A Phenomenological Critique of Sayyid Ahmad Khan's Conception of Reason

Hafiz Syed Husain

Research Scholar
Department of Philosophy
University of Karachi, Karachi

Abstract

This paper expounds a critique of Sayyid Ahmad Khan's conception of reason. Khan conceived reason (*'Aql*) as a harmonious coordination of two of its aspects or sub-structures: *'Aql-e-Insānī* or *'Aql-e-Kullī* and *Nūr-e-Qalb* or *Nūr-e-Fitrat*. It is argued that these two perspectival conceptualizings of reason presume fundamental theses which disrupt any possibility of such coordination. By the method of comparison and analysis predominantly motivated by phenomenological methodology, this investigation explains how these fundamental presuppositions disrupt the proposed coordination along three descriptive contours: (i) reason-in-itself, (ii) the goal of reason, and (iii) the directedness of reason. The purpose of this study is to develop an understanding of the problem of reason which can philosophically set the possibility of limited and scrutinized mutual critical reevaluations between secular and Islamic sciences.

Keywords: *Reason ('Aql), Islamic Sciences, Secular Sciences, Scientific Rationality, Tradition (Naql)*

1. Introduction

Sayyid Ahmad Khan's *Usūl-e-Tafsīr* (1998) [1] presents the fundamental principles of his Qurānic hermeneutics. These principles constitute a *reasoned* understanding of Qurān. This reasoned understanding of Qurān, which he deemed modern *Ilm al-Kalām* is based upon a particular conception of reason (*al-'Aql*) one aspect of which he called *'Aql-e-Insāni* or *'Aql-e-Kulli*. It is the faculty responsible for making objective generalizations from particular observations. This is what has rendered sciences and technologies, in other words, civilization possible (Khan, 1998, pp. 567-568). In his essay *Insān ke Khayalāt* (Khan, 1990, pp. 249-256) he claims that this reason is goal-directed. He considers this goal to be the knowledge and certitude—inasmuch as both are equal—such that faith is already a principal part of this knowledge. Here, knowledge amounts to the metaphysical reality of all things (Khan, 1991, p. 3). [2] However, according to him, reason—historically speaking—has always been striving for this goal without actually achieving it. Science and technology—at a particular phase in history—are particular temporal developments of this reason's striving. On the other hand, past religions (Judaism as in the times of Moses and Christianity for instance, or the differences in the revelations of past prophets)[3] are also its temporal developments. Qurān, and thus Islam as revealed to Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), constitutes its pivot. This is how Khan has taken the same position as of the early Muslim theologians and philosophers that there is no contradiction between faith and reason. The only difference is that, for the latter, reason meant secular knowledge as grounded by philosophy (Greek *Logos*), whereas for the former it was *Kalām* (again Greek inspired Logos).[4] However, for Khan, it is a particular historical manifestation of reason. This is the point which is usually missed when he is regarded a scientific naturalist. Though he explicitly repudiates the findings of Ptolemy's cosmology (inspired by Greek philosophy; in particular Aristotle) in favor of modern physics of Newton, just as he rejects traditional interpretations which stands in defiance against science— for instance regarding the possibility of miracle—but since this repudiation leaves out both logic and mathematics,[5] and since he has explicitly mentioned the possibility of historical development in reason, [6] scientific development of his time (i.e. Newton's physics in particular) is only a particular stage or phase of reason's developmental

accomplishment. Thus, Abdul Hafeez Fāzlī (2017, pp. 254-255) is partly correct in claiming that Khan's hermeneutic commitments meant the following maxim: any interpretation of Qurān that goes against the dictates of modern science must be reinterpreted such that the claim of Qurān is reconciled with science inasmuch as science characterizes the achievements of *'Aql-e-Kulli*. But it only forms a part of the story. Since science itself, according to Khan, manifests only a stage in development of reason towards its goal, this interpretation presumes the possibility of its own subversion. This means that a particular reconciliation so made can always change, at least in principle. In other words, Khan's *Tafsīr-ul-Qurān* itself —according to its own principles—is just one such interpretation among many further possible different interpretations insofar as the principles are kept intact.

This *Tafsīr* marks a particular phase with a progressive dimension that only history can reveal through further advances in sciences. We find ourselves justified in making a distinction between the interpretation (*Tafsīr*) and the principles as its precondition. The philosophical significance of these fifteen principles comes down to be one of informative of the structure with which reason is historically unfolding through the development of sciences, arts and technologies. It is not just a subjugation of Qurān under science, which apparently it is, but an indicative of something that is neither science nor the sedimented tradition of Qurānic interpretations (*Tafasīr*). These principles presume as well the historical unfolding of reason as such, insofar as this reason holds its goal as a regulative ideal towards which both philosophy and science aspires but Qurān embodies it.

Thus, reason for Khan has at least two different motivational sources; science and another source which we may call 'practical.' Latter is what finds its manifestations in Prophetic tradition. If reason could be reducible to the former then we could just equate his conception of reason with scientific rationality. But we have many textual evidences that there is more to it. It is the aspect that we have called 'practical' which requires an elaboration in this respect. Second, which correlates with the first, is his conception of nature (*Fitrat*). In what follows, we will see that this too is not equal to the nature that is revealed in science.

In order to further elaborate the practical aspect of reason, we note that besides the notion of reason captured as *'Aql-e-Insānī* or

'Aql-e-Kullī—which indeed corresponds to the capacity of scientific rationality (Dar, 1966)—he also talks about reason as 'light of the heart' or the 'light of nature' (*Nūr-e-Qalb* or *Nūr-e-Fitrat*) (Khan, 1993, pp. 251-253). This is certainly not the mystical (*Sūfiyana*) capacity of revelation (*Mukāshfa*) for he explicitly expelled it from reliable knowledge (Khan, 1983, pp. 110-113). This aspect of reason is explained as being a natural (*Fitrī*) capacity or faculty (*Quwwat*) *responsible for a radical critique which has the potential to transform the tradition* (my emphasis). This reason is inherently moral or practical and it is primarily this reason by virtue of which man is capable of being superior to animals. Prophets embodied this reason. He explicitly mentioned both, Ibrahīm (A.S.) and Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) who manifested the embodiment of this reason par excellence which corresponds to nothing but the capacity of prophethood (*Malaka-e-Nabuwwat*) as such signified by the propername *Jibra'īl*.[7] Just like science was the achievement of *'Aql-e-Insāni* or *'Aql-e-Kulli*, Islam is the achievement of this aspect of reason. It is Khan's thesis that since both have their origin in God (as being the First Cause), and since God is perfect, the two aspects can never contradict. As far as the principal existence of these two aspects is concerned, they both mirror each other. This implies that neither there is any principal priority of *'Aql-e-Kulli* or the scientific rationality over this practical aspect of reason, nor practical reason and its achievements have any such priority over the other. Just like sciences—Newton's physics for instance—manifested the achievements of scientific rationality, Islamic sciences—e.g. *Tafsīr*, *Hadīth*, *Fiqh*, *Kalām*, etc.—manifested the achievements of the practical reason. The two aspects apparently come in conflict with each other under the dialectical tensions of tradition vs. reason as *Naql aur 'Aql main Mukhālifat* (Khan, 1984, pp. 234-238), *Dīn aur Duniyā ka Rishta* (Khan, 1990, pp. 82-86) and the debate of *Ilm-ul-Riwāyah-wa-al-Darāyah* in *Ahādīth* (Khan, 1983, pp. 41-59) and in the following essays (ibid, pp. 60-89). The concept of reason employed here does seem to be subjugated to scientific rationality, especially when tradition (as *Naql*) seems to offer something that is scientifically unacceptable.[8] However, there is a possibility of a critique of tradition which can be intrinsically initiated following the precedent of *Darāyah* such that this critique does not contradict reason as *'Aql-Kullī*. Khan (1983, pp. 41-59) explicitly acknowledges this fact, though laments that it remained underdeveloped. But it is the totalizing subjugation of Islamic interpretations (the achievements of *Nūr-e-Qalb*) under scientific

rationality which is the cause of serious concern. It is the underlying assumption that since God created both nature and *'Aql*, and since He is perfect, achievements from both aspects of reason must confirm each other. If there is any conflict between them, then the dictates of one—which usually came down to be the scientific rationality—can assume the other under its jurisdiction. This is the meaning of harmonious coordination.

2. Research Hypothesis, Objective and Methodology

We thus find many discrepancies in Khan's account when it comes to understanding what he means by reason. But this only shows that Khan was mistaken in his conceptualizing of reason inasmuch as he thought it to be a harmonious coordination of the twofold structure, predominantly by presupposing unwarranted theses. This leads us to the following hypothesis: *It is possible that a critique of Khan's conception of reason may help in developing a better understanding of the problem of reason.* By 'understanding the problem of reason,' this investigation means the basic indicators which must be addressed before any structure or account can be claimed to be an answer to the question: what is reason?

This may sound counter-intuitive. For one may wonder what one might really mean by 'understanding the problem of reason?' Here, author's investigation is primarily inspired by the phenomenological methodology. It is beyond the scope of this investigation to present the full background. For a detail of phenomenological method, one may be referred to (Manen, 1990; Moran, 2000 & Zahavi, 2003). According to this, the most important thing to investigate is the right way to question (Manen, 1990, pp. 1-11). For instance, in order to investigate reason, one should not just ask: 'what is reason?' For this already presumes that one knows—to some extent—what reason is, for if one was absolutely unaware of what the reason is, then asking and looking forward does not make any sense. Thus, when phenomenology aims at understanding the problem of, say anything 'X', then it is primarily after those fundamental presumptions which must be satisfied or addressed before anyone even starts to look for an answer to the question 'what is X?' (Moran, 2000, pp. 234-237). These fundamental presuppositions corresponding to 'X' exist simultaneously at both, the level of tradition and at the level of everyday-life employment of 'X' correlatively. What is more important is that the sought phenomenological understanding consists of a structure formed by

these fundamental presuppositions. We may elaborate this briefly with the help of an example from Edmund Husserl—the founder of phenomenology. Husserl (1991), in his *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time*, worked out the phenomenology of time (i.e. 'X' being equal to time in Husserl's investigation). The ultimate aim was to work out a descriptive structure of preconditions which have to be presupposed if one is ever to have a possibility of temporally constituted experience. Here, though he apparently made use of the scrupulous observations pertaining to the everyday-life experiences of time (cf. for instance (Husserl, 1991, p. 11ff), however, beneath this apparent concrete analysis, Husserl was in continuous dialogue with how time has already been reflectively and practically intended in Western tradition.[9] The result was the intentional structure of time-consciousness which can be claimed to be responsible for the very possibility of universal conscious life (Husserl, 1991, p. XVIII). In present research, it is 'reason' inasmuch as it is intended in Aligarh episode of Islamic historical consciousness founded by Sayyid Ahmad Khan. At this latter point, we need phenomenology that is intrinsically hermeneutic; especially as expounded by Ricoeur (2016a & 2016b). This is because the intentionality—the phenomenological concept which captures the most primordial way of our immersion in this world (Husserl, 1991, p. XVIII)—if restricted to Husserl's transcendental phenomenology only, would diminish hermeneutic possibilities (Ricoeur, 1988, pp. 23-43). What we require is a historical intentionality, that is to say, our most primordial way of being engaged with the world that allows taking into account what has been historically intended as well.

We reached the hypothesis by a comparative analysis through Khan's text. Drawing from this hypothesis we state the fundamental research objective which this study aims at: *To work out the critique of Khan's conception of reason with the intention of finding the basic indicators which must be addressed before any theoretic investigation can initiate a study to answer the question: what is reason?* These indicators are precisely which form the phenomenologically desired structure for understanding the problem of reason.

3. The Critique and the Desired Indicators

A critique is an attempt to work out the structure of fundamental presumptions (Marder, 2014, pp. 3-4, 10ff). Following scrupulously through Khan's writings, this study claims that there are

three headings which together form the desired structure: (i) reason-in-itself, (ii) its goal, and (iii) its directedness (or historical intentionality)[10] towards its goal.

(i) Reason-in-itself

We have already remarked—following (Dar, 1966)—how Khan had two correlative and apparently harmonious notion of reason: *'Aql-e-Kulli* or *'Aql-e-Insānī* and *Nūr-e-Qalb* or *Nūr-e-Fitrat*. Former can be characterized as scientific rationality and the latter as practical reason inasmuch as sciences and technologies are achievements of the former whereas Islam as Islamic consciousness (fundamental ethical principles of a particular Islamic society responsible for forming a collective conscience) is the same for the latter.[11] This Islamic consciousness is reflexively informed by the achievements of Islamic sciences. Just like science can be mistaken at a particular period of history in capturing some particular aspect of nature (*Fitrat*)—the possibility of which Khan fully and explicitly acknowledges—similarly, Islamic sciences, and correlatively, Islamic consciousness can also be found to be mistaken in understanding the very same nature as well. What Khan predominantly has been trying to do is to critique the Islamic consciousness via both, critiquing Islamic sciences by confronting them with scientific rationality insofar as such a confrontation makes sense and critiquing Islamic consciousness in general by a critique that is internal to it.

What if we can validly argue that both scientific rationality and practical reason have structures which are either incomparable or whenever comparable, it is practical reason which grounds scientific reason and not the other way round? Furthermore, that this grounding of scientific rationality or reason does not exclude the possibility of critical reevaluation of any particular achievement of practical reason under the light of scientific rationality? If there is such an argument that can substantiate this then Khan would be both right, in some aspects of his argument, and wrong (in others). He would be right to think that a limited critical reevaluation of Islamic consciousness is possible through a confrontation of Islamic interpretations against the discoveries of modern sciences—which can now also include social sciences. But he would be wrong in thinking that both aspects of reason correlated harmoniously and so a totalizing critique of Islamic interpretations—Islamic consciousness—geared by sciences and

scientific view of the world, is a mistake.

Indeed, Khan is right in thinking that there is only one nature (*Fitrat*) whether approached through *'Aql* or *Naql*, also that there should be no conflict between them in principle.[12] However, the problem lies in equating this Qurānic reference to *'Aql* with what lies behind modern Western scientific rationality (henceforth referred as SR). Unfortunately, Khan never made any attempt to critique SR. On the contrary, as will be shown in what follows, no matter how we critique SR, the source capacity that renders modern sciences possible is certainly not equal to Qurānic conception of *'Aql* and *'Ilm*. The closer semantic equivalents of *'Aql* include: *al-bāb* (pl. of *lub'*) as in *'ul-il-albāb'* (2:179),[13] *Tadab'bur* as in *'afalā yatadab'barūn-al-Qurāna…aqfāluha'* (47:24) or as in (4:82) or *Nuh'ya* as in *'li-ulin'niha'* (20:128), so on and so forth. It is important that Qurānic conception of *'Aql* as in *ya'qilūn*, *ta'qilūn*, *aqalūh* (2:75) etc. does not make sharp philosophical or theoretic distinction between *'Aql* as such and *'Ilm* (cf. translation and interpretation of (2:75) in (Yusuf, 2008, pp. 37-38)). Following the same spirit, the early Muslim generations (*Sahāba* and *Taba'īn*) did not make any distinction between *'Aql* and *Naql* as such either, since for them, *'Ilm* primarily was *'Ilm-e-Hadīth* (Gilani, 2000, p. 104) or anything to which an authentic tradition (*Sanad*) could be presented (Ahmad, 1997, pp. 104-105). On the contrary, scientific rationality—especially as exhibited in the works of eighteenth and nineteenth century classical physics—must make a distinction between scientific knowledge as the achievement of theoretic or scientific reason inasmuch as the latter is the source capacity that makes former possible. Otherwise, the whole endeavor would become epistemologically circular, something which no rationality can afford.[14]

There have been many attempts on part of West to pursue such a critique. There are at least three major nexuses of such critiques: critical theoretic, hermeneutic and phenomenological.[15] Although, these nexuses differ in their philosophical methodologies, however, they all agree that the structure of SR is not autonomous. It requires a further grounding in practical, everyday life. It is beyond the scope of this paper to clarify exact nature of this grounding (for instance, cf. (Husain, 2018) for a possibility of how Kant's transcendental philosophy can be seen to be the ground of SR inasmuch as it was expounded in his *Critique of Pure Reason* and how it failed in

providing it the epistemological autonomy). The important point is that *SR cannot claim an absolute epistemological autonomy*, which means that practical matters—especially traditional values, e.g. belief systems, social or cultural practices etc. which Khan also thought to be forming the content of consciousness (Khan, 1984, pp. 1-15)—cannot all be subjugated to its scrutiny. Thus, if *'Aql-e-Kulli* or *'Aql-e-Insānī* is motivated by SR then Khan is wrong—even by his own standards—in indefinitely subjugating Islamic interpretations or the contents of Islamic consciousness under its scrutiny. This by no means establishes that the Western critique of its own SR establishes Khan's notion of *Nūr-e-Qalb* or *Nūr-e-Fitrat* as being more primordial. It is certainly not harmonious with *'Aql-e-Kulli* or *'Aql-e-Insānī* anymore under this critique, granting that it exists. As far as the exact nature of the existence and its relation with SR is concerned, at best, we can only remain silent as far as Western critique of SR is concerned in context of the above three nexuses. Thus, Khan's account of reason-as-such or reason-in-itself which corresponds to the harmonious correlation between both of his conceptions of reason (*'Aql*) is based upon uncritical, in fact misunderstood, conception of SR.

(ii) The Goal of Reason: God as the Creator of Nature (*Fitrat*)

As already remarked above, according to Khan, the goal of reason is the knowledge of the reality of all things. Unfortunately, this begs the question, for it naively presupposes that the 'reality of all things' is a thing. This philosophical naiveté could only be overcome by formulating the concept of the 'reality of all things' either by the methods of Greeks (for instance, Aristotle or Plato), or—following Martin Heidegger—by the phenomenological question of the meaning of Being. [16] These philosophical naivetés are one main reason why Khan was not being able to pose the question properly about *Fitrat*, *'Aql*, *'Ilm*, etc. let alone coherently clarify them. If one objects that the philosophical naiveté is a redundant charge on Khan for he repudiates philosophy, especially the cosmological view of the mediaeval Latin world inspired by Ptolemy, or the metaphysical pluralism of Pre-Socratics (Khan, 1984, p. 283), then one just has to read: 'But contrary to them, we believe that the more natural science and *philosophy* progress, the more firm would become the belief in the existence and glory of God' (ibid, p. 276, my emphasis and translation). Thus, philosophy for Khan is not always an endeavor to be seen with

condemnation.

However, Khan apparently has a way out of it, for he proposes what he means by the 'reality of all things:' it is God (Khan, 1984, pp. 277, 301-318). The perfect knowledge of this is impossible. Both science and religion strive for it (ibid, pp. 299-300). However, since both science and religion differ in their respective ways for striving towards it, science falls short and remains at the level of the 'laws of nature,' whereas religion aims ahead at *who created this very nature according to the very same laws*.[17] Thus the goal of both the secular science and the Islamic science is different. Since reason can neither be divorced from its goal nor its direction or aiming at this goal, the achievements or interpretations of reason which has faith at its roots cannot be totally subjugated to the critique of science. One may have no objection in a limited critical reevaluation of Islamic interpretations under scientific scrutiny, but it is Khan's over optimistic trust in the natural sciences which is problematic. Furthermore, Khan is explicitly against the mechanical conception of nature (ibid pp. 283ff), however, there seems to be no way how he could reconcile this with the scientific view of the world that aims at the mechanically leading laws of nature.

(iii) The Directedness in Reason

Khan never conceptualized the phenomenon of directedness in the structure of reason as such. But his concrete observations and reflections bear witness to its existence. As already remarked above, reason (*'Aql*) for Khan has always been striving towards its goal. The ultimate goal is God. This striving is not theoretic but historical. Both history of Islam (as the prophetic tradition which includes Judaism and Christianity) and history of secular science—from Greek philosophy till modern Newtonian Physics—are historical manifestations of this direction. Greek philosophy was led astray by over speculation. Modern scientific rationality corrected this deficiency. Similarly, we see a gradual progressive development in prophetic revelation towards God's final message which correlated with the progress of human mind at the level of civilization (Khan, 1993, pp. 139-150). This direction is one of progress towards its goal. Though there have been disruption points, for instance, falsification of Greek and Latin cosmologies by Copernican and Newtonian physics, and similarly, change or rescission (*Tansīkh* or *Naskh*) which occurred in the form of revelation of Qurān,[18] but these disruptions are not to be taken negatively, for they

are exactly what constitute the direction of reason-in-itself—the harmonious correlation of the two aspects of *'Aql*. *In fact, directedness is nothing but a coordinated structure of these disruptions*. Qurān marks the pivot of this development on the side of religion but there is no such equivalent on the side of science. In this connection, future developments of secular and Islamic sciences correspond to each other as the historical development of reason's striving towards its goal. Thus, we do not have a harmonious correlated direction of development. Instead of two, we are getting three terms to match. We have changes or rescissions (disruptions) which correspond to the prophetic development which finds its zenith in Qurān, we have overall progressive development through disruptions via secular sciences, and finally we have apparently stagnant Islamic sciences which developed and are now being made progressive by disruptions of Khan's own self-proclaimed efforts.[19] In this description, Qurān marks an odd term. One may overcome the problem by claiming that historical development of Islamic sciences corresponds to the direction of *Nūr-e-Qalb* or *Nūr-e-Fitrat* aiming at the meaning of Qurān which itself aims at the ultimate goal, i.e. God, parallel to the secular sciences which aim at the (mechanically leading) laws of nature. Then two correlated problems will arise in this context: (a) how to describe disruptions in each direction such that the resulting progress harmoniously coordinate with each other or at least do not principally conflict, (b) how to reconcile the discrepancy already identified in (ii) above, i.e. the difference in their goals. Unfortunately, there is no reconciliation possible from within the extensive corpus of Khan granting that he conceptualizes reason-in-itself as the discussed harmonious coordination.

Conclusion

Khan's conceptualizing of reason as a harmonious coordination of twofold structure is mistaken. A critique inspired by the phenomenological methodology reveals the structure of fundamental presuppositions of Khan's conception of reason. This structure corresponds to the phenomenologically sought understanding of the problem of reason. Instead of a twofold, we have a threefold structure consisting of the three formal indicators: (i) reason-in-itself, (ii) its goal and (iii) its direction or historical intentionality. All three terms correlate. Any reasoned account or any modification of reason which is corrective of Khan's conception of reason must confirm to this structure to qualify for being the reasoned account. This investigation

does not advocate an all-out rejection of Khan's account of reason. But it only establishes the preconditions which must be satisfied if Khan's account is to be made more coherent. Corresponding to (i), Khan's conception of reason suffers from conceptual inconsistency. Corresponding to (ii) it suffers from the lack of clarity in its scope. Finally in context of (iii) it suffers from inability to account the history of reason. On its own, this threefold structure is not an account of reason as such. It only formally indicates what any conceptualizing of reason must take into account. Thus, present investigation, along with its proposed threefold structure, should only serve as a prescription of correction and modification for Khan's conception of reason inasmuch as he was mistaken such that the right aspects of his conceptualizing and argument are not compromised. Hence, present investigation rejects a total subjugation of any scientific domain, secular or Islamic, under the jurisdiction of the other. But it does endorse the limited critical reevaluations or reinterpretations. A further direction of research is then opened up towards working out the formal indicators for a better phenomenological understanding of the problem of these limited critical reevaluations. It is proposed that the structure of these formal indicators stands in relation to the dialogical engagement between Islamic and secular sciences in the same manner as the structure of above formal indicators of phenomenologically led critique of Khan's conception of reason stood in relation to latter's correction and modification.

References

1. Khan's principles of interpretations—Usūl-e-Tafsīr—were published separately titled as Tahrīr-fī-Usūl-e-Tafsīr. They were first published around 1892 (Shabbir, 2006, pp. 44-46). However, whenever cited in this paper, its reference from (Khan S. S., 1998) should be considered only.

2. Unfortunately, Khan is too naïve at this point. Claiming that knowledge amounts to knowing the reality of all things begs the question. This philosophical naiveté could only be overcome by formulating the concept of the 'reality of all things' either by the method of Greeks (for instance, Aristotle or Plato), or—following Martin Heidegger— by the phenomenological question of the meaning of Being. These philosophical naivetés are one main reason for not being able to pose the question about Fitrat, 'Aql, Ilm, etc. let alone coherently clarify them.

3. For instance, in the essay Behes Nāsikh-o-Mansūkh (Khan S. S., 1983, pp. 100-103), Sr Sayyid argues that the change that is genreally refered as Naskh is one of the change that corresponds to the revelation of the past prophets; cf. also (Khan S. S., 1990, pp. 1-9)

4. Logos (meaning wisdom or reasoned account of reality) was already accounted and much debated among early and later Greek philosophers; among whom included Heraclitus, Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics. Author would refer (Wolfson, 1976, pp. 1-42) for a detailed investigation of how logos and Kalām—which originally meant speech—are interlinked in Muslim theology; cf. also (Shahrastānī, 1984, p. 24ff) for the significance of the meaning of Kalām and the development of the School of Mutakal'limūn.

5. Cf. (Khan S. S., 1983, pp. 90ff) where Khan cites an Arabic Scholar who cites Ghazālī in context of appreciating logic as the achievement of Greeks (ibid. p 92).

6. Cf. the detailed discussion of fifteenth rule in (Khan S. S., 1998).

7. Cf. Qurān (2:90-92), and its tafsīr in (Khan S. S., 1998, p. 145ff (vol.1)), especially in context of verse 92; also cf. (Dar, 1966).

8. Cf. interpretation of cosmic division of the sky into twelve zodiac signs and the cosmological phenomenon of shooting stars (Khan, S. S., 1993, pp. 214-221)

9. Cf. (Husserl, 1991, p. 3) for an explicit reference to Augustine's Confessions. Among others, cf. ibid. p. 249n6 and 264 for David Hume, ibid. p. 72, 111ff, 234ff for his use of mathematical analogies, ibid. p. 357 and 362ff for Descartes, ibid. p. 253 for both Plato and Aristotle, etc.

10. Cf. (Kelly, 2003) and (Zahavi, 2003) for the phenomenological concept of intentionality which philosophically characterize the phenomenon of intrinsic directedness of consciousness. Author's concept of directedness is primarily motivated from his phenomenological presumptions.

11. Author refers to Conscience in (1983, pp. 1-15) and Mazhab-o-Mu'āshrat in (1990, pp. 1-9), where he explicitly draws a distinction between the use of practical reason that is critically authentic and its use which is culturally biased. Conscience, according to him is culturally biased. It does not mean that it is wrong, but that it may contain errors.

12. Cf. Qurān (16:12), (13:2), in particular, (46:4). Latter—when seen in conjunction with the former two—clearly establishes that for Qurān the evidence for unity (Tawhīd) of God and nature (Fitrat) as His creation does not presume the dichotomy of 'Aql vs. Naql.

13. The reference (m:n) from Qurān refers to chapter 'm', verse 'n' respectively throughout in this paper.

14. (Husain, 2018)

15. I would refer (Rosenberg, 2001) for a discussion of the philosophical critique of SR from critical theoretic perspective; (Husain, 2018) for a hermeneutic account of how Kantian transcendental philosophy, as expounded in his Critique of Pure Reason, can be seen as such a critique which failed in its justification for autonomy; and cf. (Gooding, 2001) for a phenomenological critique. All of these show that SR is not to be construed naively as given or presumed in the methods of sciences (including social sciences).

16. Author fully acknowledges that these are not the only philosophically viable ways to pose the problem of reality. There are critical philosophical schools—for instance, both analytic tradition and pragmatism along with critical theorists—which may altogether dissolve the question of the 'reality of all things' (Loux, 2006, pp. 17ff, 46ff, 196, 259-293)

17. Cf. (Khan, S. S., 1984, pp. 277-282); my emphasis, translation slightly modified; cf. ibid, p. 282.

18. Cf. (Khan S. S., 1983, pp. 100-103), (Khan S. S., 1993, pp. 139-150).

19. In his essay Tabqāt-e-Ulūm-ud-Dīn (Khan S. S., 1983, pp. 36-40) Khan implicitly claimed that what the reformist thinking of Ghazāli (though his Ihyā-ul-Ulūm-ul-Dīn) and Shah Waliullah (through his Huj'jatul'lahul Balighah) were aiming at (i.e. Asrār-e-Ulūm-ul-Dīn) is the same what Khan is aiming at too.

Bibliography

Ahmad, F. (1997). *Tārīkh-e-Hifāzat-e-Hadīth-wa-Usūl-e-Hadīth.* Karachi: Kifayat Academy.

Dar, B. A. (1966). Renaissance in Indo-Pakistan: Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan as a Religious-Philosophical Thinker. In M. M. Sharif (Ed.), *A History of Muslim Philosophy* (Vol. 2, pp. 1598-1613). Weisbaden: Otto Harrassovitz.

Fazli, A. H. (2017). *Muslim Fikr Ki Qurānī Jihāt.* Lahore: Asaniyan Publications.

Gilani, M. A. (2000). *Tadwīn-e-Hadīth.* Karachi: Majlis-e-Nashriyat-e-Islami.

Gooding, D. C. (2001). Experiment. In *A Companion to the Philosophy of Science* (pp. 117-126). Malden , Massachusetts; Oxford: Blackwell.

Husain, H. S. (2018). Schleiermacher's Universal Hermeneutics and the Problematics of Rule-Following. *Science & Philosophy, 6*(1), 3-14.

Husserl, E. (1991). *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time* (Vol. IV). (J. B. Brough, Trans.) Dordrechts: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kelly, S. D. (2003). Edmund Husserl and Phenomenology. In *Blackwell Guide to Continental Philosophy* (pp. 112-142). Maldin, Oxford, Melbourne: Blackwell Publishing.

Khan, S. S. (1983). *Maqālāt-e-Sir-Sayyid* (Vol. I). Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqī-e-Adab.

Khan, S. S. (1984). *Maqālāt-e-Sir-Sayyid* (Vol. III). Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqī-e-Adab.

Khan, S. S. (1990). *Maqālāt-e-Sir-Sayyid* (Vol. V). Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqī-e-Adab.

Khan, S. S. (1991). *Maqālāt-e-Sir-Sayyid* (Vol. VIII). Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqī-e-Adab.

Khan, S. S. (1993). *Maqālāt-e-Sir-Sayyid* (Vol. XIII). Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqī-e-Adab.

Khan, S. S. (1998). *Tafsīr-ul-Qurān Ma' Usūl-e-Tafsīr.* Lahore: Dost Associates.

Loux, M. J. (2006). *Metaphysics: A Contemporary Introduction.* New York, Oxford: Routledge.

Manen, M. v. (1990). *Researching Lived Experience.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Marder, M. (2014). *Phenomena-Critique-Logos: The Project of Critical Phenomenology.* London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Moran, D. (2000). *Introduction to Phenomenology.* London, New York: Routledge.

Ricoeur, P. (1988). *Time and Narrative-III* (Vol. III). (K. McLaughlin, & D. Pellauer, Trans.) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ricoeur, P. (2016a). Phenomenology and Hermeneutics. In J. B. Thompson (Ed.), *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* (J. B. Thompson, Trans., pp. 61-90). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (2016b). What is a Text? Explanation and Understanding. In *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* (pp. 107-126). Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press.

Rosenberg, A. (2001). Social Science, Philosophy of. In *A Companion to the Philosophy of Science* (pp. 451-460). Malden , Massachusetts; Oxford: Blackwell.

Shabbir, S. (2006). *Religious Ideas of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan: A Critical Analysis.* (Ph. D. Thesis). Aligarh Muslim University. Aligarh. India.

Shahrastānī, M. b.-K. (1984). *Kitāb al-Milal wa'l-Nihal.* (A. K. Kazi, & J. G. Flynn, Trans.) London: Kegan Paul International.

Wolfson, H. A. (1973). *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion* (Vol. 1). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wolfson, H. A. (1976). *The Philosophy of the Kalam.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yusuf, H. S. (2008). *Tafsīr Ahsan-ul-Bayān.* Karachi, Islamabad: Daraussalam.

Zahavi, D. (2003). *Husserl's Phenomenology.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.