



**The way of interaction of science and religion in criticizing
the view of Hebatuddin Shahrastani about
the multiple earth in the Quran**

Tayebe Khosravi¹

Received: 2024/02/15

Accepted: 2024/08/26

Abstract

Seyyed Mohammad Ali Hebatuddin Shahrastani is one of the scholars of Samarra, born in 1301 AH in Samarra. The book "Astronomy and Islam" is one of his many books in which he examines the Quranic verses related to the science of new astronomy. In 1327 A.H., by writing the book "Astronomy and Islam", he tried to align the appearances of the verses of the Qur'an with the new astronomy to remove any conflict between science and religion. In fact, his thought comes from the motive of defending religion and proving its non-conflict with science to prove that science does not have a newer word than the Quran. Due to the fact that today the discussion of the conflict between science and religion has made theism face wide challenges, we have evaluated the view of Hebat al-Din regarding the multiplicity of earths in the text of the Quran and its comparison with science in order to express the scope of the interaction between science and religion and how they interact. Finally, what can be

1. PhD, Philosophy and Theology, University of Qom.

Email: tasnimkhosravi1400@gmail.com

* Khosravi, T. (2025). Assessing the Soundness of the Teleological and Natural Versions of the Design Argument for God's Existence. *Bi-quarterly Journal of Theosophia Islamica*, 3(6), pp. 64-90.

Doi: 10.22081/jti.2024.68587.1051

said for sure is that it is not permissible to combine the revelations with human sciences in order to keep the text of the Quran safe from instability and damage.

Keywords

Hebat al-Din Shahrastani, multiple earth, astronomy, cosmology, science and religion.



Introduction

Seyyed Mohammad Ali Hebatuddin Shahrستاني is one of the scholars of Samarra, born in 1301 AH in Samarra. The book "astronomy and Islam" is one of his many books in which he examines the Quranic verses related to the science of astronomy. After the death of his father in 1319 AH, he went to Najaf to study. He wrote the book "astronomy and Islam" in 1327. By writing this book, he has tried to strengthen the relationship between science and religion, and in this book he has tried to establish a balance and alignment between Islam and new science, and he emphasizes that the recognition of new discoveries by religious scholars and their adaptation to religious texts, can strengthen the faith of deniers and enemies of Islam. He believes, Copernicus, who is credited with the new astronomy, did not make a new discovery, but explained the Muslim sciences with explanations and objective evidence based on the new cosmology from the books of the late scholars in the East, which they acquired from the sciences of the Al Muhammad. In confirming the multiplicity of the earth, he cites evidence from the Quran and hadiths.

Due to the fact that the understanding and explanation of nature and the cosmos as a common point in science and theology is very sensitive, especially today that the scientific understanding of the natural world has created obstacles for theological explanations and we are witnessing the emergence of a kind of modern atheism in this era, the investigation of how The interaction of science and religion in knowing the world, has a great importance; As far as today science considers itself sufficient in the final explanation of the world and does not consider a cause called God, necessary for nature. Therefore, when knowledge of nature is raised in theology, the way science is present in theology is a very important issue. That theology in the natural method does not have a subject other than nature to prove

beliefs. Therefore, the interaction of theology and nature is discussed before the interaction of science and religion. Because first of all, the revelation texts find authenticity in connection with the proof of beliefs such as the existence of God. According to this, the muslim scholars used to study the cosmos with the assumption of the authenticity of the Quran, relying on the text of the Quran and the narrations, and they might consider their not very accurate findings, as examples of the verses. but in recent years, scientific tools and reliance on science have made scientists to the point of view of science sufficiency and no need for the existence of God, so that ontological naturalism is the dominant view of non-monotheist scientists. Based on this, the role of prior faith plays an important role in establishing the relationship between science and religion.

Shahrishani, one of the scholars of Samarra, has paid special attention to this issue and has tried to deal with various issues of astronomy in the Quran in this book and its compatibility with today's science. He states his goals in doing this research as follows:

1. Showing the alignment of the old and new astronomy and negating their contradictions according to some philosophers and scientists of the new century. He states that the acknowledgment and confirmation of new sciences and discoveries by the people will strengthen their faith in Islamic teachings and increase their certainty in the statements of the Prophet and Imams. Because there are persons among the people whose doubts and new ideas have misled them and thought that the new astronomy is against the Sharia and only the old astronomy is in accordance with the Sharia.

2. To give an ultimatum to those who oppose us in religion and blame those who believe in the path of Muhammad peace be upon him. Muhammad, who came from the Arab desert without studying among uneducated Arabs, rose. For this reason, he states that; What I

have brought in this book is occult news that is not documented by precise technical devices and does not rely on new discoveries. And thus, it is a way to silence the opponents and the best way to clarify fairness people's thoughts to acknowledge Islam and religious leaders. Because discovering hidden and unseen things through religion and without any tools, is the proof of its truth among every religion and nation.

3. Consecration and santification of the prophet Umi and rejection of what the doubters attribute to the prophet and is considered to express opinions of human philosophers and the explainer of the books of the past. It is very clear that the difference between great prophets and philosophers is one of the most important and difficult problems and issue of religions, and the best solution is to express the hidden and invisible secrets of nature by religion. With this work, I want to show that the Prophet did not agree with the philosophers of his age or before himself, so that it may be thought that he got his information from them, rather, the Prophet fought with their beliefs and opinions in many issues. We witness that the Prophet, even though he did not study, clarified the mysteries of the human world and the secrets of nature and the sky, all of which were exactly the opposite of the statements and things that the sages of his time or the ancestors believed in. Unfortunately, we, who had the honor of these discoveries, lost them. At a time when the philosophy increased at the beginning of Islam and they interpreted the verses and hadiths and even distorted the appearances of the Quran according to their will and considered its facts improbable and strange due to their lack of knowledge, they covered up the truth. So People thought that the appearances of Shariah are the translation of the opinions of philosophers.

4. Our ultimate goal is to make this book a new commentator

on religious traditions to interpret problematic verses and traditions. While the majority of the appearances of these verses have been considered allegorical verses. And this is due to the fact that they have not been able to establish alignment between new science and verses and traditions.

Hebat al-Din Shahrastani's point of view about multiple earth in astronomy

Hebat al-Din Shahrastani states in a part of the book titled "Multiple Earths" that the ancient sages believed in the unity of the earth, but Ibn Sina quoted the theory of the plurality of earths from Persian sages in Shefa. He states that Western philosophers in the 10th century Hijri, due to the discovery of the telescope and the development of science, rejected the ancient opinion that the earth was one. While Islam has already mentioned the multiplicity of the earth. Shahrastani believes that each of these planets has the force of the earth, and everything that is necessary to call the planets in the earth, such as having mountains, seas, clouds, seasons, etc., is also present in them.

He continues that the followers of other religions do not believe in the multiplicity of earth, but Islam has specified the multiplicity of earth. Without including today's tools and equipment, and he refers to the verses in the Holy Quran that refer to the multiplicity of earths: "It is Allah who has created seven heavens, and of the earth similar to them. The command gradually descends through them, that you may know that Allah has power over all things, and that Allah comprehends all things in knowledge". Based on this verse, he considers the earth to be seven and claims that this multiplicity is so strong that it contradicts the statements of philosophers regarding the multiplicity of earths. In order to examine the interaction between science and religion from Hebatuddin's point

of view and provide a solution to protect religion from wavering in scientific developments, we will continue to evaluate his point of view.

Evaluation of Hebatoddin Shahrastani's point of view about multiple earth

The term "saba samavat" is mentioned in many verses of the Quran, but the term "Arz", which means earth, appears 461 times in the Quran, and it is always singular in the Quran (Qurashi, 1371, p. 59). However, in a phrase of verse 12 of **Divorce verse**, the word "**Meslahonn**" has been the subject of various debates, and the issue is whether it is possible to infer the multiplicity of the earth as well as the multiplicity of the sky from this verse?

Therefore, the only verse that has created this suspicion about the multiplicity of the earth is verse 12 of Divorce verse, which has been stated in different interpretations, all of which do not support this opinion. In a number of verses (Surah Al-Baqarah, verse 29; surah Foslal verse 12; surah Naba, verse 12; 3 surah Malik, verse 3; surah Isra, verse 44; surah Mumunun, verse 86; surah Nuh, verse 15.), the number of heavens is stated as seven, but it does not appear from the appearance of the verses that the earth is more than one. In addition, "**Arazin**" (earths) is not mentioned in any verse. Also, in the 12th Divorce verse, "**Arazin**" is not used, and it is not clear in what field or interpretation the similarity between the earth and the sky in the verse is meant. Therefore, it cannot be said that the numerical similarity is the meaning of the verse (Yazdi, 2015, p. 90). Regarding this phrase, it can be definitely said that there is a difference in the opinions of commentators and there is no agreement on the meaning of the number of earth. Among the interpretations that have been expressed, the following can be mentioned:

The meaning of the seven earths is the climates and the seven

parts on the earth, which (old geographical scholars) have divided the simple earth into seven parts (or continents) (Mohammed bin Yaqub Kolini, 1407; Fakhr Razi, 1420, p. 566; Ibn Ashur, 1420, p. 306).

Although today the earth has many dry parts (Yazdi, 2015, p. 91). Also, another possibility is given that "**Meslahonn**" goes back to creation and it means that God created the earth as well as the heavens. Another interpretation refers to the seven spheres that are similar in structure to the earth. Also, someone believe that "**Meslahonn**" implies on the seven layers of the earth, which are placed on top of each other, like the layers of an onion (Tabatabaei, 1417, p. 326). A group believes that just as there are seven heavens, there are also seven earths in the form of layers (Abul Fatah Razi, 1408, p. 281).

Paying attention to the existing interpretive possibilities, Shahrastani has included planets such as Mars, Mercury, etc. among the earths (Shahrestani, 2007, p. 180). Considering the planets, the number of earths is more than seven, and on the other hand, even in one verse of the Quran, the number of earths is not mentioned and the singular word is used. Even the plurality that is mentioned in the language of hadiths such as "and **al-Arazin al-Saba**" cannot be considered as a proof of the seven earths because it is possible that the other aspects that were mentioned about the verse may also be the meaning of the hadith. As Imam Reza was asked about this verse and its reference to the multiplicity of earths, the Imam said:

This earth is the world, and the sky of the world is a dome above the earth, and the second earth is above the sky of the world, and the second heaven is a dome above it, and the third earth is above the second heaven, and the third heaven is a dome above it, and the seventh earth is above the seventh heaven. And the seventh heaven is a dome above it, and the Throne of the Most Merciful and Exalted is above the seventh heaven, and this is the word of God Almighty, who

says: "It is Allah who has created seven heavens, and ...". And then they said that there is only one earth under our feet and six other earths are above us (Majlesi, 1403, p. 80; Qami, 1367, p. 329; Tabarsi, 1372, p. 467).

We notice that even among the existing possibilities, stability cannot be seen in them, and we see that today we are witnessing the invalidity of some of these possibilities. Because the humanities knowledge are always evolving and even the possibilities of commentators are subject to falsification due to the progress of science. Thus, according to the objective, method and subject of natural sciences, science can always introduce new explanations and models to explain the world through the scientific study of the world, none of which support or contradict the holy texts. In other words, the revealed verses have a fixed science and what is changing is human knowledge, so it is not possible to constantly adapt the verses to human knowledge and make them suffer from instability and crisis.

Finally, according to interpretations, because the meaning of **Arz** is our earth, and other spheres are not referred to as earth, and on the other hand, their number is more than seven, the possibility that the verse refers to the number of earths like our earth is weak. Therefore, Shahrstan's inference that he considered Mars, Jupiter and other planets to be Earth and took them as an example of the multiplicity of Earth is not accepted. Therefore, verse 12 of divorce, cannot be considered as a proof of the multiplicity of the earth, and these verses cannot be used to claim that the Quran is superior to human sciences; Because we do not have a strong reason for it. Basically, comparing verses of the Quran and uncertain humanities knowledge can be destructive to the Quran, and prejudice against Islam and the Quran should not cause us to insult the holy texts with incorrect comparisons. So how should we behave in these cases.

It is necessary to emphasize that we are not seeking to confirm

or reject different statements. Rather, our goal is to show the sensitivity of the relationship between science and religion through the application of verses on science. Therefore, establishing a synergy between science and religion in this way is not correct, because on the one hand, science is constantly evolving, and adapting it to the firm and definite verses of the Quran causes damage to the authority of the divine book, and on the other hand, even in the interpretation of such verses, it is not possible to be certain that there is always a possibility for error, and in addition to the impermissibility of citing the appearance of the verses, even the appearance of the verses itself sometimes does not indicate the meaning that the scholar has deduced. Therefore, the best way to defend the holy texts is to entering theology into the natural proof of beliefs, so that the content of the divine revelation can be accepted with complete certainty, and if the verses are still unknown, there is no need to compare them with science. Because scientific explanations is always subject to evolution and change, and comparison of scientific theories and verses, can cause great damage to people's religion, faith, and beliefs. Therefore, the issue of faith and the scientific news of the Quran cannot be placed in front of each other. In other words, one can be sure of divine revelation and at the same time use science only as a way to know nature. In this way, even in the case of an apparent conflict, there is no disturbance in people's faith, and this insight can only be achieved by creating a correct attitude to the method of experimental science and theology on the one hand, and finally religion and its rank to science and theology. Just as the theory of evolution does not contradict the scriptures and the creationism, but due to the incorrect performance of theologians, it caused the suspicion of the conflict between science and religion and became a factor for the promotion of atheism in western societies.

Explaining the interaction of science and religion

The relationship between science and religion has been analyzed in scientific societies in recent years. And several relationships have been proposed for it by monotheists and atheists. Relationships such as independence, differentiation, conflict, complementarity, etc. But until now, there is no solution that can accurately examine this relationship among these views, and sometimes the misplaced prejudices of scholars and scientists lead to the emergence of views that are not in the interest of science and religion. Therefore, what should be done to solve this problem and to solve this incompatibility? Should we change our understanding of religious texts with every scientific discovery? Or should we always seek to reconcile science and religion?

It is clear that having a little knowledge of the content of the holy texts, we find that religion is the motivation of human being to acquire knowledge. Therefore, these two categories are not the same and one should not expect a common and single function from them. On the other hand, encouraging people to knowledge through religion shows that the holy texts are not the source of knowledge to the world. Therefore, the relationship between the objectivity of science and religion is negated. On the other hand, if religious scholars make religion the criterion of knowledge about the world and the criterion of the validity of scientific theories, it will cause the separation of science and religion, while religion is the motivation of human being to know the world. Therefore, the view of independence and objectivity is clearly not acceptable. Therefore, if science, which is a branch of philosophy and knowledge of the world, is not free, it is not philosophy. Therefore, science is allowed to make mistakes or contradict religion in understanding the world. These contradictions invalidate neither religion nor science. Therefore, one should not try to

align science with religion. As professor Motahari considers the realm of science to be limited to the natural and physical world and between visible causes and effects, and he states that its purpose is to discover the relationships between natural phenomena, and considers it unable to answer questions and issues outside the scope of experience and observation (Motahari, 1378, p. 325).

In order to know what relationship these two concept have with each other we must understand the purpose and goal of each; The purpose of religion is to change human behavior. and the purpose of science is to expand human knowledge of the external word. As Stephen Gould believes that the network of science includes the empirical domain, while religion related to the ultimate meaning and moral value. These two types of activities do not overlap and share and do not include all research (Gould, 1999, p. 6). But it is clear that a person cannot be committed to religion without knowledge of the world. Therefore, first of all, it is religion that needs science. I mean that the rank of religion is after the proof of God and the necessity of religion, and its proof is within the scope of rational theology, the conflict between science and religion is caused by the lack of proper interaction between philosophy and theology. In this sense, in fact, science and religion are the subject and they don't have a common method to create conflict, and if the initial interaction between theology and philosophy has been done correctly, the common goals between science and religion will guide them in a parallel path. In fact, science studies nature and compared to religion It is neutral and neutral. But theology studies nature with a rational method in order to prove the foundations of religion rationally. That is, a single nature is known from two aspects and with two methods: empirical and metaphysical methods. But the important thing that is the bridge between science and theology is the intellectual understanding of

nature, which science does not need. In fact, by emphasizing the constant need of science to use rational and metaphysical knowledge in the study of material nature, we introduce the necessity of using metaphysics in theology as a completely scientific and rational matter. If they are not provable, no evidence can be presented for the existence of God; otherwise, science, which itself requires reason and metaphysical foundations to be scientific, how can it help human being in proving and rejecting theological and supernatural teachings?

Therefore, the conflict over Explaining the relationship between science and religion before knowing the place of metaphysics and theology among the sciences is incorrect. In other words, the efforts of theologians to emphasize the relationship between science and religion, even to prove the existence of God or to defend monotheistic religions, are not only beneficial to religion, but also weakens religion. Because the content of religion is a matter of revelation and even science may never reach its truth. While comparing of experimental sciences to religion can create more confliction and leads to the doubt of the conflict between science and religion. While by proving the close relationship between theology and science, even if science and religion have apparent contradictions and contradictions in two propositions, it does not cause doubt of conflict. Because humanities knowledge and divine science do not have the ability to confront and correspond with each other, and the scientific method only finds the power of partial and falsifiable knowledge of nature. Thus, empirical science cannot provide a world view. Because the empirical sciences do not have a certain scope even for the causes and material factors of this world. In a sense, science does not have the means to enter the field of ontology at all. Because the empirical method has no way beyond the world of matter, and on

the other hand, the essence of matter has no value beyond experimental study by science (Javadi Amoli, 1395, p. 65).

As Plantinga states, the incompatibility between science and religion is not real. In other words, considering metaphysics and science to be incompatible, which ultimately leads to the lack of validity of metaphysics in proving the main principles and foundations of religions. In fact, naturalism is a challenge that, by solving it, metaphysics as a basic science finds its main place among human knowledge, and by this means, it is possible to clarify the absence of conflict between science and religion. To put it more clearly, it should be said that naturalism, by leaving the scope of the method of science, has led to the creation of doubts such as the conflict between science and religion. And with science returning to its methodical position, this conflict fades. This means that by using the metaphysical foundations of science, many of the conflicts that are expressed as a reason for the conflict between science and religion can be eliminated and compatibility between science and religion can be established. For example, theories such as the big bang, quantum uncertainty, the conflict between evolution and theism, and many cosmological theories that are presented about the finiteness and non-infinity of the universe, and each of them tries to provide models for the past and future of the world that even no objective witness has. It has not been introduced to confirm these claims. While, by turning to metaphysics and the metaphysical foundations of science, it is possible to get a true understanding of the world from among these many theories without creating a conflict between science and religion. In this way, science continues to help in the understanding of human nature and religion maintains its original validity. And with scientific developments, there is no way to waver in religion. Therefore, the main and most effective solution of theologians before any defense in removing the conflict

between science and religion is to try to make metaphysics scientific and negate naturalism. In other words, an ontological naturalist must prove his claim, just as theology, in claiming the existence of the supernatural and the transcendent world, must strive to revive and prove metaphysics. In fact, it must be proven that metaphysics is prior to science in terms of being scientific, and science has no validity without relying on it. With this scientific approach, scientific explanations are not always considered to be in conflict with the sacred authority due to the relative and variable nature of empirical knowledge, and on the other hand, the inadequacy of human sciences in understanding the sacred texts is always considered in these apparent conflicts. That is, human beings always achieve a relative understanding of the holy texts. However, general beliefs such as the truth of revelation, the existence of God, the necessity of religion, and the like are not things that can be proved and disproved empirically, and create doubts about the conflict between science and religion. Therefore, only the rational method is involved in proving these things in order to protect the fundamental teachings of the religion from wavering. In fact, naturalism has given up the link between science and nature, which is metaphysics, and limited the knowledge of the world to the empirical method. Whereas by connecting experience to the rational method, in the first degree, science can be prevented from error, and in the second degree, any scientific explanation does not create a defect in the holy texts.

In fact, when we acquire knowledge about the world with our intellect and they are valid and important for us, when we prove God and revelation with this intellect, it is valid and authentic. With the difference that the existence of God or the authority of revelation cannot be constantly questioned. Because reason has proven the existence of God and the necessity of revelation in a general way and

is not subject to the changes of the material world. That is, the object and subject of intellectual or metaphysical sciences is a separate entity from matter, not matter. As Plantinga states that:

Now we Reformed Christians are wholly in earnest about the Bible. We are people of the Word; Sola Scriptura is our cry; we take Scripture to be a special revelation from God himself, demanding our absolute trust and allegiance. But we are equally enthusiastic about reason, a God-given power by virtue of which we have knowledge of ourselves, our world, our past, logic and mathematics, right and wrong, and God himself; reason is one of the chief features of the image of God in us. And if we are enthusiastic about reason, we must also be enthusiastic about contemporary natural science, which is a powerful and vastly impressive manifestation of reason. So this is my question: given our Reformed proclivities and this apparent conflict, what are we to do? How shall we think about this matter? (Plantinga, 1991).

Therefore, if reason is not a proof, there is no proof in the case of science, and even experimental sciences cannot be considered reliable. While the intellect that studies nature has definitely understood the existence of the world before any science, which is one of the most important foundations of proving the existence of God, followed by the intellectual proof of the necessity of religion. Therefore, the apparent conflicts between science and religion are either caused by the lack of correct explanation between science and the holy texts, or there is no conflict in fact; Because the nature of human sciences has such a requirement.

But they are apparently inconsistent; they aren't really inconsistent. So even Perhaps a more promising approach is by way of territorial division, like that until recently between East and West Germany, for instance. We assign some of the conceptual territory to faith and Scripture, and some of it to reason and science. Some

questions fall within the jurisdiction of faith and Scripture; others within that of reason and science, but none within both. These questions, furthermore, are such that their answers can't conflict; they simply concern different aspects of the cosmos. Hence, so long as there is no illegal territorial encroachment, there will be no possibility of contradiction or incompatibility between the teachings of faith and those of science. These questions, furthermore, are such that their answers can't conflict; they simply concern different aspects of the cosmos. Hence, so long as there is no illegal territorial encroachment, there will be no possibility of contradiction or incompatibility between the teachings of faith and those of science. Conflict arises only when there is trespass, violation of territorial integrity, by one side or the other. A limited version of this approach is espoused by our colleague Howard van-Till in *The Fourth Day* (Van Till, 1986). Plantinga says, properly deals only with matters internal to the universe. It deals with the properties, behavior and history of the cosmos and the objects to be found therein; but it can tell us nothing about the purpose of the universe, or about its significance, or its governance, or its status; that territory has been reserved for Scripture. The Bible addresses itself only to questions of external relationships, relationships of the cosmos or the things it contains to things beyond it, such as God. Scripture deals with the status, origin, value, governance and purpose of the cosmos and the things it contains, but says nothing of their properties, behavior or history (Plantinga, 1991).

In fact, each of them has a different domain of knowledge and none of them violates the other. Because, as stated, each of them has a different subject area, and contradictions and conflicts occur when a subject is studied with two different methods.

So we can't identify our understanding or grasp of the teaching of Scripture with the teaching of Scripture; hence we can't automatically

assume that conflict between what we see as the teaching of Scripture, and what we seem to have learned in some other way must always be resolved in favor of the former. Oddly enough, we have no guarantee that on every point our grasp of what Scripture teaches is correct; hence it is possible that our grasp of the teaching of Scripture be corrected or improved by what we learn in some other way-by way of science, for example (Plantinga,1991).

Therefore, our understanding of the text of revelation must be mixed with faith, and at the same time, science also has its validity. That is, the support of the holy texts is the faith that has believed in it rationally. And the support of science is the same intellect that can believe in revelation and God before any science. Therefore, this method of referring to the scriptures is not correct. Because if science did not tell the truth, then it would not be reliable even for material life. Therefore, partial and experimental science can be a path-breaker for rational science such as theology only by generalizing, and there is no need to constantly compare partial sciences with revelation. Although science even partial and experimental sciences help us in understanding and interpreting revelation. But the interpretations of the verses can be corrected along with science. In fact, interpretation is based on science. But science cannot be documented on verses. Because science is constantly evolving. Therefore, if the interpretation is changed based on science, it is not considered a harm or threat. As the theory of evolution does not conflict with revelation and the way of divine activity in the world. Therefore, reason is the reliable criterion, not science. Because if the intellect is not a proof, the knowledge that originates from the intellect is also not valid, and with the non-validity of the intellect, both science and revelation collapse.

Based on this, our understanding of revelation is subject to human relative sciences, and scientific developments do not disturb

the holy texts, which would cause religious scholars to worry. Because we can't even reach the truth of revelation by making revelation a means of measuring science. Because empirical science is relative and falsifiable. Therefore, it is not appropriate to match them with modern science based on our relative understanding of the verses. Therefore, the multiplicity of earths is not inferred in the Qur'an, and therefore there is no need to reject or confirm knowledge through revelation. In this way, by adhering to the rational understanding of nature and religious beliefs, both science and theology achieve a consistent knowledge of the outside world without any conflict between these knowledge causing doubts. Therefore, belief in God is the first solution that can be prescribed to create interaction between science and religion and resolve their conflict.

Evaluation of the interaction of science and religion in the present era

The nature of science and its method is such that it is always subject to change, and this constant change in the study of nature does not cause the weakness of science, while the adaptation of these partial sciences to the holy texts can provide grounds for harming the verses.

In fact, nature is the creation of Almighty God, so science is necessarily divine and religious, and we never have atheistic science. Science reveals God's actions, and since science is the interpretation and explanation of God's actions, it is divine and religious. Therefore, scientists lean on scientific atheism, placing science as a tool for their atheism and offering a distorted interpretation of the world (Javadi Amoli, 1395, p. 130).

According to Javadi Amoli's view on the relationship between reason and religion and science and religion, reason, which is the source of science, is not opposed to religion at all. Reason itself is the

proof of religion. And after the proof of religion, reason is under the guidance of religion. So the science whose scholars have a religious view of existence are themselves under the guidance of religion, not their kind of empirical knowledge of nature. Therefore, the main challenge is the faith of natural scientists, not the relationship between science and religion itself. (Javadi Amoli, 1395, p. 25). Therefore, the issue of conflict between science and religion is not raised. Therefore, according to the previous explanation, the relationship between science and religion is an interactive relationship because these two fields do not have a common subject and method. In fact, science is the tool and servant of religion so that it can prove the truth of religion. Therefore, first of all, religion needs science, and then, by strengthening faith, religion plays a fundamental role in shaping the correct monotheistic attitude of natural scientists to the knowledge and use of nature.

Based on this, both old and new astronomy are not superior to each other. Because always, the benefit of human beings from knowledge to the world is relative and gradual, while the divine revelation has perfection and is not exposed to transformation. As the Christian world found new scientific theories such as theories of cosmology or Darwin's theory of evolution to be against the Bible, and theologians were not very strong in establishing a scientific relationship between the scriptures and science. Therefore, establishing a correct interaction between science and religion, especially in the current era, is one of the necessary strategies to defend religion and belief in God. That is, it should be shown that what is constantly discovered in scientific developments, whether right or wrong, does not cause any damage to religion and divine verses. While the subject of theology is the beliefs such as the existence of God, and the rational method of theology requires that it be dependent on philosophy. Therefore, the

need of theological science to philosophy, refer to its subject (proof of beliefs), and the way theologians use science to prove beliefs, plays an important role in removing the thought of "conflict between science and religion". As we should briefly mention that theology interacts with science through metaphysics. Because theology in a rational and non-religious way cannot directly use empirical sciences. Therefore, due to the partiality of science, theology should prove beliefs with the help of metaphysics.

In fact, it is rational studies in a general sense and philosophical studies in a specific sense that make the epistemological link between science and religion possible. Philosophical research is capable of examining the methods used in natural sciences and religious theology, evaluating their evidence, thus establishing a link between science and religion in the field of epistemology (Stenmark, 2010, p. 692). This means that these philosophical presuppositions and results can give way to other explanations or results, while the central core of that scientific theory remains constant. Therefore, philosophical explanations of a scientific theory are flexible and can give their place to other explanations (Biyabanaki, 1390, p. 18). In this way, the changes of experimental sciences are not against the holy texts, and every scientific explanation finds the power to adapt to it. Therefore, even though partial empirical knowledge is constantly evolving, it does not have the power to weaken religion.

Therefore, narrative knowledge in theology does not make it unnecessary for philosophy, and the rational proof of religious teachings has no other way than to be related to philosophy. For this reason, science and theology interact with each other by sharing the philosophical method, and naturally, science and religion do not interfere with the subject and method, because the basis of the validity of religion has already been proven by the rational method and not by

the more understanding of the world by the experimental method. Not only does it not disturb the previous faith, but the discovery and understanding of nature adds to the faith of scholars. In this way, the interaction of science and religion in strengthening faith shows itself; Not in proving and rejecting beliefs. Otherwise, it is not possible to establish an interaction between science and religion in an intra-religious way, and if such interactions are carried out, we will commit a mistake like Shahrastani. As Ian Barbour says about the conflict between science and religion in the 17th century: Theology in the Middle Ages was so mixed with Aristotle's school that any conflict with Aristotle's cosmology was considered a conflict with Christianity (Barbour, 1362, p. 63.).

In other words, religious scholars are not allowed to impose revelation on philosophy, and in this case, they commit an unscientific act. Thus, it seems that solving the doubt of the conflict between science and religion, and on the other hand, establishing a correct relationship between theology and theoretical philosophy, is one of the most important missions of theology, to be able to prove the existence of God in a favorable and scientific way, so that the content of the revelation enjoys credibility and there is no need to constantly compare it with science to prove the truth of religion. It is clear that the interaction of theology and philosophy proves the existence of God, and the rank of the relationship between science and religion is placed after the proof of the existence of God. This is how we can defend the text of revelation, even if we are not able to reconcile it with science.

In this way, not only philosophy in all its experimental and metaphysical branches does not conflict with religion, but it is absolutely a prerequisite for proving beliefs and then a prerequisite for using it to prove the essentials of religion. Therefore, the unsuccessful

attempt of the monotheists to make religious science, causes not only science due to its free nature, not approach religion, but also arise the suspicion of conflict. While the confliction is strongly removed from this relationship and after the commitment of people to religion, the services between science and religion become mutual and a two-way interactive relationship is established between these two areas so that both science and religion benefit the fruits of each other. Therefore, none of them should try to change the other to their own color, which will cause a crisis and serious damage to the body of human being and religion. It is clear that philosophy is the servant of religious sciences, and theology does not have the power to influence philosophy before people commit to religion, but by consolidating people's beliefs and promoting the right religion, it can influence the way science is used. Therefore, in order to defend beliefs, science should not be damaged and uncertain science should not be imposed on the verses. Therefore, both science and theology must move in the field of their method.

Indeed, any belief that is accepted with insufficient evidence is worthy of condemnation. Because little information is always more destructive than complete ignorance. For this reason, maximum rationality dictates that faith based on feelings is not a guarantee of moral action (Peterson, 2019, p.80).

Therefore, the interaction between theology and science is a way to strengthen the relationship between science and religion and remove the illusion of their conflict. Therefore, as Ian Barbour points out, the relationship between science and religion depends on the practice of theologians. And due to the fact that natural theology in Christianity is secondary to devotional and revelatory theology, the relationship between science and religion has not been well explained (Barbour, 1362, p.23).

Thus, we find that the truth of religion must be proven, not the content of divine revelation. Because revelation has not provided us with all the information that science has reached today, but it has always instructed us to think about nature, because knowing nature proves the existence of the Creator and knowing him. And on the other hand, today's experimental science cannot achieve knowledge according to reality. If revelation is definite and irrefutable, and experimental science is uncertain and partial. Therefore, if these two are compared a great damage is done to revelation and religion. That is, science cannot be used as a proof for the verses, nor can the verses be used to confirm or reject a scientific theory. Therefore, citing scientific details with the text of the Quran is not only a service for religion and defense of religions, but also causes the destruction of religion.

Conclusion

As it was explained, human science is in constant evolution, and new and old astronomy are not the issue. Experimental science is evolving and trying to become more relevant to the real world every day. So that the model of Copernicus and Galileo could provide a more accurate explanation of the reality of the world. Not that Ptolemy's model is religious and Galileo's model is non-religious. But the discussion of matching it with the content of the holy texts requires special delicacy and accuracy, which without a certain faith in the holy texts, can cause denial of religion and beliefs. Because human sciences are subject to error, while divine science is not. But infallibility in divine knowledge is not something that can be proven without proving the existence of Wajib al-Wujud and his attributes. As Shahrestani made a mistake in this arrangement and not only did not benefit the religion but also caused irreparable damage to the

religion. Because the goal of religion is not to enter human science about nature, but it has encouraged man to think about existence and how it relates to the existence of God, that reaching this stage of knowledge is not dependent on specific scientific theories or models. Therefore, in order to achieve the great and worthy desire of Shahrestani, it is necessary for theology to find a close relationship with the scientific proof of God, so that the existence of God and the necessity of religion can be proved in a rational and non-religious way, so that the content of religion is reliable. Although there are differences in the interpretation of such verses, it does not lead to departure from religion. Uncertain and inconclusive adaptation of science to the content of religion is imposing beliefs on science, which does nothing but harm and destroy religion. In fact, the intra-religious interaction can be destructive to religion. While this interaction should first of all be done in an extra-religious and rational way so that commitment to the content of religion finds rational support and there is no need to constantly try to adapt science to the text of religion. In this case, even if there is no certainty about the appearances of the doubtful verses, the conflict between science and religion does not arise.

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی

References

* The Holy Quran.

Abu al-Fatuh Razi, Hossein bin Ali, *Ruz al-Jinnan and Ruh al-Jinan* in Tafsir al-Quran, (Astan Quds Razavi Research Foundation, Mashhad, 1408AH).

Barbour, Iyan, *Religion and Science*, Bahauddin Khorramshahi, (University Publishing Center, Tehran, 1362).

Biyabanaki, Mahdi (1390), *Modeling the Antological and epistemological relations of science and religion*, Pajooheshgah oloum ensani va motaleat farhangi, vol.2, pp. 1-22.

Fakhr razi, Muhammad ibn Umar, *Mufatih al-Ghaib*, third edition, (Dar Ahya Al-Tath al-Arabi, Beirut. 1420AH).

Gould, Stephen Jay (1999). *Rocks of Ages*, Science and Religion in the Fullness of Life, New York: Ballantine.

Hebat al-Din, Shahrastani, *Islam and Hiyat*, translated and explained by Seyyed Hadi Khashrushahi, (Bostan Kitab Institute, Qom, 2007).

Ibn Ashur, Muhammad ibn Tahir, *Tahrir wa al-Tanvir*, (Al-Tarikh Al-Arabi Institute, Beirut, 1420AH).

Javadi Amoli, Abdulla (1395), *The Status of Reason in the Architecture of Religious Knowledge*, Qom: Asra.

Kolini, Mohammad bin Yaqub, *Alkafi*, (1407 AH).

Majlesi, Mohammad Baqer, *Bihar al-Anwar*, (Wafa Institute, Beirut, 1403 AH).

Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi, *Cosmology* (Maarif ul Quran 2), (Imam Khomeini Institute, Tehran, 2015).

Motahari, M (1378), *The Notes*, vol.6, Tehran: sadra.

Peterson, Michael and other authors, *religious belief and intellect*, translated by Ahmad Naraghi and Ebrahim Soltani, (Tarhe no, Tehran, 2019).

Plantinga, Alvin, *When Faith and Reason Clash: Evolution and the Bible*,

- University of Notre Dame, *Christian Scholar Review* XXI: 1 (1991): 8-33.
- Qorashi, Seyyed Ali Akbar, *Quran Dictionary*, Vol. 1, (Dar Al-Katb al-Islamiya, Tehran, 6th edition, 1371 AH).
- Qummi, Ali bin Ibrahim, *Tafsir al-Qummi*, research of Seyyed Tayyeb Mousavi Jazayeri, 4th edition, (Darul Kitab, Qom, 1367).
- Soroush, Abdul Karim (1371), *The Theory of the Contraction and Expansion of Religious Knowledge*, Tehran: Serat.
- Stenmark, Mikael (2010). 'Religion and Science', *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Religion*, Meister and Copan (eds.), London: Routledge.
- Tabarsi, Fazl bin Hassan, *Majma al-Bayan fi Tafsir al-Qur'an*, 3rd edition, (Nasser Khosro Publications, Tehran, 1372).
- Tabatabaei, Mohammad Hossein, *Al-Mizan fi Tafsir al-Qur'an*, fifth edition, (Qom Seminary Society, Qom, 1417 AH).
- Van-Till, Howard, *The Fourth Day: What the Bible and the Heavens are Telling Us About the Creation* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1986).

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی