
A CRITICAL STUDY OF SEYYED RAZI'S EXEGETICAL METHOD

Hamid Ghorbanpour*

Guilan University of Rasht, Faculty of literature, Department of Theology, Iran

(Received 19 September 2016, revised 14 May 2017)

Abstract

Exegetics of the Quran, as a phenomenon sibling with the revelation of the Quran, has a long history with no monotonous trend with many ups and downs. One of the most ancient and most important interpretative methods used by exegetists is intellectual interpretation. The fourth century AH is the beginning of this movement, in which the emergence and relative growth of intellectual interpretation was observed. Seyyed Razi is among of the pioneers of this movement in the period in question; therefore, the analysis of quiddity, nature and components of intellectual interpretation in his book, 'Haghaegh Al-Taweel fi Mutashabih Al-Tanzil', was selected as the subject of the present study. The analysis suggested that using reason as the evidence for interpretation; secular and intellectual analyses of the topic of speech are among the most important examples of the use of instrumental reason in Razi's interpretation.

Keywords: Seyyed Razi, instrumental reason, intellectual, interpretation, rationalism

1. Introduction

Exegetics of the Quran has a long history with no monotonous trend. At certain points in the history, exegetics was flourishing in a limited scope in the form of narratives preached by the infallible. However, with the passage of time the process of exegetics changed due to certain causes including distancing from the era of the infallible, expansion of Muslims' needs, emergence of new questions, progression of different sciences from different nations to the Islamic world, creation of a climate of conflict of opinions in the Muslim community, together with conditions and requirements of that time. Therefore, it underlay other exegetical methods, including intellectual interpretation, so that the phenomenon of reasoning and jurisprudence in exegetics by fallible exegetists was considered as an inevitable phenomenon. The fourth century AH is the beginning of this movement where emergence and relative growth of intellectual interpretation was observed. Seyyed Razi has died in the year 406 AH, but since most of his academic life has been in the fourth century, in reviews of the situation and the circumstances of his life, we consider the fourth century.

*E-mail: hghorbanpur@yahoo.com

1.1. Seyyed Razi's personality

Razi is one of the greatest scholars of the fourth century and the early fifth century. He was born in 359 and died in 406 AH in Baghdad, the capital of Bani Abbas caliphate and the governing quarter of a descent of Al Bouyeh. He finished his higher education by well-known reputed professors of that time in various Islamic sciences such as Sheikh Mufid, Abdul-Jabbar Mu'tazili, Rommani and Ibn Jenny.

1.2. Political, religious and scientific prospect of the fourth century AH

In the fourth century AH, Baghdad witnessed the scene of confrontation between different views and thoughts, the development of Islamic civilization and the mass gathering of reputed scientists, jurists, scholars, theologians, exegetists, writers and poets. Shiite scholars had the chance to prove the legitimacy of their beliefs through debates with their opponents. Pressures and restrictions exerted on the Shia came to be adjusted relatively. Shiite followers were able to freely raise their slogans [1]. All the sects of that era had to be equipped with Quranic proof. In addition they relied on the Quran as the greatest reference and citation source, and some attempted to adapt the Qur'an with reason [2].

1.3. The structure of Haghaegh Al-Taweel

Parts of Haghaegh Al-Taweel were published after 1000 years of obscurity by Najaf Seminary Press. Among the several volumes of this book, only one volume has been found which is one fifth of the original collection kept in Ghods Razavi Library. Abi Al-Hassan Omar Nassabah states "I have seen Seyyed Razi's interpretation of the Quran; it is among the best interpretations, and larger than Sheikh Tusi's" or elsewhere we read "I have seen a volume of the interpretation attributed to Razi; it is a very good interpretation and larger than Tabarsi's" [3]

The book is unique in its kind, so that Ibn Jenny, the professor of Razi states: "Razi composed a book on the Holy Quran as it is impossible to find a similar book" [4]. In *Haghaegh Al-Taweel*, Seyyed Razi discusses each allegorical verse in the form of a question. As a result, the book is a set of different questions, each with special scientific autonomy and benefits [5].

Seyyed does not address clear verses. He interprets verses that, at the first look, are incompatible with literary rules, legal decision, lawful verdicts, Islamic beliefs or intellectual requirements. He poses them as questions, gives answers to those questions, and finally discusses the most acceptable answer [6].

2. Haghaeigh Al-Taweel and instrumental reason

Razi did not author a perfect interpretation for the Quran, but given the polemical circumstances of the time, he authored the interpretation to defend the Quran and eliminate ambiguities from the form of some verses. Therefore, his first goal in speaking of verses was to fix the ambiguities of verses, not to provide a preliminary interpretation of the Quran. However, in this way while removing ambiguity from the form of the verses, he used mechanisms in the semantics and interpretations of verses, which could be characterized as the intellectual indicators of his jurisprudential method of interpretation. Razi's mechanisms for correct semantics of the verses are as follows.

2.1. Using reason as the evidence for interpretation

Intellectual-theological ambiguities are those in which the literal meaning induces a sense opposing the reason as well as verbal theological assumptions and beliefs accepted by Shiites. In other words, they are ambiguities that exist because of a conflict between the literal meaning and Shiite beliefs or having implications attributing unjustified and irrational qualities to the Prophet and Allah. To answer such ambiguities where the form of the verse suggests meanings and attributes contrary to the final judgment of reason, his major way is to deemphasize the resorted meaning of the questioner and to modify the wrong meaning by presenting a correct interpretation on the verse. One of the manifestations of reasoning in interpretation is the use of reason as evidence. This refers to definite arguments and edicts of reason used as intellectual evidence known as Saarefeh.

As already mentioned, incorrect interpretations out of the context of rules and principles of the Quran dialog are among the factors underlying ambiguity in verses; hence, in order to cope with these ambiguities, Razi attempts to correct the wrong meaning by providing the correct interpretation of the verse. First, resorting to intellectual edicts, he judges the necessity of the verse for carrying a meaning other than its literal one and then, using correct mechanisms and rules of exegetics, he attempts to provide the correct meaning of the verses.

Sayyed Razi uses one of the applications of instrumental reason in exegetics including the use of reason and intellectual judgments as Saarefeh evidence in order to interpret verses, to remove malicious characteristics from God or prophets and to carry a meaning opposing the literal one. However, given that the use of final judgment of reason as evidence in interpretation of verses is not specific to Sharif Razi, and because of the atmosphere of rationalism, other exegetists used such an approach, to explain and understand Razi's methodology and to be acquainted with differences and commonalities of his method against others', a comparative analysis is required. Razi together with those who quoted by him under verses (including successor, after successor and close-to-his-age exegetists) used several methods on the use of reason as evidence in exegetics. In the following, some of their comments on a controversial verse are presented.

2.1.1. Disregarding the role of reason as evidence

Disregarding the role of reason as evidence, some exegetists provided interpretations, which were judged by Seyyed Razi as being wrong because of conflict with reason and intellectual arguments. For example, when the questioner seeks the literal meaning and interprets the verse representing Zechariah's wonder about the ability of God to fulfil his promise, Razi regards it as inappropriate for Zechariah [7]. Razi refers to Ekremeh and Soddi who said, "after the glad tidings of angels to Zechariah, Satan made the affair ambiguous to him, and to recognize its divine or demonic glad tidings, he said: Oh, lord, how shall I have a son?" and then criticizes the interpretation as follows: "This shows full ignorance and blindness of the speaker with regard to Prophets' position on what is permissible and what is wrong for them ... Prophets are so highly ranked to be a victim of demons or cannot distinguish the voice of demons and angels." Razi criticizes the interpretation through directing the audience's attention to Prophets' features when receiving revelations or God's glad tidings. He also refers to the context of the verse.

2.1.2. Other exegetists

Another group of exegetists noticed this exegetical rule to interpret the above-mentioned verse [7, p. 197-198].

Having pointed out that Zechariah had knowledge of God's power, and consequently had no doubt or wonder about the divine glad tidings, a group of exegetics attempted interpreting the verse in this way: The phrase uttered by Zechariah after hearing the glad tidings of God, saying "*how shall I have a son?*" is interrogation, not exclamation. This means that Zechariah wanted to know which one of his wives would be the mother of this annunciated child [7, p. 195].

Obviously, in the above interpretation, the evidentiality of reason in excreting doubts from Zechariah as a prophet is stressed, but the presented interpretation lacks any proof. In other words, the transmitter is moving in the direction of rationalism because he has used reason to clean the prophets' existential realm from defects and negative aspect. It refers to an approach where the ambiguous form of the verses implying Zechariah's surprise regarding God's glad tidings is negated based on the rule of reason on the prophets' innocence.

However, this interpretation lacks any proof in term of affirmation, because, first, it is not proved that Zechariah had multiple wives, and secondly, the base for such a form of interpretation is not clear. Thus, although a kind of analysis is observed in some affirmative aspects, it must be noted that the analysis lacks basic reason or reference.

Another quotation transmitted by Razi is as follows: "Zechariah wanted to know whether his wife will have a child in that old age or she will become younger" [7, p. 196]. He also mentions the commonality between these interpretations, which both deny the fact that Zechariah was surprised by the

divine glad tidings. He argues that this interpretation is exposed to the second problem observed in the previous one, that in the although mentioned interpretation has analytic aspects; there is no reason contained in the analysis. He poses some questions as follows: *Why has Zechariah's word been carrying on this way? Is it that in the interpretation, there is not another documentary guess or estimate?*

In two previous interpretations, while paying attention to the rule of reason, certain attempts were made to interpret the verse to glorify Zechariah as a prophet of God by negating the attribute disputed in the verse (Zechariah's wonder of God's glad tidings). However, in contrast, some exegetists, while glorifying Zechariah as the prophet of God, accepted and justified it. For example, Abu Ali Jobaaee denied the fact that Zechariah had asked to deny the divine power, and that no doubt had been created for him. He interpreted the verse as follows: "Zechariah's word is the acknowledgment of the integrity and recognition of the necessity to commemorate the divine blessings" [7, p. 197] ... "Zechariah's wonder is similar to one's wonder seeking something that was long disappointed of it, while suddenly, he achieves it via an improbable way." [7, p. 197]

Abu Moslem Ibn Bahr also acknowledged Zechariah's wonder and defined his situation like one who wants to hear good news again, and when he refers to his mind, he finds his reflection vain, since God has power over all things [7, p. 197].

Razi, as an exegetist who uses reason as evidence, is classified in this group of exegetists. He interprets Zechariah's words as follows: "Oh, Lord, if you would make me equal with others, then where and how I would have a child, but it is you who made me superior to other by the blessings and gave me something I did not think of" [7, p. 195].

To compare the three interpretations given by Abu Ali Jobaaee, Abu Moslem Ibn Bahr and Razi, it should be noted that Jobaaee and Razi's interpretation excel Abu Moslem's, because his explanation of Zechariah's wonder has not eliminated the ambiguity of the verse. On the one hand, Abu Moslem rejects the wonder, but on the other hand, has attributes qualities such as undue hesitation and doubt in the power of God to Zechariah, while his analysis has no reason to carry out affirmative aspects. In addition, Zechariah's situation is compared to ordinary people who have no divine aspects and guidance. But regarding the interpretations provided by Razi and Abu Ali, it should be noted that the two interpretations have a kind of analysis regarding the affirmative aspects, and these analyses are linguistic rather than pure intellectual. In the meantime, there is not much difference between the two interpretations. Thus, it should be argued that Razi's interpretation excels Jobaaee's, because Razi has fundamentally negated the quality of wonder. In other words, the glorification aspect of Razi's interpretation excels Jobaaee's, because although Jobaaee has not considered Zechariah's wonder as a doubt of God's power, he has interpreted the verse as Zechariah is considered as an ordinary person. Looking at exegetists' opinions about the use of reason as evidence in interpretation it must

be noted that some have overlooked the role of reason. In contrast, some have paid attention to this role. Nevertheless, regarding the use the affirmative role of reason, some interpretations as well as analyses are based on reason and some are intuitive. Razi's method has advantages compared with those exegetists who have not paid any attention to the role of reason. It has advantages compared to exegetists who have used reason as evidence in interpretation as well, because from the affirmative aspect his interpretation is reasonable and predominant. As already mentioned, his analysis is literary rather than intuitive.

2.2. Secular analysis

As already noted, reason is an important source for different functions and activities of human cognition. One of the most important activities of the reason is analysis. Although some refer to the tasks of reason through functions like abstraction, synthesis, and analysis as sensory concepts [8] others rely on concepts such as general concepts construction, understanding general concepts, division, analysis and synthesis, definition, extraction, measurement and comparison of concepts, judgment, reasoning, and deduction within propositions as the most important epistemological functions of reason [9]. The purpose of this article is the last option, i.e. reasoning and deduction. Reasoning and deduction are defined as intellectual generation or mental production obtained through picking up several known and associated cases together [7, p. 274]. This means that reason has the power of analysing concepts, sorting words, picking the concepts up together and deducing the result made by reasoning.

According to this introduction, it could be noted that one of the major functions of reason in interpretation is disambiguation of the form of verses through analysing the form and topic. In other words, what causes the conflict among some verses of the Quran or among verses and the audience or causes assumptions, intricacy, (or ambiguity) as well as grounds to object to some verses of Quran is incorrect interpretation and misconceptions of the topic. It is one of the areas of reason and jurisprudence in the interpretation by the early exegetists, including Razi. However, he does not act in a similar manner. Rather he uses a variety of mechanisms. To investigate Razi's exegetical method for the analysis of a topic, attention to other exegetists' approach in this area is essential.

One of the most controversial verses that Razi investigated through quoting other exegetists' opinions is verse 18 of Al 'Imran, "Allah bears witness that there is no god but He, and (so do) the angels and those possessed of knowledge, maintaining His creation with justice; there is no god but He, the Mighty, the Wise". The questioner asks that the secular analysis indicates that, testimony will be carried out for the accuser while the accuser does not testify for himself, and that the witness' position is less than someone whom the testimony is performed for. The base for the doubt in the verse is the testimony of God. To find the solution of mentioned doubt, exegetists are provided various

explanations of the topic (The Quality and nature of the divine testimony) as follows:

Some traditionists have interpreted the divine testimony in the mentioned verse to the creature's testimony on the creator's oneness by stating "creation is based on need and humility towards God, therefore everything testifies his oneness" [7, p. 162]. This is faced with problems. First, interpreting the divine testimony to creatures' testimony of the Lord's oneness by drawing attention to the poverty and misery of the creatures to God requires explanation and reason. In this sense, firstly the relationship between creatures' poverty and neediness and the testimony on oneness of God have not been explained properly and lack clarity. Secondly, why should the testimony in the mentioned verse be carried out in this sense? Because no rational analysis is provided from the mentioned concept that could be used as evidence in interpretation as being rational or axiomatic (or self-evident). Thirdly, in this quote the testimony of creatures on oneness of God is addressed, not testimony of God, which the verse implies.

Another statement was quoted under the verse by stating: Lord of the universe with astonishing tact and accurate creation and superlative reason and his vast power to people certificate that there is no God except unique God, who has remedy everything well and captures all creations [7, p. 163]. In this quote, the testimony of the Lord on oneness of himself is considered as a kind of signifying wisely acts of the agent capable of own acts. In other words, the testimony of the Lord is known as a kind of formative or genetic testimony that requires reason. That is why carrying the verse in this sense requires reason. Other is that in this quote artefact signifies on unity of the creator. It is recognized as God's testimony on his oneness which is the testimony of creatures on oneness of God. It is not the God's testimony on his oneness and it does not match with form of the verse. In fact, these two quotes, speaks about the testimony of creation on oneness of God, not the testimony of God and it is in contrast to form of the verse. Secondly, a particular interpretation that is presented on the topic namely the Lord's testimony may lack crisp and clear explanation.

As in the first case or there is no reason for the concept of verse based on that meaning like any two recent cases. Another quotation is regarding Moarrej Soddosi. According the manner of Gheis Elaan tribe he has said: the purpose of the "testimony of God" is "speech" [7, p. 162] that Seyyed Razi worked on that referring to other verses. The versus which the word 'testimony' used for God and figuring out the meaning testimony in them as 'speech', will lead to the semantic corruption of the mentioned verse and negation of the entire semantics [7, p. 162-163]. In other words, Soddosi was intended to explain purport of mentioned verse by the noted semantics. However, the original meaning provided by him, for the word 'testimony' has been faced with problems. Apart from providing reason on its own semantics (the word شهادت - to testify, means 'to say') beside of citing one of the Arab tribe dialect and the noted dialect eloquence and its prevalence, it must prove that the practical meaning of the word 'testimony' in mentioned verse is as same as the lexical root. Others

stated that the word ‘testifying’ means ‘judging’ and this ‘judging’ means announcing or expressing or means as judging or forcing have dealt with interpreting mentioned verse using different Quranic quotation [7, p. 162-163].

Razi, in the criticism referring to those who believe in such semantics of the predecessors, has said: contemplation is needed in this quote [7, p. 164]. While like previous quote, in addition to prove the provided semantic root, it must be shown why the word ‘testifying’ has been used in noted verse as ‘judging’. (The semantics used as a basis for eliminating the ambiguity of the verse is to define شهادت - testimony - as adjudication.) Some with respect to the verse through hidden phrase in verse have been said: “In fact, God Almighty says: Glorified Allah makes people aware of his justice and charity and says there is no God except unique God who behaves them with justice and charity” [7, p. 164].

In criticizing this quotes it must be said, firstly principle of hyperbation and existence of hidden phrase in the verse requires reason. Secondly specifying the scope of the meaning of the word ‘testifying’ in the mentioned verse on God’s testimony on his own righteousness is faced with two fundamental problems. Primarily: limiting the concept of ‘testimony of the Lord’ which is the general concept, in a sense, requires a reason. Secondly, allocating to this particular instance has lack of reason. It means why this instance is considered as the meaning of the verse among other instances. Therefore, in this quote, both the principle of specifying and relying on the considered instance has no reason.

Supreme judge Abu Al-Hasan has offered another interpreted quote. He believes that the testimony of the Lord means God has indicated reasons of uniqueness and his merit on worship to the people. Since these reasons have been given to all and understanding instrument of this concept, the reason has been given to all as well. Therefore, the Supreme Being has been witness on this issue [7, p. 164-165]. This quote is superior to some other proposed statements. Since unlike some quoted statements, the subject of the testimony is God, not others but it can be argued regarding the God’s testimony. The testimony is recognized to provide reason from God to the creatures because it lacks proper explanation and reason, while the quality of this testimony has been not clearly stated. It means it is not clear what these reasons are. Secondly, bringing them to the people is to what quality? Therefore, regardless of the bugs incurred, it could not completely fix the ambiguity.

Although the answer of supreme judge Abu Al-Hassan in positive aspect is combined with rational analysis, it did not mention the answer of the central question applied on the verse. However compared to other statements it has less bugs. As noted above, the main factor of doubt formation in this verse is the disputes over the quality and the topic ‘testimony of God’. Therefore, Razi has been started to disabuse to resolve this doubt by analysing this topic. (Seyyed Razi’s analysis is based on God’s attributes and traditional accepted concepts of Arabic. It means that affairs which are resorted to in order to explain the quiddity of God’s testimony are among those available by the testimonial of tradition and language users in every witness’s testimony.) He paid an attention

to divine essence attributes, by expressing the difference of the Lord's testimony on his nature through human's testimony for the benefit of each other. It just happened through removing the cause of doubt assuming these as equal and the consistency of these two types of testimony together. It means God's divine testimony on his nature is for the reason that his servants find knowledge of him and his existence be manifested and proved to them. As witness's task is to teach, what he testifies on to others reveals its accuracy as well. This is why Bayyeneh (oral testimony) is known as Bayyeneh that ravel the right and resolves the wrong. In fact, witness, as testimony is a way towards the attainment of this knowledge. What led to this is called witnesses, as it is tool to gain knowledge to the others [7, p. 161-162]. However, Razi's quote did not explain the quality of the Lord testimony. It has answered questions about mentioned verse because question of the questioner was not directly about the quality of the divine testimony, but was regarding its whys. However, other exegetists have talked about the quality of God's testimony to answer the questions, the main question being not the quality of the divine testimony. It was regarding some of its disadvantages. Therefore, Seyyed Razi's quote has the advantage over other quotes in spite of not paying the quality of the of the Lord testimony, in this respect which has answered the questions. Although among others statements, quote of supreme judge Abu Al-Hassan is a better interpretation after Razi's interpretation. Like the other exegetists, he had the least problems in spite of not paying into the central question of the questioner.

2.3. Intellectual analysis

2.3.1. The first approach

It was said that one of the causes of questions about Quran verses, is the contradiction of Quran verses with Shiites accepted ideas. For example, a researcher through posing the question, implying to form of the verse 154 of Surah Al-Imran which said: if (assuming) you were in your houses (also) those who killing was written to certainly came out to their own shrine. He has a doubt plan on determinism and its conflict with the Shiite opinion, which believes in human in violation of divine destiny and governs, on his fate [7, p. 343]. Meanwhile some Shi'ite exegetists that Razi has attempted without mentioning their names have suggested statements in response to the mentioned doubt, according to their interpretation of the votes. Some said: The phrase "those who killing had been prescribed for them" in verse means "those who killing infidels is obligatory upon them". Therefore, in these interpretations, killing made by them not they are killed; Sharif Razi has confirmed mentioned quote, noting that in terms of literature it is permissible that infinitive has attributed to two subjects or two objects.

As evidence and reasons of allocating infinitive to two subjects or two objects is available in the mentioned verse [7, p. 375]. In this interpretative quote, the way selected to resolve the contradiction between Shiites' opinion and

form of the verse is the rejection of the meaning appeal to the questioner from the discussed verse. In other words, the meaning of the verse that underlie similarity (or intricacy) has been criticized the opinion attributed to Shiite. Despite the fact that Razi has confirmed above-mentioned interpretation, seems this statement is incorrect. Although the literal rule used in this interpretation is strong and acceptable, there is no evidence and reasons that show the mentioned rule exists in the noted verse. Secondly, deviation from the known meaning of the verse, which has been assumed in questioner's question, is unwarranted. In other words, well-known meaning has priority over the non-famous meaning. As Razi has been criticized mentioned doubt by accepting the same famous meaning as well. Thirdly, this interpretative quote has left difficulties and ambiguities of the questioner unanswered because the problem mentioned in the verse is that the Shiite opinion implies authority and lack of determinism. On the one hand, verse implies determinism and these two are incompatible; but this interpretative quote has not solved this problem. It only has replaced the object and subjects in verse, but has not resolved doubt of determinism in verse. Meaning of the verse in the question was "Those who killing upon them was written, certainly went to shambles with their feet".

But in interpretation of what mentioned, 'killed or victims' in their famous meaning has changed to 'killer' and the meaning is as follow: Those who must kill others went to their shambles and induction of the verse on determinism still remains; because according to both concepts, both those who have to kill and those who must be killed will go to shambles. Regarding the context of the verse, it means determinism, since the verse has quoted: if we had possession [and promises of the Prophet were true] we were not killed here. And in response to their complaining, referring to divine ordinance it has said that: "Say: If (assuming) you were in your houses [also] those who killing was written to certainly came out to their own shrine' means being killed (based on the first meaning) or killing others (based on the second meaning) is their inevitable fate" [10].

How the relationship between the inevitable fate raised in verse is still unanswered with this interpretation, regarding believing authority and lack of determinism which is Shiite's idea, has been questioned by the questioner. The interpretation is also in contrary with the context of the verse; since complaining of those was protest against being killed and the victim according to the above verse stipulates, 'We would not be killed'. They said if the promise of the prophet was right and so on, we were not killed. However, in the interpretation it has been said: if you were in your houses, those who must kill were gone to shambles and this is the contradiction and the interpretation is not related to the verse. Others stated that the audience in the verse is hypocrites. Therefore, they answered to the mentioned doubt in such a way that if you hypocrites do not hurry to helping the Messenger of Allah, the believers will help him with the explanation, that God has knowledge on such a fate or this new is recorder in guarded tablet [7, p. 374-375]. The points that the audience of the verse is the hypocrites were problematic and have been considered inconsistent with verses

context [7, vol. 4, p. 50]. Apart from Razi himself he had some criticism on some evidence of Quranic verse; the issue still remains. It means doubt of conflict between meaning of the verse and Shi'a belief remains in this quote like what was said in the previous quote. The problem was that, according to context of the verse, the believers will go to shambles by their feet and induces determinism. However, the exegetist has been trying to fix doubt of determinism with some of the explanations; he was unsuccessful, because it has not explained the relationship between science and divine decree with human freedom.

As it observed, the mechanism of fixing doubt of conflict between Shia belief and the form of verses, in two previous quotes has been modifying meaning of the verse. The rightness or wrongness of the ideas of Shia is not argued. Nevertheless, Razi's mechanism to eliminate the alleged conflict between the Quran verses and Shia beliefs was that he dealt with correction of improper theological idea attributed to Shiite. It was underlying plan for doubt about the verse, in addition to clarification of the subject and refutation of wrong idea attributed to Shia. It means Razi considered the meaning of the verse true in contrary with the meaning of the verse and Shia belief to response the question of the questioner. He has also known the belief attributed to Shia wrong. In another word, criticism of the assumption is the background of doubt through rational analysis of topic, Razi's method in eliminating the doubt from the mentioned verse.

Therefore, in the correct explanation of the belief attributed to Shiite (or the topic in the verse) firstly: it considered the belief attributed to Shia, which is the cause of creating contrast as lie and accusation. Secondly, it has eliminated the doubt using expressing the correct idea of Shia and verbal analysis of the topic. Also with the explanation that human does not have the power to violet the thing that God's science belonged to it, human's will would not be negated and God's science will belong to the act that human's will is involved in. So human's will, may not be negated in this God's destiny. In continue it mentioned, "Occurrence of an act by human which is clear to God is not a reason that the agent is constrained and have not any will by himself". Pointing out agreements of many of Muslims to this entry that "when the science of Allah accrues on something, inevitably that act it will be issued from God, and this divine science on certain accordance of the act by the agent will not be a reason of that act to make it to compulsion and determinism". (This statement is another form of the point that science is the function of known not the cause of known.) He has ruled out the noted doubt that evokes the conflict between Shia belief and the form of the verse. It provides a correct interpretation of the verse in the light of this explanation [7, p. 373-374]. The important point is that Razi's method in resolving noted doubt in explanation of the topic was associated with the rational analysis. Unlike other exegetists that have studied the semantics of the mentioned verse apart from, criticisms on their interpretation, questions and ambiguities of the questioner has not been resolved.

2.3.2. The second approach

Another approach of Razi in response to the conflict between Shiite beliefs and verses form is denying the literal meaning of the appeal. Citing the divine wisdom as interpretation evidence and providing a correct interpretation for the similar verse, using analysing elements of the verse and topic and finally confirming the answers through quoting traditions. In another words, in this approach, he needs to reform the apparent meaning of the verse through rational analysis of the verse not the idea attributed to Shia. Since Razi has not attempted transmitting other sayings under the verse, thus comparison of his method to other exegetists will not be possible under this title [7, p. 474-476].

3. Conclusion

The review of Razi's exegetical opinions showed that using reason as the evidence for interpretation, secular and intellectual analyses are the most important instances of the use of instrumental reason in Razi's interpretations. Initiatives and analyses with no basis are also seen in his work. It should be noted that other exegetists (Shiite or non-Shiite) have also practiced these methods. However, Seyyed Razi has greater success in the interpretation of verses. In comparison with other interpretations, his exegetical opinions have been less defective.

References

- [1] A.A. Fagjihi, *The condition of the Shiite in Sharif Razi's era*, in *Allameh Sharif Razi Memorial*, Rowshangar Publications, Tehran, 1996, 303.
- [2] A. Mets, *Islamic civilization in the 4th century*, Amir Kabir Press, Tehran, 1983, 227.
- [3] A. Helli, *The introduction of Haghhaegh Al-Taweel Interpretation*, Razavi Publications, Mashhad, 1991, 91.
- [4] I. Khalkan, *Vafiyat Al-A'yan Wa Anbae Ibna Al-Zaman*, vol. 4, Dar-Alfekar, Beirut, 1985, 416.
- [5] B. Khorramshahi, *The Encyclopedia of the Quran and Research on Quran*, vol. 1, Nahid-Dustan, Tehran, 1997, 697.
- [6] S.J. Mostafavi, *Sharif Razi's interpretation method*, in *Allameh Sharif Razi's Memorial*, Rowshangar Publications, Tehran, 1987, 59.
- [7] S. Razi, *Haghhaegh Al-Taweel*, Razavi Publications, Mashhad, 1991, 194.
- [8] M. Rey Shahri, *Cognition rudiment*, Dar al-Hadith Institute, Qom, 1999, 201-204.
- [9] M. Hosein Zadeh, *Knowledge references*, Imam Khomeini Institute, Qom, 2007, 74-251.
- [10] M. Tabataee, *Almizan in Quran interpretation*, 5th edn., vol. 4, Islamic publication, Qom, 1987, 49-50.