

Theoretical Reason and Practical Reason for Kant and Tabataba'i

Leila Sadat Mazlum^{1*}, Hossein Houshang²

¹Department of Comparative Philosophy, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
²Associate Professor in Imam Sadegh University, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Theology and Philosophy, Tehran, Iran

Received: September 21, 2014

Accepted: December 10, 2014

ABSTRACT

The issue of reason and its division into theoretical and practical reason is one of important issues in philosophy, whether in the philosophy of Kant or Allamah Tabataba'i. Kant maintained that there is a faculty in human which has two independent functions; theoretical reason based on its a priori rules pays it attention to recognition of "what is", by taking its materials from experiences and combining them with mind's forms, in this way it will acquire cognition. But metaphysical issues such as God and self and world as a whole, aren't existed in the world of experience, so there is no way towards their cognition by theoretical reason. Although this doesn't mean that the way for their understanding is obstructed and that no way is available to understand them. So just here a way appears as practical reason. Practical reason concerns about ethical musts and must not, and aiming to prove and justifies its propositions, presumes metaphysical things.

In contrast, in Tabataba'i's philosophy there are two independent faculties that each has its specific function. Theoretical reason concerns about understanding of facts and "what is" and practical reason pays it attention to ethics and what Allamah Tabataba'i called constructed things. For Allamah theoretical reason, which included a wider realm, is a reason that also can study metaphysical issues such as God and self and to obtain knowledge about them.

In the present paper we will try to compare Tabataba'i's viewpoint of theoretical reason and practical reason with Kant's, and this will be suggested that both thinkers have some agreements and disagreements about theoretical reason and practical reason and their relations. For example both thinkers maintained that practical reason about its statements or votes has independence from theoretical reason and that those statements originated in reason, therefore it doesn't need the world of experience for justification and confirmation of its statements.

KEYWORDS: Theoretical reason, Practical Reason, Kant, Tabataba'i

INTRODUCTION

"Reason", wisdom, and bodily sense in the thought of Greek philosophers divided into "theoretical" and "practical". Some philosophers regarded same nature for theoretical reason and practical reason, and maintained that the material of both of them is reasoning, with a difference that what is the subject of understanding by theoretical reason is a knowledge kind, and about practical reason, its subject is actions. Even some stated that division based on subject isn't right, and that the understanding of both is upon theoretical reason. And some believed that: the kind of one of them is perception, and the other one is act, then interaction between the two leads to a combination of knowledge and act.

Two great contemporary thinkers who thought of this matter in modern age, in western and Islam world, are Kant and Tabataba'i. According to foundations of their knowledge, they have different views about this matter, although there are some similarities between them that lead comparison of both philosophers.

Kant's philosophical system, in both practical and theoretical sections, is introduced consistently and in an ordered way. His philosophy has been started with recognition and then ended to metaphysic. Although some of Kant commentators maintained that main aim of Kant in discussing about recognition was to provide a philosophy for strengthening the foundations of mathematics and sciences, and metaphysic was a secondary matter; but others believed that according to the results from Kant's works in critical period, is that he was highly under influence of metaphysic crisis in his time and he had tried to find a solution for that.

Theoretical reason for Tabataba'i is a reason that judges about the truth of things and their existence and nonexistence and their inherent qualities, whether they are in the realm of human behavior or not. Theoretical reason's propositions are insights that signify things and reflect something in external world, so in this regard he has a viewpoint like Kant's. In other words, theoretical reason takes its foundations from experience and external world.

But practical reason as an independent faculty has a specific function. The realm of practical reason for Tabataba'i is human acts, and practical knowledge doesn't represent realities.

*Corresponding Author: Leila Sadat Mazlum, Department of Comparative Philosophy, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

A comparative look at these two great thinkers, from west and east, is very important because both are philosophy of ethics and have a new idea and innovation about practical reason and its relation with theoretical reason. Division of reason into theoretical and practical and also the way of their influence on each other will demonstrate that how much both thinkers have agreement and disagreement about definition, method and limits of understanding, and how these two reason are functioning. We can find a deeper perception of this controversial issue through explanation of these agreements and disagreements.

Theoretical and Practical Reasons in Kant's Philosophy

Using Copernicus's model which said if we reverse the relation between mind and object and saying that for verification of a theory it is the object and the external that must be matched with the structure of mind, then we conclude that in this way we can explain synthetic a priori propositions.

Therefore self and its abilities have extensive effect on our understanding of the world, and in other words, self is the necessary condition of knowledge. Plentiful experimental data can be understood and ordered through this self in a meaningful whole.

In theoretical field Kant maintained that knowledge is a combination of mental forms and external material. Self through its forms makes knowledge possible. Self, in theoretical field, has three faculties: sensation, understanding, and reason. And Kant refers to another one that is active imagination which is placed between senses and understanding which plays an intermediate role and conveys formations.*

"Sense", "understanding" and "reason" could be surveyed respectively and in proportion with natural function of human's perceptive faculties. For Kant, the realm and limits of recognition of senses necessarily will impose themselves on understanding, and the later one will impose its requirements on reason.

"Space" and "time" are presented as a priori forms of sense, and "a priori details" in "transcendental senses". The a priori forms of time and space are described as two conditions for any mathematical knowledge; so that geometry and its proofs are based on theoretical intuition of "space", and mathematics and its axioms are based on the theoretical intuition of time.† And generally both are grounds and a priori base of any experimental cognition; but a priori forms of perception don't limit to these two (time and space), and Kant in his works specially in the section of "transcendental logic", in *Critiques of theoretical Reason*, tried to demonstrate that there are also some non-mathematical concepts that signify external things. And fundamentally the knowledge of experimental objects is impossible without them. The system of a priori principles of understanding makes this possible for us to issue synthetic a priori propositions (as it represented itself in experimental sciences especially in physics).

Synthesis and more importantly unity of perceptions from sensuous intuition were possible by understanding components,‡ therefore sense and understanding (definitely through active imagination) by application of its specific a priori forms, combine perceptions with concepts and give them unity, and this provides the needed background for declaring scientific axioms. Kant understood very well that emergence of scientific axioms –in the way he thought of it- besides need of synthesis and combination of many perceptions, also it demands another element, namely "unity" and the unification act by subject; because the act of synthesis and combination itself is based on a prior subject, or an conscious understander who is aware about the "necessity" of such synthesis.§ But in fact the processes of synthesis and unification will be done simultaneously by same faculty and ultimately by true subject. Therefore for Kant, self and its faculties play the main role in recognition of knowledge.

Theoretical and Practical Reason in Tabataba'i's Philosophy

Humankind is defined as "talking animal" in the thought tradition of Islamic thinkers. Talking (in its logical meaning) is a parameter for separation so it is the distinction between human and animal. According to Islamic thinkers, this separation leads to humankind wholeness and soundness, and human is human because it is talking. Talking refers to that part of human truth that has the power of thinking that also called as self. The content of Molavi's poem also refers to this truth that humankind's essence is composed of thinking and its thoughts which are upon self. If we named the structure and entity of humankind as its nature, so we can say that thinking is a part of its nature, or in another words, thinking is a natural thing for human.

Allamah Tabataba'i who is nurtured out of Islamic tradition has same anthropological view and for him a characteristic that distinguished human from animal is that trait -namely talking and thinking ability as human's

* Kant, Immanuel (1997), *Critique of theoretical Reason*, p216.

† Ibid, 218.

‡ Kant, Immanuel (1997), *Critique of theoretical reason*, B91-10.

§ Ibid, B92

existential truth. In interpretation of verse 179, Al-I'raf chapter, about those that Holy Quran introduced them as animals and even inferior, Tabataba'i said:

«فقدوا ما يُمَيِّزُ به الإنسان من سائر الحيوان، و هو تمييز الخير و الشر و النافع و الضار بالنسبة الي الحياة الانسانية السعيدة من طريق السمع و البصر و الفؤاد.»

Fovad (which is used instead of Heart by Tabataba'i) here refers to human's self that has thinking ability:

«... المعنيان جميعاً - التعقل و السمع - في الحقيقة من شأن القلب اي النفس المدركة فهو الذي يبعث الانسان الي متابعة ما يعقله او سمعه من ناصح مشفق...»[†]

Therefore the reason of human is a part of his structure and existence or his essence, and rationality needs coordination with essence and self and moving on its natural path:

«لفظ العقل علي ما عرفت يطلق علي الادراك من حيث ان فيه عقد القلب بالتصديق، علي ما جبل الله سبحانه الانسان عليه من ادراك الحق و الباطل في النظريات، والخير و الشر و المنافع و المضار في العمليات حيث خلق الله سبحانه خلقه يدرك نفسه...»[‡]

Allamah Tabataba'i in this expression divided reason into two kinds, practical and theoretical. In his eyes, theoretical reason is about science and “-what is-s”, but he regarded practical reason as a reason that discusses about musts and must nots of life and considered it about human acts and behaviors.

Comparison of Kant's and Tabataba'i's Practical and Theoretical Reason

One of important thing in Kant's and Allamah's philosophy is a distinction that they consider between noumenon and phenomenon. Confessing a sort of necessary relation between noumenon and phenomenon, Kant maintained that it is an inescapable thing to accept noumenon, but he said that because noumenon never will be experienced, it will remain unknown forever. In the other side, Allamah emphasized that what emerges in mind (nature) is an appearance and representation of reality (existence). So in contrary to Kant, there will establish a meaningful connection between phenomenon and noumenon, then the problems in Kant's philosophy reach their answer in an acceptable way.

According to this, another division in reason is suggested by these two thinkers. Both maintained that reason is divided into practical and theoretical, and they believed that it is upon theoretical reason to know “-what is-s” and also recognition of objects and external world; and the task of practical reason is to know what are life's musts and must nots, and ethical principles.

But about the concerns of practical and theoretical reason, besides similarities they have differences also. In Kant, we have one reason that has two functions, theoretical and practical functions, in fact practical reason continues the way of theoretical reason and covers its limitations; and in contrary to Kant, according to Allamah we have two independent reasons which each has separate function, so that practical reason's concerns are constructed things and the concerns of theoretical reason are real things.

Quiddity of Practical Reason for Kant and Allamah

Both thinkers considered reason as discriminator of human from other animals, regarded it as a gift for humankind. Their views of reason lie within two similar frames from two different aspects: 1- in regard with inherent value of reason in human, 2- in regard with the function of reason in human existence.

For Kant through reason human can enact moral code, through reason they can turn themselves into a religion, or can acquire dignity and status. Humankind through reason has conscience and according to it will own good will. In the view of Kant, this firm foundation is very reason, and he released it from religion dominance.

Allamah Tabataba'i also saw reason as a divine gift that provides us distinction between good and evil, and he was proud of being the follower of a religion that all its rules are based on reason and has been invited people towards reason. Allamah declared that it leads to calmness and fortune of human if its existential aspects to be under supervision of reason. Reason is the noblest force in human existence.

For Allamah it is the genuine character of human that its reference is reason, and he believed that the quality of human life is dependent on surviving of reason against feeling. Directing on correct direction, perfectionist people use it for acquiring fortune and happiness. There is a force in reason that can distinguish right from wrong, but it may be deviated by long wishes and desires ... God defines reason as a force that human enjoy it in his religion and by it he can find his way to truth and knowledge and righteous acts. Kant also regards cultural and moral things such as freedom, virtues, and equality as a priori principles, and in terms of Kant they are inherent of reason. But their realization is gradual and scheduled. For both thinkers, this reason automatically evokes respect to each other within us, therefore both of them tried to place the rationality umbrella over everything. Both philosophers paid their

* Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; Al-Mizan Quran Interpretation, part eight, p. 341, Al-Elmi Lil-Matboo'at Publication, 1995.

† Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; Al-Mizan Quran Interpretation, part nineteen, p. 390, Al-Elmi Lil-Matboo'at Publication, 1995.

‡ Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; Al-Mizan Quran Interpretation, part second, p. 253-4, Al-Elmi Lil-Matboo'at Publication, 1995.

attention to the functional importance of reason because it can release human from obeying desires and lusts. Allamah maintained that when one or more of person's internal desires erupted and he is suffering from high anger or excessive fear or felt hopeless or is arrogant and stingy, so he can't decide rightly, except he thinks that his vote a reason-based one. Therefore reason can save human from those desires which were mentioned by Allamah. It is the case also in Kant's philosophy that reason leads to freedom for human, also to dignity –as in comparison with freedom. So reason for both philosophers is the origin of ethics and humanity, and as a distinguisher between human and animal.

Another point is about the relation between practical reason and theoretical reason. For both thinkers, there is no remarkable relation between theoretical and practical reason, whether for Kant that practical reason for him is a sort of complimentary for theoretical reason and its shortages, and in view of Allamah the votes of practical reason are constructed things that have nothing to do with theoretical reason's votes.

Unity or Duality of Theoretical and Practical Reasons

Kant believed that both reasons in fact are one. In other words, we have one force that sometimes because of a specific function we call it as theoretical reason and in other times because it has another kind of function, therefore we call it practical reason. It is like an actor who plays two roles. This opinion itself has different kinds which will be mentioned below. It is said that here there is a difference between these two reasons, namely their objects or things are understood, and definitely reason here is the understander.

In fact the problem isn't that we have two reasons or two faculties, but if we consider human's reason, this reason may have two distinct functions. One of them is "cognition", but a cognition that isn't related with act. When we discuss about the secret of galaxy or human's eternity, at first our aim is to find a secret. This is theoretical epistemology. But we sometimes try to reach a cognition that isn't separated from act and we obtain this because we engage with it practically. For example cognition about ethical issues is a practical cognition, but it isn't that when we speak of ethics, so a practical cognition is acquired. For example a cognition that a sociologist obtains about ethics in a tribe or a nation through research, is a theoretical one. The aim of our cognition is to determine what is in agreement with reality (true) and what is false (opposing to reality). In practical cognition we try to distinguish between good and bad, which behavior is right and which one is wrong. One is aware that a work is right if he do it. This kind of reason's function is called cognition of act.

Kant believed that as we have some obvious rules in theoretical reason that have priority to experience and are considered as a priori, in same way in the realm of practical reason we have a group of rules that are a priori axioms and human's reason in itself can understand them. Definitely the difference between theoretical and practical reason for Kant is merely about their applications. We have only one reason. Kant declared that there is ultimately one reason but its references are different. This means that we have only one reason but it can deal with its concerns in two ways. "In one way it objectifies its concern, while this concern in fact is from another origin than reason, another way is that the concern to objectify itself. Former is the knowledge of theoretical reason and later is the knowledge of practical reason."^{*} In other words, reason in its theoretical function realized objects that are presented to it in intuition, but in its practical function, it is in itself the origin of its concerns. According to Kant, reason in its practical function deals with the foundations of determination and assessment of will. Or it is a faculty that "develops opposite or correspondent object to concepts, or intends to develop them (whether the material strength for this is enough or not), namely it requires its causality."[†] Theoretical reason deals with knowledge and understanding, but practical reason deals with preference according to ethical rules.

But in contrary to Kant, Allamah Tabataba'i believed that we have two independent faculties that one of them is theoretical reason which pays it attention to what is-s and the other one is practical reason that musts and must nots are its focus. Theoretical reason is used when we examined some theoretical inquiries and contents. But there are some important points about the difference between theoretical and practical reasons for Allamah that must be developed. Some emphasize on this matter that understanding of theoretical thinking is dependent on considering some questions about explanation and anticipation. This means that on one hand theoretical reason explains previous facts that are happened before, and on the other hand, describes what will happen in future. In this regard, theoretical thinking focuses on facts and their explanation. These contents are expressed by some terms which are understandable for all. With attention to these matters, theoretical rationality is an approach that is used in natural sciences and the humanities science, and tries to provide a description of their related events.

Therefore, in contrary to Kant, practical and theoretical reasons are two separate faculties with specific functions for Allamah. Understanding in fact is the task of theoretical reason. Any kind of understanding is occurred

^{*}Kant, Immanuel (1996). *Practical philosophy*, p64.

[†] - Ibid.

by a faculty called theoretical reason. Whether its concern is general or specific, or whether it is related to act or not related to act. Understanding is the work of theoretical reason. But practical reason is a working faculty. And its work is only act. Generally these are two utterly independent faculties for self. And same as anger and lust have nothing in common.

The relation of Practical Reason to Causality and Option

Duty is an act that one is required (obligated) to do it. These acts are determined by practical reason. "Law is a statement that includes an absolute order." Law is divided into two parts: practical and theoretical. Here practical law (namely laws as are composed by practical reason) is considered. For Kant, practical law that is originated in fortune, is pragmatic law (caution and prudence rule), and the law, if any, that hasn't any motive but happiness is ethical law. The former shows us how to reach happiness, and the latter shows us how to keep it. The former is based on experimental principles, because it is related to satisfaction of desires; and the latter is only related to choice right in reasonable being. What here called "ethical law" and is related to rational being is the origin of duty. A characteristic of this law is that it has generality and necessity. These two characters are distinguishers between law and rule. According to division of reason into theoretical and practical, law is divided into two kinds: theoretical law belongs to "what is" according to causality in nature; and practical law belongs to what "must be" according to choice right or practical reason. So we call the origin of duty sometimes practical reason and sometimes option and sometimes ethical law, and these interpretations are used in Kant as synonyms.

The fundamental idea of Kant's ethics is that human's act must be not only in compatible with duty but also must be merely upon duty and in regard to ethical law, hence Kant ended up the fundamental concept in his philosophy of ethics, namely will's autonomous quality; for Kant one mustn't obey nobody except human for establishment of ethics, this is human being that enact and enforce ethical law that originated from its absolute theoretical reason, now if we evoke other things except human—even God- for doing an ethics-based act, then we are under sovereignty of another one and our act isn't an ethical one, in other words we aren't free anymore. Freedom realized when human obeys reason and conscience. In other words, while one can don't act ethically, but he hears his conscience and acts ethically, a practice that is merely his duty. Therefore all people who seeks ethical law in anything other than human, not only destroyed human's freedom but also ethical value will be ruined. The point that must be considered is that freedom is an idea, and idea in Kant is a guiding principle. Definitely freedom idea is provable in in ethics, but since human has two sides, material and spiritual, human in the realm of phenomenon is required and obligated, and in the realm of noumenon is free, therefore we can't and don't know how to be aware of our freedom and to make it as an object to our cognition in a way that we obtain knowledge and cognition about phenomenon in the realm of theoretical reason.

In comparison of Kant's opinion on freedom with Allamah's opinion it can be said that in both philosophers' thought, the freedom of human is his inherent right because of his rationality and dignity. Dignity and freedom have a tight relation in both ethics of Kant and Allamah. In one hand, human must be free because human has rationality and dignity, and in the other hand, freedom itself leads to dignity for human. In Kant's philosophy the internal side of freedom is considered more than its external side. This means that human not obeying lust and desires. Freedom is an essential concept in Kant's philosophy of ethics which has a role to play in both parts of his philosophy, theoretical and practical, although it is more important in practical part. Kant regarded freedom as the base of ethics, and the foundation of the principles that are originated from this freedom, which requires human to be moral, is rationality. This is why he believed that moral laws not only about human, but also about all reasonable beings are applicable and their trueness among human kind is merely because they are reasonable. Kant considered the generalizability of moralities, and this generalizability can be realized only through reason. Because feelings have a personal dimension and are different one by one. This freedom is related to releasing from any pressure externally or internally and also is related to person's relations. Because leads to creativity in human.

For Kant human is an independent being. The most prominent principle in Kant's ethics philosophy is the independence of will. Since it is the origin of human nature's dignity and any reasonable being; and in contrary, dependence or other kind of belief degrades humankind into lower level, and this is in opposition to inherent dignity of human.

Both thinkers, especially Kant, warned about imitation of others, because human is defined according to his thinking, and imitation is an obstacle in the way of growth and true fortune. For Allamah imitation in reason-related issues is against dignity and respect. Also for Kant, imitation has no position in ethics.

An important ethical supposition in Quran is freedom and right to choose for subject. This was regarded by Allamah also. And this is a deniable principle that human may find his way to perfection in all levels. Allamah also in interpreting Quran emphasized on person's option, and described his view in this regard during the interpretation of Quran's verses. For example in interpretation of verse 88, chapter 12, stated that: human in the creation is free to

choose, and gave him freedom to act. So that he can choose to do or no to do an act. If he decided to do, he is free to do, and reversely ... and nobody has the right to order other one according his wish.*

Therefore, human is a being who based on its creation has knowledge and right to choose, and he can distinguish between good and evil and to choose freely, and through very his specific creation he bears the heavy divine burden on his shoulders.

The foundation of freedom for both thinkers is equal with human's rationality. But in Kant, freedom is more internal, namely freedom from all desires and feelings that are obstacles on the way of person's ethical life. But Allamah Tabataba'i focused more on its philosophical aspect and discussed about the existential origin of freedom.

So their intents of freedom aren't equal. But both emphasized that if a person did an act forcedly, then his act has no moral value.

For Allamah, freedom is for human being, in addition to God. And for Kant, human being is utterly free and is limited only by itself. Although there are no common foundations in freedom debate in the thought of Kant and Tabataba'i, but both of them are at one that human must have full freedom externally and internally.

The Specifications and Function of Practical Reason

The statements of practical reason are named constructions by Allamah, and he maintained that they are constructed by human's fancy. In definition of construction he said: "the construction is giving the definition of something or its related rule to another thing through fancy."[†]

Thus Allamah named the science which is obtained about practical reason's objects as constructionist science, and this determines the relation between human and its present acts. Definitely this must be added that constructionist sciences are based upon a truth and the relation also must be extracted from them and following this some external effects will be happened on them.

In another classification, Allamah considered constructions and their related sciences as constructions in general sense and placed it against essence and construction in specific sense originated from human's feelings and are necessary for activity of human's active faculties. Allamah maintained that this kind of construction can be in any living being's behavior. The specific constructions related to human are divided into two groups by Allamah: construction before and after community formation. Pre-community constructions aren't based upon individual. The concepts such as justice, good and bad, the principle of science following, and construction of sure-led guess are pre-community construction. But post-community constructions are the effects of human's active and formative faculties and are dependent on individual, including marriage, education, superiority and subordinacy, forbidding and enjoining and so on. In another classification, post-community constructions are divided into unchangeable general and changeable private. Fixed general construction are including construction of science following and construction of community, and changeable private construction of different community forms are various in different ages.

The main items in Allamah's definition of practical reason's function are: any living being deals with some acts, takes some points as the goals of its activities, and moves towards them by some strengths and tools that are provided in a natural and formative way. Also active strengths of human make some feelings within him so that led him to love the acts of his faculties and to demand them, and in other hand, to hate some events that are in contrary with his faculties and strengths and don't want them.

"I must want this desirable", this is the relation that we establish between our active faculties and our feeling form which is correspondence with an act's effect. For example, "we must eat this food" is a relation that one has established in memory of fullness during hunger. He placed the relation of necessity between himself and the internal sense of fullness or pleasure and his mild mood in fullness. In this mood he regarded himself as desirous and that as desire. This fullness penetrates in swallowing, chewing, putting in mouth, taking, approaching, and rising hand.

So any work which is assayed in comparison with human's leniency and perfection or non-leniency and deficiency, its goodness and badness will be cleared. Therefore person makes must and must not constructions. These don't need any enactor to enact and to announce them to persons, rather the nature assigned these musts and must nots are assigned to human kind. So all individual and social musts and must nots become construction in this way.

Allamah added that the construction of obligation is a general construction that no act is excluded from it. Any act is realized according to belief to its necessity. Good, bad, ugliness, and beauty are direct production of obligations and musts. Allamah believed that principles of usage, community, and right-wrong are constructions that human's reason itself constructed their related musts and must nots. Human constructed justice and oppression for

* Tabataba'i, Al-Mizan Interpretation, Vol. 20, p. 388, 2000.

† Tabataba'i, Rasa'el Al-Sab'ah va Hekmat, p. 129, 1997.

his/her interest. He seeks everybody's interest for the sake of his interest, and justice-related must is constructed by human because of everybody's benefit.

The late Tabataba'i didn't believe that the good and the bad are eternal things, but he maintained that society's intellectuals may present new concepts according to their understanding and the progression of society for better realization of society's interests.

For Allamah reason has a cognition nature in both its kinds, and the only difference between them is about their objects. In summary, the object of practical reason is related to practical things, and the object of theoretical reason is related to impractical things. For adherents of this view, there is mixing up of science and act in practical reason.

The main criterion that may be derived from Kant's philosophy about theoretical reason is its practicality. This means that only that knowledge may be considered as science that is based upon experience. Therefore, although for Kant human's reason has some structures that come before experience, but the beginning of science and also its usage are placed in experience and its realm. In fact Kant wants to say that all our knowledge begin with experience, because our senses must be impressed by things for activation of our cognition faculty, and when senses that are our raw materials of experience were introduced, the work of our mind begins. In other words, rejecting rational and divine intuition for human, that is human has no intuition of impractical facts, Kant intended to limit intuition faculty in human to sensual intuition which this intuition is possible only through sense related items namely time and space by receiving external data. So for Kant, science has a fundamental root that is sense and experience.

Ethics or practical reason is another process in Kant's thought and it can be said that it is a sort of theoretical reason's outcome or result. Because for Kant, in practical reason, reason is considered in its practical role, or its working or effective aspect or its subjectivity about doing acts and moral behaviors, which in it rational cognition isn't under attention. To describe this it must be said that for Kant in practical reason awareness of what is isn't considered; rather knowledge of what people must do is important. In other words, for Kant reason can be appeared in thinking to the same extent that it can be in act. Therefore, philosopher of ethics has the duty to derive a priori moral elements and to represent their origin so that propositions and a priori moral axioms to be used in practical reason same as in theoretical reason. So Kant's project in practical reason is to demonstrate possible principles that may be called moral axioms.

The moral cognition considered by Kant is like scientific cognition that is based on a priori axioms. Just as Kant discovered that scientific cognition is possible if a priori items to be attributed to experience by mind. Also as he said we must not seek the foundation and origin of obligation and commitment in human's nature or in world situation, but we must seek it merely in concepts of reason as a priori.

Therefore, about the function of practical reason in Kant and Allamah, and its relation to theoretical reason it can be said that for Allamah practical reason has a function that relatively is independence of practical reason, in fact, practical reason is the same faculty that controls the act and behavior of men. Or its work is to understand musts and must nots, in other words, practical reason is the base of life's sciences, and practical reason judges that whether I must do this or not? But for Kant, the function of practical reason follows the function of theoretical reason. In first critique, Kant discusses the quality of metaphysical possibility. Kant stated that reason in first case is called as theoretical reason and in second case as practical reason. For more explanation it must be said that in first case reason merely embodies a priori concepts of mind through senses (these concepts aren't from sensual experience in no way, but they are as the form of person's mind). According to Kant, these sensual experiences are immediate perceptions, but without a priori concepts they led our mind to nothing. But about second function of reason that is called practical reason by Kant in fact reason embodies something that never is included in realities.

Objectivity and Justification in Practical Reason

For Kant, a priori synthetic proposition is an intersection of objective and mental things. In other words, real accordance between objective things and our mental concepts only may be realized through synthesizing a priori synthetic propositions, which this has occurred in Newtonian physics completely. Therefore Kant says that generality and necessity, as characteristics of a priori synthetic propositions, provide the conditions for objectivity and also are main criteria for objectivity. Because Kant maintained that objectivity is making an agreement between mental things and external ones. Or objectivity is accepting that there are some general and necessary rules in nature which a priori synthetic propositions represent them. Kant divided imperatives into two groups, conditional and absolute, which conditional ones aren't moral imperatives for him. Conditional imperatives are divided into two kinds: an example for first one is "if you want reach that outcome then you must have that thing or you must do that act", and he called this kind as "doubtful conditional." An example for second kind says that "because you naturally interested in happiness so you must do that act", this example isn't formally a conditional, but in its content there is

a condition with this difference that doubtful state which is existed in first one –because maybe somebody doesn't want reach that mentioned outcome, so in this regard this is doubtful- isn't existed in second one, but in second conditional statement there is a definite willing to happiness. Kant named second one as “emphasized conditional”. Both imperatives are conditional and none of them has a moral value, since a moral axiom mustn't be conditional. Although conditional imperatives may be authentic, but they never can be objective; since they are always conditional. They provide cause for who he interests in the mentioned goal, but this isn't right about who he doesn't show interest in that outcome. It seems that all conditional imperatives remain in mind and are dependent on person's wishes and wants and none of them will be consisted with “real imperative of reason”.

Another group is absolute imperatives that are called as necessary imperatives by Kant. Absolute imperative in a priori way and independence from experience is: obeying general rule that can be expressed generally this way: “act in a way so that the rule of your act will be willingly the general law of nature.”

Obligational imperative commands us to do our duty and do this for itself. This isn't depended on any condition and doesn't say us that: “do your duty if this or that is happened ...”, in other words, this imperative is an absolute thing. On the hand, since all effects and data are produced through nature's laws, absolute imperative can be defined as follows: “do in a way that your act method will be turned into nature's law according your will”. Both formulations are clear and show the contradiction of absolute imperative and conditional imperative. Therefore objectivity in Kant's practical reason is related to necessity same as in theoretical reason, and Kant in fact introduced a new definition of objectivity, so that whether in theoretical or in practical reason, those axioms have objectivity that are necessary.

But objectivity in Tabataba'i's theoretical and practical reason is different Kant's. Allamah divided human's perceptions into two groups of real and constructional perceptions:

Real Perceptions

These are such meanings that ultimately have conformity with external things, in a way that these beings are inherently equal with these meanings. This is the case whether these meanings were produced through abstraction or contemplation or to attributing them to things or not; for example “earth”, “sky” and “stars” that have exact instance in external world, so that abstraction, thinking, and assignation of these meanings or not has no effect about them, so we call such meaning as truths.*

Constructive Concepts

“These are meanings that we assign to external things and if we ignore the aspect of imagination and thinking, there is no external realization and instances for them. For example the word “property” that through this meaning owner can realize his possession without any trouble and disturbance by others. Or like “headship” that through this one can manage thing in the realm of his headship”.†

What we said here about real concepts clears that constructional concepts are products of mind and language, and we call this process as construction. In other words, constructional concepts are discovered by mind or made of it.

Constructional concepts make a relation between truths and for example build some new concepts for example between land and human, so that “if there is no construction then there are no property, no owner and owned one, but only human and earth.” So the concept of ownership can't be occurred.

Constructions are produced by human for satisfaction of his primary needs in social life, and also for realization of his good and benefit, or to prevent evil and lose.

These perceptions and knowledge aren't produced by external things, indeed it is human that produce them and he is inspired by internal feelings in this construction. “These internal feelings themselves are from active faculties and working systems in human kind. These practical sciences aren't produced from theoretical reason, they are granted to human by omnipotent God”. These concepts all are “imaginative and only are in mind and imagination, not in external world. What is present in external world is only human and its acts and its influence on external things and materials. Therefore the rules that are issued by practical reason for Allamah aren't objective and this is against theoretical reason that has real propositions.

Necessity and Generality in Kant and Tabataba'i

Kant maintained that human's cognition is from union of two faculties, understanding and sensation. Sensation receives sensible forms, and then the understanding faculty will be impressed after receiving the material of cognition and will be activated, so cognition may be occurred. For Kant there is a difference between theoretical cognition and experimental cognition. Experimental cognition has no necessity and generality, since experience

* Tabataba'i, Human from the Beginning to the End, p. 49.

† Tabataba'i, Human from the Beginning to the End, p. 51.

teaches us that a thing is in this or that way, but doesn't teach us that that thing isn't otherwise or isn't in this or that way.

There is relative and presumptive generality through induction only in experience. But non-experimental and theoretical cognition is a cognition that isn't based on experience and has generality and necessity.

Now if we have a proposition and axiom that no exception is within it, then it is non-experimental and has necessity and generality. Therefore, generality and necessity are criteria which demonstrate a proposition is non-experimental. Thus, in Kant, practical reason's propositions have necessity and generality, and take their generality from their non-experimental quality.

Kant believed that there is no generality and necessity in experience and sense; he said that necessity and generality haven't external existences so that to be obtainable by them.

But our mind has these concepts in a priori way. So necessity and generality of propositions in theoretical mathematics and theoretical empirical sciences, and essentially wherever there is a necessary and general axiom, is indebted to assignation of understanding's items. And necessity itself is one of these items.

Consequently, about necessity and generality in Kant's axioms, whether axioms of theoretical or practical reason, it can be said that generality and necessity of theoretical reason's axioms are obtained from mind, and practical reason's axioms have generality and necessity because they haven't empirical component.

About generality of law and conformity with human's acts it can be said summarily that Kant differentiated between "rule" and "principle". Rule is mental form of moral law in moral subject, and principle is general and objective aspect of moral code, for example, this saying that "I mustn't lie" is a rule and "lying is bad principally" is a law or general principle. Now one must will in a way he be able to express his willful rule as general law. Moral principle or moral law is respectable and binding and we must will and do in way that to be able to state our will as an absolute and general law, or to turn it into a general moral law. Kant called this transformation of moral rule into general law or principle as "absolute or categorical imperative".

The main question before Allamah is that why constructions must have authority and necessity. About authority, he used rational yardstick of spirituality and non-spirituality, this means that necessity of planning, preservation of system, forbiddance of disorder, necessity of respect to individual's rights, and so on, all return to social spirituality and non-spirituality. In this way human's reason understands these and decides that constructions have authority. So it seems that human and society have no need to canonical rules and religion because of constructions and relying on reason by human. But Allamah, while he pays his attention to constructions, maintained that human needed canonical rules or religion for social justice. In interpretation of a part of Baqarah sura, verse 213, said that basing upon self-interest, the exploitation of human by human is an existential element of human being, and this element leads to conflict in life. But there is another element in human, namely perfectionism and cooperation, which necessitates laws for human society. Law can originate from human, whether its materialistic or liberalist forms, or it may be from a divine source. In interpretation of above sura, Allamah said that history has demonstrated that human-originated laws have prevented wars and devastations, and also maybe in a reverse way have caused these.* This question may be suggested here that why human-originated laws can't prevent wars and destruction? Allamah's answer here is that although practical reason understands generalities, but sometimes some generalities about acts or some mean generalities such as veracity is good or mendacity is bad will be unknown to practical reason and it can't understand all general aspects of badness and correctness also all related details, so it brings many uncertainties for human understanding. Thus human must be relied on something not limited one which is omnipotent God, in this way human can release himself from reason's restrictions.

Tabataba'i and Kant have different view on necessity and generality in practical reason. Tabataba'i maintained that practical reason's rules take their necessity from God, but on the other side, Kant maintained that practical reason's rules take their necessity from self-based reason. About the relation of necessity in practical reason with necessity in theoretical reason in Kant it can be said that experimental propositions in theoretical reason aren't necessary and take their necessity from reason just like as practical reason which takes its necessity from reason.

In relation to necessity and generality of theoretical and practical reason In Tabataba'i we can say that according to him, we have to enact practical reason based on theoretical reason especially natural sciences. There is no hope that in the field of social constructions some terms or propositions to be produced so that they not to be assigned to truths in a way. Therefore in Tabataba'i, in contrary to Kant who takes necessity from reason, we observe that necessity and generality are taken from reason and external.

Justification in Practical Reason

* Tabataba'i, *Al-Mizan Interpretation*, Vol. 2, 116-132, 2000.

Human in itself for Kant is the end, because will in any person is the origin of moral law and strength of general moral laws. Ethical imperative is absolute and will -which is subordinate to moral imperative of moral law- isn't contingent to no condition and follows no tendency or prudence. Will only follows moral law that person is its enactor. So will only follows its law, therefore it can be said that: will is free and autonomous. This autonomous quality of will can be expressed in correct two ways in formulation of the categorical imperative. In this way, this principle will be established that never act according to any rule that can't be transformed into a general law consistently. And act always in a way that will to be able to consider itself such that it decides about and enacts general law by its rule.

For Kant, the supreme principle in ethics is "will's supremacy" and if we don't accept it, then we must exploit other methods to justify the foundations of ethics, method that were not accepted by Kant as sufficient ways. In this regard, Kant said: even we turn to God's will for justification and explanation of moral propositions, still there is this question that why we must act according to God's will. If we accept will's sovereignty, then the laws of will are originated in its essence, and sovereignty of will means its freedom. Kant didn't say that we must not obey God's will if it occurred, but at first we must know that it is a duty to obey God. Thus before obedience to God, however we as reasonable beings must enact laws. Therefore, "autonomous quality of moral will" is the supreme principle of his ethics.

The justifiers for (practical reason's) constructions are divided into metaphysical, environmental, social-cultural, and individual by Allamah. Metaphysical justifiers are divine and devilish ones, and geographic environmental parameters are related to workplace, living place, social-cultural issues, education, and political sociability, and individual justifiers are depended on individual mood:

- A) Mental problem is one of justifiers of construction which is different one by one.
- B) Internal feelings and moralities are very influential on people about following a specific kind of construction.
- C) Different geographical regions have different and high effects on constructions through region's natural specifications for example coldness and warmness.
- D) Development is an effective element in this regard in human life, because of increasing awareness, yesterday life isn't consistent with today requirements, and so about yesterday requirements with today life.

Allamah has different opinions about practical reason, therefore has different views about its justification. Sometimes for him in some of his works the justification is upon reason itself, and sometimes it is upon practical outcomes of practical reason's rules, and sometimes he attributed it to God. In contrary in Kant's practical reason, the justification is upon reason only and this is reason or will that will decide that which rule is right and wrong and which one must be obeyed.

About justification of theoretical reason and its relation to the justification in Kant's practical reason it must be said that justification in theoretical reason is provided by experiences and a priori rules of reason, but in practical reason it is only from reason itself, because there is no experimental origin for practical reason's rules. But about theoretical reason's rules in Allamah, he has a very close view to Kant's, because justification in these rules is from reason and experiences but in practical reason it is in a way from act and its results.

Eternity in Practical Reason

Allamah believed that one obtains beauty and ugliness concepts in three steps, and generalizes them to other issues:

At first step, person will be fascinated by seeing the beauties of others (nemely a good proportion and proper placement of sensation organs in related places) and regarded them as consistent with his state, and he extracts the concept of beauty from this consistency with his state and temperament. On the other hand, the concept of ugliness is derived by observation of disproportion among organs.

At second step, one generalizes these concepts to acts and constructional meanings –in terms of agreement and disagreement with society's intent (individual and social happiness for human kind); for example "justice" concept is a beauty because it is in agreement with human's happiness, and "oppression" is a bad and ugly concept because is in disagreement with human's happiness.

In this stage, both concepts are generalized over other events and real things which are in consistency with perfection and happiness and if these real things and events were consistent with individual and social happiness then the abstract concept of good will be derived otherwise the abstract concept of bad will be derived.

Here it is concluded that one after these steps called good what may lead human towards happiness and enjoyment of life and called as bad what are in reverse way. Therefore for human, justice, help to needy people, education, benevolence, and so on are good, but injustice, hostility and so on are bad. In this way, eternity of moral principles also can be justified, because if agreement or disagreement of acts with social intents (that is perfection

and happiness) to be eternal, then they are good or bad eternally; otherwise their quality will be unstable and changeable.

About human and its eternity Allamah proved that human is eternal in two ways, one about opinions which their opinions are similar to antecedents and the second is their acts. He believed that after resurrection the world with all of its requirements which bodies is one of them will turn into afterworld. He doesn't believe that bodies in resurrection time are obedience to soul. For him, after genesis of resurrection world and resurrectional bodies, human will be realized as a truth composed of body and soul in resurrectional world. Therefore soul, despite its difference against body, throughout this episode is in a way in unity with body according to their entities, and one's body in this episode is his worldly body and he is the same worldly person. For Allamah human's practice and act is live and eternal and although person distances from his previous acts after some time, but that is happened within its vessel in the world and has an effect that will not disappeared.

Allamah also believed that in addition to our act's appearance there is an essence for our act that this will be appeared in another episode. He maintained that human seemingly lives according to a conventional and constructional system, and because any constructional thing relies upon a formative and original thing which is its underneath, then human being according to the essence is placed in a natural and formative system.

Thus Allamah maintained that although human's acts are formed upon a constructional system, but these acts have a truth and their truths are in another world, and then all past acts are present and visible for him in resurrection and nobody has no doubt about his acts. He believed that it is impossible that a thing including human's act to be eliminated from the whole system.

About eternity of moral rules Kant believed that because ethics is based on the concept of human as a free being ... and isn't in need of another being supreme to human to know his duties and also isn't in need of another being except him and law to do his tasks. Then ethics never needs religion because of itself, rather it doesn't need religion thanks to practical reason. According to Kant ethics is based on "independence and autonomy of will", so it is obvious that except about things including emotions (fear, hope, authority), he negated natural and metaphysical issues about will, and this is the main cause that he didn't establish ethics upon religion. But because ethical laws force us to consider the supreme good as a bridge between virtue and happiness and as a definite postulate, that is to say through moral codes we are required to presume God and eternity; therefore ethics leads to religion inescapably.

Kant's philosophy of ethics is based upon freedom of will, this is why religion originated in ethics; this means that will is follower of the absolute, but this is will itself which is deviser of the absolute. Whoever thinks that ethics is based upon divine rules, thus follows the will of the other. And definitely he is convinced that belief in God who rewards for the good and punishes for the bad is a necessity thing for assurance about full obligation to moralities. Although emphasized on rational cognition of moral criteria and independence of moral obligations and their establishment on reason's and conscience's commands, but he demands belief in God for giving meaning to human's moral efforts.

Therefore, according to Kant, people need religion and God for cognition of moral duties, not for finding motives. They don't need religion for act to their duty; rather ethics is self-sufficient thanks to theoretical reason.

Eternity for Kant is "to regard God as general enactor of law, who must be respected, in our duties", but what is the meaning of respect for God? This means to obey the moral law and act aiming to discharge one's duties. Understanding of moral law is independent of religiosity, but believer one considers moral law as God's command. Therefore, in fact, in order to understand moral law or for obedience it isn't necessary to look at religion from viewpoint of law. Autonomy may be based on a thing other than reason. If we regard morality as loyalty to God's will, then we are encountering will as another religion, this means that if we consider ourselves as rewarder and punisher behind moral law, then we have followed the "prudence" rule, therefore fear of punishment or expected reward is our motive to obey moral law, so the moral value of our acts will be spoiled.

Therefore our practical reason and this theoretical practical reason is the only valid ground of religious belief and act. In this case, religious claims must be limited to those that are consistent with our moral argument in the limits of theoretical reason, even I must know what are my duties before that I accept them as divine commands. Kant argues that moral bindings in this sense are independent of religion and even God. Ethics' morality because of itself doesn't need religion at all, rather thanks to theoretical practical reason, it is self-sufficient. But since it is difficult to make tangible claims of moral bindings without God and His will, so based upon reason we can only accept that we have to be religious according a moral duty, it means that we consider our duties in a way so that they all are God's commands and we will do this for strengthening our moral intention and determination.

In regard to comparison between views of Kant and Allamah about eternity, we see that both have different opinions in this regard. Allamah relates it to God and otherworld, but in contrary Kant about eternity of moral rules maintained that it isn't an otherworldly thing, and it is only will and reason which justifies eternity of these rules.

The Gap between Theoretical Reason and Practical reason

Since reasonable self wants to obtain perfection, so it is an inherent trait for theoretical wisdom to pay its attention to the depth of truths, and reasonable self also in practical wisdom tries to reach objective and practical perfection. Genuine understandings are desirable for human directly and because of these sciences.

For Allamah this is the kind of our view of and our demand from understanding, and our approach to external object that can determine what is the kind of wisdom for us, theoretical or practical. Thus some sciences are desirable merely because of themselves and exploration of truth is for truth itself. In this case, inherent effects and benefits of these sciences are scientific ones, and their practical effects and benefits are secondary and borrowed ones not inherent. Of course there is some knowledge that may be desirable only for their practical usages and scientific effects about them aren't considered by mind, for example ethics and art and politics, but theoretical sciences that were mentioned in first group although have firstly some scientific effects and benefits inherently and for affirmation, what is desirable about them is truth itself, but when affirmation and realization is considered such sciences (practical and not rationally) dismiss theoretical cognitions and pursuit scientific benefits totally.

For Allamah the relation between theoretical reason and practical reason is that theoretical reason concerns about understanding of things which are certain and fixed or in the other words they are existed eternally and may not be changed through time and place changes. But the knowledge of practical reason is unstable, transformable, and relative.

According to this explanation, reason has two kinds of understanding: 1) First one is certain and firm and leads to an absolute judgment by person, for example knowledge of God, and also sciences such as geometry and mathematics. 2) Second one is an understanding that is related to devise acts and their realization in external world. In this case, understanding is a function of findings from outside of mind, some findings that understanding may be under transformation and reconstruction through their change, although it can be said that in second case also any object of understanding may be stable in a proper limits with attention to its operational and realization conditions. For example, giving money to a beggar who is needier is always good and a virtue.

For Kant, generally, moral must and must not are constructional sciences, and in answer to the question that what is the relation between constructional sciences and real and theoretical sciences including empirical or philosophical ones he negated any relation between them. Allamah here is in agreement with some Britain philosophers such as More and Hume about this matter that rationally we can't inference musts from "what is-s".

Kant also started from theoretical field, but when he saw that this field leads to a closed way and deadlock and he couldn't progress in his thought school properly, and then he entered ethics and practical wisdom field. Kant maintained that there are some points in theoretical reason that he can't resolve problems. In the field of theoretical reason Kant wanted to explain the world and to reject empirical theory of some antecedent philosophers such as Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, and then to prove this matter that in encountering external world, not only world is presented to us, but also we understand it. This means that if there is no human, then it is unknown what will happen to the world? In contrary to what empiricists say that external world impacts on us and our mind actually isn't an image of the external world that is represented to us, rather we understand it. Kant expanded his opinion. For example he said that when we look at a rose, its beauty is from where? Whether it is from itself or I am to see this beauty in it? Kant unlike antecedent philosophers said that this is me that am beautiful and I see beautifully. When he said this and attributed all to himself, then he declared that there is no external world but I don't know essentially that this world is the world in whose view? I don't know if I weren't human, whether there is a world in itself or not? In other words, he turns the world into a phenomenon. We can consider it and the world is unknown for us inherently, and what we grasp in external world are phenomena that we take from external world.

Thus there are things that we can consider them in theoretical reason. Therefore we go to practical reason. Kant regarded a wide field for practical reason. Moralists before Kant were empiricists who came to this view that what we realize from external world, behaviors, and characters and so on all are represented to us as constructional. Kant didn't want to accept this. Since that wasn't in agreement with his school fundamentally. Also according to his promise he intended to rationalize Christianity and church. Previous constructional ethics wasn't understandable for him and he couldn't accept it. In his ethical school, Kant claimed to rational explanation and he wanted to understand what the relation of religion to ethics is.

Through dividing reason into theoretical and practical, Kant maintained that theoretical reason, because of its concepts and categories that are effective only in experience realm, is incapable totally to prove and to negate metaphysical things, so it can be said he is an agnostic in the field of theoretical reason. He maintained that human can't prove or negate God's existence and his traits and also of self and any other non-empirical things. Human nor can introduce a proof about the existence or non-existence of them because existence or inexistence are understanding items that only are effective in experience realm. If theoretical reason attributes its concepts, for example existence and inexistence, to non-empirical things, then it entangled in mistake; but about practical reason

he believed that it can prove the existence of God and of self and of eternity, also he wrote a book entitled "Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone". In this book he stated that there is full coordination between practical reason and religion.

The Effect of Theoretical Reason on Practical Reason

To understand Kant's ethics philosophy, separating it from his thought system leads to misunderstanding of Kant. In first critique, Kant asks about possibility of understanding the problems of mathematics, physics, and metaphysics, and finally concludes that: because of a priori synthetic propositions in mathematics and physics, their cognition is possible. But the cognition of metaphysical propositions through theoretical reason is impossible, because these propositions aren't a priori and synthetic. So it may be mentioned that Kant in his first critique seeks a priori synthetic propositions and the specification of cognition's concern is that they are a priori. This matter is followed in his second critique, namely *The Critique of Practical Reason*.

Kant's predecessors mainly believed that ethical question must be initiated from ethical definition that consequently the concept of moral law and binding can be derived from it, but Kant disagreed with this view. He regarded predecessors' approach as the source for all confusions about transcendental principle of ethics, because they were seeking a will's concern to produce it in an article from a law.

Instead they must look at a law that directly determined will in a priori way and then must went to seek a proper concern for it. The primary duty of a philosopher of ethics for Kant must be that he separates a priori elements in ethical knowledge and demonstrates their origins. In this sense we can say that philosopher of ethics asks that how are a priori synthetic propositions possible in ethics?

Kant discusses antecedence of practical reason over theoretical reason. This antecedence in Kant's thought has two meanings, first one is rational antecedence of ethics or practical reason over metaphysics or theoretical reason, and second one is value antecedence of practical reason over theoretical reason. The antecedence of practical reason over theoretical reason means that there is no ethics within metaphysics. This made a great crisis among philosophers, because this Kant's opinion opened the way for him to induce metaphysics in ethics. The main discussion is that what the meaning of antecedence of practical reason is and what is its relation to transcendental idealism. The antecedence of practical reason means that ethics is genuine, and it is a reason that formulates the theory of ethics and issues moral rules upon it, or in fact issues rules about what "we must do". In the discussion of antecedence of practical reason over theoretical reason, in terms of rational, Kant believed that ethics doesn't debt to metaphysics, rather it is metaphysics that joins the ethics, and strength of metaphysics is from ethics.

But Allamah Tabataba'i, regarding two realms for the understandable, maintained that there are two reasons for human: practical reason and theoretical reason. Practical reason judges about human's behaviors and that whether they are good or evil, and beneficial or harmful; and theoretical reason judges about the truth of things, objects, their existence and inexistence and their inherent qualities, no matter they are within circle of human behavior or not. Therefore in the view of Allamah, in contrary to Kant, these two fields – theoretical and practical reasons- are totally independent, while in Kant we noticed that theoretical reason somehow is effective in involvement of practical reason in cognition of ethics; since in fact it is the restriction of theoretical reason that places practical reason on this way.

There is no doubt that, in Allamah, ethical purification and sublimation in practical reason affect on theoretical reason, so according to Allamah if we wanted to leave free reason in thinking, arguing, and inference, then we must supervise our good and bad desires and emotions. If greed rules over us, if hostility, prejudice and spite subjugated us, if we were jealous and revengeful and these fires were blazing in us, we must know that this fire will destroy our existence, health, calmness and our organs as its fuel, and produce dark smokes which make our spirit gloomy, therefore our reason will be blind.

So as theoretical reason is the guider of practical reason, also human sublimity in practical reason brings brightness and serenity and strength to theoretical reason. In other words, these two sides of reason have mutual effect on each other.

Conclusion

One of important differences between Kant and Allamah Tabataba'i, in relation to the issue of theoretical and practical reasons, is about the essence of this faculty, reason. Kant maintained that we have only one faculty that is divided into two because of its function; in fact if reason's function is about "what is-s" then it is theoretical reason, and if it concerns about musts and must nots, then we encounter practical reason. But Allamah and Kant are in agreement about the function of practical reason –cognition moral issues and life's musts and must nots- and also about the function of theoretical reason- cognition of "what is-s". But the difference between these thinkers is that

according to Allamah there are two independent faculties for human, and these two different reasons are existed independently with independent functions.

Another difference between these two philosophers is about the necessity of the rules of practical reason. For Kant, the rules of practical reason have necessity and are true for any person in any time and any world, and actually their justifications come from their necessity. But according to Allamah the rules of theoretical reason originated in constructions and these are mental things for Allamah which human constructed for its interests, therefore these rules are relative.

Beside these differences, there are similarities between both philosophers about theoretical and practical reasons. Both maintained that practical reason's decisions came from reason itself and without any relation to external world and therefore they need theoretical reason for their justifications, also both take the hand of theoretical reason away from practical reason, and they believed that theoretical reason doesn't interfere in practical reason and in justifications and necessity of practical reason's decisions.

REFERENCES

- 1- Avicenna, Abo Ali Hossein bin Abdollah, *Al-Isharat va Tanbihat*, Vol. 2; by Shahabi, Mahmood; Tehran University, 1960.
- 2- Meskoyeh, Abo-Ali, *Tahzib Al-Akhlagh*, Sharh Taharah Al-Iraq, Isfahan University, Isfahan, 1949.
- 3- Ahmadi, Babak, *Truth and Beauty*, Nashr-e-Markaz Publication, Tehran, 1996.
- 4- Aristotle, *On the Soul*, Trans. By Davoodi, Alimorad, Hekmat Publication, 2000.
- 5- Al-As'ad, Abdollah, *Doros fi Elm Al-Nafs Al-Falsafi*, Imam Al-javad Institute, Beirut, 2011.
- 6- Scruton, Roger, *Kant*, Trans. By Paya, Ali, Tarh-e-Now Publication, 1998.
- 7- Islami, Hassan; *Tabataba'i and Defending Reason*, Religious Researches Magazine (Quranic and Hadith Sciences), No. 11.
- 8- Esfehani, Sheikh Mohammad Hossein; *Nahayah Al-Derayah fi Sharh Al-Kafayah*, Al-Maktabah Al-Tabataba'i Publication, Vol. 2.
- 9- Eftekhari, Mehdi; *The Place of Reason and Emotion in Allamah Tabataba'i's Opinions*, Qum University, Qum, 2012.
- 10- Omid, Masood; *Philosophical Inquiries in the Personality of Imam Ali and a Contemplation on the Horizons of Tabataba'i's Thought*, Tabriz Medical University Publication, Tabriz, 2000.
- 11- Bruce, Aune; *Kant's Theory of Morals*, Trans. By Al-Boyeh Alirezza; Boostan-e-kebab Publication, Qum, 2002.
- 12- Ilkhani, Mohammad; *Boethius's Metaphysic*, Elham Publication, Tehran, 2001.
- 13- Ilkhani, mohammad; *The History of Philosophy in Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Samt Publication, Tehran, 2014.
- 14- Bahmanyar bin Marzaban, *Al-Tahsil*, By Motahari, Morteza, Tehran University Publication, Tehran, 1996.
- 15- Palmer, Michael; *Moral Problems*, Trans. By Al-Boyeh, Alireza; Islamic Culture and Sciences Research Center, Qum, 2007.
- 16- Ja'fari, Mohammad Taghi; *Beauty and Art in Islam*, Institute of Allamah Ja'fari's Works, Tehran, 2006.
- 17- Javadi Amoli, Abdollah; *Pure and Practical Wisdom in Nahj Al-Balaghah*, Asra' Publication, Qum, 1992.
- 18- Javadi Amoli, Abdollah; *Ethics' Foundations in Quran*, Asra' Publication, Qum, 2000.
- 19- Javadi, Mohsen; *Eternity of Moral Principles and Constructions Theory*, Ma'refat Quarterly, No. 15, 2009.
- 20- Javadi, Mohsen; *The Question of Must and Is*, Islamic Propagation Publication, Qum, 1996.
- 21- Moore, George Edward; *Principia Ethica*, Trans. By Tavakoli and Askari yazdi, Ali; Samt Publication, Tehran, 2009.
- 22- Johari, isma'il Hemad; *Taj Al-Loghah va Sahah Al-Arabiyah*, Vol. 5, Dar Al-Elm Al-Malayin, Beirut, 1985.
- 23- Ha'eri Yazdi, Mehdi; *Inquiries of Practical Reason*, Iranian Wisdom and Philosophy Research Institute, Tehran, 2005.
- 24- Hosseinzadeh, Mohammad; *The sources of Knowledge: An Investigation on Epistemology*, Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Center, Qum, 2009.
- 25- Deleuze, Gilles; *Kant's Critical Philosophy: The Doctrine of the Faculties*, Trans. By Va'ez, Ali; Nashr-e-Ney Publication, Tehran, 2007.
- 26- Ross, W. David; *A Commentary on Kant's Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*, Trans. By Kamalinejad, Mohammad Hossein; Hekmat Publication, Tehran, 2007.

- 27- Ramazani, Reza; The Moral Opinions of Tabataba'i, Islamic Thought and Culture Research Center, Tehran, 1999.
- 28- Zibakalam, Fatemeh; The Current of Philosophical Thought in Western World, Tehran University Publication, Tehran, 2006.
- 29- Sullivan, Roger, Kant's Ethics, Trans. By Fooladvand, Ezat-Allah; Tarh-e-Now Publication, Tehran, 2001.
- 30- Sabzevari, Molla Haddi; An Commentary on Monzooemeh Hekmat Phalsapheh, Dar Al-Elm Publication, Tehran, 1996.
- 31- Shahrzoori, Mohammad; Rasa'el Shajarah Al-Elahiyah fi Al-Oloom Al-Haghayegh Al-Rabaniyah, research and correction by Habibi, Najafgholi; Iranian Wisdom and Philosophy Institute, 2004.
- 32- Shirzai, Seied Razi; The Lessons from Sabzevari's Sharh Manzooemeh, Hekmat Publication, Tehran, 2004.
- 33- Shirzai, Sadr Al-Din Mohammad; Al-hekmah Al-Mota'aliyah fi Al-Asfar Al-Aghliyah Al-Arba'ah, Dar Al-Ehya Al-Torath, Beirut, 1987.
- 34- Sane'i Dareh Bidi; Manoochehr; The Philosophy of Ethics and Behavior Foundation, Soroosh Publication, Tehran, 1998.
- 35- Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; Al-Mizan fi Tafsir Al-Quran, Vols. 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16, 17; Al-A'lami Al-Matbo'at Publication, 1985.
- 36- Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; The Principles of Philosophy and Realism, footnotes by Motahari, Morteza; Sadra Publication, Tehran.
- 37- Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; Rasa'el Sab'ah va Hekmat, Nashr-e-Ketab, Tehran, 2004.
- 38- Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; Social Relations in Islam, Trans. By Hojati kermani, Mohammad Javad; Boostan Ketab Publication, Qum, 2008.
- 39- Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; Nahayah Al-Hekmah, Trans. By Tadayon, Mehdi; Boostan Hekmat, Qum, 2008.
- 40- Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; Hhuman from the Beginning to the End, Trans. By Larijani, Sadegh; Tehran, 2010.
- 41- Tabataba'i, Mohammad Hossein; The Manner of Mysticism, Ishraq Outlook, Ishraq Ketabsara, Qum, 2003.
- 42- Toosi, Khajeh Nasir Al-Din Mohammad bin Mohammad, A Commentary on Isharat and Tanbihat, Nashr-e-Ketab, Tehran, 1964.
- 43- Ghazali, Abo Hamed; Maghased Al-Falsafeh, Trans. By Khaza'eli, Mohammad; Jami Publication, Tehran, 2012.
- 44- Ghazali, Abo Hamed; Mizan Al-'Amal, commentary by Ali bo Molhem; Dar Al-Maktabah Al-Hilal, Beirut, 1995.
- 45- Farabi, Abo Nasr Mohammad bin Mohammad; Fosool Montaza'ah, research by Fozi Metri Najar; Al-Zahra Publication, Qum, 1983.
- 46- Fakhr Razi, Mohammad bin Omar; Mabahees Al-Mashreqiyah fi Elm Al-Elahiyat va Al-Tabi'iat, Bidar Publication, Qum, 1989.
- 47- Firoozjani, Ramezan; rationality for Allamah Tabataba'i, Mind Quarterly, No. 17, 2008.
- 48- Copleston, Fredrick; A History of Philosophy, Trans. By Bozrogmehr, manoochehr, and Sa'adat, Isma'el; Scientific Cultural Publication, 1996.
- 49- Kant, Immanuel; The Metaphysics of Ethics, Trans. By Enayat, Hamid, and Ghasiri, Ali; Kharazmi Publication, Tehran, 1990.
- 50- Kant, Immanuel; The Lectures of Moral Philosophy, Trans. By Sane'i Dareh Bidi, Manoochehr; Naghsh Negar Publication, Tehran, 1999.
- 51- Kant, Immanuel; Critique of Judgment, Trans. By Rashidian, Abdolkarim; Nashr-e-Ney Publication, 1998.
- 52- Kant, Immanuel; *A New Elucidation of the First Principles of Metaphysical Cognition*, Trans. By Hadad Adel, Gholamali; Collegiate Publication, Tehran, 1988.
- 53- Korner, stephan; Kant, Trans. By Fooladvand, Ezat Allah; Kharzami Publication, Tehran, 2001.
- 54- Kresgard, Christian; The Source of Value for Kant and Aristotle, Arghanon Quarterly, No. 16, 2000.
- 55- Guthrie, W. K. C., A History of Greek Philosophy, Vol. 8, Scientific Cultural Publication, Tehran, 1998.
- 56- Gordon, Graham; Philosophy of Arts, Trans. By Olia, Masood; Ghoghnoos Publication, Tehran, 2004.
- 57- Lahiji, Abdolrazagh bin Ali; The Jewelry of Wish (Gohar-e-Morad), Research by Imam Sadegh Institute, Sayeh Publication, Tehran, 2004.
- 58- Levin, Philosophy or Search for Truth, Trans. By Mojtabavi, Jalal Al-Din; Javidan Publication, Tehran, 1972.
- 59- Aristotle, Metaphysics, Trans. By Khorasani, Sharaf Al-Din; Goftar Publication, Tehran, 1988.
- 60- Mojtahedi, Karim; Critical Philosophy of Kant, Amir Kabir Publication, Tehran, 1999.

- 61- Mohammad Reza'i, Mohammad; Ethics and Philosophy of Ethics for Kant, Nameh Mofid Magazine, 2009.
- 62- Mohammad Reza'i, Mohammad; Explanation and Criticism of Kant's Philosophy of Ethics, Islamic Propagation Center, Qum, 2000.
- 63- Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi; Philosophy of Ethics, by Sharifi, Ahmad Hossein; International Publication, Tehran, 2012.
- 64- Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi; Criticism and Examination of Moral Schools, Imam Khomeini Research Educational Center, Qum, 2003.
- 65- Motahari, Morteza; A Criticism on Marxism, Sadra Publication, Tehran, 1995.
- 66- Mozafar, Mohammadreza; Fiqh Principles, Trans. By Gharavian, Mohsen; Dar Al-Fekr, Qum, 2012.
- 67- Molla Sadra, Al-Hikmah Al-Mota'aliyah fi Al-Asfar Al-Arba'ah, Dar Al-Ehya' Al-Torath, Beirut, 1997.
- 68- Mamadpoor, Mohammad; An Introduction to Thinkers' Views of Art, Mehr Publication, Tehran, 2004.
- 69- Nasir Al-Din Toosi, Mohammad bin Mohammad; Sharh Al-Isharat va Al-Tanbihat, research by Hasanzadeh Amoli, Boostan Ketab Publication, 2004.
- 70- Naghbzadeh, Mir Abdolhossein; Awakening from Dogmatism Sleep, Agah Publication, Tehran, 1985.
- 71- Vojdani, Fatemeh, and others; An Analysis of the Gap between Opinion and Moral Act in Allamah, Ethics Quarterly, No. 18, 2004.
- 72- Sabzevari, Hadi; Sharh Manzomeh, Boostan Ketab Publication, Tehran, 1996.
- 73- Hartnack, Justus; Kant's Theory of Knowledge, Trans. By Hadad Adel, Gholamali; Fekr-e-Rooz Publication, Tehran, 1997.
- 74- Hooshangi, Hosein; Theory of Constructional Perceptions and Addend Philosophies, Contemporary Wisdom Magazine, No. 2, 2011.
- 75- Coplestone, Fredrick; A History of Philosophy, Trans. By Sa'adat, Isma'il, and Bozorgmehr, Manoochehr; Scientific and Cultural Publication and Soroosh Publication, Tehran, 1996.
- 76- Jaspers, Karl; Kant, Trans. By Naghibzadeh, Tahoori Publication, Tehran, 1991.
- 77- Yazdani Moghadam, Ahmad Reza; Anthropology and its Consequences in Tabataba'i's Political Thought, Islamic Culture and Sciences Research Center, Qum, 2012.
- 78- Yoseph, karam; Kant's Critical Philosophy, Trans. By Mohammad Reza'i, Mohammad; Islamic Research Center, Qum.

English Resources:

1. Beck, L. w.(1960). A commentary on kant's critique of practical Reason, chicago, the university of chicago press.
2. Campbell, Stephan R(2002). Constructivism and the Limits of reason. Studies in philosophy and education 21, Kluwer.
3. Caygill, Haward(2000). A Kant Dictionary. Blacwell.
4. Caygill, Haward(2000). A Kant Dictionary. Blacwell.
5. H. J. Paton (1947). Categorical Imperative: A Study in Kant's Moral Philosophy, London.
6. Kant, Immanuel (1785 [1964]), Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, trans. by Paton, H., New York: Harpan & Row.
7. Kant, Immanuel (2002). Critique of Practical reason. Trans by Werner S. Pluhar, Introduction by Stephen Engstrom; Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
8. _____(1996). The Cambridge Edition of the works of Immanuel Kant, America, Cambridge university press
9. _____(1996). Practical philosophy. Translated and edited by Mary J. Gregor, Cambridge University Press
10. _____(1999). Critique of Reason, trans, by Norman Kemp Smith, New York, Macmillan
11. Kempt Smith, Norman(2003). A Companion to Kant's Critique of theoretical Reason. Palgarave Macmillan.
12. O'Neil, Onora (1998), "Practical Reason and Ethics", Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
13. Oneill, Onora(2000). "Kantian Ethics", in: A Companion to ethics, ED. By Peter Singer, Blackwell Publishing.
14. paton, H.J, the categorical Imperative, london, huthinson's university paton, H.J, the categorical Imperative, london, huthinson's university Powell, Brian K. (2006), "Kant and Kantians on "the Normative Question"", in Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, Vol. 9, No. 5.