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ABSTRACT

From Razi’s logical views one can name: Compound neglection of theorem, Postulating the self-evident all concepts, the mutual relation of the implication and conformation, the abandonment of implication in the sciences, modality in conditionals, the conditions of productivity of conjunctive syllogism and the issue of productivity of the fourth figure.

Athir al-Din al-Abhari one of the outstanding students of Fakhr al-Razi, meanwhile to explain or challenge some of the thoughts of Fakhr al-Razi, in some of his works is explained and expanded a layout similar to layout of Khonaji, views like: The discovery of special conditional and special conventional’s reflection in particular negative, and that it is evident that a decree is compound, but, his expression is in such a way that does not owe himself to Khonaji and meanwhile there are also topics in the Abhari’s works which isn’t seen in the Khonaj’s works: discovering the natural proposition and its independent validity as a quantified proposition, adding three other forms to the productive forms of the fourth figure in the compound modalities and adding the subjective proposition to the dual division of the predicative restricted proposition.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Fakhr al-Razi after Farabi and Ibn Sina is third Muslim logician who has an important role in the development and expansion of Aristotelian logic in the Muslim world, however, some of his votes like Compound neglection of theorem, Postulating the self-evident all concepts, the mutual relation of the implication and conformation, and the abandonment of implication in science is disputable.

Athir al-Din al-Abhari who is one of the outstanding students of al-Razi, in his logical works, meanwhile to explain or challenge some of the thoughts of Fakhr al-Razi has found important innovations in Sinai logic. Like discovery of natural case and its independent credit as a special case, discovery of special conditional and special conventional’s reflection in particular negative, adding three other forms to the productive forms of the fourth figure in the compound modalities and adding the subjective proposition to the dual division of the predicative restricted proposition. This article meanwhile to compare logical vote of al-Razi and al-Abhari will pay to explain their logical innovations:

2. THE AGREED VOTES

2.1. Logic Tomography System

Ibn Sina inspired by Farabi’s initiative in discovering the duality of mind in action and consequently and division of the science to thought and affirmation is divided logic in two main parts of supervisor to imaginations and affirmations and bring Aristotelian logic season from nine chapter to two chapter which is known as two syllabubs fingerprint logic. This type of fingerprint logic which was completed gradually has fundamental differences with nine fold fingerprint logic, like: independence is defined logic of the argument, place of discussion topics, place of inverse discussion, implying topic and discussion of four relations in the two part logic, detailed discussion of five techniques in the nine fold logic.

Fakhr al-Razi who was fascinated by dichotomous fingerprint logic of Sinoe has written savior logic in the same style and in addition to describe tips book has summarized it in the name of signs and warnings of brains which suggests his great effort on compliance of dichotomous fingerprint logic and the logical school of Sinoe.

Athir al-Din al-Abhari who also is familiar with logic via Bu Ali and Fakhr al-Razi books is written Aysaghvijy, discount of idea and right title and prove sincerity which has all specifications of the system of fingerprint logic of Sinavi logic.

2.2. Compound Negligence of Theorem

Logicians are divided the scientific knowledge to image and acknowledgement following al-Farabi and in the definitions which have brought for image and acknowledgement is considered the verdict distinction criteria of image from acknowledgement and have found different votes in relation with the issue of warrants and acknowledgement:

Ghazali by studying the difference between science and knowledge says: knowledge is related to world of imaginations which knows imagine as the knowledge and acknowledgement as the science. He knows knowledge and understanding of the nature of the singular like understanding the meaning of bodies, change, world and origination known as image and knowledge of positive or negative between them known as acknowledgement and says: each acknowledgment is stop on two prior image on it, for example, in acknowledging that the world is accident, at first should be an image of the universe and an image from the event which is achieved science and acknowledgment proportionally between that two.

Fakhr al-Razi also like Ghazali is seen acknowledgment as compound. With this difference that for him, a sentence isn’t a knowledge and understanding issue, but is a sensual act and a part of acknowledgment. Fakhr al-Razi says: the science is on two kinds of divided image and acknowledgment and the basic difference of image and acknowledgment is as the difference between the simple and compound. He is known the sentence as sensual act and part of the acknowledgment and says: the

---

acknowledgment is the same case which is compound of sentence along with image of subject, predicate and the proportion of the verdict.

But al-Abhari, meanwhile the belief of assuming compound to acknowledgment, in the “Daghayeho o al-Afkar" goes a step further and has sentenced to the evidence of compound of acknowledgment. He says: the acquisition knowledge isn’t out of two cases, or the image is without sentence and or the image with the sentence... and each acknowledgment is compound of three image, sentenced image, sentenced to imagine and sentence imagine and knowing it is a trivial matter.

Some logicians of seventh century like Khajeh Nasir, Arnavai and Katebi Ghazvini are brought the same statement and are considered compound the acknowledgment, and some other the logicians like Samarghandi, Taftazani, Mohaghegh Davani believed that the sentence is a cognitive and perceptual issue and the verb of exist of sentence is incompatible with the perceptual and cognitive load of having it, but the famous view of philosophers is that the acknowledgment is a simple issue and is the same of sentence or coincide with the sentence and the triple imagination of subject, predicate and the proportion of the verdict are the terms acquisitions of acknowledgment not the components of acknowledgment.

Assessment
The fact is that the acknowledgment is a simple issue and the sentence isn’t part of the acknowledgment, but is the same of acknowledgment or requisite of acknowledgment. The sentence is included the explorer verb and the verb of exist sentence is not incompatible with the perceptual and cognitive load of having it. Sentence since is oneself verb is except of the acknowledgment, and since is that the unity of subject and predicate in the outside is the same of acknowledgment, and also the imagine which is not aside from the sentence and is required the sentence is included the acknowledgment, so the acknowledgment is included the imagine which is the same of sentence with an interpretation and with another interpretation is required the sentence.

Therefore, the imagine compound of acknowledgement is not acceptable in the idea of Fakhr al-Razi and the sentence of al-Abhari to its evidence.

3. DISPUTED VOTES

3.1. Postulating The Self-Evident All Concepts

Famous among logicians is the same information is obvious and without acquisition and some other is theoretical and need to acquisition. Fakhr al-Razi in the summary of logic argues with this method, but in his other books claims that all human’s images are obvious and can’t be gained no image by definition. But this theory of Fakhr al-Razi is not accepted among logicians after him. So that, al-Abhari is criticized the claim of Fakhr al-Razi based on obvious of all images and is endorsed the famous view of logicians who say: all images and also all acknowledgment are not obvious, otherwise, we haven’t any unknown, on the other hand, all of them are not theoretical, otherwise, is not yield any science for us, so each of the image and acknowledgment is on the two types of obvious and theoretical which theoretical also leads to obvious, because is a vain circle and sequence.

Fakhr al-Razi is adducted two reasons to substantiate its claim based on obvious of all images:

3.1.1. First Reason
If we want to build a subject through clear thinking and to reach an image desired, that desired is not out of two cases: is active or passive. The desired if is unknown and passive for us its demanding is impossible, because self is unaware from it and passive can’t be desired, and if the desired is active for us, so is perquisite in our minds and the study of perquisite is impossible. If said the desired in some respects is active and in some respects is passive, we say: these two directions are variable and different, therefore, the active direction because of the impossibility of study the perquisite and the passive direction also because of absolute unknown is not sought.

Criticism
Al-Abhari is not known fixed the claim of Fakhr al-Razi about the obvious of all images and in the above rejected argument says: the first assumption of Fakhr al-Razi’s argument isn’t acceptable, because is permissible that the unknown object and its complications is clear for human and he is not neglect that object and is demanding to understand its nature.

Unlike the view of Fakhr al-Razi, the unknown and passive issue can be desired, because human consciousness about some of the credits and complications which is true about unknown object is enough to be desired it. As human is aware to the heavenly creature and the angel of Gabriel and may be demanding the recognition of truth and its true nature.

Khajeh Nasir says: this issue has another assumption which Fakhr al-Razi is not noted it, because the desired is an issue which is not absolute passive and not absolute active, but has both active and passive aspect, thus is not absolutely famous and not absolutely out of mind awareness and hence is demanded and acquired.

3.1.2. The Second Reason
The second reason of Fakhr al-Razi is that there isn’t a way to define the nature of object, because the defining of the nature of the objects isn’t out of four cases: the definition of all the elements of nature, the definition of some components, the definition of affairs outside the nature and the definition of composite of internal components and external affairs which all four cases is impossible, because all components of nature is same the nature which is the definition of object to self and impossible, and since the reagent of an object is the reagent of each of its component, if reagent is in the parts of nature, again the definition of object will be self and impossible and the definition of object to the external affairs stop on recognition of assigned of that affair to that nature and it also stop on the imagine of nature itself, because the various natures may be have common transverse, in this case, the description out of the essence can’t be the reagent of noun nature, unless before aware of...
its noun which is required remote and void. From the nullity of the second and third assumption can be concluded that the fourth assumption is also impossible.

**Criticism**

Al-Abhari as criticism says: all or any component of nature is apart from nature, the nature is the components with description of community and whole, while the reagent in the first assumption is included the components without the social commission. And the reagent of an object is the reagent of whole parts of a nature not the reagent of each of each components. And the understanding of assign of some properties to an object do not stop on the imagination of the nature of the object, so, each four cases is permissible not impossible.

Fakhr al-Razi in his second reason is known impossible the definition of object to some of its components and the whole definition without detail definition, while is permissible. The whole knowledge and recognition is not possible without the recognition of component, but the whole definition is permissible without the definition of component and it is when the component is obvious and is needless of definition. And the definition of nature to essentials or the definition of object to all components also unlike the opinion of Fakhr al-Razi is not required remote and stop the object on self, because the nature is contrary with the essentials. May be essentials or the components of nature need definition and their definition is stopped on matters other than whole definition.

He in the third assumption of second reason claims that the definition of object to external accidents and attributes stop on science in particular their expectation and is required remote, while this argument is also false, because when between an object and its fair description is clear expression, science to description is required the recognition of that object, although its specifically does not come to human’s mind. On the other hand, the recognition of noun is stop on recognition of appositive, but the recognition of appositive is not stop on the recognition of noun. The relation between the adjective and noun or row and rhyme is a one way relation, means, although the recognition of nature is stop on the recognition of its rows, but the recognition of its rows isn’t stop on the recognition of the nature, but if know its belong to that nature will suffice. So, the definition of special rows is not required circle.

The definition of nature to all its essences which is total limit, unlike the claim of Fakhr al-Razi isn’t acquisition of result or the definition of object on self, because essences is apart from the modality. The limit components are in the verdict of cause and cause has naturally priority on effect. Hence, the definition of essences is not the acquisition of result and not the priority of object on self.

All images and also all acknowledgments are not obvious, otherwise the acquisition of everything was impossible for us, beside, all of them are also not theoretical, otherwise, any scientific is not yield for us. An object become attainment by other, if the other is also theoretical, its acquisition will be depending on to other and if we quote the words leads to circle or sequence which both of them are void. Then, each of the conceived and verification is on the two type: obvious and theoretical.

Khaje Tosi knows the argument of Fakhr al-Razi has an obvious fallacy and with his detailed criticism is revealed the wrong of both reasons of Fakhr al-Razi and has contributed the justice as well.

**Assessment**

The truth is that essence is composed of the same essences, but the two have credit conflict with each other and this credit contrast will suffice for inclusion accuracy of essences is the total limit of modality. Modality is reagent or limited, essences are descriptive of community and whole, while, the components of total limit is overhead and without description of community and totality, so the definition of total limit is not required stop of object on self. Moreover, as in his discussion will come types of definitions, the recent reason of Fakhr al-Razi is incompatible with his comments in Mantegh o al-Mohkles and Nahayat al-Maghohl on the types of definitions. Fakhr al-Razi has not a convincing reason to prove the obvious of all images and the objections of Athir al-Din al-Abhari, Khonaji and Khaje Nasir are relevant on the reasons of Fakhr Razi. It is right that some of the images are evidence and some other are theoretical.

3.2. The Mutual Relation of the Implication and Conformation

The followers of Ibn Sina’s logic in the case of correlation between the triple implications said: the implication of inclusion and obligation are function of the implying matches and function in the sense that function is not found without nationality, so, two implications of inclusion and obligation are requisite of implying matches, but the implying matches is not requisite none of them and is found without them and there isn’t a correlation between the inclusion and obligation, but Fakhr al-Razi and Sheikh Eshragh Sohravardi believe that the implying matches is also required the obligation implication. Means as the obligation is not found without matching, matching also is not without obligation. The reason of Fakhr al-Razi is that each modality has accessories and at least has this obligatory that “that object is and isn’t otherwise that object”6 and in the Sharh O al-Esharat and al-Tanbihat says: “no modality do not obligatory, although is negative obligatory”.

Al-Abhari is disputed the above argument and is rejected the correlation parties of implying matches and obligation. He says: we are imagining an object sometimes, while does not occur that “is that object and is not other that object” in our mind, because reference to implies obligation should be physical and mental requirements and this claim of Fakhr al-Razi isn’t physical and mental requirements, otherwise, will be required the imagination of infinite affairs and that is impossible.

**Assessment**

In the other dispute related to the argument of Fakhr al-Razi can be said: the need for anything with the public object and that isn’t other that object is the requisite of broader concept, not the requisite of the specific concept which with the imagination of obligatory and required and the relation of two is achieved determined to need. While, the logicians the mental
necessity of the broader concept known as the terms of implies obligation which in it from the imagination of required comes to mind obligatory.

Therefore, al-abhari’s criticism on the opinion of Fakhr al-Razi and Sheikh Eshragh is relevant based on correlation parties of implication of matching and obligation.

4. SPECIFIC IDEA OF FAHKR AL-RAZI

4.1. Neglecting Theory of Implication in the Sciences

Ibn Sina for the first time in addition to divide implication in to three types of equalization, inclusion and obligation is referred to the neglecting of obligation implication to the extent of total and speech in response to the Mahoo. He says: the human who is indicated all the nature of allied essential individuals can be a speech in response to the Mahoo and animal which is indicated all the common nature essentially different individuals and implies to implicate of equalization on the body contains sensitive soul, hence can be a speech in response to the Mahoo, but animal is not indicated all the nature of human or horse singly, sensitive is not indicated all of the nature of body contain soul singly or talker is not indicated all of the nature of human singly, but is part of that and the implication of part to total is the type of obligation implication equalization or inclusion, hence, can’t be a speech in response to the Mahoo. Split and close up can’t be a real reagent of objects singly, because imply on the obligation implication of essence.

Logicians after Ibn Sina have proposed neglecting of obligation implication into three forms of certain neglecting (lack of its application in total limit), public neglecting (its disuse in the sciences) and more general neglecting (failure to apply it in all positions including science and language practice and conversation) which certain neglecting is the thought of Ibn Sina and most of Muslim logicians and public neglecting is the thought of Ibn Sahlan Savi who Fakhr al-Razi is also followed him, but according to Fakhr al-Razi is known.

Ibn Sahlan Savi is believing into disuse of obligation implication in the sciences. He as argument says: equalization and inclusion implication is used in sciences not obligation. Because the obligation implication isn’t exclusive and limited, accessories of each object has other accessories and also going to infinity. The obligation implication is not valid, because accessories itself have accessories and supplies continues to infinity, so in the case of credit of obligation implication, it comes necessary the single word has the infinity effect and because of the infinity of accessories and not being regulated of them is not obtained agreement, because surrounded by all infinite accessories is something out of the human responsibility.

Fakhr al-Razi who is affected by Ghazali in the most of his thoughts is followed Hakim Savi in this case and has believed public neglecting of obligation implication with this difference that is considered disputable the argument of Saheb Basaer and has brought another reason to prove his claim. He is believed to public neglecting of obligation implication and lack of its applications in the sciences, because of the disciplined of obligation implication and Athir al-Din al-Abhari is not commented in this case, but most logicians of seventh and eighth centuries such as Khonagi, Armavi, Khaje Tosi and Alame Helli are criticized the arguments of public neglecting theory of Fakhr al-Razi and with the siege of the neglecting of obligation implication in the total limit are believed to the at least realistic of neglecting theory. For the clear of truth is necessary is investigated the arguments of neglecting of obligation implications:

4.1.1. The Reason of Ghazali and Sheikh Eshragh

The obligation implication is not valid, because is not verbal and in the lexical status, but is rational and logical implication.

Criticism

This reason is violated by inclusion implication, because the inclusion implication is also rational like the obligation implication, while do not believe its neglecting. Each word in its basic position has situated meant to its matched effect which consequently and due to it implies on the necessary component of the meaning of the subject. If the initial postural implication is a valid word and the mediation postural implication is invalid, it comes necessary the inclusion implication is considered neglected.

4.1.2. The Other Reason of Ghazali and Ibn Sahlan Savi

The obligation implication is not valid, because the accessories itself have accessories and the supplies continues to infinity and if the obligation implication is valid because of the infinite of accessories and is not being regulated of them, the agreement is not obtained, because surrounded on all infinite accessories is something out of the human responsibility.

Criticism

Fakhr al-Razi in criticism of this reason says: if the accessories are infinite, the terms of obligation implication should be necessary and the accessories are between a finite, but Khonagi is rejected this criticism of Fakhr al-Razi and says: and if say that the accessories are between a finite, this problem is not solved, because each object has a necessary, at least is that “is that an object and is not other that object”, and each required between has another required between which transfer of called to its required relative characteristics is required transfer from it to the other required relative characteristics and is drawn to the invalid sequence.
Khosravi in the criticism of the second reason is writing: mental necessity has two different means, one necessity meant to specific which of understanding required, its necessary comes to the mind. The other required meant to more general which with the imagination of necessity and required and their relation is obtained clearly express of required. While, the mental necessity of the most special feeling between is valid in the obligation implication. It is forbidden that the specific necessity of an object be infinite, otherwise the necessary understanding will be stopped to the infinite concepts. And Fakhr al-Razi is said each object has necessary between can’t be the necessity meant to specific, but is necessity meant to more general and sometimes we imagine one object while is not come to our mind its more general necessity which reach to this fact that happens sequence1.

1.3. The Reason of Fakhr Al-Razi

The obligation implication is not out of two cases or between the necessity in it is valid or not. The second case lead to the impossible because of the infinitely of accessories and the first case is required invalidity because of the relativity and is not being regular because between of the necessity is different according to individuals and in relation to subjectivity of individuals and for this reason hasn't a certain criteria and therefore, its application in the sciences is invalid2.

Criticism

If in the obligation implication the between of necessity is valid absolutely and is between for all individuals the effect will have a certain criteria. Moreover, this argument of Fakhr al-Razi is violated with the lack of neglecting of equalization implication. The equalization implication also is different in relation to subjectivity of individuals, because some people are aware of the word statute and some other are not aware. If the individual differences in between and not between of accessories cause the invalidity of the obligation implication, then their awareness and lack of awareness to the words statute will cause the invalidity of equalization implication, while is not such3.

Assessment

Who are oriented to the seize of neglecting of obligation implication in the total limit (certain neglecting) have thought that the theory of Fakhr al-Razi knows neglected the obligation implication in all positions including language of science and common and conversation language, while the more general neglecting is not desired of Fakhr al-Razi. The most important reason of neglecting of obligation implication in the sciences is the clarity and precision in the language of science. Not being disciplined of obligation implication in the language of science cause ambiguity and uncertainty, but the equalization and inclusion implication are clear. The argument of Fakhr al-Razi is a firm argument by relativity of the obligation effect compared with the mentality of a person with this explanation and its violation is a different compare through the equalization implication is also different by state, because the difference in the status resolves by aware of the word status, while difference in the obligation effect depends on non-verbal elements in the minds of people.

5. THE SPECIAL IDEAS OF ATHIR AL-DIN AL-ABHARI

5. 1. The Discovery of Natural Case and Its Independent Credit as a Special Case

The natural case in the seventh century AD is identified by Athir al-Din al-Abhari and is considered discussion of logicians as a logical issue. Before the seventh century, the issues like “human is a species” and “human is generic” or is not attractive by scientists or have brought such examples for neglect1.

In the analysis of the logical structure of these issues have been propose three theories: the natural neglected, natural personal negligence and natural independent credit as a special case. Some of the logicians like Ghout al-Din Shirazi are believed on the natural neglected, thus they are known same and in a row the natural issues with the neglected issues and some other is believed on natural personal negligence and are known same the natural issues with the personal issues2.

Athir al-Din al-Abhari in some of his logical works is criticized the split monopoly of the local issues to the credibility issue in three parts of personal (special), neglected and obstacle (limited)3. He is added another part as the natural to them and has introduced the natural issue as independent issue which his this work is an example for latter. Al-Abhari says: the issue which its subject is a certain person is named special or personal “author of Zeid”. And if be general is not out of the two cases: or the general nature since is general belongs to verdict and or individuals and its examples belongs to verdict. In the first case call the case natural, like “sex of animals” and “human beings”. And in the second case which the general examples will be belonged to the verdict, if the quantity of people as mentioned total or partial is named limited, the total limited like “all humans are animals” and partial limited like “some human beings are authors”. But if the quantity of individuals is not mentioned say it neglected, like “human author”.

Most philosophers, special modern logicians are believed to natural independent validation as a special case following al-Abhari and are divided the local issues into four types of personal (limited), natural, neglected and obstacle (limited). They say the natural issue is in the personal verdict, means that the value of natural to more value of personal and the neglected issue is in the verdict of partial limited.

5.2. The Discovery of Special Conditional and Special Conventional’s Reflection in Particular Negative

The old logicians have ruled absolutely which slight negative hasn’t the inverse level of integrity. Athir al-Din al-Abhari does not know this verdict contains special. He says: when minor negative special constitutional or special custom be true, its required component will be effective in its reflection like itself. Note that, the slight negative of special custom is composed of two cases of specified and implied, its specified case is the slight negative of public custom and its implied case is the slight positive of public absolute which is mentioned to it with no intrinsic. The inverse level of such case because of its implicit case which is positive becomes true and the inverse verdict of the special slight negative is that each of the two are reversed as itself (or both of them as public custom). Khajeh Nasir has memorized from this innovation of al-Abhari with praise in the logic books of Tajrid and Tadli al-Meier4.

2 Fakhr Razi, 1381 Hijri, pp. 20-21.
5.3. Add the Mentality Case on the Encomium Division on the Expedition Case

One of the valuable innovations of the followers of Sinoe logical school is the division of the limited expedition case into three types of true, foreigner and mentality. Fakhr al-Razi in his description in the eye of wisdom book of Ibn Sina in the analysis of the meaning of the total positive expedition case has noted the distinction between the true and foreigner case for the first time and with inspired by Sheikh al-Rees.

Ibn Sina in the analysis of the total positive expedition case meanwhile enumerating the six ruling and valid condition for its issue says: the objective of total meaning in this limited case is not the totality j or general j, but its objective is each of the individual j, whether its available individuals are out of the mind and whether are in terms of intellectual assumptions in the mind.

Fakhr al-Razi in the “explaining of eye wisdom” in the explaining of Ibn Sina’s expression says: sometimes the objective of j is its foreigner individuals and sometimes this means that if are found individuals in the foreigner world will be noun to j, if our objective of j is the first meaning in case of death of all horses, the case of each horse is animal will be false, but if its second meaning is our objective, the case of each horse is animal will be true always, whether a horse is available in the outside world and whether is not.

Fakhr al-Razi in the Mantegh al-Mokhles is proposed the application of the total positive limit in two ways of according to the truth and according to the external exist and have shown its effect in the debate of the inverse of involvements level.

Some of the logicians of seventh century AD in light of this guidance of Fakhr al-Razi are proposed the division of the limited expedition case on two types of truth and foreigner explicitly and with more elaborates.

Athir al-Din al-Abhari while explaining the true and foreigner cases is added the mentality case on the two and is divided the limited expedition case on the three types of true, foreigner and mentality which this his work was an example for many of the latter. According to al-Abhari, the case of each j is b may be applied according to the external exist or according to true or according to the availability of mentality. The objective of first use is that every external j is attributed to b in the outside world, like: each sheep is ruminator. The objective of true is that everything is required j, is required b, it means that b is necessary for human existence, therefore, if is found in outside will have that verdict, whether is foreigner and whether not. And the objective of third use is that everything is in the mind of attributed to j is a noun of b within mind.

6. CONCLUSION

Fakhr Razi’s opinion is not acceptable about the compound being of acknowledgment and the verdict of Abhari is also unjustified to its evidence.

The reasons of Fakhr Razi is not compelling on the evidence of all images and also his argument on the correlation parties of equalization and inclusion implication and the objections of Abhari and Khajeh Nasir is relevant on it.

The desired neglecting of Fakhr Razi in the obligation implication because of the not being disciplined the necessity of it is public neglecting, not more general neglecting and the criticism of oriented to at least realistic of neglecting theory is not convincing.

The guidance of Fakhr Razi about the distinction between the true and foreigner cases is caused the encomium division of limited expedition case by Seraj al-Din Armavi which is provided the necessary conditions for innovation of Athir al-Din Abhari in the adding of mentality case and division of limited expedition case on the three types of true, foreigner and mentality.

The opinion of Fakhr Razi has been instrumental about and complete it by Athir al-Din Abhari with the addition of three scores on the scores result in fourth shape in the components involvements for modern logicians.

The discovery of natural case and its independent credit as a special case and the discovery of slight negative in particular and adding the mentality case on the encomium division of limited expedition case are considered as the most important logical initiatives of Athir al-Din Abhari.
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