

## Pantheism in Ebn Arabi's and Mulla Sadra's viewpoint

1. Seyed Morteza Hossini Shahroudi, 2. Khodadad Asemi\* (Corresponding Author)

<sup>\</sup>.Professor of philosophy Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

<sup>Y</sup>.Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Campus, Mashhad, Iran

### Abstract

Pantheism as one of most important common topics among philosophy and theosophy and it is as a basic for Sadraian<sup>1</sup> philosophy which Ebne Arabi, as the father of theosophy, has discussed about it in the most of his books and Mulla Sadra, in the book of Asfar, has explained it by application of the rule of simple unity truth. Pantheism has various basics and for explaining and interpretation of it, it is possible to research about it in Ebne Arabi's book, Fesas Alhekam. Ebne Arabi believes that anything except the God, are just a God's showing, shodaw or God's epiphany, whereas Mulla Sadra believes that in the World, there is just one true existence which is self-existent (it refers to God because he is the only person who is self-existent and independent from other beings. Translator) and all possible existents (anything except God) are just a direction of God's directions, in the other word, Truth is God, and others are just his showings, God is the principle and others are just his epiphanies.

**Keywords:** Ebn Arabi, Mulla Sadra (who has other labels such as Sadrol Motalehin, Sadra, etc. translator), Simple truth

---

<sup>1</sup>. Means a philosophy which Mulla Sadra has presented.

## Introduction

Pantheism is fundamental of many other topics of theosophy, so, theosophists has discussed about it more than any other topics. Viewpoint about pantheism includes theosophy or philosophy theories which has a long history and according to historian of philosophy, first person who tried to explain it obviously was a philosopher who was called as Parmendis, he says clearly: Existens just exist (it has truth) and it is unique and unit (Capelston, greek, Rome, p61).

By this word, he not only shows that existence concept has truth but also says that its antitype is unit.

Epiphanism viewpoint essentially is based on two matters: a) existence has an objective reality; b) antitype of such objective reality is unit. According to these two topic, it became famous as epiphany and Ebne Arabi's personal epiphanism getting is about an existence which has objective reality and its antitype is a unique and unit item whose name is God or Right, and he is one person with all of completenesses. His relation to the world is a relation between a shower and a showing and according to this all things in this world except than him, which we mentioned them as different things or beings, in fact are nothing except than his showings or epiphanies (Ebne Arabi, Fosos Alhekam, p120, 55, 49). In this article we will try to explain Ebne Arabi's and Mulla Sadra's viewpoint about relation between epiphanism.

## Appearance in Ebne Arabi's theosophy

Ebne Arabi believes that any thing except than God, are just God's epiphany, showing or his shadow. Causality here, doesn't mean creation of possible existents, but it means that an absolute existence has deformed himself in various things and he is showing himself in different showings. Such existence has no distinction between himself and his lower showings and he is not far or separated from them. In fact, true polarity is impossible in existence and sensitive obvious polarity, is just acceptable as polarity among different showings. All of beings vs Holy Right, God, are nothing. In fact-or as Halaj says- all of beings are showings of Holy Right (High world which is called as Lahut in Islamic theosophy) in down world (which is called as Nasut in Islamic theosophy).

He is sacrosanct one whose down world's secret make his secret of powerful high world's brightness secret to be obvious, where he showed himself among his slaves as an eater or eating being.

Just God is true existence and other beings are additional existence (Ebne Arai Ensha Davaer, p6-7).

In the other word, none of possible existents has no existence against the God: ((God is ascribed by existence and there is no possible existent who can be ascribed by existence. But we can say that God exactly is the same as existence. This is the same thing which Prophet Mohammad has said: God was while there was nothing by or with him-God exists while there is nothing except than him (Ebne Arabi, Fotohat AlMakieh, volume 3, p429).

In the main Arabian context it is said that: "KANA ALLAHO VA LA SHEI MAAHO"

Here, Ebne Arabi dose not use the word of "KANA" as a verb, but he believes that it is an existence letter and it is not about time and so the famous phrase from Jonaide Baqdadi which says (he is now the same) "VA ALAN KAMA KANA" cannot be true and it is so impolite that we think Prophet Mohammad has said something which is incomplete and there is need to complete it) (The same reference, volume 2, p56).

God is absolute existence, an existence which Ebne Arabi refer him to ((Him)) (or in Main Arabic language as Hoo, Hova) and says: God is absolute existence and there is no origin or end for him, in fact He is Him (Hova) (Ebne Arabi, the book of AlAzal, p 157).

(Hova)(Means him), which Ebne Arabi, has defined it by the Arabic Article letter of (Al), is not a pronoun, but it refers directly to God's essence, because it is a metaphor of God's unity which points to God's essence in his truth, i.e without any addition to an adjective outside of such truth. Main reason for such metaphor can be that (Hova) is inward of any beings and (Hova) is a metaphor for God's unity and therefore Quran has said, "GHOL HAVA ALLAHO AHAD" which means, (Tell, Hova(God) is unit). So, Hova is absolute essence which eyes by their eyesights, or wises by their thoughts can not to understand him (Ebne Arabi, the book of Elia, p 137). The reason for this is elimination of an relation or addition in God's essence and its absoluteness and therefore, absolute essence is a truth which is mentioned by (Hova), since there is no place which is not one showing of God's showings, except (Hova) has showed in its inward). (The same reference) Therefore, Because God's unity has fluent among all of beings. In fact, this is (Hova) which is self existence, because this relies on himself, and beings are his showings and depend on him. Wisdom has no power to reject such truth and religion also approves it (Ebne Arabi, Fotoahat AlMakieh, volume1, p291).

Pantheism in (Hekmat e Motaly) (means Holy Philosophy which is the name of Mulla sadra's philosophy).

In the topic of pantheism, Mulla sadra, against his belief about ((Personal epiphanism)), at first presented his reasons about (Graded Pantheism), a word can be ascribed it by middle thing between (distinction of existence) which refers to Mashaian philosophers, and the word of (personal existence). The reason for this , as he has said, for considering the order of steps in teaching the philosophy topics, and it has no conflict with theosophist's thought which says: Pantheism, absolutely and essentially (Mulla Sadra, AlAsfar Arabeh, volume 1, p71).

A) Graded pantheism: In this type of pantheism, which has been emphasized by Mulla sadra in his books, is a coordination for his philosophy- it says that although unity in existence is true, also Multiplicity in existence is true, it means that existence has some grades which its common and difference interfaces is nothing more than truth of existence. As Ayatolah Javadi Amoli says there are grades in truth, first true pantheism which is dominant on polarity and it has flow in it and there is no virtual dominance or flow in it, but it is a true one. and the fourth, True polarity is deformed under true unity in a way (Refer to Javadi Amoli, Rahiq Makhtum, Section 5, volume 1, p548-547).

In Masha philosophy, existence has been divided in two groups of cause and effect and each of them has a seperated existence. Mulla Sadra in Hekmate Motaly has reject this categorization and he has considered effect the same as relation to the cause, it means that division between cause and effect will be returned to division of existence to independent and relating agent. In this theory, effect also has existence, but a dependent existence.

B –Personal Pantheism: Mulla Sadra, in topics of cause and effects, has completed philosophy as he said. He studied about truth of cause and effect and has passed from ((graded pantheism)) and has reached to (Personal Pantheism) which means in the world, true existent is unique who is self existent and any other possible existent are just a direction of his directions.

According to the existent documents about possible existents, this relation is virtual or just a spoken common. But here the purpose of virtual, is theosophic virtualit, and it means any thing except the God, are sub-existents and who has a true and origin existence is self existent and he is the God, and what make it to be different and various degrees of existents to be happen is severity or weakness of grade in epiphanism (Refer to Ebne Tarakeh, Tamhid Alqavaed, P35, and P 111). It means that there is a difference between epiphanies with respect to degree of severity or weakness, one is a complete and full showing and another is an incomplete one and this difference is called as grading for showings. In the other word, according to credit of nature, just Holy

Right God's existence is an origin and a true right and other things than him are null and void, Although they are virtually called as existent (Refer to Mulla Sadra, AlShavahed AlRobobieh, P49).

Therefore, Mulla Sadra same as Ebne Arai, considers anything than God as a face of God's face. God is absolute existent who surrounds all things. God is the truth, remained things are his showings, God is principle and others are his epiphanies.

According to Mulla Sadra's viewpoint and therefore personal pantheism, anything in the possible world than him, which we consider them as existent (material or abstract things) are essentially nulls and they have no truth. Mulla Sadra mentions this Ayeh from Quran, Sureh Qesas, Ayeh 88 which says: ((Everything will be perished except his face)) and explains that, essential perishing and truth nullity of possible things is proved for them originally and forever. Therefore, if we consider nature of possible thing with respect to ((it is itself)) (Or as its said in Islamic philosophy, Hiah Hiah) then we can not say it exists, but if we consider the relation of possible thing to its complete creator, it is right to say it exists (Mulla Sadra, Almadba va Almaad, p30). In another word, Mulla says ((There is no gods except Allah)) is a public testate (When some one wants to be Muslim, he should testate about two things, at first he should says there is no gods except Allah, or in Arabic language La Ellaha ela Allah, and then he should say Mohammad is God's prophet, these testates are called as Shadatein which means two testates-translator) and ((no one exists except than him)) is intellectual's testate. The difference between these tetates is that in the first one, testate is about rejecting theo-adjectives from other things except than God, but in the second one testate is about rejection of existence from other things except than Allah, implies rejection of existent completeness from beings except than God, and this monotheism is better than the first one (Mulla Sadra, Mafatih Alqeyb, p 243).

Hekmate Motealy and rule of simple truth:

Ayeh 153 in Sureh Anam says: (This way is right way so follow from it) invites people to follow from God's right way, according to Mulla Sadra, the right way which prophets have paced it, is the true monotheism (Mulla Sada, AlShavahed Alrobobieh, p310), a monotheism which according to Mulla Hadi Sabzevari, ( Taliqat bar, AlShavahed Alrobobieh, p 774). Is based on two principle of (unity in multiplicity) and (multiplicity in unity) and in the other word, it is based on (Assimilation in Immaculacy) and (Immaculacy in Assimilation). For owner of such degree of monotheism, there is no veil about right for creatures and also there is no veil for right about creatures. Mulla Sadra, in his books, tries to show this right way by the rule of ((simple truth is whole of all things and there is nothing without it))

He presents two explanations for such rule: first one is based on graded pantheism and the second one is based on personal pantheism.

A) simple truth rule based on graded pantheism:

according to graded pantheism, Self existent who is on the highest degree of existence is true simple, which means there is no combination for him and therefore he has all of completenesses of other existents and there is no imperfection for them. The reason for such case is that simple truth can not be without of other's perfections, because if so, this will become as combination of having and loss or a combination of thing and nothing and therefore it will not be simple truth no more. Therefore self existent is whole of all things and it is not possible to reject any perfection or existence item from him and therefore he is comprehensive of all of perfections and toom of all of imperfections and defections. (Mulla Sadra, Al Asfar Al Arabaeh, p100). So, because self existent is simple truth, he has all of perfections and existent direction of all things and he is toom of all of their limits

and imperfections. It means God, while is unit, is the same as all things and he is existence of whole of world and there is nothing without him (Mulla Sadra, Almashaerh, p49, Alarshieh, p221).

B) Simple truth rule based on personal pantheism.

According to personal pantheism, truth of existent has just one person who has no multiplicity on it, neither lateral nor longitudinal. Other things except than God doesnot exist even as lower degree of existents than God, but they are just this unique truth's showing. Therefore, self existent is simple truth who has all perfections, it means there is nothing outside of him and any perfections belong to him. And it doesnot mean that he has other's perfections and he is toom of other's imperfection and limit directions.

Although, Mulla Sadra's word about explanation of simple truth rule is more about first one(graded explanation basic) and in few items, second one (personal pantheism) has been explained by him. But considering the meaning of simple truth (Refer to Shabi, p52) and Mulla Sadra's new viewpoint about principle of casuality, leads the direction of this rule to personal pantheism.

In fact, Mulla Sadra by presenting the philosophic rule of ((Simple truth of whole things)) and presenting of second explanation, answers to way for association of complete simplicity and self existence's true unity and multiplicity of possible creatures. In the other word, he tries to explain a new explanation of simple truth rule based on personal pantheism (second explanation) and in the other hand, he tries to show this rule as one of proof ways for personal pantheism. Therefore, simple truth principle should be considered as one of most important steps of Hekmateh Motalieh in ontology topic which is a gate way toward true personal pantheism and due to this principle, Mulla Sadra considers self existent as whole of truth whose absolute property of his existence does not let any other thing to be exist neither dependent nor independent one and it is not possible for an effect to be realized except in a showing of cause.

### **Study the reasons for personal pantheism**

We said presnted reasons for personal pantheism before Mulla Sadra, has been hesitated by Mulla Sadra. But, according to Sadra's followers they have presented three reasons for this topic.

1-Reference causality to showing

Mulla Sadra, in the end part of causality explains that why by his explanation of causality, personal pantheism has proved. Abstract of his induction which he has presented in his different books is as following: (Mulla Sadra, 1981, b, p301-209, the same 1982, p49-50).

Introduction 1: causality is the same as cause's essence, because if it is an additonal adjective, cause's essence itself is not cause of possible creation and there is need to another item for being as a cause, therefore casuality of cause is not essential but it is a possibility, so cause of possible creation is not known.

Introduction2: being effective is the same as effect's essence, because if it is an additional adjective for essence, then essence is no more as an effect, then it is casual created or it is maybe dependent in its realization (then it is not an effect or possible existent).

### **Conclusion**

If effect is the same as being effect, then it is cause's effect and sinc cause's effect (causality) is the same as cause's essence, then truth of ffect has no distinct identification and then effect should be considered as cause's showings. According to limitness of existent's nexus in cause and effect system, it is shown that all creatures in fact are refered to one existent who is in fact as an existent and other are his showings.

Some researchers have introduced this induction as (( proof for personal pantheism by studying about effect)) (Javadi Amoli, 1372 , P781-763) and they have considered it as an induction which has passed from graded pantheism and has reached to personal pantheism and they say:

{According to above explanation, effects are considered as cause's adjectives and there is no production relation between description and described, it means that if there is a production relation between the world and the origin, then the world will have a portion of existence, while if there is a description relation, the describing agent will have no portion of existence and therefore person who is outside, will be someone who has showings and epiphanies} (Javadi Amoli, 1376, a, p 498-891).

### **Criticize and study**

It seems that this amount of discussions can not prove more than the existence of relator and it is not shown that why describing agent have no portion of existence. In fact, purpose of showing and epiphany is the same as existence of relator which has no philosophic problem in this way, but there is nothing more than graded epiphany requirement for this. But if purpose of showing and epiphany means that an item which has no portion of existence and it can not be called as an existent then, it is obviously said that all of these showings are null (Javadi Amoli, 1376-B109). and then whole the topic of causality even as a showing meaning will be hesitated, because causality by any meaning, requires for accepting the existence and a reality for effect, although there are few relators:

#### 2- Null of self-existent's limit ness

Another reason which have been considered by someones to prove personal pantheism, is application and paying attention to null of self-existent's limitness and this is called as :((proof for personal pantheism by studying about the cause)) (Javadi Amoli, a, p137, 456,539,584-588, 782-785, Tehrani, 1417, p214-216).

### **Their induction can be presented in three following introductions**

First introduction: Self existent is a limitless existent.

Secodn introduction: Limitless existent doesnot remain place for others' existence.

Conclusion: any other existence which is either independent or the same as relation, can not exist, either longitudinal or traverse.

### **Criticize and study**

It is clear that limitless existent does not remain any place for other existence, in traverse form, but it is questionable why no place in longitudinal form? It seems that in this induction, we are faced to a distinction viewpoint about existents even longitudinal form whereas in graded viewpoint, there is no conflict between limitless for self existent and lower existents in graded pantheism and this is the basic rule of simple truth. It means that according to graded pantheism, other's existents are the same as relation to self existent and they do not limit him any way which conflicts his limitless.

### **Abstraction for existence from self existent without any directions**

It seems that most important rule for personal pantheists is this reason. This reason which most of followers for Hekmate Motaly have presented and it is surprisingly that there is no criticize for it by denier of personal pantheism. The simplest explanation for this is as following:

When we are adaptating a concept as function of its abstraction, Essence of self existent without considering an additional item, is an antitype for concept of ((existen)), but possible existents if they are nature, are according to limit direction, and if their existence is considered, then causality direction, is a concept for existent. Its

meaning is that self existence originally and other existent consequently exist. When, abstraction of a concept needs to an additional adverb for subject, then its verification for that concept also needs the same additional external adverb and therefore, verification of existence for either nature or possible existent is virtual and subordinative and if a scholar or even a Masha philosopher considers verification of derivative for true subject's essence, but theosophist (or philosopher of Motaly) by their accurate hesitate, will consider its verification according to description to state of described as an allowable item))(Javadi Amoli, 1375, B-1375, P25-24, same reference, 1369, p 425, 1398, p595, 596, Qomshei, 1355, p63, Tabatabaiee, 1410, p169-172, same, 1981, p260 Ashtiani, 1370, p165-170, 131 p 158-159).

Explanation of such topic is that we know in philosophy, {beings} are not considered as the same things for example:

1. Human is being.
2. Existence of human is being.
3. Self existent is being.

Discuss about personal pantheism

Now, it's the turn for study about a view which does not accept personal pantheism of Hekmat Motaly. Here, some requirements of personal pantheism, which can be philosophically hesitated are presented and studied. Major topics for this is opposite proof (it refers to a type of proof which uses the opposite side of conclusion to reach to the opposite side of introduction) and it shows that accepting personal pantheism will require acceptance of items which are impossible, (so personal pantheism is impossible).

1. Null of common meaning for existence

According to word which present personal pantheism against graded pantheism, self existent just verificate on self existent and the it is needed- as some philosophers have explained it- for possible things which are Self existent's showing and epiphanies to be null (Javadi Amoli, 1376, b- p109). In the other hand, we, in usual life, call them as beings and therefore there should be a common literally meaning between self existent and possible existents, because:

1<sup>st</sup> introduction: we can not call self existent as a being like we call possible existent as beings.

2<sup>nd</sup> introduction: we call possible existents as beings.

Conclusion: concept of existence is a common literally meaning for self and possible existent.

But it is not an acceptable conclusion, because being concept is a self evident item, which we abstracted from it and if are possible existents, then this concept can not verify on self existents and therefore gate for knowing the self existent is closed and by this shutting, all claims which lead to acceptance of personal pantheism and monopoly of existence for self existence, are also useless words. So while proof for personal pantheism required common literal meaning and after its proof, we should accept common literally meaning. As a result, acceptance of personal pantheism, needs acceptance of contradiction and therefore personal pantheism is invalid.

### **Criticize and study**

It is possible to answer to this question in this way:

((After proof of personal pantheism which is associated by denying of graded ranks of existence, topic is presented in this way that existence has a unique meaning which if refers to Holy Right's essence, it is a true meaning but if it refers to others, then it is a virtual meaning. Of course, this virtual meaning is not a literal one

so as {being} in virtual meaning has other meaning than its true meaning but it is a virtual in its relation-not in its application-, therefore being is used in one meaning in all applications, for example when we see a tree in a mirror and we say it is a tree, we don't have any other means for it except than a true tree. So, tree has one meaning in both states, but relation for this meaning for outside tree is a true meaning ,but relation to the picture of tree which is seen in the mirror is a virtual one.It should be noticed that , this virtual meaning ,itself is a true corrector and this word is a way of unity which has placed between face and showing)(Javadi Amoli, 1372, p250).

#### **Others also answerd to this question in this way**

{concept of existence is application for individuals and it considers that all existence degree is a showing of one principle , in a common literally meaning,but according to existence in essence place, it is irrelevant to things and at last, it is completeness and unity, and existence of possible existent's is virtual existence and the same as relation to Holy Right, while moral common is a literal word, and because of this , it is written in some theosophist's book which is mentioned that existence for self existent and possible exitent is a literally common meaning ,while it is a moral common one) (Ashtiani, 1370, p193).

These two answers requires that meaning and concept of existence also to be a common meaning and there is a difference, which is based on relation and this is because relation is originally and in essence form, and second time it is subordinately. If we want to accept this answer, most things which is possible to say is permission for implying of personal pantheism dose not lead to a different meaning of graded pantheism.

#### **2. Null for equality of thing and being**

Some of followers for personal pantheism have said: ((According to the basic of natur originality, or existence originality, in state of quote to disticition or graded of existence, is categorization to cause and effect or being and existence, but according to the basic of personal pantheism, effect is not antitype of existence, but it is his showing and so, division is a thing which is divided to self existence and his showing))(Javadi Amoli, 1376, a- p 500).

If this word be true, then it requires that we accept null of equality between thing and existence and we accept thing more general than existence which is divided to self existence or showing. Then, either we should accept showing as a null and thing is either null or existence, and it means that concept of thing has a combination of two contradictions (It is associated by existence in one side and it is associated by null in other side), or we should not even accept thing as a null and if so, then we accept something between null and existence and it requires compensation of two contradictions.

#### **Criticize and study**

In most articles by personal pantheists, there s no answer for this problem and it seems that for solution of such problem, we should accept equality between thing and being and if we don't want to reject personal pantheism in its true meaning (which was presented in second induction in b-chapter), then previous solution for the last problem is presented.

Also, as an external antitype for this problem, it is possible to present the next problem, it means:

#### **3. Null of acceptance of knowledge before creation and action knowledge for self existent.**

According to theosophists' way, in personal pantheism, in fact it is not possible to accept knowledge before creation and action knowledge for self existence and this has been clearly discussed among correspondence between Seyed Ahmad Karabalaee and Sheikh Mohammad Hossein Esfahani (Kompani) which was about

meaning of one of poems by Atar Neishaburi. Seyed Ahmad Karbalaee has interpreted Atar's poem in this way:

He, Great Holy, in his High place (absolute essence) does not see or understand anything except himself, since this absolute essence place is before God's name formation and even before place of unity which is total place, so there is no credit for knowledge (Tabatabaee, 1410, p 55).

And Alameh Tabatabaee explains this topic in this way: {equality of knowledge and existence is against their separation and in the other word, proof for knowledge in truth way and proof for objective or virtual shadow existence in a virtual way, are not possible to be combined, since know-ability for something is according to its existence way, if it is true existence, its knowledge is true and if it is virtual, then its knowledge is virtual} (Tabatabaee, 1410, p173).

But according to graded pantheism, existence of beings don't reject other beings and knowledge about self existence belong to its truth.

#### **Criticize and study**

This problem is one of most serious problems for personal pantheism itself, separated from graded pantheism interpretation, causes an important philosophic question. One dimension in this question shows that theosophy essentially tries to prove and relate anything to God's essence, which even sometimes causes God's knowledge. For combination of these two words, Mulla Sadra has said something which requires to refer to theosophist's viewpoint about graded pantheism and because it is more suitable, we will discuss about it in fifth chapter.

#### 4. Acceptance of showing for other without showing for himself

It is said in some words that acceptance of personal pantheism needs possible existence world (World of anything except God) is showing, but they are not the true face, since when it is said that possible things are showings, but they don't exist, in fact they show some other thing and how it is possible for a mere null can show and be epiphany of other thing, in fact acceptance of such thing is opposite to subordinate rule, it means proof for their show is subordinate for their own being as face.

#### **Criticize and study**

It seems it is possible to answer this question in this way, that they are especially outside of subordinate rule, since they are antitype of thing's showing, not other thing's showing, same as the sentence which says: {there is a book} which is especially outside of subordinate rule.

But it is possible to answer this question in this way that, showing needs presence and presence needs abstraction and since {total abstract knows himself} then, having show needs being knower about himself, and this, itself needs himself-show and himself-presence and himself-presence is the same as existence.

Again, it is possible to answer this question in this way that, the rule of {total abstract knows himself} will require gaining what was wanted to be gained, since it is said in this rule, because any abstract's essence is present for himself, then he knows him-self, while here it should be proved that possible beings' essences are present for them and it is questionable.

#### 5 Non-Justifiability of multiplicity

It seems that most important problem for personal pantheism, is null of proper philosophic justification of multiplicity, and it means that if there is one and just one existence, who is just self existence, in the world, then this problem is presented why these multiplicity should be justified? Or we should totally deny multiplicity in

reality which is associated by rejection of thinking principle, since thinking is just meant by two existent of knower and known or we should accept this multiplicity which is associated by rejection of restricting truth in one thing)(Motahari, 1378, p45, Mesbah Yazdi, 1402, p53, Haeri, Yazdi 1361, 112).

### **Criticize and study**

Theosophists, for solving this problem, refer multiplicity as showing and epiphany, it means that there is no true existence than one thing, and skies and earth and whatever between them, is just showings of one unique truth and when this unit being shows himself by the name of Winner(Qafer-in Islamic thought, there are thousand name for God such as Allah, Qafer or Winner, Vajeb Al Vojud or self existent, Baten or Inward, etc. translator), or by the name of Inward, then multiplicity will be vanished. In theosophic's viewpoint, multiplicity are Right's mirror and when the mirrors are broken, there will no change in outside world, and what was seen in the mirror will be considered as a mirage and secret of the world will be shown) (Javadi Amoli, 1375, b543-545).

But it seems that this cannot solve the problem to say that topic has transmitted from existence to showing, since again this question maybe asked that are these epiphanies are really multiple or their multiplicity is a false? If they are really multiple, so multiplicity really exist and if multiplicity is itself a showing, not existence, it cannot solve the problem. Right answer is that Mulla Sadra, himself has explained his different viewpoint about this view and he coped very well to explain multiplicity while accepting of third reason. He, in the end part of causality, in a chapter by the name of (( proof for multiplicity of possible facts)) or clearly explains that purpose for being the truth, is nothing except than being the origin of effects and purpose for multiplicity is the same as number of effects and rule. So, how possible existent has no external truth, he answers in this way:

((any possible existent has two direction: one direction which makes him being and essential existent for the other, because it is existent and essential for other, and according to this, all of beings have equal portion in absolute existence without any difference. And the second direction which their identification is formed and this is due to severity or weakness of existence, therefore possibility for possible existent is due to its lower degree of complete degree of self existent... therefore any possible existent is a combination which is combined from an absolute existence direction, and an occur direction from a formed degree of weakness, here there are few ration considerations:

Considering for possible being's essence in brief form without analysis of these two directions, in which it becomes possible being and in fact an especial extent of beings' extent.

Considering possible existence, due to their absolute being without any formation and limiting to a degree of degrees and extent of extents and this is the same as theosophists' viewpoint which is self existent's truth and it is associated by essential identification and it is the same as possible beings' identification. Since there is no difference between this or that being according to this direction.

Considering possible being's formation, separately from existence nature and this is the same as formation which is mere credit and this is what theosophists consider as a null, this is the possible beings' degree))(Mulla Sadra, 1981, b, p320-321).

And it is surprisingly that even Sir Mohaamad Reza Qomsheiee who is the first and most important followers of Hekmate Motaly also clearly explains that: (( multiplicity of face in existence is also true)) (Qomsheiee, 1355, p46) therefore, it seems that persons who consider a distinction between personal pantheism and graded

pantheism, have not any idea about first and second consideration and according to the first consideration, it is possible to accept an existence for possible being and then accept their multiplicity.

#### 8-force and liberaty

One of the requirements for personal pantheism is that Ashaereh viewpoint has a better understand than Motazeleh viewpoint about human and its action. Since if relation between God and others be as face and showing then anything is in fact his showing and this action should be essential and forever. If so, human action is also a showing and there will no more liberaty for human's action. Ebne Arabi, in the book of Fotohate Makieh, volume4, refers to Ayeh 96 in Sureh Saffat from Quran which says: "And God created you while you didn't know"

And says our action's origin is not our body, but it is a power which God has created it and therefore God related creation action to himself (p20) and continues that most of people don't know about it and Motazeleh have claimed that human is creator of his action and understand their power but they forgot creator of such power.

#### Conclusion

Pantheism was a thesis which was at first presented by theosophists but at first, they had no philosophic interpratition without any problem and even philosophers of Hekmat Motaly had criticized some of theosophists' reasons. Then philosophers tried to present some philosophic reasons for this claim and Mulla Sadra is most important philosopher among them who explained it philosophically. But there were some statements in his books which gradually caused different viewpoints among his interpreters. Some consider graded pantheism as an acceptable philosophic explanation for theosophy pantheism and other believe that acceptance of graded pantheism in Hekmate Motaly is just a bridge to reach to the final destination of such theory which means acceptance of personal pantheism and rejection of and any other existence even existence of relation except Self existent-Holy God.

For judgina among these two viewpoint, we at first presents some Hekmat Motaly Follower's viewpoint about personal pantheism, which is considered as a higher one than graded pantheism. Three reasons have been presented by them: on is based on refering cause to showing, second one applies un-limitness for self existence and third one is based on abstraction of self existence from any direction. Philosophic study has showed that these first two reasons, philosophically are unable to be as a prove for such claim and there is just third reason which can have some idea about it. These ration was an accurate attention to difference between quality of verification of existence on possible and self existent, i.e it showed that being at forst is verified on self existent and if it is about possible existent it is a subordinate and consequent form of existence. This idea is an important conjunction is an important problem which makes graded pantheism deeper than personal pantheism than it was at first seemed.

#### Reference

- (1) Holy Quran
- (2) Amoli, Haider, (1990), Jameol Al Asrar va Manbaol Al Anvar, Ministry of Culture and Higher Education, Scientific and Cultural Publications, Tehran, Iran.
- (3) Fanari, Muhammad bin Hamza Al-Anasi, (1996), (described of Mafatih AlGheib), Molly Press, Tehran, Iran.

- (4) Farabi, (1985), *Fusus al-Hikam*, Bidar Press, Qom, Iran.
- (5) Hallaj, Hussein ibn Mansur, (2000), collection of Hallaj, Yadavaran Press, Tehran, Iran.
- (6) Ibn Arabi, (1918), *Anshaol Aldavaer*, Leiden press, Iran.
- (7) Ibn Arabi, (1980), *Fusus al-Hikam*, Beirut Press.
- (8) Ibn Arabi, (1997), *Book Alya' the treatises of Ibn Arabi, the efforts of Mohammad Shahabdin Arabi*, Beirut.
- (9) Ibn Arabi, (1997), *Ketab Al Azal, the treatise Ibn Arabi, the efforts of Mohammad Shahabuddin Arabi*, Beirut.
- (10) Ibn Arabi, (2000), *Shrkh Fusus al-Hikam, vol 1*, Qom, Iran.
- (11) Ibn Arabi, *Alfetohat Almkyh, vol 4*, Beirut Press.
- (12) Ibn Sina, Hussein, (1984), *Alshfa' (Alalhyat)*, Ayatollah Mktbh Almrshy Press, Qom, Iran.
- (13) Ibn Sina, Hussein, (1997), *Alashfa' (Almntq)*, research Hassanzadeh Amoli, Islamic Propagation Office, Qom, Iran.
- (14) Ibn Tarke, (1982), *Tamhidol Al Qavaed*, Ministry of Culture and Higher Education Press, Tehran, Iran.
- (15) Javadi Amoli, A, (1998), *Described Transcendental Philosophy*, Zahra Publications, Tehran, Iran.
- (16) Javadi Amoli, A, (2003), *Rahigh Makhtom*, Asra Center Publishing, Qom, Iran.
- (17) Jundi, M, described of *Fusus al-Hikam, no place, no frustration, no to (software mysticism)*.
- (18) Kashani, (1992), *Fusus al-Hikam*, Bidar Press, Qom, Iran.
- (19) Majlesi, Mohammad, (1984), *Behar al-Anwar, vol 4, 3*, Alvafa' Institute. Beirut.
- (20) Mulla Sadr, (1981), *Alasfar, Dare haya' Atras Arabi*, Beirut.
- (21) Parsa, M, (1987), *Fusus al-Hikam*, Center for Academic Publication, Tehran, Iran.
- (22) Plotinus, (1993), *Asolojiya, initial research Rahman, , Bidar Press, Qom, Iran.*
- (23) Qaiser, (1997), describes the *Fusus al-Hikam, inappropriate*, Scientific and Cultural Publishing Company, Tehran, Iran.
- (24) Sabzevari, (1981), *Talighati Shavahed al Rebobiyeh, correction and suspension Seyed Jalal al- Ashtiani*, Center, University Press, Mashhad, Iran.
- (25) Sabzevari, (1990), *Description Almnzomeh, correction and suspension Ayatollah Hassanzadeh Amoli and dedicated R & M Talebi publishing original*, Tehran, Iran.
- (26) Sabzevari, (2004), *Asrar Al-Hakam, with an introduction by Professor Karim Sadoughi Feizi, the religious press*, Qom, Iran.
- (27) Sadoq, Abu Ja'far, (1978), *Altohid*, Islamic Publishing Institute, Qom, Iran.
- (28) Shahabi, Mahmoud, (1976), *Alnazrah Aldaqiqeh Fe Basit Al Haqiqeh*, Iran Philosophy Society, Tehran, Iran.
- (29) Tosi, N, (1962), *Resal fi Haghigha Alvejoed*, Qom, Iran.