

INVESTIGATION OF INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF HUMAN PSYCHE IN IDEAS OF RHAZES*Seyedmohammadreza Azarkasb,**Master Islamic philosophy and theology, Imam Sadiq University, Tehran, Iran
Smra7292@gmail.com**Dr. Seyedheydar Azarkasb,**PhD philosophy of Education, Department of Education, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran.
azarkasbseyedheydar@gmail.com**Sara Nikkhahberenjabadi,**Master Psychology, Azad University, Tehran, Iran
Saranikkhah2@gmail.com*

Abstract. In this research, viewpoints of Rhazes about knowing human psyche have investigated in these sections: human creation, structure of the soul's parts, relationship between soul and body, reason's position, mental health of human, social aspect of human psyche and situation after death. The method of this paper is documentary analysis and reviewing of library resources. The statistical society of this research is accessible historical resources, works and documents such as three valuable remained works of Rhazes (al-Tib al-Rouhani, al-Sirah al-Falsafiah and Akhlaq al-Tabib). In addition, the researches about him are used to understand his lifetime's situations and apprehension of his works. About human's creation, Rhazes believes that soul belonged to a transcendental world before its merging with matter, and was uncreated. Rhazes -like many of Islamic philosophers- holds that reason is the distinguisher between human and animal and it deserves to command other two faculties. He mixed this idea -that was taken from Plato- with the idea of moderation -which was taken from Aristotle- to make the theory of balance of faculties. In Rhazes opinion, if the balance of these faculties be disorders and one of them does an extreme act, the human's soul will become sick. In his view, the way to treat these diseases is to interact with others and to use them as a mirror for his soul. The utopia of Rhazes is a society in which individual and collective wisdom is dominant. He posed a remarkable theory about gaining pleasure and introduced it as process of returning to natural state. From Rhazes viewpoint, death is the soul's salvation of matter's prison and soul's comeback to his transcendental world.

Keywords: Rhazes, Anthropology, Soul's Faculties, Relationship Between Soul and Body, Social Aspect of Human Psyche.

1. Introduction

Viewpoints of Rhazes about knowing human psyche have not investigated independently and unitedly in works about Rhazes specially in these sections: human's creation, structure of the human soul's faculties, relationship between soul and body, reason's position, mental health of human, the problem of how to gain pleasure, social aspect of human psyche and situation after death. Research on Rhazes is a long-standing one, but about knowing the individual and social aspects of human psyche in his works there is not enough researches. For example, Europeans in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance only considered the medical aspect of the Rhazes, and just in the last two centuries they also noticed to his philosophical and moral ideas (Azkaei, 2003: 39&40).

Muhammad bin Yahya bin Zakaria who was famous for Rhazes was born in 865AD/251AH in Ray and passed away in 925AD/313AH there (Mohaghegh, 1973: 4&7). He had taught philosophy from Balkhi -as Ibn-Nadim said- and from Iranshahri -as Naser Khosrow said- (Safa, 1964: 421). Rhazes considered himself as a follower of Plato's ideas, and in fact his opinions have a perfect harmony with ideas that are attributed to Plato (Pines, 1946: 68&69). He theorized about utopia following Plato, too. His philosophy is also near to Pythagoras, Democritus and the wisdom of ancient Iran (Safa, 1964: 422). However, according to the situations of his time, he was the most open-minded thinker of the Islamic era or perhaps of all human history (Sharif, 1983: 632). Rhazes was considered the philosopher of reason and experience, and his philosophy was a completely humanistic philosophy that merged with reality (Rhazes, 1977: 5&7), he only relied on arguing reason and has considered the virtue of reason at the beginning of the book "al-Tib al-Rouhani¹" (Sharif, 1983: 618). In the social aspect, Rhazes believed in the authority of collective wisdom and considered interaction with others to be the way of mental health. Accordingly, the investigation of his philosophical components -including aspects of knowing the human psyche in his viewpoints- is a matter of concern.

2. Literature and Background

De Boer was the first European researcher that understood the philosophical significance of the works of Rhazes and wrote some articles about it (Azkaei, 2003: 41). A number of Orientalists followed him, including Paul Kraus who published "al-Sirah al-Falsafiah²" and "al-Tib al-Rouhani" and some of other works of Rhazes in 1939 at Cairo.

In the Muslim world, people like al-Biruni, Ibn al-Nadim, al-Qifti, Ibn Abi Usaibia, al-Majriti and Ibn Khallikan pointed out to his works (Faramarz Qaramaleki, 2013: 237), but in the eastern part of the Muslim world, the name of Rhazes was forgotten due to the Mongols' burning and mastery of the Ismailists (Azkaei, 2003: 39&40). In Iran, historians wrote more than philosophers about Rhazes (P.44). In the last century, Abbas Eqbal Ashtiani translated the book "al-Sirah al-Falsafiah" to Persian, Dr. Mahmoud Najmabadi collected the Rhazes works and noticed to his medical aspect, Dr. Mehdi Mohaghegh wrote the book "philosopher of Ray" about Rhazes and Dr. Parviz Azkaei translated the book "al-Tib al-Rouhani" to Persian and noticed to various aspects of the natural and philosophical wisdom of Rhazes in his book, "Hakim Razi".

3. Research Methodology

In this research, the method of documentary analysis and reviewing of library resources has been used. We tried to investigate a comprehensive review of ideas of Rhazes on knowing individual and social aspects of human psyche by analyzing his main texts and works about him. Statistical community of this research is available historical resources and documents, such as three valuable books left by Rhazes ("Akhlāq al-Tabīb³", "al-Sirah al-Falsafiah" and "al-Tib al-Rouhani") as well as quotes from him in other books. In addition, some of the researches about him that wrote in Persian, Arabic and English have been read for a better understanding of the situations of his time and the meaning of his texts.

4. Findings Concerning Knowing Human Psyche in Viewpoints of Rhazes

Rhazes has investigated anthropological issues as the study of human soul or "Ilm al-Nafs⁴" in many parts of his books. He had two books, namely "al-Nafs al-Saghir⁵" and "al-Nafs al-Kabir⁶" (al-Biruni, 1992: 14) which disappeared today unfortunately. If we study these books, we would understand his views about knowing human psyche better than now. We will investigate some viewpoints of Rhazes in four sections:

Viewpoints on human creation

Viewpoints on human soul's faculties

Viewpoints on relationship between soul and body

Viewpoints on social aspects of human psyche

Viewpoints on soul's situation after death

4.1. Viewpoints on Human Creation

Rhazes has not spoken in detail about the creation of human beings in his works, however his books in this field may have destroyed. There is a book called "Fi Khalq al-Insan⁷" attributed to the Rhazes about this subject, but Paul Kraus refused this hypothesis (Najmabadi, 1992: 277). It seems that Rhazes had another book named "Fi Anna Lil Insan Khaliqan Motqanan Hakima⁸" (Mohaghegh, 1973: 112), which is not available today. Despite this, there are some quotes from Rhazes in the field of creation of human beings specially in the matter of transduction of soul in matter. First of all, it should be noted that Rhazes believed that five things are eternal and increate: God, soul, time, place and material. Some researchers believe that Rhazes had taken this belief from ancient Persia, but he changed Devil to soul (P.286). Rhazes knew the general soul as the increate, the living and the effective (Halabi, 2003: 126), which is the cause of the will of God for creation of the world (Sharif, 1983: 623). In this view, the ignorant soul merged with material before creation, to gain physical pleasure, so God created the world. The soul moved into the human body and forgot about its original world (Hosseini Shahroudi, 2014: 13). There are other ideas about the Rhazes theory of soul. Some believe that the root of this belief is in the teachings of Manichaeism (Corbin, 1982: 190). Some hold that Rhazes believed that at first, the nature of light -which is the spiritual essence and substance of soul- created, and then animal soul created from this light's shadow (De Boer, 1903: 79). Others believe Rhazes -like Plato- considered ideas in human beings from their birth, so they only remind these facts (Badawi, 1993: 239). It seems that the last belief is consistent with his famous theory of soul.

4.2. Viewpoints on Relationship Between Soul and Body

Rhazes believed that after transduction of soul in body, soul manages the relationship between itself and the body, therefore he coined the term "al-Tib al-Rouhani" (De Boer, 1903: 78). This term became popular among scholars after Rhazes (Mohaghegh, 1973: 156). He believed that a physician should also be a psychiatrist, because the physical situation is the

2. Philosophical Biography

3. Ethics of Physician

4. Knowledge of Soul

5. Diminutive Soul

6. Great Soul

7. On Human Creation

8. To Prove That Human Has a Wise Skillful Creator

result of a person's psychological state (Fakhouri, 1994: 357). According to Rhazes view, the patient's listen to the physician provides a cure for his illness (Ibn Khallikan, 1987, p.5, 158).

Rhazes adhered to this method in practice. He personally visited his patients and gave them definite remarkable salary (Ibn Nadim, 2002: 531). He has a treatise named "Akhlaq al-Tabib" that Abdul Latif Muhammad ibn Razi has corrected it. This treatise is a letter to his disciple Abu Bakr ibn Qareb Razi who was special physician of one of the rulers of Khorasan (Rhazes, 1977: 11). He taught his student to behave kindly and talk beautifully with patients and to avoid violence against them (P.84). This advice indicates the importance of the physician's behavior to the patient in his treatment. Rhazes also quoted from one of his patients that when a doctor arrives in the patient's house, the patient feels a unique comfort (P.88). These sentences show that, in Rhazes viewpoint, the states of the soul have a wide impact on the health of the body.

4.3. Viewpoints on Human Soul's Faculties

Rhazes followed Plato's theory of soul and divided it into three parts: Logos (reason), Thymos (anger) and Eros (desire) (Sharif, 1983: 630). In his opinion, the position of the Logos is the brain, the position of the Thymos is the heart, and the position of Eros in the liver; however, brain is just a tool for thinking, so mental actions take place in the substance in which it is transduced (Mohaghegh, 1973: 176), so Rhazes did not deny the immortality of the soul.

In the theory of spiritual medicine, working too little or too much of each of these parts causes some problems in soul and body. Working too much by Eros causes indolence but working too little by Eros leads to physical weakness. Working too much by Thymos causes injustice to others while working too little by Thymos leads to inefficiency. Working too much by Logos causes asceticism whereas working too much by Logos leads to foolishness (Mohaghegh, 1973: 176&177). Rhazes believed that in a philosophical and wise life, man observes the moderation between the two extremes, he lives neither so ascetic that harms himself physically and psychologically nor so much in pleasure that his intellect destroys and he causes annoying others (Sharif, 1983: 629). In the following, we investigate viewpoints of Rhazes in the position of Logos as the most important part of the soul, the subject of pleasure as the goal of the Thymos and Eros and mental health of man which, in fact, is the balance of faculties:

A. Viewpoints on the Position of Reason

Measuring everything with the criterion of reason by Rhazes and his humanism are comparable to western scholars such as Michel de Montana (Azkaei, 2005: 262). In Rhazes opinion, reason is the greatest gift of God for human because he understands the world by it, therefore we should put the reason in the position of ruler (Mohaghegh, 1973: 166&167). Rhazes considered reason as the juror in all problems (Badawi, 1993: 236) and he assumed it sufficient to distinguish between good and bad. Rhazes believed that Logos of all human beings are the same and differences are due to different educations (Sharif, 1983: 628).

In viewpoint of Rhazes, the most important human superiority over animals is the ability of will and doing work after thinking (Rhazes, 2002: 6), therefore he should not allow his Eros and Thymos to control himself. Rhazes believed that a real philosopher is one that think carefully before doing everything (Mohaghegh, 1973: 170). In fact, philosophy is the similarity of man to God as much as human ability and this means self-purification (Rhazes, 1992: 100).

Rhazes states three criteria to know if the reason is ruling or not: the assessment of the consequences of a work in terms of the amount of suffering and pleasure and to choose more pleasure and less suffering, notice to the mediocrity based on the Platonic view and the enjoyment of gifts of the world (Faramarz Qaralameki, 2010: 24). In his opinion, desire takes us to follow unstable pleasures, but our reason calls for more permanent enjoyments (Najmabadi, 1939: 278).

Rhazes believed that Socrates, whom he called the leader of philosophers, suffered working too much in philosophy and used his Logos more than a healthy man at the beginning of his life, but at the end of his life he moderated in thinking and acted in community effectively (Rhazes, 1992: 90&91). However, Rhazes acknowledged that philosophers live in poverty, though they do not ignore necessities of the life and avoid austerity (P.100).

B. Viewpoints on the Problem of Pleasure

The most important problem in "al-Sirah al-Falsafiah" and whole Rhazes viewpoints is permanent enjoyments (Eqbal Ashtiani, 1935: 655). At first, Rhazes investigated the definition of pleasure to understand what the permanent enjoyment is. He defined pleasure as a negative concept, and pain as a positive concept (Halabi, 2002: 126&127). In other words, he assumed enjoyment as the end of pain and returning to normal condition (Sharif, 1983: 631). It seems that Rhazes adapted his theory from Plato via Galan (Mohaghegh, 1973: 248).

Some may think that Rhazes hold that the normal state of man is enjoyment of life and assumed pain a disruption in this normal state, but this belief is not perfect. It is true that he considered pain getting out of the normal state, but he did not recognize to remain in the normal state as the permanent pleasure; even he believed that when pleasure continues for a while it will change to pain (Rosenthal, 1975: 103). In Rhazes opinion, the pain is getting out of the normal state and pleasure is returning to it, so pleasure comes after pain because, if man does not go out of a natural state, he could not return to it (Mohaghegh, 1973: 241). Therefore, according to Rhazes viewpoint, returning from an abnormal state to the normal

state is pleasing. This belief of Rhazes reminds us this verse of the Holy Qur'an: "With hardship comes ease"⁹ (Surah al-Inshirah, verse6)

Rhazes believed that the source of many of human's problems is a misunderstanding about the concept of pleasure (Faramarz Qaramlaki, 2010: 25). For example, human desire only considers the unstable pleasure and does not consider pains after that pleasure, so reason which can predict subsequent pains, should take control of the human will. According to Rhazes theory, sometimes reason should prevent pleasure even in cases that there is no subsequent pain, because excesses in pleasurable activities lead to destroy their pleasure. In addition, if Logos follows Eros, even in harmless cases, it will accustom to this adherence, so the position of the ruler and obedient will change (Mohaghegh, 1973: 171&172). According to this issue, Rhazes believed when a pleasure seeker faces hardness, he pains more than others (Rhazes, 1992: 98).

In Rhazes opinion, painning others is an immoral act except in a situation that that pain saves them from a greater pain. That pain not only is permissible but also is obligatory. A clear example of this issue is the medical profession, especially the surgery (P.95), which Rhazes was an expert in it.

Rhazes believed that those who enjoy rational pleasures reluctantly pleased with sensual pleasures (Najmabadi, 1992: 202). In his view, sensuality and lechery is not rational, because it causes some unachievable pleasures to person wishes. Philosophers believe that humans have less ability in lechery than animals, so their perfection is not in sensuality (Mohaghegh, 1973: 173). In fact, a human being can never achieve all his desires because he imagines and thinks about unachievable pleasures, so he upsets due to lack of them (P.174).

C. Viewpoints on the Human's Mental Health

In Rhazes opinion, mental health means rule of the reason on human will and the threat of the position of reason by other faculties causes mental illnesses. He believed that the basic state of human is healthy, but the soul due to the internal or external factors can become sick (Faramarz Qaramaleki, 2010: 23). In al-Tib al-Rouhani, he has mentioned a number of these diseases, such as love, egoism, envy, anger, lie, sting, unnecessary worry, grief, greed, lechery, etc. He also has written how these diseases could be treated (Mohaghegh, 1973: 200-193).

Rhazes denounced love, because in his opinion love makes lover pain more than pleasure (P.193). However, this opinion was about human love and of course he thought like his master Plato in spiritual love (P.195).

Rhazes proposed a way to understand soul diseases which is use of another person as a mirror for himself. In this method, everyone knows his defects by notifications of his friends and fellows, so he assumes them as a mirror for his own soul. (Faramarz Ghalamaleki, 2010: 26). He believed, like Plato and Galen, that since everyone loves himself, he cannot simply see his imperfections, so others can better show his defects (Mohaghegh, 1973: 187).

This issue exists in Islamic teachings. For example, there is a quote from Prophet Muhammad states that each believer is like a mirror for other believers, so if he sees a defect in one of them he will correct his defect (Bukhari, 1994: 120). There is another quote from Imam Sadiq states that, anyone that tells me my defects as a gift is my best friend (Kulayni, 1990:236).

4.4. Viewpoints on Social Aspect of Human Psyche

It is expected that a philosopher and physician like Rhazes had some ideas about society as well. This point has shown itself in Rhazes suggesting way for treatment of mental illnesses which is use of mirroring feature; because in this way, the patient need to help of other people in the community to treat himself. Rhazes believed in the utopia influenced by Greek philosophy, and this belief also influenced Farabi's works (Azkaei, 2005: 689). In Rhazes opinion, utopia is city dominated by wisdom (P.729). Rhazes was influenced by Manichaeism in his utopia (P.692). Unlike the mainstream authority in Iran in most periods of history, he did not believe in the divine approval for rulers (P.706). In fact, Rhazes used the reasonable parts of ancient Iran in his theory, but he rejected unreasonable parts of it. He believed that the ruler of the utopia should be a philosopher, influenced by Plato's "Laws" (P.694). However, Rhazes did not consider people to be intellectually different, and believed that humans have the same rational power (P.718&719). Accordingly, he believed that the education of people is the duty of the ruler. In fact, he held that in utopia all human beings must learn philosophy and act wisely (P.726). It is clear that if Rhazes utopia have existed, we would be closer to the world peace now.

4.5. Viewpoints on Human Soul's Position After Death

Some researchers hold that Rhazes believed in the post-death world, however some others hold that Rhazes denied the resurrection. Finally based on the words of Ibn Nadim and Ibn Abi Usaibia, it seems that he is different from other philosophers in the way of resurrection (spiritual or physical) (Mohaghegh, 1973: 112).

The post-death world in Rhazes view seems to be the same as the pre-birth world which soul lived there. This idea exists in a poem of Rumi that states we have been in heaven, we have been the compeer of angels, and we will return there because there is our homeland (Rumi, 1997: 212). Rhazes believed that only people who recall his transcendental world by

⁹ ان مع العسر يسرا.

learning wisdom and philosophy can free from the material world (Hosseini Shahroudi, 2014: 14). He believed that the soul was placed in the human body to be activated and to reach the transcendental world and the only way to reach this world is to learn philosophy (Pines, 1946: 59). Rhazes held that permanent enjoyment exists in post-death world. He believed that the perfection of man is not obtaining physical pleasures as Eros commands, but his perfection is to free from this world and go to the world which there is no pain there as the Logos tells him (Rhazes, 1992: 92). In Rhazes view, the true philosopher avoids the pleasures that harm the reason, morality and prefer knowledge and justice, because they lead to real pleasure after death (Eqbal Ashtiani, 1935: 656). In his opinion, everyone prefers limited and unstable pleasure of this world to unlimited and permanent enjoyment of that world, will loses. (Rhazes, 1992: 93). He believed that the fear of death is irrational, because if a person believes in another world, he must be pleased of transfer to a better world, and if he considers the death the end of life, then he must be happy for end of this suffering world (Sharif, 1983: 632). He believed that human soul after death will live similar to their lives in this world in pleasure and pain (Najmabadi, 1939: 277). Some researchers hold that Rhazes believed in the soul's reincarnation so that at least some of the souls after death transduce in a new body. It has said that he believed -following Plato- that the soul would be released at the time of death if it had acquired rational perfections, otherwise it transduces in another body (Hosseini Shahroudi, 2014: 14). He also believed that killing animals is allowed because this act bring their souls to a higher level of humanity (Arberry, 1957, 38). However, this act must take place in a tolerated way, not brutal way that is more than necessity (Eqbal Ashtiani, 1992: 97).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Mentioned results show that Rhazes -influenced by his main profession that is medicine – has a therapeutic view to human soul. Accordingly, Dr. Faramarz Qaramaleki stated that Rhazes moral system is the first moral system of the Islamic era which is based on the theory of health (Faramarz Qaramaleki, 2010: 20). It seems that the axis of this system is the human soul, which Rhazes investigated it from creation to death. He believed that duty of the philosopher -the physician of the soul- is to treat soul's diseases. At this section, we will discuss the results and conclude some ideas:

5.1. Viewpoints on Human Creation

If human creation means creation of the general soul that Rhazes assumed it increate and eternal, it can be said that he did not speak about its creation. But if human creation means beginning of relationship between soul and body, it can be said that he considered the general soul and the primary material as two increate and eternal substances that connected at the beginning of the world by God. This connection changed inorganic material into living body that his life depends on the soul. Rhazes considered soul as the real ego of human, so it seems that he is not happy with the connection between the soul and the body, because this connection has taken soul away from his original world. Hence, he has described transduction of soul in body as "ignorantly being deceived". However, his exact theory in this subject is still ambiguous, but some of the aspects of his viewpoints are clear like soul existence in a transcendental world before its transduction in the body and being increate of soul.

5.2. Viewpoints on Relationship between Soul and Body

As mentioned above, Rhazes believed in a close relationship between soul and body, so that he held that a physician should also be a psychiatrist and knows the interactions between soul and body. It seems that Rhazes believed that the impact of soul is more than body in this relationship, because he investigated impact of mental state and factors on physical health more than impact of physical state and factors on mental health. However, when he said that tedium of pleasure leads to its absence, he investigated an external factor of pleasure which is a physical factor.

It seems that Rhazes believed in dualism in the problem of relationship between soul and body. This kind of dualism considers the soul as the ruler of this relationship. He believed that the soul should not only remember its transcendental world in this connection, but also use this connection to return to that world. Accordingly, Corbin mentioned that Rhazes considered awareness of people who do not care their origin as duty of philosophers (Corbin, 1982: 192).

5.3. Viewpoints on the Human Soul's Faculties

Rhazes considered Logos as the faculty that deserved to dominate other faculties. He, like many Islamic philosophers, believed that reason is the most important things, which distinguishes between human and animal. He merged this idea -that adapted it from Plato- with the idea of Aristotle's mediocrity and posed the theory of faculties balance. In Rhazes opinion, when the balance of this faculties collapses, and the demands of one of them dominate, the human soul becomes sick and needs treatment. He posed an interesting idea about pleasure and introduced it as a process of returning to normal state. It can be concluded that he considered adventurous life more enjoyable than invariable life, because you have to get out of the normal state to return to it. Generally, he considered intellectual pleasures better than sensual pleasures.

5.4. Viewpoints on Social Aspect of Human Psyche

It seems that Rhazes wanted a utopia in which the wisdom of men rules over their relations and the wisest person rulers the society. He believed that the philosopher deserves to rule over people, just as reason deserves to rule over other parts of human's soul. However, he believed that this should not prevent ordinary people from learning wisdom and philosophy. In

his view, following of the wisdom of the crowd causes the growth of society, just as following reason that causes mental health for human.

5.5. Viewpoints on Human Soul's Position After Death

In Rhazes opinion, death is the point of soul liberation from the body and an opportunity for it to return to its transcendental universe. However, as mentioned above, some researchers believe that Rhazes believed in reincarnation, but this is consistent with liberation theory. Theory of Rhazes can be in following way: If a person at the time of death has remembered his transcendental world, he will transmit to it, but if he fascinated by the material world and does not grow enough, he will transduce to another body to reach the necessary level to free from this world. He believed there is no reason to fear death, because death is a point of relief from pain. It seems that Rhazes believed that after death the soul goes to a world in which there is no pain. Since Rhazes defined pleasure as the absence of pain, the greatest possible pleasure in the post-death world can be achieved. But if we consider another part of his definition that defines pleasure as return to normal state, then since the soul does not go away from the normal state in post-death world to return to it, there is no enjoyment there. It seems that this part of Rhazes viewpoint, like his opinion in the creation of human, is not clear.

Suggestions. It seems that viewpoints of Rhazes on the understanding of human psyche and his mental health can be elaborated more. His views in each of these sections may be the subject of an article. In addition, some of these views can be compared with other similar philosophers and religions views. Furthermore, some other ideas can be investigated in his works. For example, his utilitarianism in problem of the criterion of moral acts -Which takes into account the profits of all human beings and leads to world peace and peaceful coexistence- and his dualism in the problem of relationship between soul and body can be investigated.

References

1. The Holy Quran
2. Arberry, A.J. (1957). *Revelation and Reason in Islam*. London.
3. Azkaei (Sepitman), P. (2003). *Ayene-ye Miras Journal: Razi Shenasi dar Asr-e Hazer*. No.22. Autumn 2003. P. 38 – 52.
4. Azkaei (Sepitman), P. (2005). *Hakim Razi (Hekmat-e Tabiei va Nezam-e Falsafi); Muhammad bin Zakaria Sairafi*. Second Edition. Tehran: Tarheno Publication.
5. Badawi, A. (1993). *min Tarikh al-Ilhad fi al-Islam*. Cairo: Sina Publication.
6. Biruni, Abourayhan Muhammad ibn Ahmad (1992). *Fehrest-e Ketabha-ye Razi va Namha-ye Ketabha-ye Biruni*. Corrected and Translated by Mehdi Mohaghegh. Tehran: University of Tehran Publication.
7. Bukhari, Muhammad bin Isma'il (1994). *Sahih al-Adab al-Mufrad*. Corrected by Muhammad Nasser al-Din Albani. al-Jubayl: Maktabah al-Dujayl.
8. Corbin, H. (1982). *Tarikh Falsafe-ye Eslami*. Translated by Asadollah Mobasheri. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publication.
9. De Boer, T. J. (1903). *The History of philosophy in Islam*. Translated by Edward R. Jones. London: Luzac.
10. Eqbal Ashtiani, A. (1935). *Mehr Journal: Maqam-e Muhammad bin Zakaria Razi Dar Falsafe*. No.31. December 1935. P.649 - 659
11. Fakhuri, H. (1994). *Tarikh-e Falsafe dar Jahan-e Eslam*. Translated by Abdolmuhammad Ayati. Tehran: Elmi Farhangi Publication.
12. Faramarz Gharamaleki, A. (2012). *Ayene-ye Miras Journal: Tabaqebandi-e Jaryanha-ye Razi shenasi dar Iran va Gharb*. No. 50. Spring and Summer 2012, P.235 -250
13. Faramarz Gharmaleki, A. (2010). *Ensanpajuhi-e Dini Journal: Nazarye-ye Ensan-e Salem dar Nezam-e Akhlaqi-e Razi*. No. 24. Autumn and Winter 2010, P.19-33.
14. Halabi, A.A. (2002). *Tarikh-e Falasefe-ye Irani*. Tehran: Zavar Publication.
15. Hosseini Shahrودي, S.M, & Rastin, A. (2014). *Amuzeha-ye Falsafe-ye Eslami Journal: Barrasi-e Dorosti-e Entesab-e Tanasokh be Suhrawardi va Zakaria Razi ba Tekia bar Asar*. No. 14. Spring and Summer 2014. P.3-22.
16. Ibn Khallikan, Shams al-Din Ahmed (1978). *Wafiyat al-Ayan wa Anba Abna al-Zaman*. Corrected by Ehsan Abbas. Beirut: Dar al-Sadir.
17. Ibn Nadim, Muhammad bin Ishaq (2002). *Kitab al-Fisrist*, Translated by Muhammad Reza Tajaddod. Tehran: Asatir Publication.
18. Kulayni, Muhammad ibn Ya'qub (1986). *al-Kafi*. Corrected by Ali Akbar Ghaffari and Mohammad Akhundi. Tehran: Dar al-kotob al-Eslamyah
19. Mohaghegh, M. (1973). *Filsuf-e Rey*. Tehran: Islamic Studies Institute of McGill University, Tehran Branch.
20. Najmabadi, M. (1939). *Sharhehal va Maqam-e Muhammad bin Zakaria Razi*. Tehran: Elmi Publication.

21. Najmabadi, M. (1992). *Moalafat va Mosanafat-e Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Zakaria Razi*. Tehran: University of Tehran Publication.
22. Pines, S. (1946). *Mathhab al-Tharra ind al-Muslimin*. Translated by Muhammad Abdulhadi Abu Rideh. Cairo: Maktabah al-Nahda al-Misriah.
23. Rhazes, Muhammad bin Zakaria (1977). *Akhlaq al-Tabib*. Corrected by Abdullatif ibn Muhammad al-Abad. Cairo: Maktaba Dar al-Turath.
24. Rhazes, Muhammad bin Zakaria (2002). *al-Tib al-Rouhani*. translation by Parviz Azkaei (Sepitman). Tehran: Cultural Institute of Ahl-e Qalam.
25. Rhazes, Muhammad ibn Zakaria (1992). *al-Sirah al-Falsafiah*. Corrected of Paul Kraus and translated by Abbas Eqbal. Tehran: Enqelab Eslami Publication.
26. Rosenthal, F. (1975). *The Classical Heritage in Islam*. Translated by Emile and Jenny Marinorstein. London: Routledge.
27. Rumi, Jalal al-Din Muhammad (1997). *Koliyat-e Shams-e Tabrizi*. Corrected by Badia' al-Zaman-e Foruzanfar. Fourteenth Edition. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publication.
28. Safa, Z. (1964). *Mehr Journal: Aqayed-e Hekmi-e Muhammad Bin Zakaria Razi*. No.108. Winter of 1964. P.421-427.
29. Sharif, M. M. (1983). *Tarikh-e Falsafe dar Eslam*. translated by Nasrollah Pourjavadi, Tehran: Markaz-e Nashr-e Daneshgahi.