



## Avicenna and MullaSadra

Zahra Ganjepour

Department of Humanities, Philosophy and Islamic Theology, Islamic Azad University of Fasa, Fasa, Iran

\* Corresponding author's Email: ganje.1366@yahoo.com

**ABSTRACT:** One of the fundamental of philosophy is the concept of possibility. This concept of the for its importance in Islamic philosophy arguments, has always been by Islamic scholars. Among Islamic scholars, Avicenna and MullaSadra this concept have been discussed in model of concept of "Possibility of inherent" that is it refers to equity of the nature innate than existence and inexistence (lack). This speech of Avicenna that dependence of the existential effect to its cause, is for being its existence, so effect in its existence is need to cause and this is due to the possibility of poverty that began of expression Avicenna and finally reach to accomplishment by proficiency MullaSadra. Avicenna knew need criterion to possibility of inherent that of the most important it commodities, was the importance of have the nature, in possibility of inherent, pose nature as a principle; i.e. possibility of inherent, is description of nature. Mulla sara with deepen to concept of the possibility of poverty and it stabilize based on the theory of originality of its existence. To his opinion, need criterion to cause is possibility of poverty.

Received 25 Dec. 2013  
Accepted 05 Feb. 2014

ORIGINAL  
ARTICLE

**Key words:** Avicenna, MullaSadra, theory of originality

### INTRODUCTION

If use word of possibility in philosophy without any reservation, purpose from it is possibility of substantive. That can concept of possibility in veritable dis conjunctive proposition of state such that the possibility of establishing from divide of ruling between disclamation and prove. To this expression that; any concept of supposable, either its existence is necessary or not. The second alternative i.e. its existence is not necessary, also divided into two kind that either it nonentity is necessary or not, the prior that its existence is essential "obligatory" and the second that its nonentity is necessary, impossible and the third not its existence is necessary and not its nonentity is possible. Avicenna knew need criterion to cause the possibility of inherent and possibility of inherent is consist of existence and inexistence and has two existence and substantive dignity. The possibility of inherent is a validity matter, because possibility is requisite of the nature and nature is a validity matter and whatever be endowed to it, also be will validity. This phrase of Avicenna that "the possibility is to meaning non- appropriateness of existence and nature, that nature requisite is possibility object, is not considered. Rather offer a meaning of now of possibility that is same how the existence of possible of existent. Indeed, the possible of existent is consider for its existence and is dependency existential and needy and defendant, poverty and need is existential dependency of possibility object" explanatory this is that Avicenna did not suffice to possibility of substantive and he unknowing it enough. Hence, he was pursuit of other criterion for possibility, that in fact section of poverty and requirements also spread to in the dignity is possibility existential and in this case possible of existent both substantive dignity is possible and needy. In addition to the possibility and dependence in entity

of existent of possible and in depth of it reality also is based. So can concluded that the initial plan of possible of existential possible, fulfillment in the school of Avicenna and is not for it introduce, MullaSadra major initiative on about the possibility of poverty. From point of view MullaSadra, need criterion according to originality, is in existence of possible and not in their nature. Because according to this principle, nature is validity and all orders placed in criterion section. Need criterion to cause from point of view MullaSadra is dependency be they existence that he interpretation from this matter to possibility of poverty.

### Survey of point of view Avicenna about inherent and poverty possibility

#### Possibility is essential of nature

Possibility is essential of nature, and nature also is a validity matter. Description that endowed to nature also be will undoubtedly validity and also never be not separated, possibility from nature and it is always endowed to it. And reason this claim is that nature for qualification to possibility, not have need nothing. Because possibility is equality of nature innate than existence and inexistence. And intellect when envisage the nature with regardless of any other matter, this two the necessity (existence and inexistence) foreclose from it. I.e. for foreclose this two the necessity from nature, is not need to nothing, and this shows that for abstraction of possibility from nature and nature to possibility, is suffice nature innate (Beheshti, 2008).

#### Definition of the possibility of inherent

Separation of existence from nature have this privilege for Avicenna that cause Avicenna the matters that are in intellect (reason), them into two parts: **1)** some are no for incumbency own innat, and obviously that are no will refusal, otherwise not existence. Such

existential is possible (possible by itself).**2)** some also are self-existent for its nature (necessary by itself) (Alicenna, B2009).

Self-existent is existential that assumption of its inexistence is requisite of impossible. And existent, possible is existential that is not impossible the necessary of assumption of existence and inexistence. Self-existent is its existent the necessary. And we purpose from existent possible here on is possibility of inherent. Here can have given a division for self-existent: 1) self-existent by itself 2) self-existent by other. Self-existent by itself is that for himself and not for any other thing be impossible from assumption of inexistence. But self-existent by other is that its existence is obligatory with something else. For example, the number four is not self-existent by nature but is self-existence by other. Because with assumption of existence two with two be obligatory, and also burning is obligatory. But not by itself but by deal with subjectivity and passive strength .i.e. be obligatory with torrid and sizzler factors (Alicenna, 2000 and 2006)

Possibility of substantive is consist of existence and inexistence. Thus such thing is have two existential and substantive dignity. And but its existential dignity, is not in its nature the derivative and perspective. Any object of incident that precedent the existence and inexistence, is essentially an existence possible and this character (possible) will never be separated from him. So what that is essentially the existence possible and for its existence possible need to other existent such as cause, that bring out it from equality limit and enter into existence area. Because object of possible, in its nature have not coherence and unity with existence and also have not a scare and alienation from it and in fact than existence and inexistence is without reservation (equality mode). So requirement of effect to cause is in possibility of inherent. Property of existence possible is that existence possible the necessarily is need to something else that it does existence the actually. And any existence possible for validity of its nature is always existence possible, but perhaps be self-existent by other that is either constantly the self-existent by other, or that is in some times self-existent by other. But kind of existence possible must be have of substance that in the time of it precede, exist. Existence possible that constantly is self-existent by other, also is simple. Because dignity that have it for validity of its nature, is but dignity that comes from the other, and by the community of this both is that have identity of existential. Hence, something except the self-existent, for validity of its nature, is not free from mixture with power and possible. And except he, are mixture of couples and only he is unique (Alicenna, A2009).

And what is that because get up existential of the possible, is belonging and relevance by other. Purpose

from belonging to other, is self-existent, that is same of without need from other, we will. According to believe of the sheikh, poverty and richness, same of nature (innate) and all identity, from of the existence of poor and rich. Need to other, same of nature of the dependent and non-needy from other, is same of nature of the richness. In place to speak of indestructibility and elsewhere from incommutably of poverty and richness to it owners. Because, inherent, is difference and in contravention. Point of important in the words of boali, is need and poverty of existential and also is non-needy of existential. Effect and poor (needy) in their existence is need to cause and rich. Meaning this word, is not nothing but the possibility of existence or poverty. This possible with the possibility of substantive have verbal share. And sheikh with the same basis to respond to those that know the possible only in existence of find of the needful, but in continuation, other not have need to subject and cause. Conclusion Alicenna is that: need and existential poverty as well as is existential self sufficiency of effect and poor into itself existence is needy to enriched effect. Meaning this word is not something except the possible of existent or poverty

#### **Theory Alicenna about of criterion of the need to cause**

From point of view philosopher, criterion of need to cause is possible and intent of possible is foreclose of the necessity of existence and also is foreclose of the necessity inexistence. I.e. the possibility of an object is that it object is not inherently no requirement of existence and no requirement of inexistence. So, possible is inherently the equitable of attribution between existence and inexistence. Such existential for exist the need to preferable out of itself that it preferable is same cause of existence of it. The nature all thing is possible and any possible have need to cause possible is from orders of nature and also is from orders of necessary and indivisible of nature and for force indeed that its nature is as a concept of validity that be abstraction from existence, the possible also is necessary the validity matter, also be will validity (Motahari, A1989).

Sages in their compilations, many reasons bring for rejecting of criterion be of occurrence and in proof of possible. Including the reason include:

**1)** If an object based on the rule "The first order of nature appointment, namely is nature order, after possible order is nature order. Then cause requirement, then effect existence" rational analysis, we find out that first appointment are order of itself nature and in this order is not but itself. Then is the possible and then is needy (cause requirement) and be after cause area the requirement, that is the cause has affirmative relationship with its, (effect requirement) so

effect is obligatory, (effect existent) so, cause it make, (effect existence) so, effect be existent and for example, man in order before is (possible) and in the next time is (existence) and it the object of possible after cause area is cause according to rule of "That is every something until its existence not reach to requirement and necessity stage, not becoming a existent" that in finally is existent and occurring (Motahri, B 1989).

2) The sages say:( first introduction) cannot know the creation of object need to cause it occurrence, because occurrence to mean of appearance, is a description that abstraction from envisage the sequence of existence of nature on it inexistence, for example, (A) the absence in a time and then because that its existence is acquainted to inexistence, we call it occurrence. Second introduction: on the other hand, the nature for validity of its inexistence and until is non-existent, necessary is non-existence, and when it came into exist and become clad to existence, necessarily is existence. Third introduction: on the other hand, the necessity is criterion of disdain from cause. That is nature due to this is that existence or inexistence for it the necessity, not will cause. Principally the cause is for that necessary to the object. Conclusion of this three introduction it is that occurrence is a description that of existence sequence of object on its inexistence become abstraction that is the sequence of necessity of existence upon necessity of inexistence. And because the necessity is criterion of disdain, cannot occurrence know, need criterion to cause. Therefore, the necessity and incumbency of only released when that nature become apart from existence and inexistence of its validity, because in this cause there is no requirement and no requirement of inexistence. So reason (intellect) until does not consider the nature with its possible, not find out it need to cause, and this shows criterion and need criterion of the nature, is same the possible and no requirement of the nature(Tabatabai, 2006).

First introduction: if the occurrence of one way of another, criterion is needed of the nature to cause, (preference of object upon itself), is necessary. Second, preference of object upon itself is improvise to impossible. So the occurrence at all cannot have interference in need of the nature to cause (same). Sages saying this such that the nature is spontaneous has not the requirement than existence and inexistence, and on the other word: Its proportion to existence and inexistence, is identical, and must something else out it of equality and it is same cause. So sages the causality principle the prove with same possibility of inherent and it back to principle of the preponderance refusal without preponderant (MesbahYazdi, 2010).

Tabatabai say: the possible have need to other and clad and its ascription to existence and inexistence

is stop on a matter of outside of its nature, that is of the basic necessities. That is of propositions that conception of matter and predicate it will suffice to acknowledge and accept it. Because if we the nature with regard to it possible, that is consider with regard to equality of its proportion to existence and inexistence, and stop having preponderance one of two sides of existence and inexistence upon a matter of other also conception, we immediately the admittance it propositions, so the description of possible to one of two describe that is the existence and inexistence on the matter of other, have to stop the beyond of the beyond of nature of possible, that we call it cause. Common sense no doubt to this matter, and if we be live that the possible nevertheless its attribution to existence and inexistence is identical, can without that appropriateness himself or another object, be endowed to existence and inexistence, we are out of human nature (Tabatabai, 1992).

Criterion theory is the possibility of substantive inherent for requirement on the cause based on the principality of nature and authenticity of existence, because as that we saw pose the nature as the principle and we said each the nature it attribution is equality with existence and inexistence and we call this equality as possibility and we state that the nature according to of the ruling of principle the preponderance refusal without preponderant in clad to existence is need of preference namely cause. Although discussion of principality of existence or the nature the considered of the time of Mirdamad to next and before it time clear, is not the discussion about it, but since the nature in view of first to of human is familiar than existence, philosophers the base on nature principality and they discussion about need criterion to cause. But with regard to that the nature is matter of validity and regardless the cause, have not proof and realization and even with consider to cause also is only an existence of validity and virtual. So the origin of need to cause cannot be in, that is possibility of substantive cannot be criterion of need (MesbahYazdi, 2005).

#### **Survey of point of view Mullasadra about possibility of inherent and possibility of poverty**

#### **Survey of point of view Mullasadra about possibility of inherent**

In mind people, the possibility use to meaning possibility of general and philosophers and logician also understanding of the possibility this means the general possibility. But gradually among reasonable people, the possibility has been found a more specific meaning and predication on foreclose the necessity of existence and inexistence. The meaning specific of possibility has been found that possibility of genera can both attribution to obligatory and foreclose matter (MesbahYazdi, 2005). The possibility of about acts is

mean affair that set in between recusant and obligatory (Hassan zadeh Amoli, 1999).

The possibility in the real meaning word is same the possibility of specific, because only in this cause is that the object than existence and inexistence is equal and no way in it, dignity of obligation and refused. So, possibility of specific has been found possibility of general and term possibility of custom and word to a meaning quote and has been found the second position. Since that certification of possibility to meaning second is more specific than possibility to meaning first, to its saying possibility of specific. The nature or concept only have in mind of human one of these three features (possibility and impossibility and necessity). Otherwise itself nature than to nature is nothing except the nature and description of possibility the attribution only comparable to with existence to it, that in this cause none of the qualities, not will have the possibility and obligation and refuse (MesbahYazdi, 2005). Mullasadra said about reality of possibility: The possibility is inexistence innat requirement (appropriateness) than each of two necessity (existence and inexistence) and not requirement of foreclose of them (two). And here that some assumed that possibility of inherent to understand of reality of the nature and is not to consider extrinsic affairs.

Because the possibility is to meaning necessity foreclose of the existence and inexistence and nature of order, be foreclose all of characteristics and including necessity of the existence and the necessity of the inexistence. The necessity of existence an inexistence of foreclose the nature (possibility of inherent), and for this reason, foreclose of the necessity the existence and inexistence also be foreclose (without possibility of inherent), so cannot by validity of foreclose this two necessity of nature innat, claimed that possibility is related to nature order. Nature order is order of concept and is clear that none of the possibility and necessity and refuse is not in the objects concept. The three concept apply as direction to theorem and nature innat only is one conception and is not in where on no theorem of true (Hassan zadeh Amoli, 1999). The possibility of substantive of view to equality than the nature to existence and inexistence that requisite of inexistence, is necessity of the existence and inexistence and received of inexistence of being requirement and inexistence. Such thing to exist, to preferable that it bring out of stable limit, is origin of agent that give to its existence. That is the nature to benediction of creation of agent, endowed to the existing. So the nature by existence that receive of agent, will be preferred. In there this question arises that the nature will be transferred to existence, that this existence because is not reliant to their nature, how emerged and what cause need of he too subjective

origin? Can such answered that attribution it being to existence and inexistence will not be identical, because for necessity fixing of object to the nature of it, the existence for itself of existence is necessity and inexistence for it is impossible, so the existence of existents is the possibility lack of description of the possibility of substantive. On the other hand, existence of possibility due to restrictions, not have the obligation and necessity of eternal, but they only missing in other condition (Javadi Amoli, 2005). Possibility of substantive is requirement of nature and is to meaning foreclose of necessity of existence and inexistence of nature and inexistence of requirement it that is not separable from nature. The possibility of inherent is validity matter that become of abstraction with rational analyses, because description is nature that the reason (intellect) consider it separate from existence and inexistence, because the nature of this point of view is a validity matter, descriptions that endowed from this aspect to they, also undoubtedly would be validity (Sadr Aldin Shirazi, 2004).

Possibility of inherent find out in two things:

**1)** Quiddities that are not necessity of the existence an inexistence, on the other word, the possibility of specific constitution from two possibilities of general: one obligatory affirmative and other foreclose negative. So each theorem that direction in it be possibility of specific, is in fact involve two theorems: one the theorem of foreclose (negative) and one theorem obligatory (affirmative).

**2)** Apart from quiddities of possibility, any combination of assumption that we make from the nature of obligatory or impossible, they also have the possible of inherent for example, compound two self-existence be counted inherently the possible, so that the combination of the two partners and self-existence also consider a matter of possibility. Of course is impossible with realization the two self-existence or two partners, but refuse is not for of their complex. The impossible is due to the characteristics of composition components, not that their composition have be drawback (same). This Mullasadra theory was about the possibility that when he was believes in principality of nature and so that he says: I promise to authenticity of existence and principality of nature the accepted from tellers to it and I have strongly believe to it, until my lord lead me and the truth revealed for me and this was that quiddities that call at the comment of discovered and certain people, Ayan sabteh, they have no interest of existence. Anny height and Kenneth Salf Zaman fi...Alayan Alsabth Alzb intense aromas penile We Alvjvd aslachamotte (Sadr Aldin Shirazi, 1984).

**Survey of point of view Mullasadra about possibility of poverty**

Reality is of Mullasadra initiatives and purpose of reality is this means that any existence possible is has two dignity. One is the dignity of existence and other is the dignity of nature. But must be one of the two, be truth and the origin of works and other validity and abstract of mind. So existence is original and nature is validity. This matter be considered at beginning at the time of the Mirdamad and Mullasadra to this case that weather is with the nature or with existence? The terminate the Mirdamad despite was Mashaie, be proponent of originality the nature and Mullasadra follow from his professor and then oppose with it strongly and be advocate(proponent) of originality of existence (Motahari, B1989). The originality of existence is have consequences and results a lot, that one of results of it from point of view Mullasadra about originality of existence, is possibility of poverty. In possibility of poverty of possible creature in comparison with god of subhan is in ruling relationship, but existence of interface also have two meaning that meaning its first is meaning a word of existence that is the interface between issue and predicate, and meaning its second is existence of in other that in here is considered meaning the second and so, existence of interface, is existence that among existences of independent they create, correlation connection. This existence is the same of correlation and belonging to parties, namely, existence of there is related to parties, have not any independence of their parties, in a way that without their parties never is not imaginable and reasoning. So, existence that are in other, not nature and their identity is related parties (Shirvani, 1998). And from other orders possibility of poverty is quiddities converting to concepts, because the world is connective than obligatory of excellence, so compulsorily is lack the nature and of they be the concept of abstraction because existence of connective have not the nature and but nature only providing is spread that measured contingents with one another, and because their relationship be survey with essence of holy, the category and nature of their being questioned but denying (Javadi Amoli, A1996). The conclusion that by discuss the issue of reality and accuracy in its aspects, divisions of obligation or necessity, possibility or impossibility has been found to another from. Thus impossibility due to inexistence and disagreements with reality (originality), there would be removed. Validity of nature and lack nature of obligatory, making out another kind, i.e. the obligation and necessity, and ultimately, possibility of substantive alteration to the possibility of poverty or existential, and what that remains, is a existence real and has order that order of higher it from an existence of independent and other order are the exact of relevance and dependency to he (Sugar, 2010). Need criterion of effect to cause: the

existent is two kind: first kind, is existent that existence of it reality be of abstraction and is the exact of existence other kind is that existence of reality it nature not be of abstraction and is the exact of existence. Or in other words can say that first kind of existence pure and infinite but second kind existence is limited. The first is self-existent by itself and the second is self-existent by other. Self-existent by other is the same of belonging and dependency an existence to self-existence by itself. So the reality of any effect and how the existence of any existent of existent possible not be will other meaning accept the same of connective and dependency to self-existent. In other words, the reality of any existence in possible world, for it cannot imagine the same effect and same relationship and need and dependency. In other words, role of existence of possibility in the existence world, is as well as the role of the meaning word in the world of speech. Namely as that meaning letter in the words vast world and sentences diverse building not are other thing except the exact of relevancy and dependency, and existence of possibility in existence world is no other thing except exact of relevancy and dependency. So, the effect is not nothing except exact of relevancy and dependency by other, but means of effect is not thing except the exact of relevancy and dependency by other (Ibrahymy dynany, 2009). The two philosopher although are in two different school, but in their thoughts about the possibility, have commonality and dispute that the root of the commonality be arises of a single possibility. Both philosopher in defining the possibility of substantive or possibility of inherent are with one another common, and it defining this way: equality of nature inherent than existence and inexistence. The possibility is requisite of nature and nature that is a matter of validity, descriptions that also endowed to nature, also will be validity. The possibility never be separated from nature and always endowed to it, because for ascription to it does need to anything. The two philosopher have with one another disputes that is:

**1)** at the time of Alicenna, the discussion of the originality of the nature or existent was not posed to from of formal and even a number of Alicenna words is identic with reality, but mojar problems the design and have been discussed by overcome the originality of nature. But in transcendent wisdom that its founder was Mullasadra, the reality is of the basic infrastructures.

**2)** from other cases of difference between the two philosopher is need criterion to cause that Alicenna knew need criterion to cause the possibility of inherent or the possibility of substantive, but Mullasadra knew need criterion the possibility of poverty.

3) Alicenna knew the possibility of inherent the description of nature and because the nature be abstraction from existential limit that is inexistence, it return is also to inexistence, Mullasadra knew the possibility of poverty the description of existence but exact of context of existence.

4) Mullasadra knew the possibility of poverty the description of existence of connective and is correlate without an intermediary to the rich and independent, but from the perspective of Alicenna, the possibility of substantive the accede by existence to cause.

5) Mullasadra knew the possibility of poverty has incertitude, because this possibility is exact of existence and existence also issues to incertitude. So any the size the degree of the existence of existents is a stronger and more severe, is closer to cause and existence of independent and is more dependency of them. From the perspective of Alicenna the possibility of inherent is from nature requisites, the nature also is non-issue to incertitude.

6) According to possibility of substantive, needs and requirements and need criterion is three thing: about criterion of the requirements the object to cause, is difference among prolocutors and a group of philosophers such as Alicenna: prolocutors, posed occurrence the need criterion and Alicenna knew the possibility of inherent need criterion. Alicenna say speech based on originality of nature and for requirement and need criterion and need consider three matter of separate. But Mullasadra that knew the possibility of poverty based on originality of existence, except existence is nothing until set in it width. So, the requirement is exact of need and need criterion also was not will something other than it.

7) Alicenna knew possibility of substantive need criterion to cause and this possibility of substantive the discussion both in philosophical discussions and both in the discussion of reasoning the logic, but possibility of poverty Mullasadra only used in the philosophical discussion, or on the other words, he in nowhere no talk of possibility of poverty.

## CONCLUSION

According to whatever discussed so far, Alicenna to theory of the existential possibility and its criteria the achieve as distinct from possibility of substantive. But whatever Alicenna not achieve to it, and could not achieve, was position of philosophical existential possibility. The possibility for Alicenna was like other issues of philosophy, but the existential possibility for Mullasadra was a new plan that could to solve many philosophical problems. Concepts and theories of philosophical to its proportion, has different capabilities and each according of power and the extent of territorial, play a role. So, some of concepts of

philosophical has role of basis and some other role of building that an example of manifest of it is possible, that in the intellectual system based on originality of the nature and authenticity of existence, call possibility of inherent and in intellectual system based on originality of existence and authenticity of nature, call existential possibility. From the perspective of Alicenna, need criterion to cause is possibility of inherent that is based on originality of nature and authenticity (reality). Although, at time of this two philosopher, is not pose the discussion of the originality of nature or existent, but in possibility of inherent, this two philosopher the posed nature as a principle and they say that every of nature, its attribution is equality with existence and inexistence and to call it possible. Possibility of inherent is a matter of validity, because possible is requisite of the nature and nature also a matter of validity and whatever be endowed to it also will be validity. So in the possibility of inhere that is according to originality of nature and authenticity of existence, nature fully engaged to itself the mind of the philosopher, that proceed with description on to logical, and hence consideration to the existence and existent from beyond the veil of nature. Existential possibility is project able for aspects of existential of creature, so possibility of inherent will never to have a basic role. But this possibility of inherent in intellectual system based on originality of existence (reality) and authenticity (validity) of nature be alteration to possibility of poverty, that possibility of poverty has role underlying, that possibility of poverty is dependency of existential of effect to cause of itself, and is for existence of existent, or on the other word, existential possibility is same poverty of existential or existence of dependence. And need criterion in possibility of poverty is possess, i.e. whatever be fuller is poorer, because is rich, is poorer. Because his asset is exact of poverty. And whatever have be less than, its poverty is less that, because he has nothing the possibility of poverty have many capabilities that from one side discussion of cause and effect, need of effect to cause and it criterion, relationship of and kind of relationship between creator and creation. It totally changed and give a new perspective and deeper into the philosopher, on the other hand provide the reasons of philosophy expansion and create new areas for philosophy dynamic.

## REFERENCES

- Alicenna, H. (2006). *Theology of salvation, translation and commentary* Yahya yasrby Institute of garden books, Qom.
- Alicenna, H., Alasharat. & Altnbyhat (physics, theology and mysticism), Hsnmlkshahy translation and commentary, Volume I, Sixth Printing, S.

- Alicenna, H. (A2009). *Theology of the Book of Healing, descriptions of Ibrahim Dadju*, Second Edition, published by Amir Kabir, Tehran.
- Alicenna, H. (2000). *Healing Theology (Fan XIII, Article 14)*, translation by Mohammad mohamdi gylany, Islamic Propagation Office Seminary.
- Alicenna, H. (1994). *Healing argument, translation and research Qvamsafry M*, first printing, think of the day, Tehran.
- Ibrahmy dynany, GH. (2009). *philosophical principles of Islamic Philosophy, Volume II, Humanities and Cultural Studies*, Tehran.
- Beheshti, A. (2008). *Existence its causes are described in the fourth style (Alasharat and Altnbyhat)*, Second Edition, Institute of garden book, Qom.
- Hassan zadeh Amoli, H. (1999). *Shrh alasfar Alarbh MullaSadra Shirazi*, garden books, Qom.
- Javadi Amoli, A. (1996). *Rahighi sealing, description of Transcendent Wisdom, formulate by Hamid Parsania*, Asra, Qom.
- Javadi Amoli, A. (2005). *Proofs of God's explanation, the researcher Hamid Parsania*, Fifth Edition, Asra, Qom.
- Sugar, A. (2010). *interface existence and independent of Transcendent Wisdom*, Qom, Institute of Garden Book.
- Shirvani, A. (1998). *description of philosophical colloquials and wisdom initial and wisdom final*, Qom, Institute of Garden Book.
- Sadr Aldin Shirazi, M. (1984). *Almshar*, Henry Corbin, translated into Persian by Mirza Emad Idoleh, Tahoor Library, Tehran.
- Sadr Aldin Shirazi, M. (2004). *Al-shawahid al-rububiyah*, translation and interpretation, Javad Mosleh, Soroush, Tehran.
- Tabatabai, M. (1992). *wisdom final, Volume I*, description of Ali Shirvany Institute of garden book, Qom.
- Tabatabai, M. (2006). *wisdom initial, Volume I*, description of Ali shirvany, Daralfkr, Qom.
- Motahari, M. (A.1989). *collection of Works (detailed description of the system)*, the fifth volume of Philosophy, Sadra, Tehran.
- Motahari, M. (B.1989). *collection of Works (detailed description of the system)*, Volume VI of Philosophy, Sadra, Tehran.
- Mesbah Yazdi, M.T. (2005). *description of Alasfar Alarbahe, Volume I*, research rule of Mohammad taqy Sobhani, Institute of Educational and research Imam Khomeini, Qom.
- MesbahYazdi, M.T. (2010). *Philosophy of Education, Volume II*, the Islamic Propagation Organization, International Publishing Company, Tehran.
- Mohammad Rezai, M. (2004). *philosophical theology with the introduction of Jafar Sabhany Institute of garden books*, Qom.