Bi-quarterly Journal of
Theosophia Islamica
EISSN: 2783-3240
Vol. 3 ● No. 2 ● 2023 ● Issue 6

Analyzing the Rule of Emanation from the Simple One in Islamic Philosophy: From Interpretive Challenges to Transcendent Elucidation

Arash Rajabi[1] Sayyedeh Masoumeh Tabatabaei[2]

Received: 2025/03/27 Accepted: 2025/05/08

Abstract

"One of the most crucial philosophical rules and a cornerstone of rational principles is the " Nothing but the One emanates from One." This article, employing a library research method for data collection and an analytical and descriptive approach for data analysis, aims to accurately explain this rule. It also seeks to address the arguments of those who oppose the rule, as they haven't correctly grasped its underlying premises. By carefully considering these premises, we find that the "unity" referred to in the rule is not numerical unity, but rather true, real, and original unity. Furthermore, the "One" signifies a simple entity from all aspects and dimensions. "Emanation " implies direct emanation and illuminative emanation, and "homogeneity " refers to shadowy homogeneity . With these introductions, the meaning of the rule becomes clear: From the

1. PhD in Theoretical Foundations of Islam, University of Islamic Knowledge, Qom, Iran.
Emails: Eshragh.sadra@Gmail.com
2. PhD in Islamic Theology, University of Qom, Qom, Iran (Corresponding Author).
Email: Eshraghm@yahoo.com

*Rajabi, A.& Tabatabaei, S. M. (2025). Analyzing the Rule of Emanation from the Simple One in Islamic Philosophy: From Interpretive Challenges to Transcendent Elucidation. *Theosophia Islamica*, *3*(6), pp 28-56.
https://doi.org/ 10.22081/jti.2025.71703.1068

One that is simple in all respects (basīṭ min jamī' al-jihāt), by virtue of the principle of shadowy homogeneity (Senkhīyyat ẓillīyyah), and without an intermediary and with an illuminative relation (iḍāfah ishrāqiyyah), nothing but the One emanates.. Indeed, according to the elucidations of Mystics and Transcendent Philosophers (Muta'allihīn), the single effect that emanates from the utterly simple One (God) is precisely what they call Expanded Existence or Expanded Grace.

Keywords

Rule of the One, Unity, Simplicity, Homogeneity , First Intellect, Islamic Mysticism, Ash'arites, School of Segregation.

Introduction

The Rule of the One (Qāʿidat al-vāḥed), which states that "from one thing, only one thing can appear" (Dinani Ibrahimi, 1986, p. 611), has been one of the most fundamental and crucial philosophical and intellectual principles. It has long been a subject of attention for both ancient Greek philosophers and Islamic theologians, who have consistently strived to explain and elaborate upon it (Suhrawardi, 2001, pp. 64-226; Khajeh, 1996, pp. 261-1405, 74; Damad, 1988, p. 351; Mulla Sadra Shirazi, 1981, p. 332).

Allamah Helli considered the belief in the core idea of this rule to be the doctrine of the early philosophers, specifically the ancient Greek scholars (Allamah Helli, 1312, p. 44). Averroes attributed this rule to Themistius among the ancients, as well as to Plato (Averroes, 1377, p. 163). Plotinus explored this rule in his "Enneads" (Theology), and this very book was a key text that drew the attention of Muslim philosophers to this important principle (Plotinus, 1413, p. 134). According to Hanna Fakhoury and Khalil Georr, Plotinus was influenced not only by the schools of Pythagoras and Philo but also by Plato. From the Stoics, he adopted the principle that "all beings emanate from the One." Thus, the origin is the Oneness (the One), but the question remains: how do all beings issue forth from the simple Oneness? (Hanna Fakhoury & Khalil Georr, trans. Abdolmohammad Ayati, 1386, p. 91).

In the history of Islamic thought, this rule has always been a subject of great interest. Its Greek origins never prevented philosophers from thoroughly discussing and exploring its implications; the geographical source of knowledge was never considered an impediment to acquiring wisdom. Consequently, Muslim philosophers across various schools—including Peripatetic philosophy (Hikmat al-Mashsha), Illuminationist philosophy (Hikmat

al-Ishraq), theoretical mysticism (Irfan Nazari), and transcendent philosophy (Hikmat Muta'aliyah)—as well as theologians, and at times even Qur'anic exegetes, jurists, legal theorists, and hadith scholars, have considered this rule in their respective fields. Both proponents and opponents have sought to affirm, negate, critique, or elucidate it in accordance with their own schools of thought and principles.

In Western philosophy during the Middle Ages, this rule gained prominence following the translation of Avicenna's (Ibn Sina) philosophical works. Medieval philosophers referred to Avicenna's rule of issuance as Emanation, signifying something that has emerged from a source. Thomas Aquinas also addressed this rule in the fourth section of his book, "Summa contra Gentiles," (Mahdi Ha'eri Yazdi, 1361, p. 113; Aquinas, 1362, Vol. 1, p. 38).

This rule states that, by virtue of the principle of homogeneity , nothing more than a single, unified entity can emanate from a simple entity in all its aspects.

Throughout the history of Islamic thought, this rule has been met with two main approaches. One approach, despite diverse interpretations of the rule, has consistently focused on explaining, justifying, and providing arguments for it, largely praising its significance. The other approach, manifesting in various forms, has fiercely opposed and challenged this rule.

The first approach is adopted by most investigative Peripatetic and Illuminationist philosophers, mystics, and transcendent sages. They have elaborated on the rule, each offering their distinct interpretations.

The second approach is championed by most Ash'ari theologians, the Salafiyya sect, some Imami theologians, and adherents of the School of Segregation.

Imam Mohammad Ghazali, Imam Fakhr al-Din Razi, Allamah Hilli, Ibn Taymiyyah, and the followers of the School of Segregation have directed their opposition towards the "effected One". They argue that through this rule, philosophers have limited God's power and free will, because, according to this rule, God only has the power to emanate one creation. (Ghazali, 1382: p. 129; Fakhr Razi, 1986: Vol. 1, p. 335; Allamah Hilli, 1425: pp. 172 & 395; Ibn Taymiyyah, Vol. 5, p. 292; Mirza Javad Tehrani, 1374: p. 240; Mohammad Reza Hakimi, 1388: p. 171).

Mūḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ʻArabī, Ibn Taymiyyah, Qāḍī ʻAḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī, and Taftazani also do not consider the causal One, which is the agent of issuance, to have an external referent. Based on the multiplicity of divine attributes over the essence, they hold that God possesses multiplicity in His affirmative attributes and beautiful names (Ibn ʻArabī, 1404: Vol. 1, p. 199; Ibn Taymiyyah, undated: Vol. 5, p. 292; Al-Ījī, 1425: Vol. 7, pp. 188, 201, 207, and Vol. 8, pp. 57, 61; Taftazani, 1409: Vol. 2, p. 99).

It's clear that many misconceptions about the Rule of the One stem from a lack of precision regarding its fundamental premises, particularly unity, simplicity, and homogeneity . Therefore, it's essential to first provide a clear picture of these premises.

This article aims to present the approach that supports this rule based on Islamic philosophy. In this research, Islamic philosophy refers to, in historical order of Islamic rational sciences, Peripatetic philosophy, Illuminationist philosophy, theoretical mysticism, and transcendent philosophy. The article will elaborate on their various explanations, while also considering the opposing views, to clarify the correct interpretation of the rule.

1. Elucidating the Principles of "The One" (Al-Wahed)

1-1. The Concept of Unity

The concept of unity is undefinable; like the concept of existence, it's self-evident. The One (Wahed) is synonymous with the existent. Of course, the "One" that is synonymous with the existent refers to a specific kind of unity, namely, absolute unity.

To elucidate the concept of unity and how something is attributed to it, we must state:

A. When something, in its attribution to unity, is independent from all aspects, considerations, and perspectives, such that by virtue of its external reality, existence, and objective realization, it is pure unity and the very essence of that reality—not something for which unity is established. Rather, the concept of unity is abstracted from the core essence and intrinsic nature of that thing, independent of all causal and restrictive aspects, negating all additions, attachments, existential and non-existential dimensions, and without any substantive or accidental intermediaries. It is abstracted by itself and for itself, and the essence is pure, unadulterated, and the very essence of unity. In other words, unity applies to it by an inherent, eternal, everlasting, and perpetual necessity. This type is called the True, Real, and Original Unity (Wahdat-e Haqqah-ye Haqiqiyyah-ye Asliyyah), and sometimes it's referred to as Collective Unity (Wahdat-e Jam'iyyah). This type represents the true individual and the real instance of unity. (Mirza Mehdi Ashtiani, 1377: p. 44 and Hasanzadeh Amoli, 1383: p. 26)

B. If the concept of unity is not abstracted from the core essence of the One and the very truth of its reality without a causal aspect, and if, in the intellect's view, it resolves

into two things—meaning that in reality, it is "a substance for which unity is established" (dhatun thabata lahu al-wahdah) rather than "a substance that is unity itself"—yet the subject of unity, in its attribution to unity, does not require a mediating cause or a restrictive aspect, then this type is called the Real but Not True Unity (Wahdat-e Haqiqiyyah Ghair-e Haqqah). (Mirza Mehdi Ashtiani, 1377: pp. 44-45 and Tabataba'i, 1414: p. 140)

C. If the concept of unity is not abstracted from the very essence of the One, and if, in the intellect's view, it is analyzed into two things, and in its attribution to unity, it requires a mediating cause (*wāsiṭa dar ʻurūḍ*) and a restrictive aspect (*ḥaythiyyat-e taqyīdiyyah*), as well as a unifying aspect that is inherently attributed with unity and is truly one—then this is called the Unreal One (Wāḥid Ghayr Ḥaqīqī). (Mirza Mehdi Ashtiani, 1377: p. 45).

Since the Almighty God is pure existence (*wujūd-e maḥḍ*) and has no existential limit, the second assumption (referring to the "Real but Not True Unity") is impossible and unattainable for Him. No form of multiplicity can enter into Him. His existence, His beautiful names (*Asmā' al-Ḥusnā*), and His exalted attributes (*Ṣifāt-e ʻUlyā*) exist by eternal necessity. He is the true instance of the concept of unity and the One with True, Real, and Original Unity (Wāḥid bi-Waḥdat-e Ḥaqqah-ye Ḥaqīqiyyah-ye Aṣliyyah).

1-2. Simplicity (Basāṭat)

Simplicity is the opposite of composition. By simple (basīṭ), we mean a thing in which no kind of composition is present. As Farabi states, "The simple is that which has no part in its essence" (Al-Basīṭ huwa al-ladhī fī dhātihi lā juz' lahu). (Farabi, 1405: p. 125)

The most complete concept and perfect instance of simplicity is an existence that is absolutely pure and free from composition—a pure simple. Other existents are simple from one perspective and compound from another. Thus, a simple entity in all respects is an existent in which no kind of composition can be found. Other individual simple things are considered relatively simple.

Only the Necessary Existent by Essence (Wājib al-Wujūd bi al-Dhāt) is pure simple (basīṭ maḥḍ) and simple in reality (basīṭ al-ḥaqīqah), meaning no type of composition can enter into it. According to the wise Mirza Mehdi Ashtiani, the most perfect kind of simplicity is exclusively confined to the holy essence of the Reality of Realities (Ḥaqīqat al-Ḥaqā'iq) and the Origin of Origins (Mabda' al-Mabādī). Simplicity in this sense is identical to true, real, and original unity (waḥdat-e ḥaqqah-ye ḥaqīqiyyah-ye aṣliyyah). This means that the One with true, real, and original unity is a pure simple, and no negative limitation can enter into its essence and existential identity. (Mirza Mehdi Ashtiani, 1377: pp. 54-55)

1-3. Emanation (Ṣudūr)

According to the philosopher Shahrazuri and many philosophers who followed him, including Sadr al-Muta'allihin, the philosophers' intent behind "emanation" in this rule is that the cause must be in a state where the effect emanates from it. In this sense, the cause precedes the effect and the relationship between them. (Shahrazuri, 1383: p. 337 and Sadr al-Muta'allihin, 1981: Vol. 2, p. 205)

The meaning of emanation here is positive, creative, or illuminative emanation. This refers to the cause bringing the effect forth from absolute non-existence, inherent nothingness, quiddative contingency, perpetual annihilation, and primordial darkness into the realm of existence and luminosity. This is achieved by expelling all

forms of non-existence and negative aspects, and by bestowing the overflowing grace of existence through a prior necessity and antecedent obligation. In other words, in illuminative emanation, the source brings the emanation from the hiddenness of non-existence into the arena of existence, and by way of positive necessity, it blocks all paths to non-existence for it, thereby granting it existence. (Mirza Mehdi Ashtiani, 1377: p. 54)

Mirza Mehdi Ashtiani divides emanation into two types:

1. Direct Emanation (Ṣudūr bi al-Dhāt)

2. Indirect Emanation (Ṣudūr bi al-ʿAraḍ)

Direct emanation refers to emanation without an intermediary, while indirect emanation refers to emanation with an intermediary. This means that an effect or emanation that comes directly from a cause is a direct emanation. Conversely, an effect or emanation that comes through an intermediary of the cause—meaning an effect of an effect, or an emanation of an emanation from the cause—is an indirect emanation. In reality, an indirectly emanated effect or emanation is a direct emanation of the intermediary, and an indirect emanation of the cause of the direct effect. Therefore, the first emanation from a cause is a direct emanation, and other emanations that stem from this first emanation are indirect emanations of the cause of the first emanation. Similarly, an emanation directly from the first emanation is a direct emanation from the first emanation, and its further emanations are indirect emanations of the first emanation and indirect emanations of the cause of the first emanation. Consequently, all the emanations of the contingent world, by the rule "Whatever is indirect must eventually terminate in that which is direct" (Kullu mā bi al-ʿaraḍ lā budda an yantahī ilā mā bi al-dhāt), are direct emanations from the First Cause and direct emanations from the Necessary Existent by Essence. (Ibid., p. 69)

According to this classification, the meaning of emanation in the rule of "The One" is direct emanation, not indirect, because the emanation of multiplicity from the true One through an intermediary raises no doubt regarding its permissibility and possibility. Furthermore, the intent is not that only one thing emanates from the One at a single time, but rather that absolutely, eternally, and perpetually, nothing but one emanates from the One. Thus, the direct emanation of the One is always one. (Mirza Mehdi Ashtiani, 1372: p. 451)

1-4. Homogeneity (Senkhīyyat)

The principle of homogeneity is one of the confirmatory premises of the "Rule of the One." Philosophers use the term homogeneity to describe the inherent suitability and likeness between a cause and its effect. This means that the root and kind of the effect's perfections are present in the cause, such that, due to this inherent characteristic, not every effect emanates from every cause, nor is every cause the cause of every effect. (Tabataba'i, 1414: p. 166)

In the universe of existence and the realm of contingency, all contingent beings, to move from the state of equilibrium and non-existence into the sphere of being and existence, are dependent on something other than themselves. The existent on which the being of a quiddity depends is called the cause, and the quiddity that, in its very existence, needs a cause is called the effect. (Ibid., p. 156)

The fundamental impact that the cause leaves on the effect is none other than the very existence of the effect. The cause's creation is the effect's existence itself, not the effect's quiddity, nor the mere coming-into-being of the effect's quiddity. (Ibid., p. 157)

Therefore, causality and effectuality represent an existential relationship between the existence of the cause and the existence of

the effect. The existence of the effect is pure need, dependence, and intrinsic lack of independence, subsisting through its bestowing cause. In other words, the relationship between cause and effect is an illuminative relationship, where the cause bestows the existence of the effect, and the effect is pure connection and attachment to the cause. It has an existential dependence and need for the cause, and the cause bestows existence upon its effect. Thus, an inherent suitability must exist between the cause and effect to specify the emanation of the effect's existence from the cause, ensuring that a specific effect emanates. If such suitability were absent, it would necessitate that every cause could be the cause of every effect, and anything could emanate from anything.

To avoid the fallacy of equivocation, it is important to note that homogeneity is conceptualized in two ways:

1. Productive Homogeneity (Senkhīyyat Tawlīdīyyah): This is like the homogeneity between a small amount of water and a large amount of water, or between mist and the sea. In this type of causality, the addition of the effect to the cause results in an increase in the cause, and its separation leads to a decrease or reduction. Scholars deny this form of homogeneity for God Almighty and created things, indeed, for any cause that bestows the existence of an effect. Most of those who deny homogeneity for God and attack those who affirm it have understood homogeneity in terms of productive homogeneity. (Sayyid Jalal al-Din Ashtiani, 1380: p. 43)
2. Shadowy Homogeneity (Senkhīyyat Ẓillīyyah): This is like the homogeneity between a reflection and its reflected object, a branch and its root, a thing and its shadow, or a reality and its subtle manifestation. In this type of homogeneity, the addition or non-addition of the effect to the

> cause does not result in increase or decrease. In fact, addition is intrinsically impossible. This type of homogeneity ultimately leads to disjunction (tabāyun). (Ibid., p. 44)

The homogeneity of the Almighty God with the contingent world is shadowy homogeneity. The world is a reflection, a shadow, and an indication of God Almighty's existence.

2- Elucidating the Approaches of Proponents of the Rule of the One

In explaining the Rule of the One and articulating its intent, various perspectives exist among the schools of Peripatetic philosophy (Hikmat al-Mashsha'), Illuminationist philosophy (Hikmat al-Ishraq), Mysticism (Irfan), and Transcendent Theosophy (Hikmat-i Mutaʿāliyah). Each of these schools has interpreted the rule based on its specific philosophical foundations.

2-1 The View of Peripatetic Philosophy (Ḥikmat al-Mashshāʾ)

Avicenna, across his various works, made a special effort to explain and elucidate the Rule of the One. He believed that from the true One, only a single numerical emanation occurs (Avicenna, 2005, p. 684). He held that it's impossible for the creation from God, the Great Creator, to be multiple, neither numerically nor in terms of matter or form. Therefore, the first creation from the First Cause is a numerical unity, and its essence and quiddity are singular, not material. Thus, none of the corporeal forms that manifest bodies can be directly related to the First Cause. Instead, the first entity related is the pure Intellect, because it's devoid of matter. The First Intellect is of the type of simple unity; hence, from a simple entity, due to its simplicity,

undoubtedly a single unit is created, and there is no multiplicity in simple wisdom (Avicenna, 2006, pp. 435-437).

Accordingly, Avicenna believed that the First Source (First Cause) is absolutely pure, and the initial emanation from it is not in the form of multiple things. Instead, the First Emanation is the "Pure Intellect" or "First Intellect," which is the manifest aspect of this matter. The One emanates precisely because there exists a necessary being called the First Originator, and this is the singular, unique First Principle, which is necessarily existent. Similarly, Bahmanyar held that an absolutely simple being, which has no composition whatsoever, cannot be the cause of two things that possess a natural congruity with each other. This is because nothing can emanate from it unless the emanation of those things becomes necessary. Therefore, if this simplicity is preserved, what emanates from it is a natural unity; meaning, two things that have a natural relationship with each other do not emanate from a perfectly simple entity (Bahmanyar, 1996, p. 531).

2.2. The View of Illuminationist Philosophy (Ḥikmat al-Ishrāq)

Suhrawardi, the founder of the Illuminationist school, explains the Rule of the One by asserting that from a true One, which is a real unity, no more than one effect can emanate. This is because it is impossible for darkness to emanate from light, whether that darkness is pure or something else. This is due to the fact that the necessity for light is something other than darkness, and God's essence is not composed of what causes both light and darkness. Darkness does not come into existence without God's mediation, and light will not need anything other than light. From a single light, no more than two lights will arise, because one of them is not the other. Thus, the first thing that emanates from that light is a "single, abstract light," even though

it is unified, and it's impossible for darkness to be created from two lights simultaneously (Suhrawardi, 2001).

Suhrawardi believes that the "single light" refers to a simple, abstract light composed of all other lights, and that the emanation of multiplicities occurs directly. In his view, the First Emanation is the proximate light, the greatest light, and the single, abstract light, which is neither corporeal (as corporeality entails composition) nor psychical (which would require a material body), but rather Intellect. It possesses no distinction other than its perfection, due to the necessity of congruity between cause and effect (ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 40-226).

2.3. The Approach of Theoretical Mysticism

Although Sheykh Muhyiddin Ibn Arabi didn't fully endorse the application of the Rule of the One, we can't truly consider him an opponent or enemy of this rule.

In his book *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (which was mistakenly referred to as *Futūḥāt* in the source text, as *Futūḥāt* is another work by Ibn Arabi and this discussion appears in *Fuṣūṣ*), he argues that God is absolute. He believes that the emanation of things from God is due to His boundless grace, not merely His singular essence. Therefore, the emanation of the cosmos can be explained by the multiplicity of divine names, and he debates Islamic philosophers on this rule. Ibn Arabi maintains that, as Mystics state, more than one thing does not emanate from a simple One, yet the world possesses multiplicity. Thus, this multiplicity came into existence in this manner, and the multiplicity in names is a different matter (Ibn Arabi, n.d., Vol. 4, p. 231). What's put forth in Mysticism is the emanation of grace from an effusion, not the emanation and creation of an existent from a necessary existent. What we understand from Ibn Arabi's discourse is not a critique of the Rule of

the One itself. Rather, he either contemplates the unity of the emanated entity because the nature of the emanation is not an absolute identity that would be an absolute unity but relates to God's many names; or he contemplates the multiplicity of the world because all these are manifestations of a single grace that has encompassed all people and the world. Therefore, he never explicitly stated that two things emanate from a single simple cause.

As Javadi Amoli states, if Ibn Arabi's intention behind "drawing a comparison" (likely referring to a type of analogy or distinction) isn't to negate the Rule of the One, but merely to point out its shortcomings despite accepting all its aspects, then he hasn't expressed a sound view (Javadi Amoli, 2003, p. 129).

However, Sadr al-Din Qunavi believed that God is one by His essence, as it's impossible for more than one thing to emanate from a single unity. In Qunavi's view, that unity is a universal unity, and what has been created and what has not yet been created both exist within divine knowledge. This existence is shared between the "great ones" (who are the First Existence, also called the First Intellect) and other creations, and not as philosophers from the Peripatetic school have mentioned (Sadr al-Din Qunavi, p. 74).

As Mirza Hashem Eshkevari, the mystic, believes, the First Emanation is the "universal pervasive existence" or "general effusion," not the First Intellect. And the First Intellect is not the primary intermediary in all creatures; rather, a universal and pervasive existence is the intermediary.

2.4. The Approach of Transcendent Theosophy (Ḥikmat-i Mutaʿāliyah)

Sadr al-Muta'allihin Shirazi, the founder of Transcendent

Theosophy, explained the Rule of the One by stating that if a simple emanated entity is the cause of something, its causality must be such that its natural analysis is impossible, ensuring its causality is identical with its essence. However, if this cause operates through multiplicity, conditions, precision, or other factors (which, consequently, are not the origin of simplicity and composition), then it will not be the origin of simplicity and composition. Therefore, a simple origin means that its reality is intrinsically the origin for other things and is not divisible into two parts, where one part of its reality is realized by one means and the other by another. Unlike us, whose natural existence is realized through two distinct things (like speaking and writing), in such a case, more than one thing would emanate from it, while it is undeniable that "order" is something more than that. Thus, the nature of "order" is understood from two different meanings, which contradicts this assumption. Therefore, if we assume the cause is a true simple entity, its effect will also be a true simple entity, and vice versa. Something whose effect is more than one, and some of these effects do not exist for others, is in reality divisible in both its essence and its existence.

Sadr al-Muta'allihin (Mulla Sadra) believed that the first thing emanating from an existent is both its essence—which encompasses all its states, beauties, and unity—and a simple existence called "Imā" (sign), "Martabat al-Jam'" (rank of collection), and "Ḥaqīqat al-Ḥaqā'iq" (reality of realities). Sometimes, it is also called "al-vaḥdat al-Kubrā" (the greatest unity). Similarly, God Himself is called "Martabat Wāḥidah" (the single rank) or "al-vujud al-Ilahi" (the Divine Existence) due to the attribution of His names to causes and other external existents. This (what was just mentioned) is not causality, because causality by its very nature requires both a cause and an effect. Therefore, causality is realized for specific matters and

their relationships with each of their established existents, and this is what the mystics refer to as the "First Intellect". This is thus a brief statement that can be compared with other explanations. Relative to other existents and creations, priority here pertains to other matters. However, here, in rational analysis, we prove the priority of the First Intellect relative to the absolute essence and the specific nature of other things. This means that the First Emanation is a simple existence, and it comes into being based on its own rank along with a specific essence to which a particular possibility is linked (Sadr al-Muta'allihin Shirazi, 1981, pp. 204-231).

He reconciled the belief of mystics who agree with the first emanation of a simple entity with the belief of mystics who consider the First Intellect to be the first emanation. He believed that this simple effluence or absolute unity encompasses the various stages of creation, each possessing unique characteristics in its own place. The First Intellect initially defines this simple effluence, and all other creatures are subsequent determinations of it.

In explaining the Rule of the One, Mirza Mehdi Ashtiani states:

The unity in the cause refers to the singularity of the entity in all its aspects and emanations, resulting from the multitude of its relations. This added multiplicity is pure and free from the essence that precedes and follows it, and generally from all forms of multiplicity. This characteristic is exclusive to God. The unity in the effect means that the effect possesses a unity derived from its cause, even though it might exhibit multiplicity in other aspects. In other words, what is one based on its own truth and existence is indeed one, even if it might appear multiple in meaning or by attribution. Emanation (ṣudūr) here refers to immediate emanation, not mediated emanation. This is because mediated emanations from a true unity are matters that bear no difference among themselves. The purpose of the

rule is not that more than one unit cannot emanate at a given time, but rather that more than one thing will not come into being from a single, unified entity (Ashtiani, 1993, p. 451).

He believes that prominent philosophers attribute the application of this rule to true unity and absolute simplicity in all respects. The purpose of establishing the aforementioned rule is to bear witness to and indicate the unity and multiplicity of causality and its effects, as well as their diversity or lack thereof. This indication is limited only to cases where the unity of the cause exists. Otherwise, based on this rule, the emanation of multiplicity from singular causes and simple natures cannot be overlooked, nor can its reason be accepted as an affirmative proof.

Therefore, when this rule is to be expanded to include the rule of absolute unity and the broader rule, it must be said that from one thing, in terms of its singularity and dignity, no more than one thing can emanate. Considering that unity is not limited to a true unit for the aforementioned statement to hold true—because every multiplicity ultimately leads back to a unity, and anything with multiple aspects eventually leads to a single aspect that doesn't disrupt the others—it's not necessary to restrict the Rule of the One to true or simple unity. However, given that the main intent of great philosophers and sages in establishing this rule was to explain the nature of the cosmic order and the entire universe, as well as God's attributes in sacred verses and His manifestations to His grand essence and merciful being, most of them have specifically applied this rule to the true unity that is unique to God (ibid.: 77, pp. 55-61).

Based on this, Ashtiani believes that the unity in the cause refers to true unity and absolute simplicity. And the unity in the effect refers to external unity and a simplicity that is not composed of multiple orientations; like the First Intellect, which, in mental analysis,

has various aspects, but externally it is simple and unified, and the multiplicity of aspects does not disrupt the unity of its characteristics.

The emanation (ṣudūr) also refers to immediate and natural emanation. Therefore, this rule can be stated as: "From a single unit in all aspects, in a single position, naturally, meaning no more than one thing emanates without mediation in its stability" (ibid., 71).

Allameh Tabataba'i also believed that the "One" refers to a simple emanation with no internal composition in its essence. Therefore, a unitary cause is a simple entity, considered a cause by its simple essence, and a unitary effect is also a simple entity, considered an effect by its simple essence. Here, then, unity stands in contrast to multiplicity, which has diverse components and points to no single order (Tabataba'i, 1994, pp. 165-166)..

3-1. Explaining the Opposing Viewpoint to the Rule of the One

Some Imamiyyah and Ash'ari Theologians

Based on the explanation of the Rule of the One provided by Peripatetic philosophy, many theologians have come to believe that the true One, which is the ultimate cause, is only the cause for a single numerical effect. This is because the Peripatetics considered the ten intellects and nine celestial spheres as effects, either directly or indirectly, of the true One. (Avicenna, 1384: Vol. 3, p. 823)

Even though the Peripatetics' goal in limiting the intellects to ten was to validate the nine celestial spheres, and now, based on modern physics and astronomy, Ptolemaic astronomy's nine spheres are nothing more than a myth, the foundation of the Rule of the One wasn't built solely on this premise such that its collapse would bring the rule down with it.

Khajeh Nasir al-Din al-Tusi, in his commentary on *Al-Isharat*, clarifies that Avicenna believed the true One necessitates only one numerically singular entity, namely, the First Intellect. (Avicenna, 1383: Vol. 2, p. 684). Although their intention for the First Intellect was an existent that possesses the actuality of all things—as Plotinus states in the *Enneads*, "Indeed, in the First Intellect are all things" (Plotinus, 1413: p. 98)—and the indirect emanation of all existents ultimately terminates in the true, real One which is the Cause of Causes, nevertheless, this explicit affirmation of the numerical unity of the effect has led theologians to assume that if the One on the side of the cause refers to the Necessary Existent (Wājib al-Wujūd), we would face two problems:

1- Limiting the power of the Necessary Existent (Wājib al-Wujūd). This is because it would imply that the Necessary Existent is only capable of creating a single entity. (Allamah Hilli, 1425: p. 396; Fakhr al-Razi, 1986, Vol. 1, p. 335)

2- Believing that the Necessary Existent is a necessitated agent (fāʿil mūjab), meaning it is not free. This is because a free agent typically has numerous actions and effects, not just a single one. (Allamah Hilli, 1425: p. 172)

These criticisms are based on the premise that the effect is a numerically singular unit. However, according to the exposition of Transcendent Philosophy (Hikmat-e Muta'aliyah), the effect is not numerically singular; rather, it is one by true, real, and shadowy unity (wahdat-e haqqah-ye haqiqiyyah-ye zilliyyah). It bears a shadowy homogeneity (Senkhīyyat ẓillīyyah) with the One on the side of the cause. This perspective not only does not limit God's power and choice, but instead posits that the first emanation is a unity in multiplicity, and all things are but reflections of that true One.

The Ash'arites have raised another objection: that the One on the side of the cause is not truly one and simple in all respects either. They argue that it possesses multiple real attributes that are additional to its essence (za'id bar dhat). Consequently, they believe this rule (the Rule of the One) applies only to a necessitated agent, not to a free and active one.

Furthermore, from the Ash'arite perspective, it is permissible to attribute multiple effects to a single, simple cause. This is because all contingent beings are attributed to God Almighty, even though God is transcendent beyond composition. Philosophers, however, have generally prohibited attributing multiple effects to a truly simple and universally singular cause, except through a multiplicity of instruments, conditions, or recipients. They maintain that only a single effect can be attributed to a truly simple and universally singular entity. Since the Ash'arites affirm real attributes for God, they argue that God is not truly simple and singular in all respects. Therefore, they conclude that God Almighty does not fall under the purview of this rule. (Al-Ijī, 1425: Vol. 4, p. 123; Vol. 7, pp. 188, 201, 207; Vol. 8, pp. 57, 61)

As previously alluded to in this article, Muhyiddin Ibn Arabi, based on the multiplicity of divine names, also considers God Almighty to be outside the scope of this rule, thus aligning with the Ash'arites on this matter. (Ibn Arabi, n.d.: Vol. 4, p. 231)

Some thinkers, in addition to considering the effect as a numerically singular unit, contend that when we introspect, we frequently observe the direct emanation of multiplicity from our own singular soul. For instance, the soul becomes pleased, enraged, joyful, or sorrowful. Or, in the brain's workshop—the soul's most magnificent activity center—it conceives, affirms, judges the impossibility of the conjunction of opposites and contradictories, transcends time and

space, perceives existent things as non-existent, and embodies non-existent things as existent. Consequently, the soul's unity and essence are never disrupted by emanating such diverse and contradictory multiplicities.

These thinkers have therefore rejected the Rule of the One due to the perceived necessity of believing in homogeneity (Senkhīyyat), by which they mean identity in essence, nature, or attributes and characteristics. They argue that believing in the identity and similarity of God's essence, nature, and even attributes and characteristics with those of creation is tantamount to denying God. This is because the entire being, essence, and attributes of creatures are contingent, needy, dependent, limited, and subject to motion and rest, whereas God transcends all these imperfections and needs. Hence, the Rule of the One has no real-world instance or application. Furthermore, based on this understanding, an absolute simple cannot be realized in the objective world. (Allamah Mohammad Taqi Jafari, 1376: Vol. 26, p. 210)

Despite these arguments, none of the great philosophers have ever intended such a meaning for homogeneity. They, in fact, agree with these thinkers in rejecting the aforementioned meaning. Instead, their understanding of homogeneity is the one previously explained in the section on the premises of the Rule of the One.

3-2. The School of Tafkik (Separation)

The School of Segregation, which aims to purify religious knowledge from philosophical and mystical ideas, has also opposed this rule, following the path of some Imami and Ash'ari theologians. They deem the Rule of the One as fundamentally Greek in origin, using this as a tool to dismiss it from the realm of

thought. Like those groups, they believe this rule is one hundred percent contrary to preserving unlimited divine power and prophetic/Qur'anic monotheism. They also argue it contradicts the concept of the Necessary Existent being a free agent (fāʿil mukhtār). (Mohammad Reza Hakimi, 1388: p. 142; Sayyid Ja'far Sayyidan, n.d., pp. 19-20; Mirza Jawad Tehrani, 1374: p. 230)

3.3. Salafism

The Salafis and Wahhabis have also vehemently attacked this rule. The spiritual father of Wahhabism, Ahmad ibn Abd al-Halim al-Harrani al-Dimashqi, known as Ibn Taymiyyah, believed that philosophers say "the Lord is one, and from the one, only one emanates." He argued that their intention behind the Lord's unity is that He has no affirmative attributes whatsoever, and multiple meanings are inconceivable in Him. This is because multiple meanings would lead to composition. Therefore, according to their view, God cannot be both an agent and a recipient, as the aspect of agency is different from the aspect of receptivity, and this implies a multiplicity of attributes, which in turn necessitates composition.

Despite this, Ibn Taymiyyah notes, philosophers still claim that God is the Intellector and the Intellected, Intellect itself; the Lover and the Beloved, Love itself; the Delighted and the Delighting, Delight itself; and so forth, encompassing various multiple meanings. They assert that each of these attributes is identical to the others, and an attribute is identical to its possessor; thus, knowledge is power, which is will, and knowledge is the Knower, who is the Powerful. However, Ibn Taymiyyah asserts that this "One" that philosophers claim exists, exists only in minds and has no external reality. Therefore, he concludes, the principle upon which they build—"from the one, only one emanates"—is a corrupt principle. (Ibn Taymiyyah, n.d., Vol. 5, p. 292).

Results, Analysis, and Discussion

Based on the aforementioned interpretations, the role of a correct elucidation of the rule's premises becomes clearer in properly understanding the rule itself.

All divine philosophers consider the "One" on the side of the cause to be the "True One" and "Pure Simple," from which only a single entity emanates. However, Peripatetics identify the "One" on the side of the effect as the "First Intellect," which is numerically singular. Illuminationists see it as a "Single Abstract Light." Gnostics and Transcendent Philosophers (Muta'allihīn) regard it as "Expanded Existence or "Expanded Grace which possesses hierarchical degrees. They consider the First Intellect to be the initial determination of Expanded Existence and the first imprint on the page of Expanded Grace.

According to the Peripatetic and Illuminationist views, the emanation of the First Intellect from the True One is direct and essential (bil-dhāt), while the emanation of other intellects and all other contingents from the One is indirect and accidental (bil-ʿaraḍ). However, according to the Gnostics and Transcendent Philosophers, the True, Real One has only one emanation, which is direct and essential, and it is not numerically singular. All other existents are merely imprints, shadows, and determinations of this first emanation. Indirect emanation occurs within the determinations of the first emanation. In other words, the first emanation from the True, Real One is an Expanded Existence that encompasses all contingents and pervades all creation. The realization of various longitudinal and latitudinal levels occurs within this first emanation, which is indeed Expanded Existence, and the first and most noble level of Expanded Existence is the First Intellect.

The correct elucidation of the Rule of the One, which also removes the criticisms of negating divine free will and limiting God's power, is the one provided by Transcendent Philosophy. This elucidation states that from the One with True, Real, and Original Unity, nothing but a single entity emanates. In other words, from a single cause that is simple in all respects, with no compositional aspect in its essence, only a single, simple effect emanates. That single effect is Expanded Existence or Expanded Grace. All existents, with their astonishing multiplicity in longitudinal and latitudinal orders and according to hierarchical degrees, are but the imprints and levels of Expanded Grace.

The reflection of Your face, when it fell into the cup's mirror, The gnostic, from the wine's glow, fell into raw craving.

The beauty of Your face, with one glimpse it cast into the mirror, All these images fell into the mirror of illusions.

All these reflections of wine and opposing images that appeared, Are but a single gleam from the face of the cup-bearer that fell into the cup.

The final point is that, based on the principles of both modern and traditional logic, any valid inferential structure can be transformed into a conditional compound that possesses logical truth. (Zia Mouahhed, 1386: p. 10; Allamah Hilli, 1385: p. 79)

Therefore, the Rule of the One, which is a valid inferential structure, can be transformed into a conditional compound with logical truth, creating a true exemplary structure. We can state: "If an entity is a true One, then nothing but a single entity emanates from that true One." In this context, we consider the true One (cause) to be the essence of God Almighty, who is identical with His names and attributes, and the single effect to be the Expanded Grace that flows through all existents and levels of being.

References

Ashtiyani, M. (1993). "Ta'līqah bar Sharḥ Manẓūmah-yi Ḥikmat-i Sabzavari" (Commentary on Sabzavari's Manzumah of Wisdom). Edited by Abd al-Javad Falturi and Mehdi Mohaghegh. Tehran: Tehran University. [In Persian]

Ashtiyani, M. (1998). "Asas al-Tawḥīd" (The Foundation of Monotheism). Edited by Seyyed Jalal al-Din Ashtiyani. Tehran: Amir Kabir. [In Persian]

Ashtiyani, S. J. (2001). "Sharḥ Ḥāl va Ārā-yi Falsafī-yi Mullā Ṣadrā" (Biography and Philosophical Views of Mulla Sadra). Qom: Bustan-e Ketab.[In Persian]

Avicenna & N. T. (1996). "Sharḥ al-Ishārāt wa al-Tanbīhāt" (Commentary on Al-Isharat wa al-Tanbihat). Qom: Nashr al-Balaghah. [In Arabic]

Avicenna & N. T. (2004). "Sharḥ al-Ishārāt wa al-Tanbīhāt" (Commentary on Al-Isharat wa al-Tanbihat). Edited by Ayatollah Hasan Hasanzadeh Amoli. Qom: Bustan-e Ketab. [In Arabic]

Avicenna, H. b. A. (2006). "Al-Ilāhīyāt min Kitāb al-Shifā'" (Theology from the Book of Healing). Edited by Ayatollah Hasan Hasanzadeh Amoli. Qom: Bustan-e Ketab. [In Arabic]

Bahmanyar. (1996). "Al-Taḥṣīl" (The Attainment). Edited by Shahid Morteza Motahhari. Tehran: Tehran University. [In Arabic]

Damad, M. M. B. (1988). "Al-Qabasāt" (The Illuminations). Edited by Dr. Mehdi Mohaghegh, Dr. Seyyed Ali Mousavi Behbahani, Professor Izutsu, and Dr. Ibrahim Dibaji. Tehran: Tehran University. [In Persian]

Ebrahimi Dinani, Gh. (1986). "Qawā'id Kullī Falsafī dar Falsafah-yi Islāmī" (General Philosophical Rules in Islamic Philosophy). Tehran: Institute of Cultural Studies and Research. [In Persian]

Fakhoury, H. & Khalil, G. (2007). "Tārīkh-i Falsafah dar Jahān-i Islāmī" (History of Philosophy in the Islamic World). Translated by Abd al-Mohammad Ayati. Tehran: Elmi va Farhangi. [In Persian]

Farabi, A. (1984). "Al-Fārābī fī Ḥudūdihi wa Rusūmihi" (Al-Farabi in his Definitions and Drawings). Edited by Dr. Ja'far Al Yasin. Beirut: Alam al-Kutub. [In Arabic]

Fayyaz Lahiji, A. (2004). "Shawāriq al-Ilhām fī Sharḥ Tajrīd al-Kalām" (The Dawns of Inspiration in the Commentary on Tajrid al-Kalam). Edited by Ayatollah Ja'far Sobhani, Sheikh Akbar Asad Alizadeh. Qom: Mu'assasat al-Imam al-Sadiq (Peace be upon him).

Ha'eri Yazdi, M. (1982). "Heram-e Hastī" (Pyramid of Existence). Tehran: Institute of Cultural Studies and Research. [In Persian]

Hakimi, M. R. (2009). "Ilāhīyāt-i Ilāhī va Ilāhīyāt-i Basharī, Naẓarhā" (Divine Theology and Human Theology, Views). Qom: Dalil Ma. [In Persian]

Hasanzadeh Amoli, H. (2003). "Waḥdat az Dīdgāh-i Ārif va Ḥakīm" (Unity from the Perspective of the Mystic and the Philosopher). Qom: Tashayyu'. [In Persian]

Hasanzadeh Amoli, H. (2007). "Hezār-o Yek Kalameh" (A Thousand and One Words). Qom: Bustan-e Ketab. [In Persian]

Hilli, H. b. Y. b. M. (1933). "Kashf al-Fawā'id fī Sharḥ Qawā'id al-'Aqā'id" (Unveiling the Benefits in the Commentary on the Rules of Beliefs). Edited by Sheikh Reza Tehrani, calligraphed by Zain al-Abidin ibn Ahmad Razavi Qomi. Tehran: [n.p.], lithograph. [In Arabic]

Hilli, H. b. Y. b. M. (2004). "Kashf al-Murād fī Sharḥ Tajrīd al-I'tiqād" (Unveiling the Desired in the Commentary on Tajrid al-I'tiqad). Edited by Ayatollah Hasan Hasanzadeh Amoli. Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islami. [In Persian]

Ibn Arabi, M. (n.d.). "Al-Futūḥāt al-Makkīyah" (The Meccan Revelations). Beirut: Dar Sader. [In Arabic]

Ibn Rushd. (1998). "Tafsīr Mā Ba'd al-Ṭabī'ah" (Commentary on Metaphysics). Tehran: Hikmat. [In Arabic]

Ibn Taymiyyah. (n.d.). "Majmū' Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyyah" (Collected Fatwas of Ibn Taymiyyah). n.p., n.d.[In Arabic]

Ja'fari, M. T. (1997). "Tarjomeh va Tafsīr Nahj al-Balāghah" (Translation and Interpretation of Nahj al-Balaghah). Tehran: Daftar-e Nashr-e Farhang-e Islami. [In Persian]

Javadi Amoli, A. (2003). "Raḥīq Makhtūm, Sharḥ Ḥikmat Muta'āliyah" (Sealed Nectar, Commentary on Transcendent Philosophy). Edited by Hamid Parsania. Qom: Isra Publishing Center. [In Persian]

Jurjani, M. S. Sh & A. I. (2004). "Sharḥ al-Mawāqif" (Commentary on Al-Mawaqif). Edited by Badreddin Na'sani. Offset Qom: Al-Sharif al-Razi. [In Arabic]

Plotinus. (1992). "Atheologia" (Theology/Enneads). Edited by Abd al-Rahman Badawi. Qom: Bidar. [In Arabic]

Qunawi, S. (n.d.). "Risālat al-Nuṣūṣ" (Treatise on Texts). [In Arabic]

Razi, F. (1986 CE). "Al-Arba'īn fī Uṣūl al-Dīn" (The Forty in the Principles of Religion). Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyat al-Azhariyya. [In Arabic]

Saint Augustine, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Baruch Spinoza, Blaise Pascal, Upanishads, Dhammapada, Surangama Sutra, and Bhagavad Gita. (1983). "Falsafah-yi Naẓarī" (Theoretical Philosophy), Vol. 1. Tehran: Elmi va Farhangi. [In Persian]

Seyyedan, S. J. (n.d.). "Juzvah-yi Silsilah-yi Dars-hā-yi Naqd va Barrasī Qawā'id Falsafī, Qā'idah al-Wāḥid" (Course Notes on the Critique and Review of Philosophical Rules, The Rule of the One). Qom: Madrasah-yi Ayatollah al-Uzma Wahed Khorasani, [In Persian]

Shahrzuri, Sh. (2004). "Rasā'il al-Shajarah al-Ilāhīyah fī 'Ulūm al-Ḥaqā'iq al-Rabbānīyah" (Treatises of the Divine Tree in the Sciences of Divine Realities). Edited by Najafqoli Habibi. Tehran: Institute of Wisdom and Philosophy of Iran. [In Arabic]

Shirazi, S (Muhammad ibn Ibrahim). (2004). "Al-Ḥikmah al-Muta'āliyah fī al-Asfār al-'Aqlīyah al-Arba'ah" (The Transcendent Wisdom in the Four Intellectual Journeys). Edited by Allamah Hasanzadeh Amoli. Tehran: Sazman-e Chap va Entesharat. [In Arabic]

Shirazi, S (Muhammad ibn Ibrahim). (1981 CE). "Al-Ḥikmah al-Muta'āliyah fī al-Asfār al-'Aqlīyah al-Arba'ah" (The Transcendent Wisdom in the Four Intellectual Journeys). Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi. [In Arabic]

Suhrawardi, Sh. (1995). "Majmū'ah-yi Muṣannafāt-i Shaykh-i Ishrāq" (Collected Works of Shaykh al-Ishraq). Edited by Henri Corbin, Seyyed Hossein Nasr, Najafqoli Habibi. Tehran: Institute for Cultural Studies and Research. [In Persian]

Tabataba'i, S. M. H. (1993). "Nihāyah al-Ḥikmah" (The End of Wisdom). Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islami. [In Arabic]

Taftazani, S. (1988). "Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid" (Commentary on Al-Maqasid). Edited by Dr. Abd al-Rahman Omira. Offset Qom: Al-Sharif al-Razi. [In Arabic]

Tehrani, J. (1995). "Mizan al-Maṭālib" (Balance of Demands). Qom: Dar Rah-e Haqq. [In Persian]