



REFLECTION OF ISLAMIC METAPHYSICS IN THE WORKS OF IBN SINA

Isakdjanov Ramziddin

International Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan, Senior Lecturer of the
“UNESCO Chair on Religious Studies and the Comparative
Study of World Religions”, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philosophy

ABSTRACT	KEY WORDS
Islamic philosophy, in particular, Ibn Sina's views on metaphysics have been carried out by scientists. In these studies, the contributions of some scientists and philosophers who lived and worked in Central Asia to the development of science, the influence of Eastern philosophy on European scientists, the spread of Islam and Sufism, and the science of the word are described. Although the results of these studies originate from the features of the 9th-10th centuries, they play an important role in the analysis of epistemological and epistemological issues of today's Islamic philosophy.	The question of the eternity of the universe, theology, metaphysics, Al-Mabda val ma'ad, Ash-Shifa, An-Najat, Wajib al-wujud.

Introduction

When talking about the subject of Islamic philosophy, the names of such geniuses as Zakariyya Razi, Kindi, Farabi, Ibn Sina, Ibn Rushd, Ghazali, Ibn Tufail are mentioned. These scholars have their place in the history of philosophy, especially the philosophical views of Ibn Sina, and many works in this field are of particular note. The views of our compatriot Abu Ali Husayn ibn Abdullah ibn Sina, who is known as "Avicenna" in Western Europe, had a significant impact on the works of scientists in later times. Many scientific works and researches are being carried out in this regard. Alloma's works in the field of theology require in-depth research because the researcher can see that the laws of ancient Greek thought are used together with the teachings of Islamic faith.

Main part

Sufism, a component of Islamic philosophy, is an important part of Islamic intellectual heritage. A number of works related to the theory of Sufism have been published. In this regard, Ibn Sina's views are unique. Alloma's view of the "perfect man" is a synthesis of his rational philosophy of perepatetism and the laws of classical Sufism. In this regard, the work of the philosopher "The Address of the Treatise" has a special place. In this, Ibn Sina's religious and moral views are combined with his political, legal and aesthetic views. Doctor of philosophy, professor R. Nosirov, who studied the work, gives the following conclusions:

"So, according to Ibn Sina, the need for a law-establishing prophet is a natural necessity. As soon as such a person appears, he is expected to introduce laws and regulations similar to Allah's commandments into people's lives. On the basis of the established laws, it is necessary that the Almighty Creator knows the inner and outer secrets of all the events that are happening and may happen in the world, and that all the efforts of people should be unconditionally subordinated to him. It is important that his words be expressed in concrete images, such as the suffering or pleasure of the flesh, in order for his words to affect people effectively, because not all people are essentially wise. Paintings in order to form and strengthen faith in them. Regular observance of customs is envisaged" [1-70].

The matter of human destiny, freedom of discretion is considered one of the most important parts of the field of theology. In this regard, in the theory of mystical teachings of spiritual maturity, specific instructions and recommendations were contained. In the works of Ibn Sina, the fate of a person refers to the fact that he himself is in his hands.

"In our opinion, the conclusion of Ibn Sina that the spiritual maturity of a person depends on him seems to find its echo in the works of the connoisseur of theology, the Mystic Aziziddin Nasafi" *Zubdat ul-haqayiq* ("cream of truths"), the mature adibi and poet of his time Zeyniddin ibn Abdualil Vosifi" *Badoe'ul-vaqoe'* ("rare events"). Aziziddin Nasafi believes that the spiritual levels of a person remain the same in what condition they were created. As long as fate cannot be changed, not every person can surpass the established status from time immemorial. Spirits come to this world and remain unchanged in their words and deeds. Each of them has a certain norm "from the very beginning, it is impossible to exceed it. This suggests that every soul that comes into this world will have a certain limit." By its previous known status, it will be clearly and clearly defined in advance how long its body will be inside, how much it will breathe, how much it will eat, how much it will say, what it will learn, think, etc.

But Aziziddin Nasafi knows very well that such a reflection is contrary to the opinion of the people of wisdom. In their opinion, he says, science is imposed on a certain, that is, on what has been learned. Consequently, for people's words and activities, "there are no predefined dimensions. Possession of knowledge and wealth depends on the efforts of a person." Therefore, the more a person is motivated, the more his knowledge and level will increase. Doing good or evil, eating little or eating a lot is a matter of human discretion. The more labor and effort he spends, the more chances he will find" [1-70].

These thoughts are the themes of the religious matters in the teachings of Islam, that is, human deeds, accidents and so on. According to the scholars of hanafia-maturidia: discretion is given in human action. He is free to choose which way. Allah has created good and evil in this world. The realization of the path chosen by man depends on the desire of the creator. When a person wants to do something good or bad, Allah creates conditions for the realization of this work. Allah does not create conditions if he wills. From this it follows that the person who carries out the work is Allah, the creator of the conditions for the implementation of the work. A person is responsible for what he has done. Allah has long known every human being what he will do before his creation, and has written it down in his destiny. From this it follows that the work done by man does not happen because it was written in advance, but because Allah knew in advance that he would do this and wrote it down. This thing, in fact, refers to the fact that Allah knows everything in advance. And man is a proof that he is responsible for everything he does.

Hence, Ibn Sina's views on the issue of human action and fate are proportional to the dogmas of Islamic doctrine. These views of him were reflected in the theory and practice of the teachings of mysticism. The views of such mystical theorists as Ibn Arabi, Suhrawardii, were influenced by Ibn Sina's ideas about the perfect man.

The pantheistic views of Ibn Sina, the concept of Emanation in it later influenced the theoretical foundations of the teachings of mysticism in the Muslim world. It is undeniable that scholars such as Ibn Arabi, Suhrawardi, served as an important source for the theory of mystical ideas. Although it is noted that the differences between the idea of pantheism and the foundations of Islamic doctrine vary greatly by scholars of the Muslim religion, such characteristics as the status of a perfect person, abstinence from lust, tolerance, religious wisdom have positively influenced the spiritual heritage of Muslim world thought through the works of Ibn Sina as spiritual wealth.

In his works, Ibn Sina explained theology through the teachings of Emanation or through pantheistic doctrine. A special aspect of this teaching is the fact that being is combed from the creator, and then returned to him. The Thinker explained this issue in detail in his work "Al-mabda val - Ma'ad". The theological views of The Thinker were also the reason for the emergence of famous works of Abu Khomid Ghazali on philosophy, which later received the name "Documentul Islam".

Ghazali was the greatest figure in Islamic history to oppose a new platonian school. Ghazali divides the truth seekers from Islam into four groups, believing that perhaps one of these has reached its true essence. If it is believed that none of them has reached such a truth, then at that time the search for truth in general is in vain. These four groups are as follows: Mutakallim, Ismailis (botinians), philosophers and Sufi.

Despite the hostile salutation of Ghazali against the Ismaili groups, his position against the Muslim New Platonists was more intense and lasting. Because the mastery of reason, especially since the reliance on Greek philosophy took on a traditional nature, the Hamas of Ghazali against the views of Farabi and Ibn Sina, who were its manifestations, began. Until then, traditional researchers, thanks to their passion for religion, were criticizing philosophers who relied only on intelligence on the basis of "fear of strangers." The people of Ghazali felt all the feelings of the Sunnah in support of them, saying, "if there is such a person who has an admirable skill in this science (philosophy), he can compete in this field in equal terms with the most wise of them," and if he has even more knowledge than them, he has the potential to point out their fosid claims [2-19].

After making sure that there was no such person among the researchers who passed before him, Ghazali himself entered this work. He was seriously engaged in the reading of philosophical works during his free time from the process of teaching 300 students in Baghdad. He notes that for 2 years, with the help of God, he mastered all philosophical sciences, thanks to which he wrote a book entitled "Maqosidul -falosifa (the goals of philosophers)". In this book, the foundations of the Islamic new platonian school were so skillfully expressed that European researchers of the 13th century believed that this work was attributed to a new platonian current. Such an opinion continued in the new era, many believe that Ghazali is a person in a real new platonian Creed, like Ibn Sina and others. One of the effective works of Ghazali in the field of philosophy is the work "meyor al-ilm", an important guide to Aristotle's logic. This work of him, together with the books "the goals of philosophers" and "against philosophers", became important in the fanatical struggle between thinkers and philosophers.

Ghazali said that in the matter of the age of the universe, philosophers are in three points of view:

1. Many of the philosophical circles of ancient and New Times believe that the universe is age-old;
2. Plato believes that the world was created in time;
3. The idea of Jolinus (Galen) is hanging in this matter, that is, it has not come to a standstill (it is said that the views of Jolinus are presented in his book "The beliefs of Jolinus") [2-21].

Ghazali refutes the theory of those who understand the world as age-old, noting that the universe was created in time according to the ancient will or age-old judgment of God.

Evidence of Mathematics also leads to the rejection of the views of new Platonists. The age of the universe logically necessitates such a need that the planets and everything in them must circulate endlessly. But as we know, these rotations can be calculated using mathematics. For example, the sun rotates completely once a year, the planet Zuhul(Saturn) rotates every 30 years, the planet common (Jupiter) rotates every 12 years, the eighth sky or catastrophe kavokib (Galaxy) every 36 thousand years. Therefore, the hypothesis that the rotation of the planets is infinite and occurs in infinite time is undoubtedly opposed to this evidence [2-31].

Moreover, the number of such cycles is either odd or even, it is limited. Infinity, on the other hand, is neither a pair nor an odd, because one number can be added to it indefinitely, and that means it will remain intact. On top of that, the new Platonists believed in John's ability to exist in infinite quantities in a secluded self and or detached. For example, Ibn Sina (more than others) tried to explain it. However, imagining an infinity is practically a logical contradiction.

Ghazali rejected Ibn Sina's argument that God is not in time with respect to the world, but eternal according to his nature, and firmly defended that the world was created by him in time. According to him, when we say that God is eternal in relation to the world, we mean that God has always existed, and the world has not yet come into being. God perpetuated the universe with his body. Two realities emerge from this. The first is the existence of God and its consequent two existences, that is, the duration of God's existence and the second is the existence of the universe [2-53]. And the emergence of time is the play of our imagination, which leads us to see these two existences connected to each other by the bond of time.

But as for the idea that the universe existed as a possibility before it was created, it should be noted that such an idea does not apply to the New Platonists. According to this view, a possible thing that exists inherently from time immemorial is necessary. In such a case, there is a need not only for the possibility itself, but for two opposing things, wajib (necessary) and mutana' (impossible), which is clearly absurd [3-54].

Possible, wajib, and mutana' are actually general adjectives that are valid only intellectually. What exists is because one of these qualities is assigned to it[3-70].

According to the Neo-Platonists, the universe proceeds as necessarily from God (or, as they say, "before"), from a final cause, or light from the sun. However, a real active thing must be a scholar, a murid, and a subject who has his own free will. Therefore, these philosophers consider God to be the creator only in a metaphorical and metaphorical way.

Moreover, if the universe, as they say, existed from time immemorial, it will not be easy to say that it was created. Because creation or being created is giving existence to something from nothingness, something that has existed since ancient times, always has existence [2-103].

In this way, according to the creed of the New Platonists, nothing else can come from the one thing, the oneness. But since God is one and the universe is many, it cannot be doubted that he is the creator of the universe. In fact, it follows from their views that the "first" (God) originates only from the series

of singularities or simple elements. As for the multiplicity of entities and complexities that make up the universe, no evidence of the neoplatonists can reveal what their origin was. Moreover, the new Platonists are not even able to prove the existence of God (the fourth problem). According to them:

a) bodies do not need a reason for their existence from time immemorial; b) it is impossible to have a series of infinity, because from the antiquity of the world they mentioned, such a conclusion is drawn that different consequences are formed from a series of infinity. Some of them, including Ibn Sina, stated that infinite numbers can exist even in immaterial souls [2-13].

Thus, philosophers, while denying the will of God, are also incapable of proving his knowledge. The essence and proof of the words of Ibn Sina, who spoke passionately about this matter, is that the "First Cause" (Taalo) is completely devoid of matter, so it must be pure mind. Therefore, it is necessary to have knowledge of everything, because the only obstacle to having such knowledge was to have substance [2-211].

In short, Ibn Sina and his Neoplatonist followers cannot explain the claim that God is "intelligence", but they conclude that God is only materially non-existent. However, it can be proved that he is satisfied with his soul and nature from the fact that his material existence (the "First Cause") is not material. From the proof that it is ultimately intelligence, it can be concluded that it is devoid of knowledge and other things in itself. When we say why, it can be judged from the assumption that it has knowledge about itself and other than itself, that it is pure intelligence. Such thinking is just repeating the problem, not answering it [2-212].

They may claim that philosophers do not deny that the universe is the product of God's actions, but only deny that God willed the universe in time (that it was created in time). In this, they emphasize that in general, every activist is necessarily aware of his activities, and there is no room for doubt. Indeed, God, having created "everything" (universe), is certainly aware of his creation [4-101].

Ghazali gives a three-part answer to such a claim. 1) According to the new Platonists, just as light originates from the Sun, the universe was created by God "out of necessity". It is self-evident that this happening is not due to will and intention on the part of the person; 2) Some philosophers (including Ibn Sina) claim that the fact that "all" things come from God is the result of his knowledge of this "all" and that this knowledge is in constant union with God's nature. Of course, other philosophers, who insist that the origin occurred according to natural necessity (native), are skeptical about this claim; 3) Even if the latter assertion of happening is accepted, its only necessary consequence is that God exists only as his activity produced it, that is, that the first mind possessed knowledge. The first mind, in turn, had the knowledge of what came from what, and the next series of emergences continued in that order. According to this narration, God does not have knowledge about "all" and "general" things [2-216].

By the way, from the argumentative introductions of the philosophers, such a conclusion is drawn that God does not have knowledge even of his nature (the twelfth issue). Because we derive knowledge from nature from the quality of life, which in turn derives from knowledge and will. By denying that God can will, the philosophers fail to prove that he has knowledge of himself, and of that which is created by him. In a word, the philosophers immediately deny that God has the indisputable ability to know, to see, and to hear (that is, such attributes that all Muslims cannot imagine God without them). For, according to them, the possession of qualities indicates the presence of defects, that is, such defects can only be found in created beings. In God, there can be no deficiency or deficiency [2-221].

Perhaps the most controversial issue from the Islamic point of view is the denial of God's knowledge of physical sciences among the divine sciences. The Holy Qur'an explains about this (Surah Saba, verse 3) that nothing, not even the "particles of the heavens and the earth" remain hidden from God's knowledge. According to thinking philosophers like Ibn Sina, God has knowledge about things that are inferior to him. Accordingly, his science is "general", that is, it is not limited in time and space like "partial" science. Also, God has instantaneous or timeless knowledge of an event (such as a solar eclipse) before and after it occurs. After all, he is aware of the series of events that will cause the eclipse. Likewise, some derived person, for example, Umar or Zayd, knows it because they are aware of the concept of "man in general". To know in general, that is, to understand regardless of the conditions of time and space. The partial or temporal qualities that distinguish a particular person from others, or the things that happen in a certain time and place, are the subject of emotional experience, and God is above them and in a state of non-interference [4-201].

In his refutations and expositions, Ghazali concludes that God's knowledge exists regardless of the conditions of time and space. But at the same time, the partial things related to divine knowledge do not negate the achievements. The necessity arising from this way of knowledge is not due to the change in the nature of the knower (God), but to the relationship between his knowledge and the subject of knowledge (the known), which is constantly changing.

In the "nature" section of Tahafut al-falasifa, Ghazali explores two important issues: the necessity of causality (denying causality) and the condemnation of physical resurrection. The first issue (Issue 17 in Tahafut al-falasifa) was one of the biggest debates that pitted mutakallims in general and philosophers in particular, the followers of mashoyyun (adherents of Aristotelian views) against each other two centuries before Ghazali. The principles of philosophers to define the criterion of "secondary causes", to emphasize that they originate from the series of natural causes, were opposed by the mutakallims. After all, such an interpretation was found by mutakallims to be contrary to the concepts of the Qur'an. According to them, God, who is omnipotent, acts as He knows when He wants, and as a result, there is no need for any mediator [4-114]. "Moba'd Tabiya" raised the issue of zarrat and oraz (harmony between God's will and the nature of creatures), on which the mutakallims of the 9th century formed their views and defended the absolute independence of God from the conditions and limitations caused by nature and other factors. There are some exceptions to this, and the mutakallims of the Mu'tazili movement explained the concept of "birth" as a preparation for the theory that it is caused by natural factors [5-98].

Other Muslim scholars rejected the "secondary cause" as incorrect in terms of God's oneness and universal patronage. Thus, Ghazali took it upon himself to consciously and permanently reject the concept of causality. In this area, there are assumptions that he was influenced by Peron, the founder of the Greek school of blasphemers [6-29].

Before coming to the conclusions about Ibn Sina's and Ghazali's methods of explaining sciences, let's mention some points.

Why did the scientific revolution take place not in the Islamic world, but in Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries? Why did the development of Islamic philosophy and science stop? Some aspects of them can be pointed out.

At first glance, one of the causes of stagnation and decline in the 14th century may appear to be the Arabs' attempt to "Islamize" Greek science. Almost all Islamic philosophers made their living as doctors, lawyers, and civil servants. Although all of them were Muslims, they based their work on

Greek philosophy and science and did not attempt to "Islamize" its problems and results. Let's say it's okay, but at the same time, these scientists have come under severe criticism from religious circles. In the 12th-13th centuries, the pressure of specific Islamic sciences increased. "Foreign" sciences can be supported only if they are religiously justified or, say, fulfill a certain religious function (astronomy, geometry and arithmetic are among these sciences, in order to pray, Muslims need to know the exact time and the location of the Qibla). But many other fields of science have been criticized as religiously "useless" or as distorting the worldview described in the Qur'an. Thus, the increasing Islamization of "foreign sciences" seems to have led to a limitation of the tasks that can be interpreted as legitimately relevant research tasks.

Perhaps the lack of institutional foundations of science in Muslim culture is another big problem. "Madrasahs" were considered the main centers of enlightenment of the Arabs. These madrasahs, which flourished since the 11th century, were the main Islamic cultural institutions. They are mainly intended for teaching religious (Islamic) subjects. The entire education consisted of studying the Qur'an, the life of the Prophet and his predecessors, and Muslim law (Sharia). Philosophy and the natural sciences were not taught, but nevertheless the main texts related to them were copied in the madrasahs and handed over to the libraries. Many philosophers and scientists taught in the madrasa, but they did not teach "foreign" subjects here. The practice of "foreign sciences" became largely a private affair or was associated with the mosque (astronomy) and the court of the caliph (medicine). Free Arab science has never been formally institutionalized or legitimized by Arab-Islamic religious and political elites.

Medieval Islam did not recognize guilds and corporations. Professional groups of students and teachers could not legally formalize themselves, and this prevented their independent internal development. Consequently, it was almost impossible to establish autonomous academic institutions based on internal self-governance, as was the case with the universities of the dying Middle Ages. Therefore, it seems that the main reason for the stagnation of Arabic science in the 14th century was that the surrounding Arab world could not establish free universities that could compromise with them and hope for the support of both religious and secular authorities [7-240].

Why did the scientific revolution take place not in the Islamic world, but in Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries? Why did the development of Islamic philosophy and science stop? Some aspects of them can be shown.

This is of course the opinion of Western scientists. If we place in sequence the issues that have gained relevance for the region of our country, the scourge of religious fanaticism that poses a great danger to us and its prevention is of course. Of course, great work is being done in this regard. But, first of all, scientific research plays an important role in solving this problem. At present, in the countries where the religion of Islam has spread, a big wall has been erected between imams, religious scholars and representatives of the school of philosophy, philosophers. The historical and modern struggle and debates between representatives of this science led to the idea of not studying the opponent's science at all. This is recognized more by the representatives of Sharia. But the negative, one-sided attitude towards science and its methodology causes us various doubts and concerns. The reason is that where philosophy reigns, free thought, diversity of views, and the opportunity to choose several alternative opinions arise. In addition, during its historical stages, humanity has achieved great experience in the social, political, and scientific spheres. This broadened the scope of his thinking. Scientific and technical achievements are evidence of how knowledgeable a person is. In such a case, the science of

philosophy, which is a product of the mind, occupies an important place in the understanding of human existence and in thinking about its secrets. Many misunderstandings would have been avoided if religion, which is the spiritual wealth of mankind, was not viewed as opposed to science, but as a complementary factor. The West, which did not destroy the roots of philosophy, has now made great progress in the field of development.

Conclusion

Ibn Sina's influence on the science and philosophy of the Muslim world is significant. It is necessary to pay special attention to the work of Abu Ubayd Juzjani in spreading his works to the world. Ibn Sina influenced the work of several thinkers and philosophers after him. As an example, we can cite Omar Khayyam, a poet and mathematician, a bright example of Muslim orthodoxy. He praised Ibn Sina's work and translated one of his treatises into Persian. Philosopher Nasir Khysrov also mentioned that he was influenced by Ibn Sina's ideas in his works. Ibn Haitham, a famous scientist in natural sciences, was very familiar with the treatises of Ibn Sina. After Ibn Sina's philosophy was criticized by Ghazali and Fahriddin Razi, Ibn Rushd and Nasiruddin Tusi wrote works in support of his philosophy. For this purpose, Tusi wrote a commentary on Ibn Sina's work "al-Isharat wat-tanbihat". Nasiruddin Tusi's nephew Afdaluddin Koshani wrote several treatises on the philosophy of Ibn Sina. His student Qutbiddin Shirozi wrote an encyclopedia named "Durratut-taj" which reminds of "Ash-Shifa". Tusi's colleague Dobiran al-Katibi al-Qazwini left his work "Hikmat ul-a'in" on the philosophy of peripatetism. Qutbuddin Razi analyzes the commentaries of Nasiruddin Tusi and Fahriddin Razi on Ibn Sina's work "Al-Isharat vat-tanbihat" in his work "Al-Mukhakamat". Philosophical scholars such as Sadriddin Dashtaki, Ghiyasiddin Mansur Shirozi and Jalaluddin Davani mention that they were influenced by Ibn Sina's philosophy in their works. Asiriddin Abhari wrote the book "Kitab al-Hidaya" and Husayn Maybudi and Mulla Sadr developed a book of commentary on it. This book remains one of the main century studies of Peripatetic philosophy in Iran and India.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Important stages of the history of socio-ethical and humanistic thoughts in Uzbekistan. Institute of Philosophy and Law named after I. Mominov. Tashkent, 2007, b. -70.
2. Ghazali. Tahafut al-falasifa / edited and commented by Dr. Ali Bumalhu. - Beirut: Daru and Maktabul Khilal, 2002. - B.19.
3. Khivar al-Biruni and Ibn Sina. Abdulkarim al-Yafi. - Damascus: Darulfikr, 2002. -B.54.
4. Ibn Rushd. Tahafut al-tahafut / Under the editorship of Dr. Sulayman Dunya. -Cairo: Darul Ma'arif, 1964. -B.101.
5. Fakhry, «Some Paradoxical Implications of the mu'tazelite view of Tree will», «muslim World», XLIII(1953), pp. 98 ff
6. Van den Bergh, Averroes' Tahafut al tahafut, Vol I, Introduction, pp. XXIX of seg. Vol. II, passim
7. G. Skirbeck and N. Gile. History of philosophy. "Sharq". -T.2002, - B. 240.
8. Karimov U. Great Alloma// Star of the East. 1989. No. 11. -B.199.
9. Irisov. A. "Abu Ali Ibn Sina. Life and creative heritage". T. "Science". 1980y. -B.172-173.
10. Important stages of the history of socio-ethical and humanistic sciences in Uzbekistan. The team of authors. Publishing House of the Institute of Philosophy and Law, Tashkent- 2007, -B.69.

11. Sadykov R.G. "Man and the world in the philosophy of Ibn Sina", Abstract of the thesis for the degree of candidate of philosophical sciences, St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State University, 2000 - P.8.
12. Niyozov Y.B. "Philosophy of Ibn Sina in the assessment of modern Arab researchers" Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of candidate of philosophical sciences, Dushanbe, Institute of Philosophy named after ak. A.M. Bogoutdinova AS RT, 2010 – P.10.
13. Rakhimov M.Kh. "The Anthropology of Abu Ali ibn Sina". Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Dushanbe, Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan, 2005
14. Sultonov S.A. "Ibn Sina in the philosophical tradition of France", Abstract of the thesis of a candidate of philosophical sciences. Dushanbe: Tajik State Pedagogical University. Sadridin Aini, 2012, -S. fifteen
15. "Majmu'at rasail al-hukamo", (مجموعة الرسائل الحكماء) Manuscript of the Institute of Oriental Studies named after Beruni of UzFA, Inv. No. 2385-XI,-B. 41-42.
16. On the 1000th anniversary of the birth of Abu Ali ibn Sina. Tashkent, "Fan" publishing house, 1980, -B.90.
17. Ibn Sina, al-Ilohiyat, presented by Ibrahim Madkur, edited by Qanawati and Said Zaid, al-Cairo, 1960, p. 478.
18. Abu Ali Ibn Sina. To the 1000th anniversary of the birth. "Fan", Tashkent, 1980. -B.91.
19. Faizikhodjaeva.D. Abu Nasr al-Farabi and Abu Ali ibn Sina on logical proof. "NISHAN-PUSHIR", Tashkent-2013, -B.132.
20. Rosenthal F. The Triumph of Knowledge: The Concept of Knowledge in Medieval Islam. – M.: Nauka, 1978.
21. Rudolf U. Al-Maturidi and Sunni theology in Samarkand. - Almaty: Fund "XXI century", 1999.
22. Rudolph W. Al-Moturidi and Samarkand Sunni theology. -T.: Publication of the Imam al-Bukhari Foundation, 2001.
23. Sagadeev A. V. Ibn Sina (Avicenna). –M.: Nauka, 1985.
24. Sirojiddinov Sh. An Introduction to Islamic Philosophy: The Science of the Word. - T.: Economy-finance, 2008.