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Abstract

According to Sadra, the relationship between possible beings and the Necessary Being is dependency. He believes that all other Muslim philosophers before him, including Jalal al-Din Davani understood this relationship to be relational. However, Davani, who in his works holds that the relation between the cause and the effect is a kind of “attribution”, explains this relation in two different forms, the first of which is known as the theory of Zawq al-Ta’alluh (Inclination to Divinity); from his views in this regard one can mostly conclude the relationality of possible beings. In the second form he uses the concept of emanation instead of causality and the notion of the source of attributions (Um al-Nisab) to more precisely explain the concept of “attribution” and considers it to be synonymous with manifestation and emanation in a way that one can say Davani’s view corresponds to that of Sadra concerning personal unity. In this paper, firstly it is shown that the second approach to Davani’s view is a more complete and precise one and secondly, it is concluded that two matters caused Sadra to believe that Davani considered possible beings to be relational beings: Davani’s unsuccessful explanation of his intended meaning and Sadra’s inattention to the second form of the explanation of “attribution”.
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Introduction
Jalal al-Din Davani (830-908 sh) was one of the philosopher’s of the Shirazi school of thought who is mostly known for his theory of Inclination to Divinity. In this theory, he describes the type of existence of possible beings in relation to God by using the concept of attribution; and because he has likened possible beings to the accident, it is said that he considers the existence of possible beings to be types of attributive or relational existences; but, considering the meaning he intended and his extensive works, a higher meaning can be found for the concept of attribution and the type of existence of possible beings which is close to the views of Sadra in this regard, whereas this meaning has not been given due attention.

A Summary of the Article
Two views can be mentioned in the discussion of the type of existence of possible beings in relation to the Necessary Being: relational and dependent existence. Sadra claims that he is the first person to believe in the dependency of possible beings and holds that philosophers before him, including Jalal al-Din Davani believe possible beings to be relational beings. But a study of the works of Jalal al-Din Davani shows traces of belief in the dependency of possible beings.

Multiple articles have been printed in an attempt to converge between Davani’s theory of Inclination to Divinity and Sadra’s views; for example: “Personal Unity According to Davani”, by Hossein Muhammed Khani; “A Comparative Study of the Philosophical Explanation of Personal Unity of Existence According to Davani and Sadra”, by Baqer Hossein Lou and Hamed Naji; “A Study of the theory of Inclination to Divinity Concerning Unity of Existence”, by Mahmoud Qayumzadeh; “Causality According to Jalal al-Din Davani and Sadra”; but regarding the concept of Davani’s “attribution” also an article has been written by Munizheh Palangi titled: “Attribution Theory in Davani’s Thought”, in which they have compared this concept to Aristotle’s “homonyms in a single attribution” and Sadra’s “Illuminationist Affixation”. But in the present paper more proofs and more extensive analysis of the concept of “attribution” and particularly the concept of the source of attributions has been accumulated through study of more of Davan’s sources and works, including a commentary which was written by one of his students in the treatise of al-Zowra’.

By distinguishing between his explanations concerning the theory of Inclination to Divine and theory of emanation and on the other hand, distinguishing the theory of specific gradational existence and Sadra’s theory of personal unity, the concept of “source of attributions” in the theory of emanation was identified as being equivalent and consistent with dependent existence in Sadra’s personal unity idea. Accordingly, first the distinction between relational and dependent existence has been addressed and Sadra’s intent regarding the dependency of the effect has been explained; in the next step, through study of other evidence and views in Davani’s
works, the concept of attribution has been analyzed and we specify whether relational existence or dependent existence can be deduced according to Davani’s concept of attribution.

The concept of attribution in Davani’s views has been explained in two forms and the second form completes the first. In the first form, Davani presents an initial and vague concept of attribution. He considers existence to be limited only to God and on the hand is faced with multiplicities which he cannot consider as existing and neither can he refute them. Therefore, he uses the concept of attribution in order to provide this meaning. But in the second form, he presents attribution with the concept of initial relation and limits it to the relationship between God and other than Him and considers it to be synonymous with manifestation and emanation. But Sadra, as the inventor of the theory of considering possible beings to be dependent, believes that Davani’s writings confirm the relationality of existence, whereas he has not mentioned anything of the second form of attribution; this is while that theory is totally correspondent with Sadra’s theory of manifestation and the explanation of personal unity in regards to dependent existence.

Ultimately, it must be sad that even though Davani’s intent and meaning of attribution corresponds with dependent existence (according to Sadra’s personal unity theory), however, one cannot claim that his words are equal to that of Sadra’s; because, one cannot find the discipline and cohesiveness of Sadra’s Transcendental Philosophy in Davani’s works, which is why he has not been successful in explaining some terms and examples.
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