



Name of Candidate: Somia Ashour Mohamed Mohamed egree: M.A
Title of the thesis : Theology of Ibn Sina through References and
Attentions between the two Commentaries of al-Rāzī and al-Tūsī
An M.A Prosal in Islamic Philosophy

Supervisors: Prof. Mohammed Abdullah Afifi Prof. Rizk Yousef Al-Shami

Thesis Abstract

This thesis is entitled: "Theology of Ibn Sina through References and Attentions Between the two Commentaries of al-Rāzī and al-Tūsī."

This study is divided into four chapters. The first is about the evidences of the existence of God. The second tackles the negative attributes of the necessity of existence. The third deals with the proved attributes of the necessity of existence. Besides, the fourth is about the existence of the world, all of this is in Ibn Sina through the references and attentions between the two commentaries of al-Rāzī and al-Tūsī.

Moreover, this study conspicuously traced the views of Ibn Sina in references and the stance of Nasir al-Din al-Tusi from these references, then the stance of Nasir al-Din al-Tūsī from these references, then the stance of Nasir al-Din al-Tūsī from Fakhr al-Din al-Rāzī and finally compared the stances of Fakhr al-Din al-Rāzī and Nasir al-Din al-Tūsī in their commentary to references with their stances in their other books of the issues under study.

Through my research, I have reached the following conclusions:

-Many of the objections of Fakhr al-Din al-Rāzī to Ibn Sina were not for the sake of vituperation of the text of Ibn Sina and destroying it, but they were for the sake of elevating the text of Ibn Sina, complementing it, and filling its gaps, as agreed by Nasir al-Din Tūsī in some of these objections.

- I also found out that Nasir al-Din al-Tūsī agreed with Ibn Sina's commentary on the references in matters that he differed with him and in things other than the commentary on the references, as in the question of the world's oldness, the matter of the flood and the question of denying the purpose of the divine act. Moreover, Al-Tūsī agreed with Ibn Sina's commentary on the references, but, in his own books, he disagreed with him in these concerns. This confirms his support for Ibn Sina and his adoption of stances contrary to Fakhr al-Din al-Rāzī in explaining the references, even if he agrees with him in things other than the commentary on the references.