya, New York 1927, p. 132.

⁷ *Ibid* p. 13.

⁸ Shams al-Din Sâmî, *Kâmûs al-'A'lâm*, Istanbul 1311 (1894), vol. 4, p. 3170, col. 2; Omar Rıdâ Kakhâla, *Mu'jam al-Muallifîn*, vol. 5, Damascus, 1957, p. 185; Yusuf Ilyas Sarkis, *Mu'jam al-Matbûât al-'Arabiya*, Sarkis printing house, 1346/1927, pp. 1248-1249.

What Hoja Sa‘d al-Din wrote in his *Tâj al-Tawârikh* reads:⁹

“After having completed his education in Iran from the scholars of the day he became competent in every field. When he came to Anatolia he was welcomed by the authorities. ... [When] famous Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror turned eight of the churches into mosques after the conquest of Istanbul he gave ‘Ali Tûsî one of them, now called the Zeyrek Câmii (mosque), in which to teach for 100 pieces (akça) a day. In addition to this salary the Sultan gave ‘Ali Tûsî a village called today “Müderriş Köyü” (The Village of Teacher). The Sultan gave another village to Hojazâdah, [the “rival” of Tûsî], and yet another to Mawlâ ‘Abdulkâdir”.¹⁰

Even though his and his works’s name can be found in the several sources, past and modern, such as Taşköprülüzâde (1495-1561), Mecdî (died 1590), Hoca Sa‘dettin (d. 1599), Husayn of Bosnia (d. 1644), Haji Khalifa (1609-1657), Shams al-Din Sâmî (1850-1904), Maurice Bouyges (1878-1951), Brockelmann (1868-1956), Yusuf Ilyas Serkîs, Nishanjizâda, Zabîdî (1732-1790), Mehmed Tahir of Brûsa (1861-1924), the most extensive accounts of ‘Ali Tûsî’s life are currently acknowledged to be those in *Shakâik al-Nu‘mâniyya* by Tashköprülüzâdah (1495-1561) who wrote biographies of almost all the scholars who had lived until his time in the Ottoman lands,¹¹ and in *Tâj al-Tawârikh* by Hoja Sa‘d al-Din (d.1599)¹² seemingly taken from *Shakâ‘ik*. The same information is also to be found in *Badâyi‘ al-Wakâyi‘* by Husayn of Bosnia (d. 1644).¹³ Of Ali Tusi, Tashköprülüzâda says that he was a “wise and learned man and the master of his time”.¹⁴

⁹ Hoca Sa‘d al-Din, *Tâc al-Tawârikh*, edited and put into today’s Turkish by Ismet Parmaksızoğlu, Turkish Cultural Ministry, Ankara 1992, p. 86.

¹⁰ Taşköprülüzâde, *Şakâiyik al-Nu‘mâniyya fî ‘Ulamâ’ al-Dawla al-Osmâniyya*, edited and annotated by Ahmed Subhi Furat, Istanbul University Şarkiyât Araştırma Merkezi, Istanbul, 1985, p. 97; and in the translation of *Şakâiyik* by Majdî, *Tarjuma-i Şakâiyik*, Istanbul 1269, p. 119. See also H. Inalcık, “Mehmet II”, *Encyclopedia of Islam* (Turkish edition), vol. 7, p. 535 ; *Şakâiyik al-Nu‘mâniyya*, p. 97. By the way, Razavî is pointing out a mistake originated from the author of *Iktifâ al-Kunû’* who says that “there is a *Tahâfut al-Falâsifa* by Nasır Tusi which has not yet been printed, and this *Tahâfut* is the fourth *Tahâfut*.” Razavî does not agree with the author of *Iktifâ’* about the claim that the author of the fourth *Tahâfut* was Nasır Tûsî, and says that this is wrong, the truth is that the author of the *Tahâfut* in question is Alâ al-Din Ali Tûsî (M. Takî Müderriş-i Razavî, *Kashf al-‘Aceb wa al-Istâr*, p. 595).

¹¹ *Şakâiyik*, p. 97; Majdî, *Tarjuma-i Şakâiyik*, Istanbul 1269, p. 119; H. Inalcık, “Mehmet II”, *Encyclopedia of Islam* (Turkish edition), vol. 7, p. 535.

¹² *Tâj al-Tawârikh*, vol. 5, p. 90.

¹³ *Badâyi‘ al-Wakâyi‘*, 189b.

¹⁴ *Şakâiyik*, p. 99.

A story:

“When ‘Ali Tûsî was a teacher in the Zeyrek Mosque, there were 40 cells around the madrasa as student accommodation. In the course of time the number of students increased and when the Sultan heard this, he was very pleased. One day the Sultan together with his vizier Mahmud Pasha went to the madrasa of Mawlâ Tûsî and asked to listen to the course. Mawlâ Tûsî, on the order of the Sultan, started the course with his own *Hâshiyah* on the *Sharh al-‘Adud* by al-Jurjânî. Because of the Sultan’s presence in his classroom Mawlâ was very happy and continued his course joyfully and said many good and interesting things. The Sultan, who in fact was an intelligent and educated man, already knew the subjects explained by Tûsî and felt happy at having such a scholars in his country. He congratulated Tûsî and gave him 10.000 *akças* and an expensive robe of honour (*hil‘at*), and 500 *akças* for every one of the students. He then asked Tûsî to accompany him to ‘Abdulkarîm’s madrasa to listen to his course. .. A little while later the Sultan posted Mawlâ Tûsî to the madrasa established by his father in Edirne.”¹⁵

When Ali Tusi had become distinguished and well-known the Sultan of the time ordered him and Khojazzâda to write each a book to compare philosophers’ and Gazâlî’s ideas.¹⁶

In compliance with this order Hoca-zâde and Tûsî both wrote their books in which they explained their own ideas. Hoca-zâde completed his in four months, and ‘Ali Tûsî in six. Mawlâ gave his book the name *Zukhr*. They then presented their books to the Sultan and these were sent to the scholars of the time to be

¹⁵ *Tâj.*, p. 88.

¹⁶ Hoca Sa’dettin says, together with Tashköprülüzâda that they, the two ‘mudarrises’ were ordered by the Sultan to write each a book “to compare the ideas of the philosophers and Gazâlî” (*Tâj.*, p. 89); *Shakâyik*, pp. 98-99 ; *Badâyi*, p.). It is a strange and very difficult point to understand and explain that in spite of the publications against this idea since 1956 by the eminent Professor Dr. Mübahat Türker-Küyel of Ankara University, and then by one of her disciples now Prof. Dr. A. Aslan of Ege University in Izmir, Turkey, and my own publications in order to uproot the idea that the “third wave” *Tahâfuts* (-as I myself call these *Tahâfuts* by Hoca-zâde and Ali Tûsî-) were written in order to make a comparison between Gazâlî’s and Ibn Rushd’s *Tahâfuts*. The reality is that the *Tahâfuts* of Hoca-zâde and Ali Tûsî are not written to make any comparison between the *Tahâfuts* of Gazâlî and Ibn Rushd. This point is so clear and was spoken of by A. Tûsî so clearly in his *Tahâfut, al-Zuhr* that he says “The Sultan ordered me to compare the ideas of Gazâlî and the philosophers, and to write a book in the style of Gazâlî”. In his book, there is no direct citation of, or any hint to, the name of Ibn Rushd. It seems to me very strange that the idea that Hoca-zâde’s and Tûsî’s *Tahâfuts* are comparison between Gazâlî’s and Ibn Rushd’s *Tahâfuts* is, always and consistently repeated in a very strange manner by some people including even the name of one of today’s distinguished scholars in this field, Islamic philosophy, Prof. Hans Daiber.

evaluated and reviewed. According to this evaluation the Sultan gave Khocazâde 10.000 *akças* and an expensive mule, and to Tûsî only 10.000 *akças*. Even though the two works were famous, Khocazâde's reward was greater than Tûsî's.¹⁷

His book being considered less valuable than Hojazâda's caused Tûsî considerable chagrin, and he left his post in the madrasa in Istanbul and went to his native country.¹⁸ He did what Gazali had done before him, and became involved in sufi practice after years of lecturing in madrasa. After "rational" discussions of so many years he completely abandoned worldly affairs and devoted himself to the otherworldly matters, preferring to live in seclusion.

When Mawlâ Tûsî came to Tabrîz, one of the shaykhs there who already knew him¹⁹ prepared a meal for him by a river. The shaykh left Tûsî alone for a while in order to do something. When he came back he found him thoughtful and sorrowful. He asked what he was thinking about. Tûsî said: '*Till now I have been unable to get rid of the memories of what I have had: things such as high posts and salaries in Anatolia, and because of this I did become sorrowful, but now I have wiped them all from my memory*'. The shaykh read him a poem in Persian about the usefulness of memories, which put Tûsî into such a state of ecstasy that with a cry he fell to the ground and remained for a while unconscious. After regaining consciousness he thanked God for getting rid of his memories and regaining his composure. Then he bade farewell to the shaykh.²⁰

Then, Ali Tusi went to Transoxiana and took "refugee" with Shaykh 'Ubayd Allah Nakşibendi Samarqandî. In the course of time Ali Tusi became an "important" man for Samarqandî, and due to his relationships with Ali Tusi, Samarqandî managed to establish some connection with the Ottomans. Ali Tusi continued in the service of Samarqandî until he had acquired some degree of subtlety in spiritual affairs and attained some lofty level in the sûfî order. He stayed in Samarqand until he died.²¹

As a result it can be said that during his life Ali Tûsî accepted the principle of giving equal value to [rational] knowledge and faith and of leading a balanced

¹⁷ *Tâj.*, p. 89; *Shakâyik*, p. 98.

¹⁸ *Tâj.*, p. 89; *Shakâyik*, p. 99.

¹⁹ *Tâj.*, pp. 89-90; This shaykh is Abdullah-ı İlâhî (died 1490) who was one of Ali Tusi's former students (*Shakâyik*, p. 99).

²⁰ *Tâj.*, p. ; *Shakâyik*, p. 98.

²¹ *Shakâyik*, p. 99.

life until he dies. His writings were accepted as pre-eminent among scholars. Of these writings his *tahâfut* which he called *Zukhr* has been evaluated by everybody as a work of the highest calibre in its field.”²²

An anecdote:

“It is narrated that when Mawlâ Tûsî came back to Iran he met Ali Kuşçu.²³ And when he asked Ali Kuşçu where he was going the latter answered that he was going to Anatolia. Then he said to him: ‘Be on good terms with Kôseç (beardless). He is called Khocazâde. What you think you know exactly is ignorance compared with his great knowledge.’”²⁴

Works

Ali Tusi’s works consist of commentaries and marginal glosses. As far as we know, apart from his *al-Zuhr*, all his works are in manuscripts.²⁵ Ziriklî says that in addition to his *al-Zuhr* he wrote a supercommentary on *Talwîh* by Taftâzânî, and a marginal gloss (*haşiya*) on Jurjânî’s *Sharh al-Mawâkıf*.²⁶

The list of Ali Tusi’s works given by biographers and bibliographers is not the same in number and name. We can list the works of Ali Tusi as follows:

1. *Al-Zakhîra fî al-Muhâkama bayn al-Hukamâ’ wa al-Ghazâlî* (Haji Khalîfa; Tashköprülüzâda; Baghdâdî)
2. *Hâshiya ‘alâ Sharh al-Mawâkıf* (Haji Khal.; Tashk.; Baghd.)
3. *Hâshiya ‘alâ Hâshiya li al-Sayyid ‘alâ Kashshâf li al-Zamahsharî* (Haji Khal.; Tashk.; Baghd.)
4. *Hâshiya ‘alâ Sharh(al-Dawwânî) li al-‘Akâid al-‘Adudiyya* (Haji Khal.; Tashk.)
5. *Hâshiya ‘alâ Hâshiya ‘alâ Sharh al-Matâli ‘al- ‘Anwâr* (Tashköp.; Baghdâdî)
6. *Hâshiya ‘alâ al-Talwîh* (Tashköprü.; Baghdâdî ; Zirikli)
7. *Hâshiya ‘alâ Mukhtasar al-Muntahâ* (Haji Khalîfa; Baghdâdî)

²² *Tâj.*, p. 90.

²³ *Tâj.*, p. 137.

²⁴ *Tâj.*, p. 137; *Shakâyik*, p.161.

²⁵ R. Saâdah, *Tahâfut*, p.

²⁶ *al-‘A lâm*, vol. 5, p. 162, mentioned by R. Saâda, *Tahâfut*, p. 17.

Al-Zuhr

Of these works only *al-Zuhr* has been the subject of some research.²⁷ Our views, here, about Ali Tusi's thoughts are based on *al-Zuhr*. Another examined book of Ali Tusi is *Hâshiya alâ Sharh al-Mawâkıf*.

It is very reasonable not to have any qualms about whether Ali Tûsî, in fact, wrote a book called *al-Zuhr*. We don't need to be so painstaking about this, because the books in question by Ali Tûsî and Hojazâda were written on the order of the Sultan. So, it is very normal that there might not have been any confusion or negligence.

Today we have two books in the field of *tahâfut* written in 15th century, in Istanbul. Ali Tusi wrote a book in the *tahâfut* field. Even though different authors may say different things about the name of the book, we know that Ali Tusi himself says in his text that he has written a book in the field of *tahâfut* and given it the name 'Zuhr' that exists today in manuscript and printed form.

Haji Khalifa says: " 'Ali Tusi's Tahâfut begins with 'O God, who is alone in eternity, ... 'Ali Tusi has planned his book on twenty chapters and has given it the name 'Zahîra' ".²⁸

As for the date of composition of *al-Zuhr*, there is no good reason not to share the suggestion of the eminent historian of Islamic philosophy Professor Mübahat Türker that "he (Hocazade) must have written the *Tahafut* before 871 H. It is most probable that the date of composition is between 858 and 871; it is probably about 860 H./1455 CE".²⁹

²⁷ Rıdâ Saâda, *Tahafut al-Falasifa*, al-Dar al-Âlamiyya, 2nd impression, Bairut, 1304/1983; Recep Duran, Ala al-Din Ali al-Tusi's *Tahafut al-Falasifa (Kitab al-Zuhr)*, Arabic text, edition critique, Turkish translation, and an analysis (in Turkish), Ph.D. Thesis under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Mübahat Türker of Ankara University, Turkey. (One of these three volumes, the translation into Turkish, to which is referred here in this article in the footnotes as "Turkish translation" (T.tr.), was published by the Turkish Culture Ministry under the name "Alaeddin Ali Tusi, *Tehafütü'l-Felasife (Kitabu'z-Zuhr)*, Ankara, 1990).

²⁸ *Kashf al-Zunûn*, edited by Şerefeddin Yaltkaya and Kılıslı Rıfat Bilge, Turkish Ministry of Education, Istanbul, 1971, vol. I, p. 514.

²⁹ As for the date of composition of *al-Zuhr*, there is no good reason not to share the suggestion of the eminent historian of Islamic philosophy Professor M. Türker that "he (Hocazade) must have written the *Tahafut* before 871 H. It is most probable that the date of composition is between 858 H. and 871 H.; it is probably about 860 H./1455 CE. The Professor of Ankara University in her monumental work on *Tahafuts* says : "... Sultan gave/granted Hocazade the school where Zeyrek

On the basis of these various pieces of evidence we may conclude that Ali Tusi wrote a book in the *tahafut* field in about 871 H./1455 and “gave his book the name ‘Zuhr’.”³⁰

Hâshiya alâ Sharh al-Mawâkif

The *Hâshiya alâ Sharh al-Mawâkif* of A. Tusi is a collection of marginal notes on a part of *Sharh al-Mawâkif* of Jurjani which is a commentary on *al-Mawâkif* of İjî.

The part on which A. Tusi has written notes covers the parts of “Praise to God and prayer for the Prophet” (Hamdala wa Salwala) (three folios) and the first “mawkif” of the *Sharh al-Mawâkif* (pp. 4-76 of Istanbul 1286 H. edition). The subject-matter of this *mawkif* which contains six “marsads” (subdivision) is knowledge: 1. Definition of knowledge, 2. Absolute knowledge, 3. Division of knowledge, 4. Proofs for necessary knowledge, 5. Logical reasoning (nazar), 6. Method.

At the present we have three copies of the *Hâshiya* that two of them are in Istanbul Sulaymaniya Library Carullah Efendi collection (1438, 84b-105a; 2119, 157b-180a), and one is in Konya Yusuf Ağa Library (81, 3-79 pages).

If we try to look at this booklet of about 20 *waraks* which contains 171 marginal notes (*hashiya*) of A. Tusi we can see that as if there is a sort of connection between importance of note and its length. Out of 171 notes 11 are long, 8 are medium, 13 are short, and the rest are comparatively short or too short. We did not take into consideration short and too short notes without hesitation (such as that are about, for example, “virtue of Macca”, “difference between *rasûl* and *nabî*”); we made a choice among medium ones; we did not exclude any long notes. If we look at the long notes we realize that almost all of them are about *knowledge* or a problem connected to *knowledge*.

was teaching. Zeyrek felt sorrowful and went to Brusa” (*Mir’ât al-Kâinât*, p. 72). As it is said in *Şakâyık*, Hocasade wrote his *Tahafut* during this appointment. As he was appointed as kâdî to Edirne after he has been teacher in Istanbul in 871 H., he must have written the *Tahafut* before 871 H. It is most probable that the date of composition of the book is between 858 H. and 871 H.; and probably it is about 860 H./1455 CE. (M. Türker, *Üç Tehâfüt Bakımından Felsefe ve Din Münasebeti*, Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi, Ankara, 1956, p. 54).

³⁰*Zuhr*, ed. R. Sa’âda, p. 63; *Tâj.*, p. 90; *Zuhr*, Ch. “Introduction”, Turkish translation, p. XIII, XIV, XV, XXII; *Şakâyık*, p. 99.

The contents of some marginal notes: number 34. Knowledge is by conception, 55. When man is born his soul is a *tabula rasa*; 59, 62, 63, 64. Light, its reflection, etc., 72. Blackness of black, 82. Evidence of propositions, 169. Things perceived by sense organs.

Ali Tûsî, in addition to his writings, made a significant contribution to Ottoman education as a teacher. We can find the names of some of his students among the high ranking people in the history of Ottoman education.³¹

Thoughts

Ali Tusi thinks that the highest happiness for man is to know God. The way to reach this happiness is by contemplation of His creatures. This contemplation cannot be achieved properly only by “reason.” Reason must be supported by “revelation”, because the problems concerning divinity are difficult problems that cannot be solved without using revelation. Such thoughts are enough for us to consider Ali Tusi as a member of “mutakallimun.”

Before starting examining problems Tusi writes an “introduction” (tamhid) to his book, *al-Zuhr*. In it, he says that men have some faculties, but they are not “perfect”. Therefore, man must ask for “help” from without. This is God’s word. As an example, even though the philosophers say they are able to know everything, including divinity, they are not able to know even their own soul (nafs), and make contradictory assertions about it. This is not tantamount to saying that human beings cannot know anything about divinity, but it only means that this kind of knowledge is impossible without the help of revelation, since, “*only reason supported by miracles is able to find truth in the field of divinity.*”³²

As Gazali emphasized in his “introductions” to his *Tahafut*, the philosophers have reached exact knowledge in the fields of Mathematics, Geometry, and the sciences connected with them; but this does not necessarily

³¹ Husayn, *Badâyi’*, 293b; Some of them that we can find in some sources are the Vizier Karamani Mehmed Paşa (*Tâj*, p. 115), Molla Hatipzade (*Tâj*, p. 127), Sinan Ajami (*Tâj*, p. 132), Molla Abdulkadir (*Tâj*, p. 151), Eshrefoğlu Abdullah al-Rumi (*Tâj*, p. 171), Fenâri Alisi (*Tâj*, p. 172), Shaykh Sadullah (*Tâj*, p. 186), Abdullah Ilahi (*Tâj*, p. 195), Shaykh Shujaaddin Ilyas (*Tâj.*, p. 240).

³² *Zuhr*, Turkish translation, p. 9.

mean that they will reach exact knowledge in other fields of inquiry.³³ Theology is one of these “other fields,” and here there are some points on which the *philosophers* and the *mutakallimun* contradict each other.

The philosophers mostly use “logical reasoning” (*nazar*) and “inference” (*istidlal*) and believe that they can solve all problems, including the problems concerning divinity, by “reason” alone without help of “revelation”,³⁴ but they are not capable of doing this. In this subject, the *philosophers* and the *milliyyun* (believers)³⁵ contradict each other.

On the problem of knowing God, A Tusi says, thinkers are of two groups: the *milliyyun* and the *philosophers*. He says he wants to examine the thoughts especially of the philosophers in the manner Gazali used in his *Tahâfut al-Falâsifa*, and to indicate inconsistencies and confusions in their systems. This is not an easy task, because of the fact that theology itself is an “ambiguous” land, and Ali Tusi himself does not feel at home and has had some hesitation in deciding who was right and to what extent: he says: “*You will see me take one step forward and one step backward.*”³⁶ In spite of the fact that Ali Tusi theoretically is on the opposite side to the philosophers, he does not believe that all of what the philosophers said is wrong and unworthy; he explicitly expresses this idea: “*When some of the views of the philosophers are proven to be wrong, the sound foundations of their ideas are not adversely affected and whatever truth they contain remains.*”³⁷

Although Tusi theoretically is in the opposite camp to the philosophers and sets out to criticize them, has no intention of criticizing all their words. The difference between the philosophers and the *milliyyun*, as Gazali explained, is threefold. In the first place, the dispute is centred upon a mere word. Take for instance their use of the word 'substance' for God. In the second place, there are those things in which the philosophers believe, and which do not come into conflict with any religious principle. Examples are lunar and solar eclipses, and such matters need not concern us. In the third place, there are philosophical

³³ Gazali, "Mukaddima" to *Tahâfut al-Falâsifa*, edited and annotated by Sulayman Dunya, Sixth print, Dâr al-Maarif, Cairo, 1392/1972, pp. 76-85 ; "Prefaces" to English translation by Sabih Ahmad Kamali, Second impression, Pakistan Philosophical Congress, Lahore, 1963, pp. 1-12.

³⁴ *Zuhr*, Chapter “Introduction”, Turkish translation, p. 4.

³⁵ “Millî” from “milla” pl. “milal”: religious community, denomination. H. Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, Third print, Librairie du Liban, Bayrut, 1980, p. 918; Lane, *Lexicon*,

³⁶ *Zuhr*, Turkish translation, p. 5.

³⁷ *Zuhr*, Ch. “Introduction”, Turkish translation (from now on “T. tr.”), p. 6.

theories which come into violent conflict with the fundamental principles of religion. These are the problems of the world's beginning in time; of the attributes of the Creator; and of the resurrection of bodies. Ali Tusi adds to these three problems the problem of free will in God.³⁸

Although the main purpose of A. Tusi in writing *al-Zuhr* is to criticize the philosophers, he hardly refrains from criticizing his fellow-believers when he sees some error in their writings. He does so, because "*If the objective is to reach the reality, they must be told that most beliefs of most believers are not exact knowledge, but sheer guesses and mere opinions*".³⁹ In short, Ali Tusi's aim in writing his book is to expose the incoherence and contradiction involved in philosophical thought, and to show that the philosophers are unable to know these things only by rational demonstration.

While criticizing the philosophers Ali Tusi has no intention of being unjust towards them, and he sets himself some principles, he says:

1. I will not include in my book what does not clearly seem to me exactly true.
2. I will not consider as a problem what not a real problem is.
3. I will not follow the wish to treat unjustly the rival, [here the philosophers].
4. Whatever I will say that must be said, I will say it in a gentle manner.⁴⁰

Incidentally, it should be pointed out that contrary to the opinion of some modern writers the name of Ibn Rushd is not encountered in Ali Tusi's book.

Like Gazali, Ali Tusi examines twenty problems in his book in the order made by Gazâlî with only one exception. This exception is the chapter on knowledge (Chapter 10). These are:

1. Origination of the world and its eternity.
2. On the everlasting nature of the world.
3. In our assertion that God is the Agent and the Maker of the world, are the words used in their real meaning or are they sheer metaphor?
4. On the existence of the Creator of the world.
5. Unity of God and refusal of plurality of Him.

³⁸ Gazali, *Tahâfut*, English translation, p.

³⁹ *Zuhr*, Ch. "Introduction", T. tr., p. 12.

⁴⁰ *Zuhr*, Ch. "Introduction", T. tr., p. 5.

6. The Divine attributes.
7. On the possibility of God being composed of intellectual parts.
8. Does God have an essence apart from His existence?
9. God is not body.
10. On the nature of knowledge.
11. God knows anyone other than Himself.
12. God knows Himself.
13. God does not know changing particulars.
14. Do the heavenly spheres have a soul which causes them to move?
15. The very purpose of the Last Heaven's movement.
16. Do the souls of the heavens know all the particulars?
17. Is the observed relation between things a real causal relation or not?
18. Is the soul of man an abstract substance or not?
19. Is the soul of man eternal or created, and does it survive after the death and corruption of the body?
20. On the possibility of the resurrection of bodies, and the return of the souls to their bodies.

We can group these 20 problems in 4 categories as follows:

1. The problems concerning the world.
2. The problems concerning God.
3. The problems concerning the Heavens.
4. The problems concerning the soul.

The Problems concerning the World

In this group the most important problem is the problem of the eternity of the world (in the meaning of "universe", "all being"). A. Tusi considers it connected with, and origin of, many other problems, because of this he gave it more room in his book than the other problems. The believers (milliyyûn) assert that the world, apart from the Essence and the Attributes of God, is created. The philosophers say that God is eternal, but along with Him there are other eternal beings, such as the Intellects, the Orbits of the Heavenly bodies, Motion, Time, etc. They give for the eternity of the world four proofs of which the strongest is the one based on the impossibility of change in God. Key terms in this chapter are "time", "necessity in God", and "change in God". To the philosophers, *time* is a real existent, according to which the "priority" and "posteriority" of things are measured. What the philosophers said would be true, if *time* were an existent in

the outer world, and God were subject to *necessity* instead of *free will*, and *matter* were eternal. According to Ali Tusi and his colleagues, the mutakallimun, *time* is a sheer mental assumption. What really exists in the outer world are “what-is-coming-first”, “what-is-coming-later”, etc., but not “time”. We, by looking at and observing these particulars, arrive at a *concept* of time.⁴¹ This is the *nominalism* of Ali Tusi about time. Ali Tusi accepts that we have, generally speaking, some “ideas” that cannot be defined exactly *by definition*. In fact, we cannot find in the philosophers’ sayings an utterance explaining the real meaning of *time*. We have many expressions like that. For example, we are able to understand the meaning of the sentence “ ‘Anka is in-itself (*nafs al-amr*) possible,” but we cannot clearly explain what exactly *nafs al-amr* is, if we are asked the meaning of it. *Time* is of this kind of term. *Space* is another. These two are “mental assumptions,” in a more strict sense, the products of “estimative faculty” (*wahm*).⁴² Another concept like *time* and *space* is the concept of “possibility”.⁴³ Besides, God was not *obliged* to create the world, but He did this by His *free will*.

Based on Galen’s observations about the Sun, the philosophers developed a proof of the everlasting nature of the world. A. Tusi focuses here on the problem of the reliability of the results of observations. This, in fact, means to discuss the problems of *induction* and of *contingence* of natural laws.⁴⁴ To him, observation shows only whether something happened or not, even though the philosophers assert the contrary, not the necessity of this happening. What A. Tusi wants to do here is not to be scornful about science and scientific knowledge. He is, in fact, for exact knowledge, he is not a skeptic, because he explicitly says, “*I, now, exactly know that what I am, now, touching are the pen and the paper. Anyone who contradicts this is not worth speaking to.*”⁴⁵

The problem of the Creator of the world must be considered as integral with the problem of the eternity of the world. According to Ali Tusi “creation” and “eternity” are two contradictory concepts, and the philosophers’ claim that the world is eternal is tantamount to saying that the world is not created. Therefore, it does not need a Creator. Another point is that Ali Tusi does not accept that the world has come into existence by *emanation* which requires *necessity* in God. The

⁴¹ *Zuhr*, T. tr., p. 6 ff.

⁴² *Zuhr*, Chapter I, T. tr., p. 47.

⁴³ *Zuhr*, T. tr., p., 47 ff.

⁴⁴ *Zuhr*, T. tr., p. 54.

⁴⁵ *Zuhr*, Ch. 2, T. tr., p. 64.

philosophers claim that God has no will, whatever precedes from Him proceeds by necessity.⁴⁶

Ali Tusi considers the problem of *causality* as a problem connected with the *contingence* problem. According to the philosophers miracles are possible.⁴⁷ Inquiring into causality he examines the foundation of knowledge. Knowledge is the branch of sensual conception, because when a human being comes into the world his mind is a *tabula rasa*. Then he perceives particulars and tries to see *common* and *different* points among particulars. He draws “universal forms” from these particulars and sets up some connections between these universals.⁴⁸ The only way for man to acquire knowledge is this way. He thoroughly believes that man is able to have “exact knowledge”. One is free to choose one of two options from that knowledge is either the product of God in one’s mind, or a result of any other causes whatever they may be, we are able to know something in an absolute way; that is, for us, exact knowledge is possible.⁴⁹ Even though we know that to know something is possible, and its opposite is also possible, we are able to know this thing absolutely, and we don’t have any doubt about this knowledge. In fact, I exactly know that it is impossible not to be so.⁵⁰

Ali Tusi is one of the followers of al-Ash‘ari in saying that although God knows two possibilities of any possible thing, He creates the exact knowledge of the one of these two possibilities. Never does our knowledge have any effect on the coming into existence of other knowledge or on its disappearance. On the contrary, everything comes from God with His unmediated creation.⁵¹

The 17th chapter is like an independent chapter. Its subject-matter is the connection between so called “cause” and “effect” which the philosophers claim is a necessary connection. Ali Tusi accepts the existence of *cause* and *effect* as facts, but to him the connection between them is not necessary, it is *contingent*.⁵² The real and only cause is God. We see Tusi here as an “occasionalist”. As a

⁴⁶ *Zuhr*, Ch. 17, T. tr., p. 207.

⁴⁷ *Zuhr*, Ch. 3, T. tr., p. 70, 71, 73.

⁴⁸ “The fact of these all orthodox Islam admits, even so philosophical ... a peripatetic philosophers like Ibn Sinâ (*Ishârât*, ed. Forget, pp. 209, 219, 221 sqq.)”, McDonald, “Karâma”, *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*, eds. H. A. R. Gibb and J. H. Kramers, Fourth impression, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1995, pp. 216-217.

⁴⁹ *Zuhr*, Ch. 17, T. tr., p. 207; Ch. 18, T. tr., p. 213.

⁵⁰ *Zuhr*, Ch. 17, T. tr., p. 207.

⁵¹ *Zuhr*, Ch. 17, T. tr., p. 207.

⁵² *Zuhr*, Ch. T. tr., p.

result, contrary to the understanding of the philosophers, if God wants, He may burn cotton with water and extinguish with fire. In short miracles are possible.

An interesting idea of A. Tusi and one that is the opposite of what is generally accepted by philosophers is that “existence” or “being” is not *summum genus*; to him existence has more general concepts than “existence,” these are “becoming”(kavn), and “materializing,” “realizing,” and “becoming a fact” (tahakkuk). It is true that existence is non-existent.⁵³

Before examining the subject of composition in God, Ali Tusi feels a need to explain some concepts such as “*distinction*,” “*individuation*,” “*commonality*”. Since “genus”, “differentia”, “species” are not external existents, it is not impossible that God is composed of mental parts. Tusi accepts composed essences may exist in the mind. The only way to know a thing that is not self-evident is to know it by *definition*, and definition is made out of *genus* and *differentia*. Ali Tusi is not happy with the idea that God may be known apart from knowing by definition, “*God’s mystical manifestation of himself by means of sifât*”.⁵⁴

Though their sayings, methods, and proofs about the subject are different, the believers and the philosophers alike believe in the oneness of God. The two groups agree on the negative attributes of God. The conflict is about the attributes which affirm existence (“positive”, subûti)⁵⁵ such as omniscience, omnipotence, will, etc. For fear of ascribing plurality to God the philosophers avoid ascribing *positive attributes* to Him. Ali Tusi examining the proofs of the philosophers says that Ibn Sina has already breached this rule saying that “The Necessary First Being thinks the all. ‘Intellectual forms’ do not unite with the person thinking them; and again *intellectual forms* do not unite with one another.”⁵⁶ This is harmful to “unity” as the philosophers understand it.

⁵³ Zühr, Ch. 17, T. tr., p. 201.

⁵⁴ Zühr, Ch. 8, T. tr., p. 131.

⁵⁵ Macdonald, “Sıfa”, *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*, eds. H. A. R. Gibb and J. H. Kramers, Fourth impression, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1995, p. 545; Zühr, Chapter , T. tr. p. , The philosopher whom Ali Tusi criticizes here is probably Suhrawardî. Ali Tusi seems here to be against *mystic knowledge*, but in another place is for it. (Zühr, Ch. , T. tr. p.).

⁵⁶ Gardet-Anawati, *Introduction a la theologie musulmane*, J. Vrin, Paris, 1948, p. ; Calverly-Pollock, *Baidawi*, p. 777. Zühr, Ch. 6, T. tr., p. 106.

The Problems concerning God

In chapters 5-9, A. Tusi is interested in the problem of plurality. He examines here the problems of the Oneness of God, Attributes of God, Composition in God, the Difference between Essence and Existence in God, God is not body, God's Knowledge of Himself, God's Knowledge of the others, and the important problem of God's Knowledge of Changing Particulars.

Before starting to examine the problem of knowledge of God, A. Tusi makes a change in the list of the problems and adds a new chapter that does not exist in Gazali's *Tahafut*. This new chapter is on reality of knowledge. In Gazali's book the tenth chapter was "On the Creator of the World." "Whereas" says A. Tusi, "*this problem has already been examined before, I appropriated this chapter to the reality of knowledge which will be the foundation for the 11th, 12th, and 13th chapters.*"⁵⁷ To examine the subject, Tusi first of all reviews the state of knowledge up to his own time. According to the philosophers, knowledge is based on *mental existence* which the mutakallimun don't accept, while in the opinion of the mutakallimun and of Tusi, knowledge is *a relation, or a property based on relation*,⁵⁸ not the "coming into being of the *quiddity* of, or *rational form* of, something in the mind of the knower."⁵⁹

The philosophers do not accept that God knows changing particulars, because this requires change in God, this is an imperfection, and is not appropriate to God. A. Tusi makes an objection to this proof saying that the change here is a *change in relation*, and a change in relation does not require an imperfection in God. For knowledge is a relation or a property dependent on this relation between the knower and the known. What A. Tusi says here is the same as F. Razi has said. The difference between "was" and "will be" is a difference in temporal beings, not in timeless being.⁶⁰ Again, the philosophers say that if God knew changing particulars He would be dependent on them, and this is not suitable to Him. This would be so if knowledge were what the philosophers said. In fact, knowledge is of two kinds.⁶¹ The first kind is "acquired knowledge" (husûlî) which is passive in character; this knowledge depends on the known; knowledge

⁵⁷ *Zuhr*, Ch. 6, T. tr., p. 106.

⁵⁸ *Zuhr*, Ch. T. tr., p.

⁵⁹ F. Razi, *Kitab al-'Arbain fi Usul al-Din*, Majlis Dâira al-Maarif al-Osmâniya Printin House, Dakkan, Hyderabad, 1353, p. 137; *Zuhr*, Ch. 13, T. tr., p. 161 ff.

⁶⁰ *Zuhr*, Ch. 10, T. tr., p. 143 ff.

⁶¹ *Zuhr*, Ch. 13, T. tr., p. 163.

of temporal beings is so. The second kind is “knowledge by presence” (hudûrî) which is active in character, the known thing comes into being because of this knowledge; God’s knowledge of creatures is so.⁶²

The philosophers differ from each other on the subject of God’s knowing of others. According to them, due to being not-in-matter, God knows universals, and never changing particulars, because knowledge of changing things requires change in God. As Ibn Sina has said, “*God is a being not-in-matter. Every being is so, is a pure intelligence. Every pure intelligence has all intelligibles laid bare unto it; for it is the relation to, and occupation with matter that is the impediment in the way of the apprehension of things.*” Ali Tusi does not accept this claim, nor the claim that “*knowing the cause requires knowing products of this cause.*”⁶³ The proof of the philosophers about God’s knowledge of the other was dependent on God’s knowledge of Himself. Now, they say that “*whoever knows the other knows himself.*” This is a vicious circle.

In the chapter dedicated to the problem of the difference of *essence* and *existence* in God, Ali Tusi says that with the exception of Ash’ari, the mutakallimun accept that God has a *quiddity* apart from His *existence*.⁶⁴ The philosophers, on the contrary, refute this idea, and claim that God does not have a quiddity apart from His existence. These two are the same in God. In his reply to this claim Tusi says that “existence is existence” in the external world but “existence is not existent” there, such as, “light is light in itself, but it is not luminous.” For all these are mental existence, and sheer concepts. In this way A. Tusi is changing the subject-matter into the problem of the external existence of “existence.” According to him, what exists in the external world is not attribute itself, but the qualified thing with the attribute, and thus he has given an answer to F. Razi.⁶⁵

There is no conflict between the *mutakallimun* and the *philosophers* about the fact that God is not body. Ali Tusi wants to show here that the philosophers are not right to infer these results from these premises. Besides, what they say are the results of *induction* which does not give exact and necessary knowledge. We witness again here Tusi’s criticisms of F. Razi, Nasır Tusi, and Kutb Razi; he

⁶² *Zuhr*, Ch. 12, T. tr., p. 159, 160.

⁶³ *Zuhr*, Ch. 13, T. tr., 166; ...

⁶⁴ *Zuhr*, Ch. 11, T. tr., p. 152.

⁶⁵ *Zuhr*, Ch. 8, T. tr., p. 119.

criticizes Gazali as well for having accepted the proof of the “finitude of dimensions” as if this proof were true.⁶⁶

The Problems concerning the Heavens

Ali Tusi does not consider the chapters 14, 15, and 16 as important as the chapters where he has examined the problems of the eternity of the world, God’s knowledge, and God’s will. He says that what the philosophers claim, -that Heaven has a soul,⁶⁷ has a purpose in its movement,⁶⁸ and knows what happens in the world⁶⁹ may be accepted from the religious point of view as true with some reservations. According to Tusi the point is not what the philosophers say here, but the point is the mode of connection between the premises and the results in their inference. Here A. Tusi points out the fact that among their utterances there are some contradictions, for example, the philosophers don’t accept the “will” of God in the eternity problem, but they do this in the problem of heavenly bodies.⁷⁰

Ali Tusi wants again to show in accordance with his main aim that what the philosophers say in this matter is thoroughly arbitrary and groundless assumptions.

The Problems concerning the Resurrection of Body

Before examining the main problem of resurrection A. Tusi sums up the views about the soul in general, and the human soul in particular. Among definitions given for soul the most proper is the definition of Ibn Sînâ that soul is “*the principle of action*”.⁷¹ Mutakallimun believe that, since human soul is a part of the world, it is a thing created, even though there is a conflict among them about the time of its creation. On this problem also the philosophers disagree. Plato and his followers believe that human souls are eternal, while according to Aristotle and his disciples they are created at the time of the coming into being of the body.⁷²

⁶⁶ *Zuhr*, Ch. 8, T. tr., pp. 121-123.

⁶⁷ *Zuhr*, Ch. 9, T. tr., p. 137, 139, 142.

⁶⁸ *Zuhr*, Ch. 14, T. tr., p. 167.

⁶⁹ *Zuhr*, Ch. 15, T. tr., p. 183.

⁷⁰ *Zuhr*, Ch. 16, T. tr., p. 191.

⁷¹ *Zuhr*, Ch. 18, T. tr. p. 210.

⁷² *Zuhr*, Ch. 19, T. tr., p. 228, 229.

After discussing the proofs of the philosophers about the problems such as whether human soul is abstract or not, created or not, immortal or not, he passes to the problem of resurrection of body. He suggests to examine the problem in two stages: 1. The problem of coming back into existence of the non-existent (Ch. 20), and 2. The problem of the resurrection of body (Ch. 20). The philosophers have given us eight proofs about the impossibility of bodily resurrection. Tusi examines them one by one, and raises his own objection against them. He starts his examination by explanation of the philosophers' views about animal and human faculties, and properties and classes of human rational soul's faculties.

Then he repeats his principal thesis that the philosophers say many things without demonstration, or their demonstration is not enough to show that they want to prove.

Examining this very subtle problem A. Tusi cites four views against the possibility of coming back of the non-existent, and his personal opinion against them. The philosophers, says Ali Tusi, don't accept resurrection of bodies while the believers do. The text of the Sacred Law in this subject is so clear that there is no room to interpretation (ta'wîl).