

Analyzing the Contextual Relationship between Science and the Quran in Establishing Islamic Human Sciences

Mohammad Ali
Asadi Nasab  *

Associate Professor, Institute for Culture and Islamic
Thought, Qom, Iran

Accepted: 19/04/2025

Received: 02/06/2024

eISSN: 2538-2012

ISSN: 2008-9252

Abstract

One of the most critical and challenging issues regarding revealed human sciences and the comprehensiveness of Quranic teachings is the possibility of an Islamic human science in terms of Quranic content. Examining the content and issues of the Quran and science can be done with various purposes, but the present study, using a descriptive-analytical method, aims to answer the doubt about the impossibility of revealed human science. The results indicated that different views exist in this area. Some, assuming that religious issues and, consequently, Quranic teachings are separate from human science issues, believe that the relationship between them is one of contradiction. Others accept contextual overlap but consider the relationship to be one of opposition. A third view argues that their relationship is one of agreement, but the instances of agreement are minimal, making the realization of revealed human science impossible. According to these theories, a revealed human science is fundamentally impossible. Therefore, each of these theories represents a fundamental question and underlying doubt in this arena, and until these are answered, talking about such a science that can be both human and revealed is not logical. The finding of this paper is to address the fundamental flaws of the aforementioned three views as

* Corresponding Author: asadinasab@gmail.com

How to Cite: Asadi Nasab, M. A. (2025). Analyzing the Contextual Relationship between Science and the Quran in Establishing Islamic Human Sciences, *A Research Journal on Qur'anic Knowledge*, 16(60), 145-170. DOI: 10.22054/rjqk.2024.80037.2981

competing viewpoints and to prove the possibility of revealed human sciences as the chosen viewpoint, which we will address with an interpretative approach and a library-based method.

Keywords: Quran, Human Science, Revealed Science, Ratio Assessment, Possibility.

Introduction

There are two types of human sciences: value-laden and value-neutral. The first type is related to human happiness and misery, and God has rulings concerning them. However, the second type, such as statistics, is intrinsically neutral and not related to human happiness and misery. Value-laden human sciences, in the common sense, encompass all human affairs of human societies and claim to guide people to worldly welfare and happiness. These sciences are designed in such a way that they leave no room for religion and revealed teachings and have sometimes progressed to the point of considering religious intervention impossible even in value-laden human sciences such as education, economics, politics, and the like. Proponents of the dominance of human sciences over all human actions and states have made various claims, including that Islamic and revealed human science is impossible in terms of the content of sciences and revealed teachings. Given the above point, the question or doubt arises that a divinely revealed human science is impossible regarding the difference and divergence between the issues of revealed teachings and the issues of non-divine human sciences. Regarding the content analysis of the Quran and human science, various views and opinions have been formed. Some based on the premise that Quranic issues are divergent from human science issues, or that they overlap and concur, but in a contradictory manner and with no possibility of combining the teachings of the two, or that they have minimal overlap. In other words, considering these views how is the construction of a divinely revealed human science possible? Some fundamentally deny the realization of a divinely revealed human science. Therefore, this type of separation includes three general views: Divergence, contradictory overlap, and minimal overlap. It is clear that in this writing, we address these three issues with the approach of proving the possibility of divine science, because unless this fundamental issue is answered, one cannot speak of Quranic and divine human science. Therefore, in this writing, while criticizing the aforementioned three views (as competing views), we will prove the possibility of a divinely revealed

human science as the chosen view, using an interpretative approach to the Quran and a library-based method.

Many books and articles have been written about Islamic human sciences. However, considering that the title of this article has four qualifiers: Content analysis, Quranic, in order to prove the scope of principles, and with regard to the content of human sciences, it must be said that there is no specific precedent for it. However, there are books and articles regarding general discussions of the relationship between science and religion, or the Islamization of sciences, or the foundations of Islamic human sciences, including the book "Foundations of Islamic Human Sciences" by Dr. Ahmad Hossein, whose religious knowledge foundation is somewhat related to this article, as well as other works on the general topic; but the most important work is the book written by the author entitled: "Foundations of Quranic Epistemology of Religious Science," which this article is consistent with a minor axis of one of the foundations mentioned in that book; as are two articles written by the author entitled: "The Possibility of Religious Science and The Necessity of Religious Science," published in the collection of articles *al-Mīzān* and Human Sciences, are also related to this article, but none of these works independently address the topic of this article's title.

It has not addressed the critique and examination of the reasoning of those who deny the possibility of a revelatory human science – those who, with a specific perspective on the relationship between religion and science, have gravitated towards denying the possibility of revelatory human science.

1. Conceptualization

1.1. Science

In its linguistic sense, science is the opposite of ignorance (Khalīl, 1988 AD/1409 AH: 2, 152) and refers to awareness and perception of a thing or the perception of a relationship between two things (Rāghib, 1991 AD/1412 AH: 1, 580). Therefore, being informed of even a single proposition is considered science. However, in the terminology of scientists and various disciplines, it has different meanings; but in

this article, it refers to the "Collection of Universal Propositions Resulting from Empirical Investigations." In this definition, science is used as equivalent to Science, which includes only knowledge derived through the senses, as opposed to Knowledge.

1.2. Islamic Human Science

Considering the aim and scope of this writing, and that it is directed towards the common human sciences such as economics, management, law, politics, etc., and considering the foundations and teachings of the Quran and the definition that was mentioned for science; it is more appropriate to define Islamic human science a priori and as a chosen definition – and not existing definitions – as follows: "Collections of knowledge resulting from systematic, descriptive or prescriptive propositions of Islam, derived from any of the four sources of knowledge, related to the metaphysical nature of humans and explaining the how, causes, and consequences of their spiritual attributes and voluntary activities, whether mental or behavioral, at the individual and social levels, in order to understand, predict, guide, and manage humans and human society towards the spiritual perfections desired by the Quran."

2. The View of Divergence between Human Science Issues and Quranic Teachings

One view holds that there is a divergence between the issues of Quranic teachings and scientific issues. Proponents of this view believe that the content and teachings of the Quran only pertain to matters of worship, individual life, and the afterlife, and that the subject matter and issues of science are objectivity and external reality. Therefore, Quranic teachings have no connection with worldly and scientific matters. This view is based on the separation between object and mind, and knowledge and values. Therefore, we will proceed to critique and examine these two foundations.

2.1. The Basis of Separation between Object and Mind and its Critique

One of the foundations of the divergence approach is the separation between object and mind. According to this basis, religious and revealed propositions are mental matters and have no connection with the object and reality. Proponents of this idea believe that religious teachings deal with different subjects than scientific propositions (cf. Peterson et al., 1997 AD/1376 SH: 366). Existentialism emphasizes the distinction between science and theology and considers scientific knowledge to be impersonal and objective, while religious knowledge is considered deeply personal and subjective. The subject of science is material objects and their roles and functions, but the subject of religion is personal and moral realities (ibid: 366).

Based on this view, a science that is both revealed and human is impossible because their issues have no affinity with each other, and the object and the mind are two different worlds.

This view has serious flaws, including:

Firstly, even if the subject of existing human sciences is only the apparent behavior of humans, it still needs mental affairs and departure from objectivity to transform details into rules and, as a result, produce science. This is because, in principle, the place for general rules is the mind and not the object.

Secondly, according to some paradigms, human sciences cannot be separated from subjectivity and limited to objectivity. For example, the interpretive paradigm considers it necessary to penetrate the mind of the actor and has proposed solutions for it.

Thirdly, considering all religious propositions as subjective originates from Christian theology. In contrast, the Holy Quran, in addition to prescriptive and commendatory teachings, contains many objective and descriptive propositions, as will be mentioned later.

2.2. The Basis of Separation between Knowledge and Value and its Critique

One of the foundations and arguments of those who believe in the divergence of religion and science, and consequently the divergence of the Quran and science, is the separation between knowledge and value. Some believe that science expresses objective realities and what

is and is not and has no connection with good and bad, and what should and should not be (value propositions). Religious matters consist of a number of value propositions. Therefore, there is no relationship between these two types of propositions, and as a result, a science that becomes revealed or a revelation that becomes scientific is meaningless and impossible.

This issue was initially raised by some Western philosophers, such as Hume, and subsequently found its way into religious discussions. Of course, various interpretations have been offered regarding his words (cf. Javadi, 1996 AD/1375 SH: 29-40), but most scholars have understood his statement as a separation between "Ought" and "Is"; that is, values and facts are logically unrelated and do not derive from each other. According to the prevailing interpretation of Hume's theory, no set of descriptive propositions logically entails any set of evaluative propositions (cf. Haeri Yazdi, 2005 AD/1384 SH: 62). In other words, "Is" and "Is not" do not generate "Ought" and "Ought not's," nor evaluative propositions.

In response, we point to two matters:

First, the existence of cognitive propositions and the expression of numerous anthropological "Is" and "Is not's" (descriptive) in the Quran.

The teachings of the Quran are not limited to evaluative and conventional propositions, and the assumption that all Quranic propositions are conventional is invalidated by a cursory glance at the Quranic verses. In the Holy Quran, there are various types of propositions on human science topics. Some propositions pertain to the world and its tangible effects and consequences, which, like propositions in the human sciences, can be understood and judged through the senses, experience, and experimentation (cf. al-Baqarah/96 and 109; Āli 'Imrān/159; al-'Alaq/6-7; al-al-Balad/4; al-Ma'ārij/19; al-'Ādīyāt/8).

Second, the relationship between knowledge and value

Regarding the relationship between knowledge and value, it can be said that, from the perspective of reason and common

understanding, ideology and evaluative propositions, which are the same as non-descriptive propositions, usually stem from a worldview; that is, rationally and conventionally, "Is" and "Is not's" demand a series of "Ought" and "Ought not's." Therefore, in the Holy Quran, we encounter numerous instances where "Ought" and "Ought not's" are explicitly and implicitly based on "Is" and "Is not's," including:

The necessity of gratitude for the existence of blessings; such as the necessity of prayer and sacrifice because of the granting of *Kawthar* (Kawthar/1 and 2), which the existence of the blessing is cognitive and the necessity of gratitude is evaluative. Also, the obligation of the Prophet's kindness to orphans and the poor (evaluative) due to the blessing of guidance and the provision of refuge to the Prophet by God (cognitive) (al-Ḍuḥā/9-11); regarding monotheism, the necessity of worshipping the one God (evaluative) because there is no god but Him (cognitive) (al-Anbīyā'/25 and Ṭāhā/14). From the perspective of the Holy Quran, the dependence of "Ought" on "Is" is both possible and has occurred.

In addition to the verses mentioned in the Quran, according to the belief of Shi'a Uṣūlīs (principled scholars), all divine decrees and value propositions stem from real benefits (*Maṣāliḥ*) and harms (*Maḥāsīd*) inherent in the subjects of the rulings. Even figures like *Shaykh Anṣārī*, when discussing "salukiya" (conductual) benefits, are essentially arguing that there is benefit in adhering to the rulings themselves, even if they appear to be contrary in practice. Furthermore, some verses in which good things (*Ṭayyibāt*) were forbidden to the Jews (al-Nisā'/160) were for the purpose of punishment, meaning there was a benefit in requiring the Jews to abstain from good things; otherwise, God would not have forbidden it to the guilty Jews, just as divine punishments are similar in nature. Therefore, the origin of all ought and ought-nots lies in is or is-nots, because divine obligations serve human development. God states in this regard: "O! You who have believed, respond to Allah and to the Messenger when he calls you to that which gives your life." (al-Anfāl/24). This verse encompasses the entirety of religion and the

content of the divinely inspired message. This verse correctly states the ultimate goal, but this very goal is also the origin, meaning these rulings were established for that goal. This is a clear indication that all ought and ought-nots arise from is and is-nots, even if the benefit lies in the very enactment of the ruling, or the harm lies in not enacting it; that is, the very conduct and behavior based on obedience to God and the impeccable (Imam) includes an external and objective benefit.

The *'Adlīyyah* (those who believe in Divine Justice), in contrast to the *Ash'ariyyah*, believe in the existence of benefits in the command and the subject of rulings, due to frequent narrations (Ḥurr 'Āmilī, 1992 AD/1413 AH: 17, 12), consensus (Ḥakīm, 1992 AD/1413 AH: 2, 380), and the necessity of negating futility if there is no benefit in the "Ought" (ibid). The rational good and evil (*Husn* and *Qubh*) that Shi'a believes in is evidence of the subservience of rulings and ought and ought-nots to is and is-nots, and the existence of merits and demerits.

In response to the objection cited from Hume, thinkers have provided various answers. Among these answers, two that are supported by the Quran are as follows:

First, there is a "Necessity by comparison" between ought and ought-nots in relation to the ultimate goal of man, because reaching the ultimate goal necessitates ought and ought-nots.

These value judgments are like empirical science judgments. For example, to create water, two elements, oxygen and hydrogen, must combine; that is, this "Must be" is necessary to achieve water. Similarly, in value judgments, a voluntary act that is a value is necessary to achieve a specific religious goal, which is an objective, external reality and knowledge. For example, there is a causal relationship between the necessity of honesty and the ethical goal of achieving perfection and true happiness; therefore, to realize the effect, which is happiness, the cause, which is honesty, must be achieved, and this is the same conditional necessity (cf. Misbah Yazdi, 2012 AD/1391 SH: 61), which has many examples in Quranic verses.

The above answer – considering the benefits and harms present in the objects of revealed teachings – can be presented in the field of

value judgments and "Ought" and "Ought nots," with a deductive syllogistic argument with descriptive and objective premises, similar to descriptive propositions in the human sciences, where all three propositions (two premises and the conclusion) are descriptive; that is, reflecting objective reality. These three propositions are as follows: Believers seek perfection and happiness; everyone who seeks perfection and happiness obeys God; believers obey God.

Second instance is also possible to consider the issues in such a way that the major premise is considered self-evident and in no need of proof, in the following manner: "A worldview, which describes divine and religious reality and knowledge, determines the "Is," and reason, based on those "Is," discovers the "Ought" and produces a first-figure syllogism in this form: "God is the giver of blessings to us; and every giver of blessings deserves thanks; therefore, God deserves thanks. In this syllogism, the second proposition does not emerge from the first proposition but is itself self-evident or leads to self-evident truths." Therefore, since the major premise is of the nature of practical reason, which is based on the "Ought" of accepted self-evident truths, and does not need reasoning, but rather reasoning about it faces the problem of circularity; therefore, Hume's objection does not apply (cf. Subhani, 1998 AD/1377 SH: 200 ff.).

These two answers can be derived from the verses of the Quran. Regarding the first answer: "The Holy Quran says to the Prophet (PBUH): "Say, [O! Muhammad], 'If you should love Allah, then follow me, [so] Allah will love you and forgive you your sins. And Allah is Forgiving and Merciful.'" (Āli 'Imrān/31) This means that following the Prophet is the reason for being beloved to God. And this is the same as hypothetical necessity; in other words, following becomes necessary by analogy to being beloved and for achieving it.

Regarding the obviousness and clarity of some ethical commands and necessities, it can be said that many verses in which the wicked are reproached for not reflecting on God's verses and clear signs can be placed in this category; verses such as: "He said, "Then do you worship instead of Allah that which does not benefit you at all or harm

[you]? Fie upon you and upon what you worship instead of Allah. Then will you not use reason?" (al-Anbīyā'/66-67) which reproaches the polytheists even though it is obvious to them that idols have no benefit, harm, or movement, but they still worship them; these people deny the obvious fact that idols have no effect.

3. The View of Overlap between Human Sciences and Quranic Teachings

By overlap, it is meant that there are common issues between scientific issues and Quranic issues that both science and revelation have addressed and commented on based on their own foundations and perspectives. The views of those who deny Islamic human science in this arena are of two types: "Some believe that there are common and harmonious cases between the issues of the two, but these cases are so few that it is impossible for a science that is both revealed and scientific to be realized from the combination of the two. Others believe that revelatory propositions are contradictory to the propositions of the human sciences; that is, both have been presented, but they contain contradictory statements, and as a result, it is impossible for a science that is both revelatory and consistent with existing human sciences to emerge." These two categories are mentioned below:

3.1. The View of Minimal Overlap between Quranic Teachings and Scientific Issues

Some secular intellectuals believe in minimal interference between the content of the Quran and scientific issues. They believe that Quranic teachings in the humanities are so scarce that they cannot influence these sciences. Relying on secularism and secularism as their ideology and worldview, they insist on separating religion from various social spheres and established humanities, including political, economic, and so on. These intellectuals, influenced by Christian theology, imposed a minimalist view on the Quran (cf. Soroush, 1977 AD/1377 SH: Kiyan Magazine, No. 41). Although this phenomenon in the West is more attributable to cultural and social factors, such as the Christian

treatment of science and scientists, the financial and moral corruption of priests, the Church's inability to answer theological and philosophical doubts, and its failure to adapt to the growth of science and industry, contemporary intellectuals have also offered their own reasons and evidence, some of which will be mentioned below.

Some of the arguments of proponents of minimal interference are as follows:

- 1) Religion should not be worldly; it should be otherworldly. Religion is a spiritual and otherworldly matter whose main goal is to ensure "Eternal Happiness." (cf. Soroush, 2006 AD/1385 SH: 92-93)
- 2) Religion did not come to teach natural sciences or humanities. Dr. Soroush says: "Even if, hypothetically, it has said something in this realm, it is minimal. Even those who believe that some of the rules of these sciences can be extracted from religious texts have never claimed that religion teaches the maximum possible. The foundations, methods, and issues of these sciences are defined so independently of religion that this is the best reason for their essential distinction from religion. And if religions had come to teach these sciences, why was not an economist, sociologist, or psychologist in the modern sense nurtured within them? And why did the founders of these sciences not extract their foundations from religious teachings? Furthermore, the conflict between some of the teachings of these sciences and religious teachings is further evidence of their divergence, not the derivation of one from the other. Furthermore, if in some verses or traditions, allusions are made to certain issues of natural sciences or humanities, they are entirely "Incidental" and "Marginal"; meaning, they are not part of the inherent and essential aspects of religion, and the absence of such allusions and teachings does not diminish the religion." (Soroush, 2006 AD/1385 SH: 94-96)
- 3) Soroush states: "The burden that should not be placed on religion is the burden of a "Complete Religious Government." If religion has anything to say about governance, it is a "Minor" statement, not a "Major" one, and its minor statement concerns "Legitimacy," not "Management." And even that legitimacy is closely linked to

management. In today's complex society, government needs more than just "Legal" and "Ethical rules"; that is, "Human Sciences" are necessary for governing society, but if religion has anything to say about the human sciences, it is a "Minor" statement. Therefore, with "Minor Jurisprudence" and "Minor Knowledge," one cannot place the burden of a successful and complete government on religion. Even that minor jurisprudence and minor knowledge, in the realm of being and in itself, is even less and more insignificant in the realm of proof and in our hands." (Soroush, 2006 AD/1385 SH: 111-112)

4) Dr. Soroush also says: "A religion that wants to be eternal and the final one has no choice but to introduce a common core and thread that is suitable for all people in all ages and periods and to overlook the branches, margins, and special affairs of some positions and times; otherwise, it will become like a garment for the body of one society, one region, and one particular era, and no more; this statement also indicates the minimalist nature of religion." (Soroush, 2006 AD/1385 SH: 106)

5) Regarding the validity of traditions, Soroush states: "Islamic traditions have not been immune to the damage of fabrication, distortion, and destruction. Many traditions have been said and have not reached us. Therefore, serious deficiencies have occurred in religious texts, and they have now reached us in an incomplete and impure form. The accidentals of the Quran could also have been different from what they are now, and with the lengthening of the Prophet Muhammad's (PBUH) life, the volume of the Quran could have been much greater, and thus its guidance, clarification, and lesson-teaching would have been much more than it is now. Moreover, the knowledge of religious understanding is also in increase, evolution, and contraction-expansion, and future generations may understand this religion in a much more refined and accurate way than we do. Now, in order to believe that God's purpose in sending prophets and revealing books has been fulfilled, we have no choice but to say that at least the necessary guidance for people has safely passed through these additions and subtractions, fabrications and

placements, substances and accidents, and constrictions and expansions, and has reached them, no more. Otherwise, it is clear that if the religion had reached us healthier and more substantial than it is now, our guidance would inevitably be more complete, and our differences would be fewer; therefore, the guidance of religion is a minimal guidance that aligns with its history." (ibid: 106-107)

6) In justifying the verse of the completion of religion, Soroush says: "The completion of religion that is mentioned in the Quran (al-Mā'ida/3) cannot lead to a majority understanding. Some have mistakenly taken completion of religion to mean comprehensiveness of religion or completion of religious knowledge, or they have not distinguished between minimal completion and majority completion, all three of which are errors. Being complete and being comprehensive are different from each other. Being comprehensive means encompassing everything, but being complete means that the religion lacks nothing in relation to its purpose. The completion of religion must be understood in relation to God's purpose in sending religions and the specific function of religion. It is complete for what it has come for (i.e., minimal guidance), and it is not complete in relation to all our possible expectations. So, religion (not religious knowledge) has completion, not comprehensiveness, and its completion is minimal, not majority." (ibid: 107-109)

7) If social and political issues are stated in the verses of the Quran, they are not inherent to the religion but are a requirement of the circumstances of the time. The political and governmental issues mentioned in the Quran were to help the governance of the Prophet of Islam so that he would have a law for the government of his time. The idea that religion consists of individual and devotional matters and is foreign to political and social affairs is an image that all secularists believe in (cf. 'Abdul Razzāq, 1964 AD/1344 AH: 71, and Soroush, Kian Magazine, 1998 AD/1377 SH: No. 42).

Critique and Review

1) Contrary to the above, a logical approach requires that when we believe in the truth of the Quran and religion, we should avoid

prejudices about the scope of religion and, for this purpose, ask the Quran itself to what extent it defines its scope (cf. Mesbah Yazdi, 2012 AD/1391 SH: 32-33). In other words, a believer, by virtue of the faith they have in the truthfulness of the Quranic propositions, and considering all of it as a path to their own salvation, seeks to determine what the Quran expects of them, rather than seeking to make the Quran fulfill their own expectations.

2) Now, if we refer solely to the Holy Quran, we encounter a vast number of verses related to various social issues: family relationships (marriage, dowry, marital relations, resolving family disputes, divorce, raising children), economic transactions (trade, loans, mortgages, inheritance), obedience to those in authority, war and peace, civil, criminal, and international law, and so on. Furthermore, the traditions narrated from the Prophet (PBUH) and the Imams (AS) contains many times more of these kinds of issues than the verses of the Quran. Therefore, it can be definitively stated that Islamic teachings and knowledge are not limited solely to acts of worship and the individual sphere, but also encompass a wide social sphere, and it is certainly not the case that many issues have been left to custom (ibid: 33-36). Islam, having spoken on many aspects of life and presented numerous rules and principles in each, cannot be described as a minimalist religion. Reason cannot accept that religion has addressed some details of worldly life (such as eating pork or alcoholic beverages) that are effective in the eternal misery of man, but the essential and very important matters, such as the political and economic systems of society, which have undeniable effects, have been neglected by religion (ibid: 49). Given the clear abundance of social verses in the Quran, can anyone say that the Quran has not intervened in the field of humanities, or should not intervene, or has intervened very little?

3) The assertion by some within the realm of religion that one must choose either maximalism or minimalism is a flawed dichotomy, as a third option is correct. Because, by referring to the Quran, it becomes clear that the Quran has not spoken about many natural sciences, but it has expressed many statements about the humanities, in such a way

that if they are combined with the humanities, they give a special color to these sciences. However, it should be noted that Islamic thinkers have always clearly stated that in the Islamic humanities, we need human sciences and their experiences, and reason and knowledge are two important sources alongside the Quran and Sunnah.

4) The division of religion into worldly and other-worldly is invalid. This is because these two realms are not separate, and from the perspective of the Quran, individual and social relationships in this world lead to the betterment of the hereafter. The goal of religion is to improve the world for the eternal happiness of the afterlife. All our individual and social actions will manifest in the hereafter; improper actions in worldly life will result in misery in the afterlife. The Quran states: "Indeed, those who consume the property of orphans unjustly are only consuming into their bellies fire. And they will be burned in a Blaze." (al-Nisā'/10)

5) Martyr Motahhari, in explaining the need for revelation and revelatory teachings, states that the effectiveness of "Reason," both in terms of discovering individual interests and discovering social interests, is limited to this world. Therefore, Martyr Motahhari says: "There is no debate that the power of reason is necessary and useful for "partial and limited life management," but this is not the case in a general and broad scope. Man is not capable of devising a comprehensive plan for all the interests of his personal life, encompassing all and conforming to all the interests of his life. Although some have claimed self-sufficiency for humans through the possession of reason, even the concept of "Happiness" remains vague and controversial in their literature (Motahhari, 1979 AD/1358 SH: 2, 56).

6) Utilizing the Quran for the compilation of Islamic humanities does not necessitate that these sciences exist in the Quran in their current scientific form, but it is also not the case that Islamic knowledge and teachings in this regard are few and insignificant. Martyr Motahhari writes: "Islam is neither sociology nor a philosophy of history. In the holy book of Islam, no social or historical subject is presented in the

usual language of sociology or philosophy of history; just as no other ethical, jurisprudential, philosophical, etc., subject is expressed in the usual language and within the wrapping of common terms and customary classifications. At the same time, many issues from those sciences are completely inferable and extractable." (Motahhari, 1979 AD/1358 SH: 2, 329) It is clear that these numerous issues, when incorporated into the humanities, will transform them and give them a new order, which means the realization of revelatory and Islamic humanities.

7) Given the constitutive relationship between this world and the hereafter, and the fact that the rewards and punishments of the hereafter for humans are the very essence or the result of their worldly actions, the connection between religion and the world cannot be denied. This is because worldly deeds affect the soul and, ultimately, the happiness and misery of the hereafter. The Holy Quran says in this regard: "So this day no soul will be wronged at all, and you will not be recompensed except for what you used to do." (Yāsīn/54) The phrase "What you used to do" is general and, with its evident meaning, includes all actions, both individual and social, that were repeatedly performed. Now, if religion does not address the individual and social actions of humans in this world, it has also abandoned their happiness in the hereafter. Because religion is linked to the hereafter of humans, it inevitably has a deep connection with their individual and social world.

8) The Quranic sources and traditions (narrations) that express economic, political, educational, legal, ethical, and other goals and rulings, and directly and indirectly show the connection between religion and social affairs, and consequently the humanities, are another reason to negate the idea of a minimal scope of Islam and its non-exclusivity to matters of the hereafter. To say that traditions have problems is like saying that there are problems in historical issues or physics or politics. It is clear that due to some weaknesses and problems in the sources of these sciences, one should not abandon all their content and consider everything invalid. Rather, it is necessary to

find a way to reach correct information and distinguish the genuine from the counterfeit. In this regard, the various sciences of Hadith (tradition) and also the science of *Uṣūl* (principles of jurisprudence) are of good use, and the Mujtahid (qualified jurist) uses these sciences to determine the authentic and inauthentic ones.

In support of the above, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* divides religious teachings into seven sections (cf. Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1974 AD/1354 SH: 1, 13), one of which is knowledge related to humans in this world. In the Quran, the necessity of the social dimension of Islam is indicated directly and indirectly. God says: "Indeed, We have sent down to you the Book in truth so you may judge between the people by that which God has shown you. And do not be an advocate for the deceitful." (al-Nisā'/105)

We have sent down to you the Book in truth, so that you may judge between people by that which Allah has shown you. And be not an advocate for the treacherous. The ruling in this verse is absolute and includes governance, government, judicial, political, social, and administrative rulings.

It may be said that the government of the noble Messenger of Islam, or his judgment and adjudication, stemmed from his personal genius, and that he undertook to establish a government due to his intellect, not based on the command of the Quran and divine revelation; consequently, these matters are not considered part of Islam. However, the Holy Quran invalidates this claim in the previous verse, because it says: "O! Prophet! The basis of your sovereignty, whether in the field of governance and government, or in judgment and adjudication, must be based on revelation and what God has presented to you: "To judge between the people by what Allah has shown you." And if it had said: "By what you saw"; meaning, act based on what you yourself determine; the above interpretation would have been correct, but it does not have such an expression. Just as the very reason for the revelation of the verse is to invite the noble Messenger (PBUH) to judge between people, whether in accordance with revelation or in accordance with personal knowledge and

awareness, it indicates the necessity of forming a system of governance, judgment, and adjudication.

The duty of God's caliph is not limited to the cultural sphere, preaching, enjoining good, and forbidding evil verbally. His main duties are to reform the people of the earth, confront the tyrants of the age, and extinguish the sedition of the bloodthirsty and corruptors, and such a thing cannot be achieved except through caliphate, leadership, and power. For this reason, the great prophets always fought against oppressors and corruptors in order to achieve national power and establish a popular government based on divine revelation, and many of them were martyred in this way in order to be able to fully fulfill their second duty. It is clear that mere preaching and advising people would not have caused all these conflicts and martyrdoms; just as God in the Holy Quran has referred to the subject of the killing of the prophets of God in various expressions.

Like "They kill the prophets unjustly" and "Why then did you kill the prophets of God?" and "Is it that whenever a messenger came to you with what your souls did not desire, you rejected some and killed others?" (cf. Javadi Amoli, 2002 AD/1381 SH: 162-166)

With the Quran and abundant narrations, alongside reason and science, it is possible to organize the economic and livelihood situations of the people and reduce many of the problems of various segments of society. By using the element of reason and through expert planning, humanity can benefit from a more comfortable and peaceful earthly life, which is achieved through conformity with the value principles of Islam and new sciences and technologies, and from many of the problems that human society faces as a result of ignoring a part of the intellectual resources (cf. Javadi, 2002 AD/1381 SH: 162-167).

3.2. The View of Contradictory Interference between the Quran's Content and Scientific Issues

Some believe in the contradiction between science and religion (cf. Michael Peterson et al., 1982 AD/1361 SH), which necessitates a contradiction between Quranic teachings and scientific teachings as

well. Conflict between science and religion is possible when there is interference between the two in some way; conflict can be in purpose, method, subject, and issues; in such a way that the existing human sciences are not satisfied with any other method, purpose, or issues, and are monopolistic in these axes.

Conflict between science and religion has more history in some issues of the natural sciences; such as the theory of biological evolution, an issue that has been raised since the mid-nineteenth century. Evolutionary theology and the wide-ranging victories of modern science increasingly put pressure on traditional theology, which sought to preserve the concept of creation (according to the biblical statement). The manner of these debates shows that the parties to the conflict considered religion and science to be rivals, meaning they believed that if a theory is correct in one of these two domains, the theory contrary to it is necessarily false in the other domain (Peterson et al., 1997 AD/1376 SH: 363).

Regarding the initial conflict between scientific issues and revelation, it must be said: there is no contradiction between definitive religious teachings and definitive scientific findings; because such a situation is itself a kind of contradiction. If the findings of science are uncertain, scientific hypotheses that have not been proven do not have the power to conflict with definitive religious teachings, which are a proven matter and if both are speculative, if the speculative religious teachings have a reason for validity...

Scientific hypotheses, not definitively proven, cannot conflict with reliably presumed religious teachings like the apparent meanings (of scriptures). Therefore, scientific hypotheses are subject to religiously valid presumptions, at least until those scientific hypotheses are proven (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1975 AD/1354 SH: 17, 373). And if a definitive scientific finding contradicts the apparent meanings of revealed teachings, which are based on presumption, those apparent meanings are interpreted in a rational way to resolve the conflict (cf. *ibid*: 12, 200).

Conflicts between some revealed teachings in the field of human

affairs and some teachings of the human sciences, such as law, politics, education, etc., have been raised by some individuals. For example, Dr. Soha has stated: "The essence and foundation of human rights are equality, freedom, and justice, and the Quran opposes these three principles. The Quran's class system does not tolerate equality, its judicial rulings do not accept judicial justice, and the Quran's dogmatic intellectual and ideological system does not accept freedom of thought. In general, Islam has accepted almost none of human rights completely." (cf. Soha, 2011 AD/1390 SH: 560-580)

This viewpoint has shortcomings, some of which are mentioned below:

- 1) If we consider God as the source of judgment, the owner and origin of all rights, and as just, self-sufficient, and benevolent to mankind and all creation, then these types of objections will be resolved through a "*Limmī*"¹ argument. Mr. Soha does not believe in the existence of God (See: Dr. Soha, 2011 AD/1390 SH: 858-859). Consequently, he cannot accept any rights for God and cannot analyze matters in nature that, in his opinion, contradict human rights because he only sees the surface of worldly life. In contrast, many of Islam's legal rulings are for believers who have faith in Him and acknowledge His right to govern the universe, believing that God's words benefit humanity and lead to their happiness; therefore, whatever He does is permissible, and whatever He says is appropriate.
- 2) The allegations raised by opponents regarding violations of legal justice against the Quran throughout history must be understood and addressed based on the comprehensiveness of Quranic rights and rulings. Islamic scholars have already responded to them. For

1 . If the middle term is both the cause for establishing the major term for the minor term and the means of proving it, it is called a "*Burhān Limmī*" (Demonstration of the Reason Why). Being the means of establishing it means that the middle term is the cause of the existence of the major term for the minor term; with its presence, the major term is realized for the minor term. Being the means of proving it means that it causes us to believe that the major term has been established for the minor term; for example, when it is said: God is a just and self-sufficient being, and no just and self-sufficient being oppresses people, therefore God does not oppress people.

instance, concerning the difference in inheritance and blood money (*Dīya*) for men and women, one must consider what economic responsibilities God has assigned to men and women. A woman is either in her father's house and unmarried, married, or widowed. In the first and third cases, all her living expenses are the responsibility of her father or grandfather, and in the second case, the responsibility of her husband. No one has the right to place any burden on the woman. Here, one might even say that if we consider two questions: first, why should a woman inherit even though her expenses are borne by a man, and second, why is a man's inheritance twice that of a woman, even though all expenses are borne by men? Naturally, considering that all women's expenses are borne by men or the public treasury (*Bayt al-Māl*); we will say that the second objection and question are unwarranted. However, the first question is reasonable and must be answered. Regarding blood money, it must be said that, firstly, setting blood money does not devalue the humanity of either, as dozens of Islamic arguments indicate that women and men have equal spiritual value. Secondly, attention to a specific religious ruling clarifies the matter: the blood money of a married man does not go to him but usually to his wife, and the blood money of a married woman does not go to her but to her husband. Therefore, if a man's blood money is more, it benefits the woman, and if a woman's blood money is less, it is to the detriment of the man.

Conclusion

There is a relationship of "general and specific from two perspectives" between the issues and foundations of sciences and the foundations and issues of revelation. This is because the human sciences include the description of objective, voluntary actions of humans and the explanation of the relationships between their voluntary actions for the organization of worldly affairs without regard for spiritual and afterlife matters.

Quranic teachings encompass descriptions and recommendations concerning human insight, inclinations, and actions, aiming to enable individuals to rectify their worldly and afterlife affairs. Therefore, it

cannot be asserted that divinely revealed propositions bear no relation to propositions in the human sciences.

A barrier cannot be erected between science and divinely revealed teachings because both the Quran and the empirical sciences share numerous common issues. Consequently, the relationship between scientific and divinely revealed propositions is not contradictory. Thus, these propositions must be reconciled using rational and interpretative methods, and a system derived from them. Because Quranic principles and issues are observed and incorporated within them, it can legitimately be considered a divinely-guided human science.

Within the texts of religion and the Quran, there are so many matters relevant to the human sciences that no one can rightly claim that religion has nothing to say on the subject, or that what it offers is negligible and ineffective in influencing the human sciences and addressing their needs. Some divinely revealed propositions and principles completely alter the direction, purpose, and even the issues within the sciences. For instance, the principle of the prohibition of interest fundamentally transforms banking, and the principle of the non-domination of disbelievers over Muslims fundamentally influences the international relations of Muslims with non-Muslim states. Therefore, minimizing the significance of divinely revealed teachings from the Quranic perspective, considering the inherent connection between this world and the hereafter, and the fact that the rewards and punishments of the afterlife are the very essence or consequences of human actions in this world, along with the abundance of verses and narrations expressing social goals and rulings, is an unjust and unrealistic assertion.

The Quran is the word of God, and the human sciences are the discovery of God's actions in human affairs. Thus, there is no possibility of genuine contradiction between the two. Any perceived contradiction is superficial and preliminary, and can be resolved with a little thought and adherence to the rules of interpretation from interpretative evidence. Consequently, a third system can be

constructed by combining divinely revealed and scientifically established propositions, and it can be named Islamic Human Science.

ORCID

Mohammad Ali
Asadi Nasab



<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6092-8993>

References

Holy Quran

- Al-Rāziq, A. (1924 AD/1344 AH). *Islam and the Foundations of Governance*. Egypt: Egyptian Joint Stock Company.
- Farāhīdī, K. (1988 AD/1409 AH). *Kitāb al-‘Ayn*. Qom: Hejrat Publication.
- Haeri Yazdi, M. (2005 AD/1384 SH). *Explorations in Practical Reason*. Tehran: Institute for Research in Philosophy.
- Ḥakīm, S. (1992 AD/1413 AH). *Muntaqā al-Uṣūl*. Qom: Al-Hadi.
- Javadi Amoli, A. (2002 AD/1381 SH). *The Relationship between Religion and the World*. Qom: Isra Publication.
- Javadi Amoli, A. (2003 AD/1382 SH). *The Source of Thought*. Qom: Isra.
- Javadi, M. (1996 AD/1375 SH). *The Issue of Ought and Is*. Qom: Publication Center of the Bureau of Islamic Propaganda.
- Makarem Shirazi, N. (1992 AD/1371 SH). *Tafsir Nemooneh*. (Vols. 1-28). Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah.
- Misbah Yazdi, M. T. (2012 AD/1391 SH). *A Brief Look at the Theory of Guardianship of the Jurist*.
- Misbah Yazdi, M. T. (2012 AD/1391 SH). *Philosophy of Ethics*. (Sharifi, A. H. Res). Qom: Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute.
- Motahari, M. (1979 AD/1358 SH). *Collected Works: Mysticism, Generalities of Islamic Sciences*. Tehran: Sadra.
- Peterson, M., et al. (1997 AD/1376 SH). *Reason and Religious Belief*. Tehran: Tarh No.
- Rāghib Isfahani, H. (1991 AD/1412 AH). *Mufradāt Alfāḍ al-Quran*. Beirut: N.n.
- Saha. (2011 AD/1390 SH). *Critique of the Quran*. N.p.: N.n.
- Ḥurr ‘Āmilī. (1992 AD/1413 AH). *Wasā’il al-Shī’a*. Beirut: Al al-Bayt Institute (AS) for the Revival of Heritage.
- Soroush, A. (1998 AD/1377 SH). "Minority and Majority Religion." *Kian Journal*. No. 41.

- Subhani, J. (1998 AD/1377 SH). *Rational Good and Evil or the Foundations of Eternal Ethics*. Tehran: Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies.
- Ṭabāṭabā'ī, S. M. H. (1975 AD/1354 SH). *al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Quran*. Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah.
- Ṭabrisī, F. (1993 AD/1372 SH). *Majma' al-Bayān fī Tafsīr al-Quran*. 3rd Ed. (Vols. 1-10). Tehran: Naser Khosrow.
- Ṭūsī, M. (n.d.). *al-Tibyān fī Tafsīr al-Quran*. (Vols. 1-10). Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi.
- Javadi Amoli, A. (2002 AD/1381 SH). *The Relationship between Religion and the World*. Qom: Isra.

How to Cite: Asadi Nasab, M. A. (2025). Analyzing the Contextual Relationship between Science and the Quran in Establishing Islamic Human Sciences, *A Research Journal on Qur'anic Knowledge*, 16(60), 145-170. DOI: 10.22054/rjqk.2024.80037.2981



Qur'anic Knowledge Research is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.